

U-5774A-F - CP 2-20260415_080111-Meeting Recording

April 15, 2026, 12:01PM

1h 28m 31s

● **Headrick, Hannah S** started transcription

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 0:10

So complete.

Is Air Paul's my room?

He said he might not be able to make the numbers. Didn't he? Or was that something else? That was Travis. Travis is calling. That's right. Travis said he was calling, but he had to leave by 9. I don't know.

So I heard yesterday, he says. Well, it's 8 o'clock. They're maybe they're released, so probably like the last two, so I'll sure be on time today. It can't be three minutes.

Yeah, and my the road was shut down. It's also we try to make sure we move it to different conference rooms and things. Yeah, I was like, yeah, it's never building. It's been wandering around for about a year or more since I've been and have the easiest store until they're still.

So I felt bad. I told back and just go across the parking lot into the door and then you walk over there and it's like, oh yeah, it's closed. So you're gonna find a new door. I don't think so.

OK.

Oh.

There's somebody on the phone. Can can you give us a name of who who called into the meeting?

● **+19*****11** 2:39

Yeah, this is Travis Wilson, North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission.

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

Hey, Travis, I'm just waiting on Eric.

So.

Broken. Are you aware of that? Yeah.

There's a I've been on it. There's another link in the environmental. That's what I've been. It goes back to that.

Yeah, I don't. I'm just telling. I'm just wondering. Can you send me the link to that one? Probably. Rolling. Can I comment? Send me time to help, can't we? Yeah.

Send to.

OK, I'm like, it wasn't clear.

All right. Everybody's kind of looking. No, you can.

Sure you can. All right. Thanks. I appreciate it. I'm late. OK. We changed the the conference room just to keep it. Yeah, it does. Keeps me off my test.

And I thought I had the cleaning in the official family, so I left them home and I didn't.

All right. I appreciate everybody's patience this morning. I know 8:00 meetings are tough, so thanks everybody for joining us for U 5774 E through F merger meet today. We'll start off with some introductions here in the room and then.

Go to the online attendees. I am Morgan Weatherford from NCDDOT Environmental Policy Unit back in Dallas Division Park Division.

Austin Bell, AECOM Lead the traffic group. Celia Myers with AECOM. I'm a project manager. Christie Shuman with Three Oaks and helping with project management project history. Sorry, Eric Osmeyer, Board of Engineers.

Andrew Boles, NCUC Crush Management Unit. I'm the project manager from the UT side. Gary Jordan, US Fish and Wildlife Service. Christian on Air, AECOM Planner and Planning. Rob Ridings, Division of Water Resources.

Seth Wilcher with Federal Highway. I'm Jeff from Wobbauer, AECOM, Robo Engineer, Luke Bandert, DMC at your training.

Drew Joyner at Etap, Sarah Sherman, dot Project Management Unit, Hannah Hendrick, dot Environmental Policy Unit, David Gilson, Edition 5 Planning.

All right. And we've got Travis on the phone line.

CT **Cao, Luan T** 7:28

Ring blank out of the State of Work Preservation Office.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 7:34

Darlene.

CM **Colleen McGue** 7:36

Colleen McGee, Triangle W Transportation Planning Organization.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 7:41

Oh, Christine.

FE **Farrell, Christine E** 7:44

Christine Varrell, Environmental Policy Unit.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 7:47

Send it right back in.

GE **Gracey, Meghan E** 7:50

I'm Megan Gracie. I'm a NCDOT trainee.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 7:55

John, you brought me over here and then I'll be back yet. Just John Davison.

JJ **Jamison, John** 8:02

Just got back to my desk.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 8:06

Brian.

KK **Ketner, Brian K** 8:10

Brian Kettner, Project Development Engineer, Division 7.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 8:15

Uh, Nicholas.

LC **Lineberger, Nicholas C** 8:19

Yeah, Nick Lineberger with Congestion Management.

MC **Mellor, Colin** 8:26

Alan Miller, Division 7, Project Development.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 8:30
And see what is in the room. Uh, Tierre.

PR **Peterson, Tierre R** 8:33
Good morning.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 8:34
OK.
Chad.

RC **Reimakoski, Chad** 8:43
Chador Makoski, Division 7, Planning Engineer.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 8:48
Scott.

SJ **Scott Jones** 8:50
Scott Jones, Corp of Engineers.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 8:53
Aminetta.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 8:54
I'm Annetta Somerville with EPA Region 4. Good morning.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 8:59
Morning. Um, Eric.

TM **Thomas, Eric M** 9:05
Here at Thomas Congestion Management.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 9:09
And Jordan?

WA Woodard, Jordan A 9:12

Hey, Jordan Woodard, NCDOT Roadway Design.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 9:15

Um.

All right. Did I miss anyone? All right, before I take it over to you, Seth, do you have any particular on this, Eric? Allsmeyers, do you have anything to get started?

All right. All right, guys. Like I said, Andrew Foles of the project manager for the NCBOT. I want to thank you guys all for being here. Looking forward to hearing your comments on this. I'm actually just going to kick it right over to Celia because I think she has a presentation.

We're going to go through some slides to show some of the alternatives. We're also going to show a Google Earth KMZ outline of some of the alternatives we're looking at. And if you have any questions or anything, just feel free to throw them out there.

There any questions before we start?

Thank you. Thanks. And can everybody online here just fine?

10:17

Yeah.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 10:19

Great. Thank you. And so like Andrew said, we're just going to go through the project description and discuss some of the human and natural resources in the area, review the purpose and need that was determined or concurred upon.

Previously and run through the alternative screening process and our alternative concepts that we have developed so far and then we can discuss you know recommending you know some of those concepts that may be eliminated so that we can begin to develop our.

Detailed study alternatives.

And so this is our project study area. It is broken up into separate sections. However, it is all being studied under one NEPA document. Section A is, you know, surrounding the US 15501 interchange to.

