R-5927 CP1 & CP2 Meeting-20260610_100037-Meeting Recording

June 10, 2026, 2:00PM

1h 16m 35s

Headrick, Hannah S started transcription

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

Thank you all for joining us this morning.
927 CP1 and CP2 merger meeting. I'll start off with introductions and then I'll compare it to the private team. I'll start in the room. I'm Morgan Weatherford with the Environmental Policy Unit at NCDOT.
I'm on Isabel Neary. I just started out with DRMP as a plan.
I'm Jay McInnes with DRMP. I'm helping Division A with this project.
Morgan A Division A project team lead.
Jason Bilday, DOT, Environmental Coordination and permit.
Ripticola with Mead and Hunt, Roadway Design Lead.
Jeffrey Tig, the Vision 8 Project Development Engineer. Sean Blanchard, Megan Hunt, Project Manager.
Matthew Potter with Pine Cone Transportation Project Development Engineer. Hi, I am Gary Jordan with the US Fish and Wildlife Service on the Raleigh Field Office.
Scott, just in time. Scott Jones with US Army Corps of Engineers. Thank you. We'll go through the folks online. I'll tell you your name.
Um...
All right.
You might need to try to set up your additional.

JJ **Jamison, John** 1:32

Hey, sorry, was that me? John Jamison, DOT Environmental Policy.

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

Yeah.
Thanks, John. Rex Padgett, Division A Bund.

Cao, Luan T 1:46
on Gas State Historic Preservation Office.

Headrick, Hannah S 1:50
That's here, Renee.

Gledhill-earley, Renee 1:53
Renee Gladhill Early, State Historic Preservation Office.

Headrick, Hannah S 1:57
Bait.

Hardin, Faith 2:01
Sorry, was was that faith?

Headrick, Hannah S 2:03
Yes, alright.

Hardin, Faith 2:05
No, you're good. You're good. This is Faith Harden from the 401 group. I'm here supporting Chris Sheldon, who will be the reviewer on this project.

Headrick, Hannah S 2:14
Thank you, thanks, uh, Katie.

Harville, Katie E 2:19
Katie Harville and CDOT Environmental Policy Unit.

Headrick, Hannah S 2:23
Did you hear us all right, Katie? Is it do we need to turn off the microphone?

Harville, Katie E 2:27
No, as long as you're speaking clearly toward the microphone, it's fine.

Headrick, Hannah S 2:32
Okay, bye.
Ahmad.
Yeah.

Ighwair, Ahmad A 2:38
Amadegware Structure Management Unit.

Headrick, Hannah S 2:44
Barisa.

Sarzaeim, Parisa 2:47
Paris exercising with DWR.

Headrick, Hannah S 2:52
Hi, Chris.
I.

Sheldon, Chris J 2:54
with DWR and 401 permitting.

Headrick, Hannah S 2:58
Siobhan.

Siobhan Gordon 3:00
Good morning, Siobhan Gordon with Mead and Hunt Environmental.

Headrick, Hannah S 3:06
Almanetta.

Somerville, Amanetta 3:07
I'm Aneta Somerville with EPA Region 4.

Headrick, Hannah S 3:11

Mark.
Staley.

Staley, Mark K 3:15
Mark Staley, NCDOT, Roadside Environmental Unit.

Headrick, Hannah S 3:20
And Steve Brotherton.

Steve B Corps 3:22
Good morning, everyone. This is Steve Bromagen, Corps of Engineers.

Headrick, Hannah S 3:28
Uh, Veronica.

Veronica Miller 3:31
Hi, Veronica Miller, Natural Resources Lead for Mean and Hunt.

Headrick, Hannah S 3:36
And Travis.

Wilson, Travis W. 3:38
Travis Wilson, North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission.

Headrick, Hannah S 3:43
Thank you, Travis, and thank you, everyone. Before we get started,
Fails.
Oh, John is asking in the chat, could we clarify the roles of Meet, Hunt, Pinebone, and ERMP?
I guess just doing what? Me and Hunt's the prime consultant for Division Eight.
We're leading roadway design, project management, natural systems, and pine cones ourselves leading the merger planning environmental documentation.
And DRMP Jay McGann is a, he helps us in our office, do project management work and all. He works as the GSC. And so he's helping us out with this project.

All right. Do we have, Steve, do you have any opener remarks before we hand it over to the project team?

Steve B Corps 4:53
No, no, I really don't have any opening comments other than welcoming everybody together and ready to get this going. So I'll kick it back to you.

Headrick, Hannah S 5:04
All right, thanks, Steve. And with that, I'll hand it over to Matthew. All right, let me get my screen shared very quick. Run through a...
Little presentation, really just meant to walk us through the packet that hopefully everybody's received and had a chance to review before the meeting. But
It's a lot to cover, so feel free to stop me at any point if anybody has questions as we go through this. But intends to kind of just kind of give an overview of the project, project area, and then we'll get into the plans for moving forward.
So the project is the widening of 15501 to a multi-lane facility down in Pinehurst. This project connects just north of the 15501
To N.C. 211 Traffic Circle there in Pinehurst.
The.
The main reason for this is to address capacity limitations on the corridor and safety issues. The project's approximately 3.7 miles. Southern terminus is, again, just north of the traffic circle and extends N to the intersection with NC 73.
The project is identified in the STIP as project R5927 and it aligns with the Moore County CTP as well. It is listed there as Highway Proposal 6. It also lives in listed
Key contacts here. I will note that this is a little date. I guess Ryan Kinchilla has left DWR. So we will update the merger plan with

Hardin, Faith 7:08
Yes, so Chris Sheldon will be the point of contact within DWR for this project.

