

U-5811 CP 4A-20260513_100208-Meeting Recording

May 13, 2026, 2:02PM

48m 11s

● **Loving (Kimley-Horn), Everett J** started transcription



Headrick, Hannah S 0:11

For EU 5811.

CP4A merger meeting.

This is the project on Aviation Parkway from NC 54 out to I-40. There is a sign in sheet going around the room if you please.

Initial scribble, check whatever. By the block the front column.

Pleased to know that we've attended and obviously we'll catch everybody online otherwise so.

Why don't we start off with the introductions around the room?

We'll start with Everett and then go around the table.

Awesome. Ever loving kindly Horn product manager for you too.

Yeah. Kara Sherman dot project management unit.

I'm Jack.

I'm an intern with the Division Five Environmental Unit and the Montague Division Five Environmental Precinct, Ellis Division five environmental Mitchell Wood Relief Division, five environmental.

Deanna rippy.

Hey, Seth Holtro with Federal Highway.

Gary Jordan, US Fish and Wildlife Service Sarah Klsemer Corp.

Engineers faith pardon DWR. Rob ridings DWR. Hannah hedrick. Environmental policy. Morgan Webbard environmental policy. Ethan bloom. Kimley horn. Teresa brushham. Kimley horn.

Alright, we'll do our best to do the online participants. So we'll start with Jordan middle.



Bendl, Jordan 1:34

Bendel Kimley horn hydraulics, mainly the Culver crossings.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:38

Robert Bullock.



Bullock, Robert W 1:41

Robert Bullock, division five, construction.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:44

Wesley Chandler.



Chandler, Wesley J 1:46

West.

Chandler, roadside environmental.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:49

Bristow.



Chris Snow 1:51

Bristow Wake County Parks Rec and open space.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:55

Daniel spurrell.



Daniel Spruill 1:57

Dennis Brule, Campo capital MPO.



Headrick, Hannah S 2:00

Caitlin Ferguson.



Sarzaeim, Parisa 2:04

Paris.



Faugerstrom, Kaitlyn 2:04

Hi, Caitlin.

Fogerstorm, Canley, Horne hydraulics.



Headrick, Hannah S 2:11

Renee Berlin Hill early.



Gledhill-earley, Renee 2:21

Renee. Glad hello early state Historic preservation office.



Headrick, Hannah S 2:26

Katie harvell.



Harville, Katie E 2:29

Katie Harville, NCDOT environmental policy.



Headrick, Hannah S 2:33

Are you up here?

Are you?

Marion Marion Barra.



Ibarra, Maira 2:44

Myra, I'm with division five NCDT.



Headrick, Hannah S 2:48

J twisdale.



Jay Twisdale 2:52

Jay Twistell TTS engineer supporting the hydraulics unit with a review of the drainage design.



Headrick, Hannah S 2:58

Mark Hamlin.



Mark A Hamlett 3:01

Hey Mark came away.

County General Services Administration.



Headrick, Hannah S 3:05

Brian Overton.



Overton, Brian P 3:12

This is Brian Overton.
NCDOT archaeology.



Headrick, Hannah S 3:17

Indian park.



PJ Park, Jinyoung 3:19

Jingyang Park in CDOT geotech.



Headrick, Hannah S 3:23

Richard Campbell.



RC Richard Campbell 3:27

Richard Campbell, White County facilities design and construction.



Headrick, Hannah S 3:31

Valley and Richards.



RO Richards, Othalia 3:34

EPA Remedial project manager for Ward Transformer Superfund site.



Headrick, Hannah S 3:42

Rezia SARS, sarzia.



SP Sarzaeim, Parisa 3:45

Paris was named DWR.




Headrick, Hannah S 3:48

Great. Well, thank you everybody.


I apologize if I had mispronounced anyone's name today, but thank you so much for


attending and I'll turn it over to Theresa now to go ahead and get started with the meeting.


OK.


 **Somerville, Amanetta** 3:58
Somerville.

 **Wilson, Travis W.** 3:59
Hold on one second.
This is Travis Wilson with the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission.


 **Somerville, Amanetta** 4:00
Gave reason for his on as well.


 **Wilson, Travis W.** 4:03
I'm on here as well.


 **Headrick, Hannah S** 4:05
Thank you, Travis. Anybody else I missed.

 **Somerville, Amanetta** 4:08
Can you hear me?

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 4:10
Yes.

 **Somerville, Amanetta** 4:11
This is Amanetta Somerville with EPA Region 4 as well.
The NEPA office.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 4:18
Thank you.

 **Scott Jones** 4:20
This is Scott Jones with Sky Jones with the US Army Corps of Engineers.



Headrick, Hannah S 4:20

Anybody else?