The West Section B extends from 15.01 to about just at Barbie Chapel Rd. over the division line and I guess I'll pop there to say Division 7.

Is on the West and we have Division 5 to the right or to the east. So Division 5 territory over here and then we have c-section C which is the 54 corridor really just crossing a little Creek.

And sections DE&F, they have actually been combined now into just section F So moving forward when we show the sections on the map, it will just have ABC and F. To make it clear and and Section F will include the upgrades from Little Creek to I-40 interchange.

Any questions about the projects over here?

And so some of the human and natural resources that we have in the area, as a reminder, this project.

Was originally started I think back in like 2017 and that's when you know Christy was managing it when she was with ACOM and she and we had completed some detailed study alternatives that we had also you know coordinated with cultural resources and completed.

Well, in delineations and so we identified, you know, they're within this new project set area, we have three resources.

That were previously identified the Glen and Lenox Commercial and Residential Historic District, the Greenwood Historic District and Lee Farm and so and then with regards to natural resources, we have the Little Creek system that is you know the large area within Section C and various other streams and wetlands throughout the area.

East of the I-40 interchange is the New Hope stream system. And then you know at Little Creek, there's also the Jordan Lake Wildlife and common area owned in part with the core earned by the core.

Engineers and I'll know that we are currently updating our wetland and stream delineations. We are about 80 to 85% of through with reflies and.

And we have you know just a couple of areas left, the biggest portion being that little Creek area right now it's had they have some water pipeline installation going on and so reporting with the contractor on that to wait to finish those delineations until. The area is regraded back to the original elevations.

And and we're once we've finished with those then you know we should be able to coordinate with NCDOT to get surveys and and get moving with meeting with the core and DWR out there.

Did that answer your question here from the e-mail? Yes, thanks. All right. And so far we have identified a couple of new wetlands in some various areas. I can pull, I can

we can touch base to let you know where those are.

Thanks.

Mhm.

And so as I mentioned, our purpose and need was previously concurred upon at the in 2017 with the merger team and since 2017 the project has been placed on hold. It was placed on hold in 2019 and then restarted in 2024. And upon restarting the project, we have updated the traffic forecast has been updated. So we've gotten new volumes. Austin has developed the no build capacity analysis based on.

On those volumes and back in February 2025, we had also met with the signatories of the merger team to discuss the restarting of the project and.

And the the changes in the study area limits because the original U5774 extended all the way to NC55 and so now we are you know stopping it at I-40 and we confirmed the logical Termini and independent utility.

With FHWAMMO and so we documented that and with the updated traffic information, we updated our purpose and need report and found that the purpose and need as previously identified still remained valid.

And so we also, you know, have discussed this at a January stakeholder meeting with the division, the both divisions and the surrounding towns in TWTPD.

Any questions on this one?

All right. And so this is, oh, that's small, I'm sorry, this is our alternative screening process that we are going through with this project. And so it's a three phase process. We are currently in screening phase two and so.

That first screening phase was really to identify the alternative strategies like TDM, TSM and mass transit, a build alternative on your location or just upgrading existing and of course the new build alternative and those are all evaluated against the.

Purpose and need that was identified. And then in the second screening phase, we began looking at alternative concepts specifically for the alternatives that moved or the alternative strategies that moved out of that first phase. And and so that's what we're discussing today are the.

Concepts.

That we will then use to build those end to end detail study alternatives. And so then in that next the third screening phase, we will you know dive into the designs. We'll have preliminary device completed slip stakes and so we'll be able to calculate the impacts.

And you know, have more information regarding the bridging at at Little Creek. Yeah,

that would be basically against to our lid though.

And so like I said in that initial training phase, we reviewed each of the alternative strategies against the purpose and need and ultimately it was determined that upgrade existing roadways and.

Um, was really the only strategy that met the.

Met the full purpose and need. And then the no build alternative was of course, you know, carried forward for comparison purposes.

Any questions or comments on?

So now in our second phase of the screening process, we are looking closer at the traffic operations for each of those alternative concepts, looking at by competitive mobility and then the consistency with the local planning documents including including the steps.

Sure.

So these are our we broke the alternative concepts into kind of three segments. And so within each segment we have a couple of different concepts and they they are you know interchangeable so we can really make a match.

From each of the three segments to make an end-to-end alternative. And so our goal for today is to, you know, eliminate any of the concepts that shouldn't be carried forward to be evaluated further for an alternative end to end detailed study alternative.

And I think at this all, well, I'll just briefly talk about. So you US 15501, we've got two interchange options, 1/2 partial cloverly, half synchronized St. interchange.

And a dragonfly interchange, which that name came from the way it looks when we first started with it doesn't quite look like a dragonfly anymore, but OK and NC 54 or along the NC 54 corridor, which you know, really just stands from.

Between the interchanges, we are looking at a continuous RCI corridor and a modernization RCI corridor and so the the RCI would.

Continue the lanes from east of Barbie Chapel Rd. to Farrington Rd. where it where it narrows down to two lanes. It would continue that third lane all the way to Farrington Rd. and then also upgrade the intersections.

To RC is and the modernization corridor. The difference there is that lane would not continue on, that additional lane would not continue on and we would only be looking at, you know, making those RCI upgrades at the intersection.

Along the road and then at I-40, we are looking at four different interchange options of partial code relief, which was one of the options that was previously looked at a

flyover interchange.

L A Milwaukee B interchange, which you know has a bit more bridging associated with it, and then also A1 sided diverging diamond interchange.

And one thing I want to bring up really quickly is I think originally in this project we had looked at an option that was I want to say an 8 lane Super St. alternative and we'd find based on the traffic operations that that was no longer supported. So we have already eliminated that.