Headrick, Hannah S 7:15
OK.
Good.
So here's just an overview of the funding for the project and a rough schedule for the milestones coming up throughout the next few months and years. This project is fully

federal or state funded, so we have no federal funds.
Is.
We see here a total estimated cost currently is 53.3 million. Just a rough schedule. We are on a fairly tight timeline to try to keep the project schedule. But after today's meeting, we hope to move forward with a public
meeting sometime in the August, September time frame with our next merger meeting scheduled for October, hopefully October, November.
There we go.
Thank you.
Sorry.
Okay, so some of the most notable adjacent STIP projects, there were several listed in the actual handout, but the one that probably ties most closely to our project is the Union 5976.
project, which is improvements to the Pinehurst traffic circle itself, as well as upgrading the approaches to that traffic circle. It's roughly on the same timeline and schedule as our project.
And it's most notably important here because NCDOT intends to construct these projects together, mainly due to the complexity of the work zone traffic control and being able to construct the projects under traffic operations.
Um, so...
existing conditions for the US 15501 widening projects basically broken into three sections. The southern section of this project is more notably developed closer to an urban type of setting.
So it makes sense that southern portion from the traffic circle up to Spring Lake Road is a basically a combination of undivided 4 lane typical sections. And then there's some undivided 2 lane with turning
lanes and things like that in each intersection. So this is basically just a view of the corridor from the traffic circle that I pulled from Google Earth, showing kind of how that section is a combination of two or three different typical sections there.
Then in the central section of the project, we get into a short section. It all fits right here on this screen. But basically from Spring Lake Road to Jennifer Lake Road, we have a three lane section with a center to a
left turn lane, and then turn lanes at those specific intersections as well. So that is a very short section. It ends right there at the top of the photo.
And then as we go further north, the project becomes a little bit more of a rural feel

to it with driveways and connections being a little bit more spread out. But from Juniper Lake Road going north to the northern termini at NC 73.
believe it is, it becomes an undivided two-lane section with two-foot paved shoulders. So there are small sections where, you know, there have been turn lanes added to help with some of the traffic issues. But for the most part, the corridor Looks like what you see at the top of the photo here, where it's just a two-lane undivided facility.
Okay, so just to go over, I will note this project is a little bit further along in the project development phase than we would typically be at during a CP1, CP2 meeting. Part of that's due to just the age of the project.
I believe we've had some delays waiting for traffic forecast and models to potentially be updated. But the project had a preliminary study already developed back when we did the screening, worker screening for this project.
And we have moved forward with, you know, doing all of the survey work for natural environment and cultural resources in the area based on that initial study area. So we do have delineated wetlands and streams and things like that for
a study area at this point, which we typically wouldn't have at this point. So I just wanted to throw that out there to note that the resources noted here have been verified and as being in that original study area. Do you have surveys for red-clockaded woodpeckers?
Yep.
I do not believe those have been completed yet.

SG **Siobhan Gordon** 13:34
We've completed the surveys within the study area. We have not done them within the half mile buffer.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 13:34
It's.
OK.
So the field survey is verified. There's 20 streams and 20 wetlands were found within the study area, 5 open surface waters as well.
There's no designated zones. There are high quality waters.
In the nearby Little River, that is also listed as currently impaired, so...
There is also one historic bridge, bridge number 185, which carries the Leo Road over

Nix Creek. It was determined eligible for the National Register back in 2005 as part of NCDOT's.
statewide structure survey.
And oops.
And archaeological surveys have been completed and no eligible or listed sites were found present within the area of potential effect. And just so we're all clear, let me jump.
out of that presentation. And I kind of show where the location of that bridge is. So we have the traffic circle here on the southern portion of the project. And the historic bridge is kind of in the central portion, central to northern portion of the project.
But here is.
Leo Road, and you can see the bridge right here, fairly close to the existing alignment of 15501 through this area.
Exactly.
Okay, so...
The identified needs primarily focus around the traffic capacity and the future demand for this corridor.
We did utilize the highway capacity software for two lane analysis to determine the existing operations of the corridor. Currently, current performance as of 2024, there are major segments that operate at capacity.
which is level of service E. And the traffic flow in this area is very much based on peak hour movements for people going to or coming home from work. So the main movements in the morning would be your southbound traffic coming into Pinehurst. And then in the afternoons, it reverses with the northbound becoming that peak hour traffic.
Future demand.
So.
Based off of future demand, the studies show that the corridor will continue to degrade or traffic operations along the corridor will continue to degrade. And that ultimately results with 102 hours of delay.
in the AM peak hour, for example, and 91 hours of delay in the PM, with virtually all 5501 within the project limits, degrading to levels of service E and F or further degrades to ER.
Renee, I see you have your hand up.

Gledhill-earley, Renee 17:44
Yeah, so is that explaining, because when we got the merger packet, it shows only like 2000, an increase of 2000 a day, 2000 trip usage. So is it the hours that are driving the increase
the reason for it or as it doesn't look like that the real numbers are that much higher.

Headrick, Hannah S 18:11
Well, the existing corridor is already.
Very much at capacity, so that the...
The delays, those are...
I don't know that I have the existing delay numbers in this pack or in the presentation, but those are for the future delays. But essentially, you know, the corridor is already handling more traffic than it truly can. So
The additional traffic in the future just makes the level of E. a slightly worse level of E. or goes into a level of F.
And the next table kind of shows where, so this is just for an example, this is the northbound direction. The packet also had the southbound direction in it as well. But you'll note that, again, on the northbound direction, it's the
The.
PM peak hour for the northbound traffic is the worst. And so you see certain sections are already at level of service E, with others being level of service D. And then in the future, those all become level of service E. So it's already
fairly congested out there and then, you know, just a little bit more traffic. And in some sections, it shows more traffic growth than others, but, and I will note that the traffic that is in the packet is for baseline of what is out there existing. So that is no build traffic and traffic forecasts are a little weird that, you know, if you do a forecast for, let's say, a four lane
improvement, is going to show much more traffic utilizing that four lane improvement. So the baseline of no build is going to always show you the least amount of additional traffic on the corridor versus once you start looking at your build alternatives,
those numbers tend to increase quite a bit because you're pulling traffic off of other connected roadways, if that makes sense. And I don't know if I answered your question, but.

Gledhill-earley, Renee 20:47
Hi.
Well, I think you did. I just sort of wonder why if the morning peak hours are B's and C's, how everybody leaves at the same time to go home but not to come into work. It's interesting. Thank you.

Headrick, Hannah S 21:06
Oh.
So this is just showing the northbound direction. In the packet, there's a completely separate table that shows the southbound. I just didn't include them both in the presentation because it would be hard to read and it or it would take up two slides. So the southbound table shows the exact opposite of this.

Gledhill-earley, Renee 21:12
Of.

Headrick, Hannah S 21:28
where all of the red is in the AM peak hour and it shows the PM being fine.

Gledhill-earley, Renee 21:37
Thank you.

Headrick, Hannah S 21:39
Up.
So beyond just the capacity needs of the corridor, there are a few kind of secondary identified needs that we know from a safety perspective. There is a fairly high crash rate out here.
We updated the...
crash analysis back in December of 2025. And it's showing during the time period between January 2021 and December 2025, there were a total of 198 crashes along the corridor. And it revealed an elevated pattern of rear end collisions, which is fairly typical for, you know, a two lane corridor where you had a lot of stopping movements, people waiting to make left turns or even slowing down to turn into their driveways and things. The overall crash rate is above the statewide average for

comparable
US routes with our project being 248.12 crashes per 100 million vehicle miles traveled versus 112.24 for the statewide average.
And specific to types of crashes, total crash rate, fatal crash rate, non-fatal injury crashes, wet weather, and nighttime crash rates all exceeded the statewide averages. Um...
And then, as I...
The crashes did include one fatal crash, which that tends to push up the severity index, but the severity index is still, you know, right around the statewide average for rural US routes at 5.46 versus 5.47.
And then the other identified needs are centered around, you know, just the system linkage. US 1551 is a principal arterial that facilitates regional movement throughout central North Carolina. You know, this connects Pinehurst up to
Carthage or this specific portion of the corridor does. So just from a regional connectivity standpoint, and 15501 South of the traffic circle has already been widened and sees
fairly significant amounts of traffic on that section. So this is just kind of a continuation of that corridor and making improvements as it heads further north.
And then how it ties to the traffic circle project, you know, it currently, you have a Fairly high.
operational traffic circle out there where you're trying to push a lot of traffic through this, and then you come out of that multi-lane traffic circle and you fairly quickly diverge down from a four-lane roadway to three lanes or
eventually 2 lanes. So trying to create continuity between the corridor, both north and south, and easing how that divergence happens or pushing it further north, at least in this scenario.
And then lastly, event traffic management. Pinehurst is well known for its golf courses, and it periodically placed host to major golf events such as the US Open. The 124th US Open was held.
two years ago, I believe, down in Pinehurst. I should know I was there, but all these years run together anymore. But it's estimated that around 250,000 visitors will visit Pinehurst during the week of an event like that. Those events
While the competitions are only four days long, they do spread out over a whole week with practice rounds and things like that. So there's a significant flow of traffic in and out of Pinehurst during that period. And with 15-5 will be one being one of

the major connectors.
heading north out of town, it sees significant traffic during those events.
So our proposed project purpose stated here is the purpose of the project is to improve traffic flow, reduce congestion, and improve connectivity and mobility along the US 15 501 corridor between the Pinehurst traffic circle and NC 73.
A secondary purpose is to enhance safety throughout the project limits by reducing conflicts at intersections.
I don't know if anybody has any comments or questions with where we're at here.

SC **Steve B Corps** 27:33
Hey, hey, Matt, this is Steve from the core. You know, I always...

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 27:36
Is it?