For for consideration, we took that out. So if you were a part of this project before it got shelved, that was one of the alternatives that we did decide not to carry forward already. So that's that's where that A Lane Super Street plan, if you.

Any questions on that?

Oh, I did want to ask about the the NC 54 corridor concepts is.

For the differences between them like cost and impacts and you have to see how they affect the traffic and get public input, is that kind of that was that was part of our considerations, yes. So the the biggest difference is is looking at just upgrading intersections which is something.

That we had gotten feedback from some of the stakeholders from they they had some interest in not looking at additional pavements. Unfortunately on on each end of the projects, so towards the interchanges there are both both sides of 6 lanes. The the center of that, especially when the bridge goes over Little Creek, it's only four lanes. So our initial thought was for the traffic operations piece at least that it would make sense to carry six lanes all the way through the corridor. But we didn't want to at least look at what we do if we just upgraded intersections.

Not to RCI or other efficient, more efficient intersections to see what that would do for our traffic makes sense. And with regards to the traffic operations, we did have some you know parameters for for those that were noted in the packet like the the level of service and the.

volume to capacity ratio, hoping for you know something lower than .85 to relieve that congestion.

And so I will stop hearing the presentation and we'll switch to Google Earth. So bear with me for a moment.

We'll kick it off to Austin and Jeff to.

Thank you.

And we'll start at the West and this is so for the purposes of the KMZ, we did go ahead and piece together the alternatives so that we could see them all so.

This I don't know Jeff and Austin, how you want to discuss them if you just want to go through each one or just it might be best to focus on the interchange first.

All right, so this is the Dragonfly interchange at US 15501 and NC 54.

I guess real quick just in terms of traffic, the concept idea here on NC 54 is your lefts and your throughs and your rights from both directions come to a single intersection, generally underneath the bridge with some spacing issues to make the the turns work and then on US 15501.

That has the RCI component, so where the lefts like a Super Street one go opposite of the opposing throughs. So you can have two phase signal operations for all of those intersections to help traffic move through.

As a general overview of that idea.

Any other details to add? Not really. I mean we for this right here, we've not added pedestrian movements yet. That would be you know in the more detailed design of the of these alternatives.

But other than that, I mean they're just know that the pedestrians will be accounted for in our detailed. So we've already looked at it. We just haven't put it in the designs yet. Yes. And along those lines, we have submitted our complete streets request to IMD for their recommendations as well.

And so now we have the the partial Cloverleaf interchange option.

Yeah, I think this is similar on 5501 where it's the RCI, but it's all extending the same thing on LC54, all after crossing over like super street style. So you have four, I guess 4 intersections with eight signals.

Got all those, uh, everyone 2 days trying to help with the traffic along.

And then how about can you speak to some of the differences in traffic operations for these two? I mean, they're very similar. It's just the the drag and plot frequency just have the one intersectional in C54 where this has the two separate terminals 18501 stays pretty much the same.

I think operations wise in terms of local service delay they're they're very similar.

From the traffic side they're pretty similar. Are there any differences in right of way or other considerations in the upper right water there is businesses there that.

The the dragonfly one, which I mean we can change it on this one because basically we really need to watch out for that parking lot in that quarter and then the lower right quarter same condition we have a parking lot.

That that we should really, you know, try and avoid.

And some other constraints that are in this area. We've got the Glen Lennox

Shopping Center and Historic District right in the Northeast quadrant and the Greenwood Historic District here in the.

Northwest quadrant and so just to kind of I guess toggle back and forth between this is the dragonfly interchange option and then we've got the partial clover leaf.

Here.

Um.

About the the biped accommodations with those at this one, clearly there's signals at all the right terminals, so they'd be incorporated into that or the other one just are there free flow movements anywhere that would there there.

More likely will be free proposed. That's I think Austin can probably answer that better in the way that I did the traffic, the NC 54, your rights there that are approaching 15501.

I was able to put those as part of the signal so they could come to a stop to help with that so they would be able to operate that way and in each the the northeast and the southwest we put pedestrian refuge with the islands in there.

Since you're mentioned the features in the interchange here, there's also a a drain in the mostly in the southeast quadrant I guess and looks like the half partial cloverleaf would impact a little bit more possibly so.

So that in mind every time.

Doesn't look like it'd be much of an impact, but so turn on streams and wetlands. So these are the old streams and wetland, wetland files.

Let me have one of me pull him out of the ground.

Um, so this is the.

Is this the pipe that you or is this associated with the pipe that you mentioned, right? OK.

Could you switch to the other?

Yeah, that yeah. So that one's gonna probably have to extend the pipe.

So either of these options, if you get off of Interstate 40 and you're going to UNC Hospital, you're not taking the old road you used to take, you're going to start flat to get on the highway to campus.

I'm just thinking of the route. I know that's from Dean Dome and stuff too, but like to go to UNC hospitals, like right now you get off and you take a loop to go South and so now you'll turn left.

I I think the loop you might talking was at I-40. No, it's it's right past one line. It's like you loop around. Yeah. So you understand the left. I wouldn't use the loop. I just

want to make sure I'm understanding. Thank you. Both of those options would be OK.

Do when we try to have to go left.

No.

Any other questions on these alternatives?

Yeah.

Which part of 54 corridor do you want to look at for the RCIS? It's all very similar. I wanna start maybe east of and I would say east of Barbie Chapel pipe.

Chapel Rd. right here. My cursor is and so this is looking at the.

With the moderation and the RCI one, it's the.

This is the this is the RCI. So east of Barbie Chapel Rd.

Currently that lane is dropping right here and we are continuing it to the north. So we would have, yeah, so this is the RCI corridor. You can see the the U-turn bolts.

And we have 6 lanes of traffic total, 3 on each side. Awesome. Everybody on the side street turns right and then they have to do the U-turn to either go straight across from their original destination and keep going left. So that's the.

Pretty much the theme throughout 54. Yeah, I think there's only a few. You can see there's a leftover here. Um, on. Forgive me, I forget what that is. Um, overdone, like Little John or something. Yeah, Little John, Little John and um.

Here's to the the bridge, if you don't mind. So this one, I I don't think we have a full concept, but the idea would be we would have to widen the bridge or replace the bridge, excuse me, to account for the widening.

And so some of the other layers that you see on the screen, this darker shade green is our previously delineated wetland file. Blue lines are the streams that were the previous delineations and then the.

Transparent.

Shade is our is the core party.

Going across the grids, there's two alternates, one is a six lane, the other is because of four lane. Basically the difference is you know, 12 foot width on each bridge, you know the outside 12 feet will be.

Brought in between the two options.

With a modernization effort, do we have to replace the bridge or are we going to keep that in place right now or do we do that we don't know the I mean that'll have to be restructures and and inspections and stuff.

I'm sorry, there's there's a possibility not have to replace the bridge if you get that

one. I don't know what the condition of that bridge is. So it's we're not there yet.

We have this bridge report. Do we have those bridge reports structures?

I can look at a lot, but it's probably take me a second, right?

And so I just toggled on the modernization order alternative or option that you know continues the two lane north or to the east.

So modernization remains the same for the center of project or that that C corridor.

The only changes is that the RCM is throughout the corridor. So you looked at it for improving any of the.

Intersections that are there basically moving or reducing the number of left turns and using more E turns to make the corridor more efficient.

So how often do you want to speak to the traffic on these two? Yeah, I mean the traffic works obviously better with the three lanes through that middle section and the modernization where we have the two lanes, there's a couple higher the oversee ratios or delays, which is expected. You're getting rid of that that third.

Lane, but I think the biggest thing is the queuing, which is similar to what the future here no build has because those lines are very similar to that and modernization. So the queuing is what is more of an issue. In the morning we have two lanes traffic backing up further towards the Interstate and in the afternoon everybody leaving.

You're going to be backing up from Barrington, Barbie Chapel there W, so you're going to be impacting more of those intersections a little bit heavier.

In the winding section, the queuing's not that not that impactful. So they're able to manage and clear easier without constructing volumes with both options we are looking at a.

Barrington is turning into a grade separation, is that correct? Yeah, Barrington Rd's going to be grade separating on over both options. So that's the same between the two. OK, so that's a significant change in the.

Current tracker operations.

Thinking ahead to CP3, when we choose alternatives and we're choosing between the the continuous RCR and the modernization, it seems obvious that the modernization is going to have.

Additional impacts will be a lot more impacts than the other one. I think I got that right. Continuously have more impacts. OK, sorry. So just asking for your help when. When we do make that decision, we'll have to make sure that it complies with 404 we want. So we'll need information to to show that it's the.

The LED vote and not just the preferred alternative. So whatever you help you can

give us a map would be appreciated.

If if we choose the one that has more impacts, obviously.

Any other questions or comments on the two NC 54 quarter options?

I agree.

Yeah, I think this is one of the alternatives that was in the previous iteration within this project. Um.

Maintaining the existing loop that's out there, but much larger due to the roadway standards. Now it also has to be a two lane loop to handle the amount of traffic that's coming through that and then in the southwest quadrant, another loop added there to try to help with the.

Intersections along NC54 to break those up and be able to move the traffic through, but the loops can also impact I-40 and its operations was something to be considered there.

And just to know, you know, there are some, you know, impacts that would happen to businesses in the southwest quadrant and then in the northwest quadrant, this loop is, you know, pushing, pushing Lee Farm Rd. to the north a little to.

To relocate that and there are you know some wetlands that we were had previously identified and we have also you know reflect those this go around that are located in this northeast quadrant. So you didn't find streams there.

Yes, actually we did. So this stream right here, I believe we have reconfirmed that and we also took it a little further to the east into this wetland, Kevin.

And Black, who is doing our, he's leading our natural resources, he he thought he just found it a little more to the east, but that's kind of that's more outside of the project study area, but in the other project, yes, we did see that stream.

And these two weapons and I believe there was another one that he identified in the to the South.

I think right around here.

What's the status of those delineations now is Kevin got it buttoned up pretty well, just about he's about 80 to 85% complete. He there are still some delineations to the east here that he needs to wrap up and then the the biggest.

The biggest piece that he has remaining is around Little Creek. When he went out there, they were doing some work with installing a a water pipe along the road and so really he's just waiting for the contractor to.

Re grade that back to the original grade so he can get back out and I'm not sure you know if.

Because I assume that that that they would have had a permit that were great. And so I don't know if there's any data from that permitting process that might be worth sharing. Yeah, if somebody contacts me, I can look into that, OK.

I'll be back.

Cause I'm sure it's gonna, it's gonna be, I mean it might be back to our original elevation, but it'll also be disturbed quite a bit. Should should be, should be soon that it's gonna be well.

But yes, I I think once he heard back from the contractor for that area, then he should be able to wrap it up. It might be like a day and a half at most that he's got left. Yeah, I know we looked at this several years ago with James Lassinger, but I'm sure Eric, you probably want to lay eyes on it at some.

Yeah, I I mean, if it hadn't changed much, I may not need to like review the whole delineation, but I probably would want to go out there before we do the let them sleep.

All right. And so that was the partial plug relief and next we'll look at the fly over interchange option.

Yeah, another option here with the institute to for eastbound approaching I-40 W this fly over helps separate some of that traffic out and we do have to add a new in quadrant B there again just trying to figure out a way to make all the traffic work. Or but by order grid would be extra cost and again adding moving to quadrant B. And in this alternative, the bridges are the three levels. The flyover kind of goes across the corner of of the bridge on 54.

So we've also got some additional impacts to.

Business or commercial areas and Quadrant B in the northwest and.