SC **Steve B Corps** 27:38
Always gotta jump in whenever there's there's comments, but no, I, I...
I, you know, looking at the information that you provided and what you presented here.
I don't have an issue with the project purpose and need statement as you've put it together. I think you've demonstrated the need for capacity.
For this project, so...
I don't know if anyone else had any comments or not.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 28:15
Do you do you have that current form? Yeah, I have a paper copy or a Word. I'm not showing it and not doing things, get a verbal concurrence with everybody.
Yeah.
No.
Zoom in.
I guess. Yeah, yeah, sorry. You want to, let's talk about the study area and then we can come back to the form.
Yep.
So again, the study area was fairly well defined back when we did the screening meeting for the project, or I don't want to call it defined because, you know, we are

defining it here today. But this is the study area that was used for
the current surveys that have been completed for the project. You'll see that to know the exact width along the main corridor.
It may be in the packet. I'm drawing a blank on it right now. But essentially, it utilizes a standard width along the main corridor, 15501, and then at each intersection or connecting roadway,
that extends, I believe it's 2500 feet down each connecting roadway. There are some intersections of the study area was expanded quite a bit to potentially look at relocation of some of
of how those connecting roadways tied in.
There's quite a few of offset intersections on this corridor where
you know, if you moved one rd 1000 feet or so here or there, you could create a four-way intersection versus those offsets, which can really help from a safety and capacity perspective. So that's why at certain intersections, those
The study area does expand out quite a bit.
I didn't include the actual written description of the corridor in the slide show, but there is one.
in the packet that was sent out. Anybody have any questions or comments about the study or? I don't necessarily have a problem with that, but...
When you finish your RCW surveys, if you came across an active RCW cluster that's within the half mile.
outward radius of the footprint. And if you then wound up having to do a formal section 7 consultation, then you would have something going on that's directly tied to the project, but outside your study area. Yeah.
It's a low probability that that's going to happen, but it could.
Could we?

SG **Siobhan Gordon** 31:45
So I do want to note that we did do some survey outside the study area, just a little bit in the southern end around the traffic circle there. And there is known marked trees in that area. I think there were a couple that we found that were not marked. but there is marked red cockaded woodpecker trees around that traffic circle and a couple within the medical center that's that you'll see just northwest of that traffic circle.

Headrick, Hannah S 32:22
So are they relic trees? Yes, I'm going back several years ago, but once upon a time in the not too distant past, there were active trees in the percent to this area. I don't have any current data, though.
to know which ones are active and which ones are relic. But do you have to know for the ones that you did see, were those relic cavities?

Siobhan Gordon 32:51
I don't remember off the top of my head because it was over a year ago, but I can see if I can pull that information up while we're on the call.

Headrick, Hannah S 32:55
I.
I mean, if you do your surveys and you do not find any active RCW clusters, then your study area is fine. But if you do find it, then I guess the Corps of Engineers would be the lead federal action agency. If we had to do formal consultation, I guess it's kind of up to y'all.

Siobhan Gordon 33:11
Okay.

Headrick, Hannah S 33:22
whether or not you want to expand it. I mean, if we had to do a formal consultation for the consultation, we would redefine study area ourselves for our consultation.

Siobhan Gordon 33:38
I will pull up what we have. I'll let.
Matt with Pinecone continue on with his discussion, but I'll pull up what I have and I can share that in just a few minutes.

Headrick, Hannah S 33:52
Yeah, I usually probably wouldn't even bring it up, but just knowing the history of RCW clusters in this area, it's a real possibility you may have to address it. I don't, I think, I'm trying to think of what we've done on other projects, other similar projects.

Siobhan Gordon 34:03
Mmh.

Headrick, Hannah S 34:10
And I don't think we have.
You know, you're right for the, it's like the RCW study area is different from the rest of the project. You know, which is, you know, similar to like with cultural resources, the area of potential effect may be slightly different from
from like the study area that we're looking at right now. You know, and that's fine with me. I mean, we don't have to expand it. I'm not going to oppose what you have here, but it's just something to be aware of. Yeah, right. Yeah. And I'm glad you brought it up here because it and
Um, yeah, um, there, you know, because...
RCW would be the only thing that we'd be looking for in that, you know, that larger study area.
Okay.
Maybe we could add it as like secondary area. Well, so in your process, you would buy an action area. Yeah, so separately from that, or I mean, it is a separate thing, yes. So, the if you had to do a formal.
consultation, then, you know, the core engineers being the lead federal action agency, they would, you know, we would be talking about this, of course, but the action area for the consultation would have to include the area where the RCW clusters are at, and then we provide a biological opinion, you know,
Our action area will include that. So yes, it is a separate process. And again, I'm fine with keeping it as it is. You know, if the core is okay with it the way it is, then I'm good to go.
Yeah, I guess.
Yeah, and I, I get that.
It's not said the.
The storage got kind of their own area of interest, and that's not really what it's called, but blaming on that area of potential, area of potential, and so everybody kind of has their own designated areas, but the needle study areas.
Or, I guess, direct attacks, right? As long as you're good with it. Yeah, I'm not gonna budget what you got, but I can sign up.

And it's generally 500 feet wide along the corridor, but...
I see a hand up.
Oh, Steve.

Steve B Corps 36:50
Yeah, it's me. Yeah, I.

Headrick, Hannah S 36:51
S.
Yeah.

Steve B Corps 36:56
I almost forgot what I was going to ask you now. Well, first off...

Headrick, Hannah S 36:59
But.

Steve B Corps 37:02
The boundary that you're showing here, this looks kind of familiar to me, and I think this was the same boundary we used for the delineation.

Headrick, Hannah S 37:13
Yes, that's correct.

Steve B Corps 37:14
Okay. Now, do you think that this is going to change?
Well, I...
You're presenting the project study area here. I guess it's just for everyone's information at this point. And this kind of looks as though this is the area that you're going to use right now.

Headrick, Hannah S 37:37
Yeah, this is the area we've done the field work on. So, you know, I guess it makes sense to me to. So, this area would contain the project no matter which side of the road was what to.

Yeah, plus if there was any realignment. So this would this would contain the direct impacts of the project, the study.

Steve B Corps 38:07
Okay, that's good. That answers that question. And the question of whether we need to go out and look at any additional areas in the future. So that makes that JD information really worthwhile at this point. So I wanted to talk about that.

Headrick, Hannah S 38:09
S.

Steve B Corps 38:29
And.
Gary, I appreciate you mentioning T&E and obviously.
That's out there right now. I mean, there's going to be a need to take a look at it. surveys and of course, since we're going to be the lead, we'll be making that determination as to affect and we'll definitely be coordinating with you and

Headrick, Hannah S 38:54
Two.

Steve B Corps 39:04
You're right, it could involve areas outside of the red polygon that we're looking at right now, but we will get to that, I think, as time goes along.
I think that's all I had to say.

Headrick, Hannah S 39:22
Yeah, this is the map from the JD package. I think that was in the appendix of the handout that was sent. But yeah, it is the exact same study area as shown here, just on a different background and layout for the mapping.
Stop.
See the.
RCW maps are ready whenever you want. Unless Gary wants to see them, I, you know, I think that's kind of, you know, we're really trying to talk about CP1 study area right now. We can move on.

So, I, I will see them eventually, yeah, yeah, that was fun.
Yep.
OK, well, we'll jump back over to the concurrence form that we were.
Previously looking at, sorry, my.
I've never figured out how to turn this black screen back to normal. It just one day showed up as a black screen with white text and...
I even Googled it one day and I couldn't figure it out. But this is a stylish. It's a style.
Yeah. Supposedly it's easier on your eyes, but I don't know. It makes it harder to read when it's presented like this, I think. But so here is what I currently have as the proposed concurrence signature sheet. Project need. The need is to be the need to be addressed by the proposed project is current and future traffic congestion associated with growing traffic volumes in the project area.
Project purpose.
The purpose of the project is to improve traffic flow, reduce congestion, and improve connectivity and mobility along US 15-501 corridor between the Pinehurst Traffic Circle and NC 73. A secondary purpose of the project is to enhance safety through the project limits by reducing conflict
At intersections.
And then the project study area.
Project study area boundaries are shown on figure 2-1 through 2-2 of the combined CP1 slash CP2 packet. The study area ranges between 500 and 1400 feet wide and begins just north of the traffic circle in Pinehurst and stretches approximately 3.7 miles
So just north of NC 73. The project also includes the intersection of McKinskill Road and NC 73 with limits stretching approximately 2500 feet along each rd from the intersection with US 15501.
Study also study area also extends approximately 1500 feet west along Juniper Lake Road.
So that's what I have in here. Let me double check that figure number. I thought there were three sheets. And this figure will be attached to them. We can attach it.
Oh.
But the figure it's referencing is this one, which clearly there's three, but...
We can attach those as uh.
Reference to the forms, but I will make that quick edit.
Does anybody have any questions, comments, issues with how it's written?

Sheldon, Chris J 43:34
Looks good to me from DWR's perspective.

Headrick, Hannah S 43:39
Thanks, Chris.
Steve, I believe you're judged with that wording. If not, I'll be done. Or let us know here. OK.
Travis.
Are you good with?

Wilson, Travis W. 43:56
No problems here. I concur.

Headrick, Hannah S 44:00
Okay.
Renee or Lon?

Gledhill-earley, Renee 44:06
It's OK.

Headrick, Hannah S 44:11
Yep.
And then we'll catch up with it. I don't think anybody from the FBI is here, but separately.
OK, um, I guess I call your name off.

Somerville, Amanetta 44:25
EPA concurs.

Headrick, Hannah S 44:27
All right, thank you.
All right, thank you all for this time.
All right, well, we'll move on to discussions about CP2 then.
So the preliminary study alternatives or build alternatives that we've analyzed so far

include three different widening options. We've looked at and provided comparisons within the packet and
This is the same table that's in the package, just a little bit different color and formatting to it, but all the numbers and things are the same. But there are three alternatives that we have analyzed from a build alternatives perspective. There's A W widening,
which would widen US 15501 along the corridor with all of the widening happening to the west side of the existing alignment. One important note is as 15501 was developed over the years,
intention had always been to widen to the web. So there is additional right of way that was purchased, I guess, many years ago. But anyways, there's additional right of way that is state owned already on the western side of 15501.
So widening to the west, we're going to utilize more of that existing right of way versus some of the other alternatives. So just to note that.
We've also looked at an eastern widening or E widening. This proposed alternative would
simply switch over and the majority, I'm going to say the majority, just because at the tie end, you know, you're kind of tied to what's existing. But for the most part, all the widening would happen to the east side of the existing 15501 alignment.
And then the third alternative is a best fit widening, which proposes.
as it notes, you know, for the majority, like where we can, we would widen east or west, but basically developing an alternative that kind of snakes through the corridor the best we can to minimize impacts along the corridor length.
So as part of our analysis, we basically developed a 250 foot assessment window for each one of those corridors based off of, you know, a proposed center line for where that center line would fall for those alternatives. And you'll see in the table here,
the numbers associated with each of those 250 foot windows. I might want to, Steve just sent me a note that he's lost audio. So I don't know if we're having an issue.
Hello!
Can anybody hear?

JJ **Jamison, John** 47:54
Yeah, we can still hear you fine.

Somerville, Amanetta 47:54
We could still hear you.

Wilson, Travis W. 47:54
I can still hear, yeah.

Sheldon, Chris J 47:56
I hear you.