And with regards to Lee Farm Rd. relocation, there may be, you know, when we start looking at design, further designs, there's likely ways that we could pull that in. I don't know about.

The design goes out, we're trying to improve the SKU at the intersection, but and kind of make it less, you know, with less curves. But yeah, that could that can be improved more by, you know, reintroducing some of the curves and and it's a low speed Rd. so.

It shouldn't be a problem.

OK.

And so then the Milwaukee B interchange really had a fun time with the bridges.

Yeah, a lot more bridges on this one. I'll say for this one on the one side of DDI

NCDOT congestion management with Doctor Hummer came out with them.

List of interchange service interchange concepts that could be reviewed to see, you know how well they work in terms of practicing cost right away and things like that.

So we reviewed that to sort of get a few other ideas, see what we can do with this interchange, the Milwaukee be in the one side of the kind of.

Help come through that list, but yeah, this one tries to separate a lot of the movements there. Basically I-40 off ramps use the loops that go over as you can see in these quadrants.

And then if you're on NC54, you do your normal lefts and rights that you would typically do for your rent terminals.

Just tries to avoid the typical loops that you would normally have in the previous options.

Especially 540 has your typical diamond textile divergent.

Seems like the difference between the fly over and Milwaukee is is which movement you're using the five or four to make it where you don't have to stop and turn. Yeah, so.

Is that is it going to depend on the traffic? Which of those works better? They both work traffic wise. It's just the the bridges that's going to be just cost and on the the Milwaukee be the.

If you're going east on I-40 and you get off and you come back around the loop to to head, I guess it's also kind of east on 54, some some of the design speeds are being reduced. They're not, they're not the full, you know, 50 mile an hour design speed.

So we had to, um, just 'cause the.

You know, try try not to completely take over the whole area and and with right away we're basically having to reduce some of the design speeds. So sort of a fun option, but no real benefits over any of the other ones, right? It's a lot more cost.

This question will be is maybe we should go ahead and drop that one possibly in Milwaukee.

Possible, yes. I think, yeah, sounds like, I think that's what we'd love to do is walk out of here with fewer concepts so that we, you know, have fewer alternatives.

Yeah, all right. And the one sided DDI option. So this one, typically a DDI would consider having traffic volumes that are balanced in all directions and then for this case.

This orientation of this other half, the bonds of this interchange is much, much

higher. So everybody going 40 W into Chapel Hill, it's a very heavy movement and then everybody leaving Chapel Hill to 40 E is a very heavy movement.

So the typical DDI did not function as well because of that imbalance between those. So it was an idea.

To figure out a better way to handle that, those volumes, this will work pretty well by separating those out. So you only have to cross over on one side of the interchange. And then again you have your typical diamond style off ramps, the divergent emergency will have any loops.

So hopefully the freeway operations would also work well.

And traffic control on this one is not as bad as some of the others. On the bridge on 54 it can either be one bridge or two separate bridges. So there's there's some little bit of play with how we do the design and and.

You know how it's done.

Is signing an issue when it gets to be?

I don't think it'll be an issue. I mean, I'm not a signing expert, know a little bit, but I don't see it being an issue. It's it's every time you have something new, you know, it's it's always like, you know, kind of like roundabouts used to be. Everybody used to kind of fear them, but then.

You know, signing has improved ridership. People, people know what to do now. So it's it's something new that people are going to be used to.

There's one of these built already in Kansas City, so we also looked at that just to have as a reference to make sure we're doing it correctly. This is another one where you could minimize that relocation of the farm Rd. away from that stream because it looks like you're actually moving.

Perfect.

Yes, those avoidance matters would definitely come into play as we move into the next, the third phase of the design. And I think Jeff, you took taken a look at it. Yeah, and and it can be, it can be brought in. We still want to keep some separation.

Between the intersection, but it's kind of like as the road goes out, it really doesn't need to go out that far.

And and the main reason for the Lee Farm Rd. is because of the conflict or is there other the intersection the the stop line position, right?

The reason it was pushed out, I think previously it was because of that that two lane lube from that alternative from the Alaska and it also reduced that SKU from the farm road on the 54, but it probably you probably wouldn't need to go so far out to help

if it needed to.

Yes, yes. But yeah, that is a stream well and then possible, especially I guess like you're showing the streams parallel to the road, so it's like a fill slope would be right on top of it.

So, so you're saying the next our design, you'd see if if you can change those and so we'd be when we do the lead, but we'll be looking at reducing impacts for that leaf farm as much as possible, yes.

So you'll see you know the core property that is I said there the new house that is you know goes to the east of you know where some of our limits are and then we have the Lee Farm historic.

Area to the north, but we are we're not really having any changes or impacts associated here still have you know impacts to these businesses.

Down here in part of me, one of the benefits of the one side of DDI is that there's a lot less impacts right away. It's much more compact.

Interchange versus that's part of the reason that Austin.

And then so those are all of the concepts that we have evaluated throughout the project area and I will get back to.

Our presentation or were there any other comments before? Well, I can go back to the KMV, but were there any other comments from anybody to look at anyone?

Anybody dizzy with the zooming?

So we pulled together the concepts in a similar format as we did in phase one to take a look at the.

Consistency with each of the evaluation criteria or metrics. So as you see you know from a traffic operations and by compatibility and consistency with the local plans, it's the interchange options really meet all of.

All of these metrics, they function by competitive mobility can be included.

And you know they're improving traffic, so they are consistent with your step in the local plans at the NC 54 corridor along this route. You know some of the differences are the traffic operations. The as Austin mentioned, the modernization doesn't quite handle the.

Traffic as well and by pedability might, you know, it might have the opportunity to, yeah, because if we're not going to upgrade the corridor along the entire corridor, we may not have opportunities to do things like that.