Headrick, Hannah S 47:57
Oh, it's a Steve, it's a Steve issue.
You still not hear us, Steve?
I can draw.
Yeah.
It's him.
Should we give him a few minutes?
Yeah, thank you.

Somerville, Amanetta 48:27
That's fine.

Headrick, Hannah S 48:43
You don't have any jokes or anything about that filler here.
Well, those who like golf and interesting golf, you know, the US Open is coming again in June 2029, and then they'll be back again in June of 2035. So we have to build projects in those windows. So that's the reason the schedule is important. We have to schedule around the US Open every year, you know, when they come to town. So
29 and 29, I believe they're doing the men's and women's back to bat. So I believe so. I guess the men's men's one week and then the women's US Open is at the same golf course the second. Wow. One of those years. One of those two years has been back to bat.
I'll check on that, but...
Yup.

Go ahead. I thought I thought you were going to add a joke. No, I didn't have a joke. I guess I was going for those golf lovers, I guess. I guess so. That moment was sponsored by the Village of Pinehurst. Yeah.
Chamber of Commerce. I'm bad at remembering jokes. I remember them for like three or four days and tell them several times, and then they're gone. It's like, I can't remember it. But they're always bad, bad jokes.

HF **Hardin, Faith** 50:08
Speaking.
Speaking of sports, did anybody see the Canes game last night?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 50:14
Oh, absolutely. That was exciting. Nerve-wracking.

HF **Hardin, Faith** 50:16
Okay.
I was at the watch party at the Lenovo Center and when the final buzzer went off, the stadium just went crazy.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 50:29
Wow, that party was sold out for the watch party.

HF **Hardin, Faith** 50:34
Yeah, yeah.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 50:35
Yeah.
I've never been a hockey fan until recently, and I've got sucked into the Stanley Cup now, and now I have to watch every one of them. It's just, I don't know, it's just so exciting, you know, to watch because it's so intense. Especially last night when he hit that shot, it was like amazing.

HF **Hardin, Faith** 50:46
Yeah.

Headrick, Hannah S 50:57
It was awesome. When they won it the last time, they had a parade downtown. I was in the highway building at the time, and we went out and watched those parades come around the Capitol. We're good. Okay, we're good. Welcome back, Steve.

+17*****71** 51:14
Yeah, only by the phone. Sorry, folks. I don't know what's going on. I guess we need to pay our provider bill here or something. But you were just getting started on talking about the right away to the west and then you just stopped talking and I couldn't do anything. So.

Headrick, Hannah S 51:18
Okay.
And then...
Stuff with me.
Yeah.

+17*****71** 51:36
Sorry.

Headrick, Hannah S 51:36
I told everybody else I was going to do that, and this mess was Steve. No, just joke.

+17*****71** 51:40
Well, it worked, it worked well.

Headrick, Hannah S 51:45
No.

+17*****71** 51:47
Okay.

Headrick, Hannah S 51:47
But yeah, so just back to it. So yeah, we developed a 250 foot kind of right of way

assessment window for each of the three distinct center lines that were developed, east, west, and then a best fit widening alignment. And so the table
that's shown here and was sent in the packets. It is a summary of all of the resources that are fall within those 250 foot assessment windows. And you'll note that
You know, of course, the best fit winding is going to show the majority of the least impacts. But specifically, the eastern winding tends to be the highest in a lot of the corridors, not corridors, but resource.
areas with the highest number of wetland impact. Well, we're calling them impacts, but it's technically just within that study area. So there's 2.18 acres of wetlands, 0.42 acres of open water body,
We list them as ponds here. The historic resource is present within all three of the study areas or the corridors areas. The business relocations are essentially the same. And as we noted previously, with majority of the existing right of way being on the western side,
it makes sense that the residential relocations are quite a bit smaller going on with the western or best bit widening alternative as compared to the eastern. I will know that there are more parcels that are in that impacted area.
That's not necessarily more impacts, but I don't think we actually calculated the acreage of potential right-of-way impacts. We just looked at the number of parcels. So I would believe that, you know, the actual amount of right-of-way needed would be less, even though it's from more.
Parcels than the other alternatives, but...
But yeah, this is a simple kind of table format. We've tried to color code it in the presentation here to kind of help point out the high and low numbers for each category. Are there any questions about this?

+17*****71** 54:36
Well, I, I'm just...
I'm having to imagine some of this in my mind, so that makes it interesting. But, you know, when we had talked about this before,

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 54:44
Yeah.

+17*****71** 54:52

We had talked about NCDOT working through this process and and and and we had we had talked about best fit and and I see I see that term here. And you know, I think that kind of what we're talking about here is maybe working.
through the merger process with the hopes of maybe using RGP 31. Is that correct?

Headrick, Hannah S 55:21
Yes, I think.
Yes, that is correct.

+17*****71** 55:26
And I only ask that because I see best fit, you know, that's the buzzword from that RGP. I mean, we have worked through other projects through merger and of course, You know, DOT.
can kind of work towards 31, but I I don't know that you get locked in or or obligated at any point to to to use that and and um.
But, you know, best fit is still best fit. And when I see that, I always want to make a distinction if that's what we're thinking or not, because as you're aware, the Regional General Permit 31 has its own
extra set of requirements or other things that need to be addressed as we go through that. And this is always a good time to talk about that. But
Ohh.
You know, and I think that what I saw right before my screen went blank was that you had the West and the East and this best fit. And I'm not sure, Matt, if right now we're working towards
taken any of those out at this point, or I'm not sure where we're at at this point. So I'm sorry to kind of drag everybody through all this, but

Headrick, Hannah S 56:56
Yeah, yeah, I'll just move on kind of from this slide. This just kind of notes the impacts that we believe are the levels of impacts associated with these three alternatives. Ultimately, DOTs,
recommendation is to only carry forward the best fit widening and the west widening to compare. For the most part, you know, a lot of, oh, go ahead.