Additional bike and pit accommodations and things like that, especially we're still trying to figure out if we have to replace the bridge, but if we don't replace the

bridge, there's really not an opportunity to add any kind of accommodations for pedestrian, new bicycles or any needs, etcetera.

And so that's that was just the the consideration we threw out for that modernization idea that it may not benefit pedestrians as much initially. Some improvements obviously at the interchange or the intersections, but it may not forward itself.

And then as far as consistency with the local plans, you know the step has improvements to the corridor for capacity purposes.

And so we're the our continuous RCI is consistent there. However, the local planning documents from the TWTPD do identify modernization as a preferred option, right.

So some of the feedback we got from our stakeholders with.

DPI and Durham County Town Durham or City Durham City suggested that they would not be in favor of widening of any kind. And so that's part of the other part of the reason we we threw in there a modernization over instead modernization doesn't widen anything there there's no additional lane lane.

Pavement. Um, but the downside that is just necessarily meets all of the criteria for or review a case plan. So the other day.

Opposition there between the two core.

Any comments or thoughts on this table?

Got one more slide to discuss next steps, but if we wanna.

CM **Colleen McGue** 57:56

So this is Colleen. The the dot with the white dot inside means it meets it, but not really on this table. OK, partial. Got it.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 58:07

Is partially.

Yes, I apologize. Yeah, that there is I think a.

We included a a legend on a different slide and I think we forgot to add to this. Yeah, yeah, the black dot is is is full or pretty much complete compatibility. The dot is partial and I think there was like an X or something else.

CM **Colleen McGue** 58:19

Alright, thanks.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 58:32

It was just a hollow dive. OK, that's right. That's right. OK, there's no elements.

CM **Colleen McGue** 58:34

OK. Thank you. That's right. Um.

So going back to that previous the slide you were just on.

The the interchanges are all consistent with local plans, but the reason why we have the hollow dot is because it include these. The continuous RCI includes widening.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 59:07

Correct.

CM **Colleen McGue** 59:07

And that OK, I understand.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 59:12

Because what we're trying to do is make essentially make a continuous corridor that we don't have bottlenecks with lanes drop off. That was the idea of the continuous RCI, but we did want to take into account what would it look like if we left the network as it is, but just upgraded.

Interchanges, excuse me, intersection, intersections with the modernization quarter.

So if we add lanes, we're not necessarily keeping with the initial intent to TPO based on the based on what you guys given us.

But it does meet the traffic operations. If we go with the modernization where we don't add or or continue those, those lanes all the way through the corridor, then if we do lose some other opportunities to.

Add some of the bike and ped improvements, but we do are we are in more compliance with what you guys had initially discussed with us.

Is dot asking to drop any of these alternatives from? I think we had asked if we should look at the I-40 interchanges in particular. The rest of them we can if if we think that any of these don't meet the intent of the project or not be.

CM **Colleen McGue** 1:00:17

OK.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:00:36

Beneficial to move forward, we've got the drop in here. The ones that we we want to focus on is the RCI corridors and the I-40 interchanges. I think the best one we're going to consider. Eric, did you recommend dropping Milwaukee B? Is that what I heard over here?

I It looks like there's no reason to keep it. It's not. I I think the natural resource impacts are fairly similar to a couple of the other ones, but we don't need to look at it. That's right.

Milwaukee Bee had also, we had gotten some pushback from division as well on that option. It's just a lot of bridges, a lot of maintenance, a lot of flexing. So I think that that is one we can.

Were there any others you wanted to look back at and say we did not want to continue forward? I just like that in in the continuous RCI there is one intersection, a continuous flow intersection that does take up a lot of run away that.

I don't know if we wanted to look at that or or possibly rule that out.

Is that we?

Yeah, let's look at that one real quick. Yeah. And this is an interchange configuration that can be can be included in our intersection configuration, sorry, that can be included in either the modernization or the continuous RCI. And what intersection is this again?

It's a partial CFI or 1/2 CFI, so we only make NC 54 of the the last crossover in both directions. If you're going north and Friday center or South and then a lot approach the intersection like normal to your left through the rights.

This one was considered last time due to how heavy the volumes were of previous forecasting with that being updated. The volumes work well with the RCI corridor. So we looked at the CFI or the partial CFI because it was.

Reviewed last time, but it's an option, like you said, that could potentially go away.

Well, if input here if the reasons for carrying it forward as long as we look, as long as we care that that doesn't compare the.

The modernization of the other one the same way. I don't know that it matters, but.

I'm not sure what you're thinking as far as why, why to carry it forward or not.

So this one is the RCI corridor. So this is the other option for that intersection. So the RCI would be an option through the six lane widening for the modernization.

Or the partial CFI would be option for the 6 lane or the monoclation. CFI just takes

up a lot more space right away was and moves around traffic, but traffic operations are similar or.

So you pronounce for both? Yeah, OK.

So it sounded like there's not really a reason to carry forward. Yes, that's fine as long as we looking at the same thing for both of those.

Oops.

With regards to the I40 interchange, um.

Do we still wanna keep the fiber and the partial code relief in the one sided DDI?

I guess is there any real strong benefits? This is a difference in where you're impacting. You're impacting probably just this one business right here.

Whereas the other two options in fact this entire drip of.

I don't know if there's really a way to pull that in for either of the other options and as we move forward and design, I don't know. So you're taking away which alternative?

I'm just noting the differences in commercial impacts between the partial quote relief interchange option really impacts this single that looks like it's a gas station in the southwest quadrant because of that.

That loop and then the other two options, the single one sided DDI and the fly over don't impact any of the businesses in the Southwest quadrant, but they do impact the commercial, that commercial strip and the Northwest quadrant.

And I was just looking at Jeff to see if I don't know if there are ways to it can be studied more the basically because the CFI you have the OR because of the one side of DDI you have like if you're you're coming up rank B it kind of.

You know goes off to the left to head east. It's it's the spacing there is a little bit tricky and getting the right angle as you come into that the.

The one sided part, so the impacts between the one sided DDI and the flyover are a little bit more similar. Is there significant traffic operations benefits to one over the other or would you think just keeping one of those to compare?

Since the impact source, the traffic's pretty similar. It's just the freeway operations has an option with the file because of that loop it can be impacted more. We're the software that we use for the freeway in this instance just looks at it like as a static point in time. So if you were to have a different software.

Or review it. It might show more or greater impact. We would slowing down due to that, you know, 2535 mile an hour loop coming on to 6540.

That would be with the flyer. This one you would just have your normal diamond

style.

Theoretically be able to merge at a faster speed. Could be a trade-off between basically cost and traffic operations. Well, it sounds like it sounds like the fly over is worse than both, yeah.

But there's more bridging and so constructability might be and you were saying that the fly over you could possibly avoid the Lee the farm location too, which is really the main impact.

And that looks like the natural resource impacts are very similar. Now on the single sided, well, I think on the single sided DDI and the flyer, we could probably pull this.

Yeah, yeah, yeah, that's what I'm.

Looks like on the fly over though that that loop and B might be pushing.

And I might be pushing this off off ramp a little bit more. So I don't know if there's an opportunity to really bring that in. No, because the loop to bring it up to design speed, we have to, you know, the the radius of that loop is pretty much said. That's the business impact.

Yeah.

D the D

So if we could go back to the partial cloverleaf, is there any reason to keep that one? Because that's for natural resources, that's pretty bad, so.

I can't believe it. Get rid of it. I'm I'm a favorite.

It this one avoids those businesses in the most wise quadrant. I think that's the trade-off on that one. You're trading at businesses for weapons. The other two impacts a lot more businesses. Yeah, that's true. This one hits the gas station. I don't think it is. I don't want to pop up somewhere else, right? I'm fine with leaving it for that. But yeah, I just want to share what you were saying before. We'll have to have better documentation again on that from a 404B1 standpoint, right?

That gets selected over another option, but it does sound like the Milwaukee be everybody's OK with.

No Milwaukee V and it doesn't seem like fly over has a whole lot of.

benefit over the one-sided DDI, unless you really want to look at it. And maybe that's the recommendation to take that out. Partial cloverleaf and one-sided DDI to trade off business impacts for natural resource impacts, potentially looking

Minimizing on all of them as much as possible and particularly at the lead farm side.

Any comments or discussion on the for people on the phone especially about dropping those alternatives?

And then if everybody's good with that recommendation, we'll kind of go with that. And then I was going to say though, can we go back to the 15501 end and kind of look at the RCI, is there what did you have at the Clone Linux?

This was the other area before where we had a little bit of trade off because of the historic districts and then the wet ones on the other side, but I think that these options.

See.

Don't have that conflict quite as or at all. So it looks like the partial quote relief. The previous historic effects form had a no adverse effect for the Glen Lenox Shopping Center with the commitment I think to like retain a.

Wall and but you know, upon restart, some of the comments that we heard were to reevaluate the eligibility of this property because there has been so much redevelopment that's gone on.

Within the property. And so I think I just saw a question. It'll be a CE. Sorry. Oh, never mind. Sorry. And and so, yeah, those were the.

Previous again that was the previous FX form that was back in 2019 I think and and so we're it looks like you know we're kind of staying out of back when Linux area with the partial.

Oh, this is a Dragonfly with the partial Cloverly. Um.

There was just a small area right here.

That should be a great feel soon.

Conference Historic Shopping Center.

That's my first time encountering at the store shopping center. I'm looking at the product. It's pretty cool.

So is there any?

To keep both or eliminate one. Again, I think the traffic operates pretty similarly. It's just a matter of, let's see, we've got, you know, more, a couple more signals here than the dragonfly where you just come together for that one signal.

Any concerns in the?

Maybe the agencies do these options.

I think Eric just already mentioned, you know, watch for the this one quadrant drainage there. That's not enough to drop it for me, but I'm fine with dropping it.

Yeah, I think for the for the 5501 interchange, we would probably keep them both for now and.

Valuations as we go to make the one is equally better or more preferred for some

reason.

Yes. And so the last thing, just to make sure, right now it looks like we're trying to carry both the modernization and the continuous RCI corridors forward.

Is there any thoughts on that or any comments on those two different options alternatives?

Yeah.

CM **Colleen McGue** 1:14:51

No, I think it's a good idea to carry both forward. Um.

That from the TPO's perspective, thank you.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:15:06

The two options at 155012 options for the corridor, two options at I-40, and they can all mix and match. So the ones we're dropping at I-40 is a flyover in the Milwaukee B, correct?

So our next steps then will be to go into the third screening phase and develop these alternative detailed study alternatives a little more closely to preliminary.

Yeah, they're they're basically with with changes. They basically they'll have slow stakes and and essentially it'll be the same as like 25% plans. It'll just be a roll plot rather than blank sheets.

Um. And then public involvement. Yeah, yeah.

And quantify, obviously quantify the impacts based on the substance, right? Because we'll actually have a weapon simulation that's finished and um, any input back from sort of architecture as well. So we should have IMD as well. Yes, true. We should IMD as well.

So any other questions on kind of our way forwards or any thoughts? I didn't want to say again when I told you in the e-mail Andrew about the your.

Public involvement in your notice to the public using. Peter, thanks for the report.

That's really real important, so.

CM **Colleen McGue** 1:16:51

This is Colleen. So the next time we expect to get together would be in next spring.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:17:01

Or the concurrence point to a which talks more about the hydraulics on the on the.

CM Colleen McGue 1:17:02

With this group.

OK.