+17*****71** 57:23

Okay.
Sure.
It.
And I think we can do that. I think that always the storytelling is the important part of how you got to that one alternative that you were taking forward. And I think it's helpful that
You know, definitely from the core standpoint, you know, that we're in a position where we already have a JD that's for the project area. And I think that, you know, the waters numbers are pretty good and
And I think that if you're working to a single build alternative here, I'll just use that term that.
DOT can can say we got to that one build alternative by looking at.
Alternative West, Alternative East.
And we use that information to develop something that would meet our purpose and need.
and deal with these conflicting resources that we have up through the corridor to work towards, you know, the magic.
term that the Corps is always working towards, you know, the least environmentally damaging practical alternative, especially with regards to waters at this point. And I think that we can do that as long as the storytelling is good. Sorry, I think I made that long story even longer, but that's kind of where I was going.

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

+17*****71** 59:12
With this, I don't know if that answers the mail or not.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 59:17
Yeah, I think, yeah, I mean, we were proposing to carry the two alternatives forward. We do think ultimately, you know, best fit winding is what is going to be selected in large part, you know, we
Think, or...
Large sections of the corridor widening to the west makes a lot of sense from a, you know, existing right of way and from a impacts perspective, especially with the

natural resources. But there are sections of the corridor
where, you know, moving to the east side or somewhere in the middle to try to minimize the impacts to both sides will ultimately be the least impactful for the overall project. So, and I think you see that in a lot of these impact numbers.
The eastern winding, there's a lot of...
natural resources within certain sections that, you know, if you go all east, you're going to impact a lot of those, but there's certain sections on the west that have some as well. But there's a residential relocation 19 churches impacted too.
But on the next slide, you have new locations to twenty-one.
Are those are the businesses? Is that what they cause? Total 18 + 3 or 21 total. All of it is broken up into houses, businesses and churches.
Sorry, sorry for making confusion, but let me jump to the...
Environmental features map that was in the packet. I think this, well, well, but now let's so let's go back to where, all right, so what let's go repeat again what it is that the department is recommending.
We're recommending to carry forward both the best fit alignment alternative and the western widening alternative to analyze. And Steve, are you agreeable with that?

+17*****71** 1:01:50
It kind of broke up there a little bit on me. I didn't hear all that. Sorry.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:01:55
Are you agreeable to carrying forward both the Western alignment and the best fit? Or do you think we should just carry forward a best fit alignment?

+17*****71** 1:02:14
Well, at this point...
Um...
You know, we're identifying reasonable alternatives.
And, and, and I, you know, I hear you loud and clear that you're going to be working towards a best-fit alternative here.
And, and, as I was saying before, that the important part is, is...
Documenting and telling the story of how you got to the best fit now.
This point, if, if, if.

I think that that you can.
Include the West alternative at this point. I, I'm not sure how, how, how...

Somerville, Amanetta 1:03:06
This is Aminetta with EPA. I don't think we can eliminate, I don't think we can eliminate the West alternative at this time. Just given the similarities, we might end up with the best fit as our final, but I think eliminating it right now is a little premature.

+17*****71** 1:03:06
You should go further on.
Go ahead, Amanana.
Okay.
I would agree with that.
That answer, was it Jay? Were you asking that question?

Headrick, Hannah S 1:03:36
Yeah, yeah, Steve, I was. And so what I guess what I'm wondering is that, you know, at CP28, if I guess what I'm hearing from you, and certainly correct me if I'm misunderstanding, you know, what you would like to see some
I guess some proof that what we're calling the best fit is the best fit alternative, or, you know, some documentation that it is.

+17*****71** 1:04:08
Yeah, you know, I think that your choice of proof, I mean, you know, basically it is to show the work that the DOT has gone through to develop this best fit alternative to show that

Headrick, Hannah S 1:04:22
Mhm.

+17*****71** 1:04:24
It's based on the following factors. And it wasn't just an alternative that
came out of thin air. It is the best fit. And here's why it's the best fit, because if you look at this alternative or that alternative,

Headrick, Hannah S 1:04:41
Right.

+17*****71** 1:04:47
there is a reduction of impacts here or avoidance here or there. And I think that you have to show your work. And I think Amanette is, go ahead.

Headrick, Hannah S 1:04:56
So, well, and the...
I'm sorry, yeah, so yeah, you know what what I what I go back to is the the different sections that we we presented in the preview as a maybe at 2A we can present those. to support the, and what I'm talking about is in order to develop what's being called the best fit alternative, the project was broken up into sections at curves, so you could switch sides, and then the impacts were looked at within those sections. And then the
that you know the going west on section 1 E or whatever on that that was called which whichever one of those had the best numbers was what we what were called the best fit. Y'all correct me if I'm just just speaking there.
So, wondering if that that could be provided, and maybe in the maybe in the document to to show that here's here's how the best fit alternative was developed. Yeah, I think at the end of the day, we just want to make sure that we're doing what we need to do for RGP34 if we'd like to use that. So we just don't want to do anything at this juncture, that one, the gate needs to have later on.
If we choose to.