That's not my area of expertise, but.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 1:17:12

Right. No, but we would also have, we should have a some form of public involvement, public meeting that would include you guys as well. So we will keep talking. It's just won't be as a concurrence.

CM Colleen McGue 1:17:22

This fall, OK.

I understand. Sounds good. Thank you.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 1:17:29

So.

I was going to say in the next concurrence point we would probably try to combine because all of those things kind of are tied together. The two way there'll be a couple of little areas for culverts and things, but the main discussion will be the Little Creek Bridge.

And if that's replaced, widened and how bike ped might be accommodated across that bridge, which will be determined, help determine the preferred alternative and also how we minimize this impact. So are we tied together, are there any other major hydraulic culverts?

Project I think there's one on. I think there's one on 15501 like kind of where that drainage kind comes around. Yeah, South of the interchange.

But there's none along 54 other than the bridge. Great. Thanks. So when public involved of the inner 26 or 27?

27 So early 27. So like January, February. Yeah, I'd be late, late 26, early 27. Oh, OK, yeah, I was thinking, you know, when or at the end of the year. I was like, that doesn't. Yeah, I appreciate the situation.

Early 2027, kind of, you know, about a year from now with the spring, the next concurrence point.

And get on the calendar for that April game, right?

And you did briefly just said participating a CE document unless something crazy found. That's right, we are working towards a CE.

CM **Colleen McGue** 1:19:13

So this is Colleen again.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:19:26

So we'll be completing all the, you know, technical studies with that community involvement or community impact assessment, noise, health resources, so.

Here's that stream to South of the to the South of the interchange is the stream would be it might impact is that that would be on the hydraulics. Yes, I thought this was the other large system.

Like the 72 inch or whatever the threshold was. Yeah, that was the bigger one. It's the size. Yeah. The other ones are smaller, yes.

Um, for the bridge, Colleen, I think you had unmuted. Did you have a comment or a question?

CM **Colleen McGue** 1:20:11

Oh, just immediate next steps. I was looking at the meeting appointment. It's you all need signatures from us in the next few days, it sounds like. Is that correct?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:20:23

I think what we do is we'll basically provide a summary of what decisions were made in the meeting and we'd send those out to all the agencies and other signatories via DocuSign.

And just make sure everyone's on on the same page with those and and that way we have a list of alternatives to carry forward. Yeah, before we finish out, I just like the canvas to make sure verbally that everybody's good before we send out that form.

Yes, sorry, I hadn't gotten to that part of it. Sorry, I have a question. Any more questions about the hydraulics there real quick or any other streams before we start polling, just make sure.

CM **Colleen McGue** 1:21:01

OK. Sorry, I'm getting ahead of everybody. I apologize.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:21:16

Just make sure for the quarter alternatives we're looking at and I can't even remember what we said right now. We're looking at both of the alternatives for that intersection for the.

So at midmont, I think we had tried to. We're not looking at the C5, OK, only RCI, RCI between providing version and the modernization version, right, right.

So a lesson balls.

And then for y'all, I know the empowerment area, I think the easement on this side is much wider than it was on the east side of I-40 the last time we were looking at the project.

So I think everything should fit in the NCTOT easement, but obviously that'll be something as we look at that. We know that there'll be additional coordination with the property folks and wildlife management and your Travis Wilson, the Travis Commission.

CM **Colleen McGue** 1:22:22

OK.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:22:25

Um, Ameled with EPA has a question.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 1:22:28

What was the RCI one that wasn't carried forward? I'm sorry, I couldn't quite hear clearly.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:22:34

So it was a CFI option. So at Meadowmont and NC54 there there was a option to have this partial CFI intersection as opposed to an RCI.

This was something that was previously designed and looked at with before the project went on hold and so we just we kept it in. It is something that could be used for both the modernization and the continuous NC 54 quarter options.

But given that it does take more right of way and it doesn't really have any traffic benefits over the RCI, I believe we just decided to to only have the RCI option.

Here. So.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 1:23:27

Thank you.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:23:32

You with the changes, then the next commercial and historic district is probably still eligible. It needs a reevaluation and the traffic circle is probably OK. We just need to document the current changes versus.

What was your core origin as long as the contributing brick commercial buildings are untouched. Will that stay in the chat? Can we grab a screen capture of that comment? You can stay in the chat, but I will snag it.

And I'll come like that recording of the meeting. It might be tomorrow or I get it out since we've got meetings all day. Thank you. Thank you. I think we've reached the end of our presentation.

Unless there's any other questions, um from the from inside the room or on the on the call.

Alright, we'll just go ahead and do our polling. I guess before we close out the meeting to make sure everybody's in agreement with what's been stated. I'll start with Eric. Yes, Sir. Seth in agreement.

Fish and Wildlife Service compares. All right. I know Travis is no longer on the phone. He didn't indicate. He did indicate that he didn't have any issues, but we will follow up with him to ensure that he doesn't have a problem from WRC.

Standpoint, Aminetta from EPA. Do you concur?

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 1:25:18

EPA doesn't have any issues. We concur.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:25:22

Rob, I can go. Um, blonde.

CT **Cao, Luan T** 1:25:28

Chippo cookers.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:25:31

And then I guess Colleen, are you from?

CM Colleen McGue 1:25:35
Yep, Triangle W concurs. Thank you.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 1:25:38
And of course, dot does.
All right. Well, we'll send out the sheet for signatures in the next couple of weeks. We will also send out meeting minutes for review. If you have any other questions, just let us know. Otherwise, thank you for your time today. Thank you guys very much. Appreciate the time.

CM Colleen McGue 1:25:59
Thank you. Y'all have a good day.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 1:26:00
Thank you.

SA Somerville, Amanetta 1:26:01
Thank you.

DP Doug Plachcinski 1:26:03
Thank you.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 1:26:03
OK, everybody.

● **Headrick, Hannah S** stopped transcription