+17*****71** 1:06:23
Yeah.
And Jay, as we talked about before, I think it's important that, and, you know, maybe I'm a little too broad brush with the storytelling as to what that might mean. And, you know, the details, of course, are exactly what you're talking about, is DOT looked at the project,
In this case, you identified certain sections that were divided out based on design or curves or the design criteria that you have for the roadway and then looked at those areas to determine

Headrick, Hannah S 1:06:55
Right.

+17*****71** 1:07:04
what could be built there, what would meet the purpose and need and what would happen, what could be done to minimize or avoid impacts. And I think that that's part of that discussion to show
how you got to the best fit. So I think the only way you can really do that is if

Headrick, Hannah S 1:07:28
Mhm.

+17*****71** 1:07:34
You carry more than just the best fit alternative forward at this point.

Headrick, Hannah S 1:07:38
OK.
I think it makes sense.
So, does anybody have any issues with what we have proposed? You know, we're... I've written out the concurrence.
for us to carry both the best fit widening and the West widening forward, take it to a public meeting, get some comments, you know, develop a little bit more detailed designs to try to quantify what the impacts of each really are.
And then.
You know, really do a good job of documenting.
You know how that best fit is developed during the design phase, so...
Which ultimately, just to add, I mean, this is in the packet as well, but so ultimately the alternatives that would be eliminated from study or not recommended for detailed study would be the east widening, which
we've listed is not recommended for detailed study, you know, due to the high natural resource impacts and the relocation impacts associated with the project.
It would also eliminate.
We just try to develop kind of options that were analyzed and did not meet the purpose and need are a three lane widening with a center two-way left turn lane, as

well as the TDM and TSM alternatives that are typically with that. So
Does anybody have any?
Issues with that plan moving forward.

+17*****71** 1:09:40
This is Steve. I do not have a problem with that, no.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:09:46
Thanks.

SJ **Sheldon, Chris J** 1:09:47
All good.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:09:48
Oh.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 1:09:49
EPA supports this plan.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:09:56
Let me pull up the concurrence form.
This one I kept pretty simple. I just noted the detailed study alternatives carry forward best fit alignment, widening US 15501 to four lane median divided facility utilizing a best fit alignment didn't. And then the West widening.
which widens to a divided facility with proposed new lanes constructed west of the existing 15501 align.
So.
And I didn't mean to cut off people that were concurring. Sorry.
Thanks, Steve. It was good. Steve.
Just.
Here, I'm good.

WW **Wilson, Travis W.** 1:10:50
WRC can concur.

Headrick, Hannah S 1:10:51
Up.
Thank you, Travis. Chris, Jill.

Sheldon, Chris J 1:10:57
Yeah, I concur. I had one question about a future shared use facility shown on page 18 of the PDF, but we can get to that in a little bit, I guess.

Headrick, Hannah S 1:11:11
OK, yeah.
About that.
And then.
Renee.
You confirm.

Cao, Luan T 1:11:25
I think she's off, but yeah, she concurs.

Headrick, Hannah S 1:11:26
S.
Okay, thanks a lot.
R.
So, was that this map that you were talking about? You had a question about?
Or one page of this map, which, ohh.

Sheldon, Chris J 1:11:46
I still see the Word doc right now.

Headrick, Hannah S 1:11:49
Sorry.

Sheldon, Chris J 1:11:50
Yeah, one of these pages.

This one right here, yeah, that pale orange line.
Going diagonal. Just curious what exactly that.

Headrick, Hannah S 1:12:05
Oh, up through here.

Sheldon, Chris J 1:12:05
Future shared you, yeah.

Headrick, Hannah S 1:12:10
I think that is a...
So there, that's like a floodway going. It's hard to tell with the mapping, but this dash blue is like a floodplain area. And I believe that's a post. Let me make sure. Yeah, future. So I think it's basically some type of
Shared use path that the town.
Uhh.
Village as in their proposed future plans. But I think that's just the GIS file that was pulled in. So the alignment of that's not very clear. So it's not on the ground then.
No, it's not existing.

Sheldon, Chris J 1:13:00
Okay.

Headrick, Hannah S 1:13:01
And then it continues down 15501 on the west side of the corridor, I think all the way to the end.

Sheldon, Chris J 1:13:12
Okay.

Headrick, Hannah S 1:13:13
It's just under some of the other line work there. But yeah, I think it ends just don't work that far.
Project Terminon.

Hardin, Faith 1:13:23
Okay, yeah, I think we had a question about that, but it sounds like that's not part of the construction regard, like related to this project. That's going to be happening in the future.

Headrick, Hannah S 1:13:35
Yeah, that's just a future planned. I don't even know if there's a timeline associated, probably not, other than it being in a plan somewhere. We can get more details about that.

Sheldon, Chris J 1:13:52
OK.

Headrick, Hannah S 1:13:52
As well.

Sheldon, Chris J 1:13:53
Cool, thanks for the clarification.

Headrick, Hannah S 1:14:08
Well, thank you all. We'll send out forms in the meeting minutes for comments. If nothing else, we'll let you go. Thank you.

+17*****71** 1:14:22
Thanks, bye-bye.

Somerville, Amanetta 1:14:22
Thank you.

Siobhan Gordon 1:14:24
Thanks.

Headrick, Hannah S stopped transcription