The voucher team has represented other than NRCS on the phone.

All right, let's get started. My screen.

All right.

Thank you for joining our concurrence point for a meeting. Our last merger meeting was February of 2025 where we finalized CP2A and three.

Today, we're gonna be talking about a few design updates that are gonna just keep you informed, but also some of them will be relevant for the minimization and avoidance conversation. We're gonna then talk about the minimization and avoidance measures that have been applied and answer any other quest.

Or collect new information that may have arised in the last year.

This is a graphic just to remind you of the project location NC 54 up to I-40 about 2 1/2 miles and there are quadrant loop intersections. Both of the West End at North 54 and in the middle at the criminal Evans that one.

In the middle is a new design change since our last meeting.

We'll be replacing several culverts and also adding sidewalk and multi use path.

In the project schedule, we are here in the spring.

The.

CE will be signed in May.

Probably this week and then we'll be moving into our final design and construction after that.

After the CB4A meeting and as we get into those more final designs, of course we'll have CP4B and 4C meetings as well.

Do you?

Do you have any idea when 4C would have to be done from that schedule?

We are internally aiming for late summer, but we will let you know that changes.

All right, design updates.

So one important update is that across the lake Crabtree Quadway in the previous design, we were widening the Causeway to the South or to the east.

We are now widening it to the other side, to the north and the benefit of that is that we avoid major utility conflicts.

It's going to be easier to maintain traffic during construction and we also avoid all section 4F impacts.

There had been Section 4 impacts anticipated on both the lake and on the park, and now we have eliminated those on both resources as well as all property impacts to the Raleigh Durham authority.

Any property impact reduction is always a benefit, of course, on the disadvantage of this design is that it does increase the impact on Wake County property and there is a tradeoff on the water impacts on a site, increased dwelling impacts and.

It's like decreased open water impacts. We have looked at the pros and cons of this and felt that the benefits of this shift outweigh the disadvantages.

So even though there is an increased site increase on the wetland impacts, we wanted to propose this as the preferred design going forward.

It doesn't change CP3, because CP3 didn't go into that level of detail.

So that point doesn't have to be revisited, but we did want to.

Pause here and open this for questions.

 **Richard Campbell** 8:26

Yeah, who has determined there's no section 4F impacts on county property.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 8:34

There is no Section 4 impacts on the Lake Crabtree County Park property, which is the recreational resource, and Lake Crabtree, which is also a recreational resource. So that so the Section 4.

Is only related to the active recreation areas.

 **Richard Campbell** 8:56

OK, the lake is a is part of the park and we mentioned that one time before multiple times before.

The county owns on both sides of Lake Crabtree and we have boats and canoes that use the water and we also have canoes that go under the the road through that culvert.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 9:22

That's right. And.

 **Richard Campbell** 9:23

And the other thing is is.

The cut field stuff that Tracy parent was talking about before he retired.
The county doesn't consider it no section 4F impacts. If you're filling in the flood pool.

And dot is expecting the county to pay for some of that mitigation.

The last conversations we had with Tracy.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 9:54

We've.

 **RC** **Richard Campbell** 9:58

You know, they were gonna work on that, but we haven't come to an agreement on the the feel.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 10:07

Yes, you are absolutely right.

We haven't and we will be scheduling another meeting with the county as we are finalizing the updated impacts and associated costs so that we can work through that with you.

Is a separate but parallel conversation to section 4M. Section 4F only is related to the recreational use of the lake, and because we are replacing the culvert and because the fill will not affect the ability of boats to use the lake.

There's no section 4F impact, but there is an impact property. There is an impact to the flood pool and both of those would be addressed in upcoming coordination with the county.

 **RC** **Richard Campbell** 10:47

OK, the county.

As I said before, the county does not consider this project de minimis if dot is charging. Trying to not pay for all the mitigation.

So if the county taxpayers have to pay for any mitigation, it is not a de minimis project.

As far as the county is concerned.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 11:10

Hmm.

So. So, Ricky, when we last had these conversations, the plan for that we discussed whether you could get 11 project will include mitigation in Lake Crabtree area to offset the flood pool area.

So even though this exhibit doesn't show that mitigation area, I do want to confirm that we're continuing forward with the conversations we've had with y'all. When Tracy Parrot was still around, that there will be excavation that offsets that flood pool, what Teresa's talking about is there's still.

Some details to work out with Wake County.

Specifically regarding the cost component, as we look at right of way and the cost actually construct, those are the details we still need to work through. But in terms of the overall kind of conversations you've had with we're moving forward with that understanding that this project will off.

Some of those impacts, that's right.

And regarding section four of the impacts that we do have are not considered Section 4 of impact. So that does not in any way reduce the need for us to come to the agreements with the county.

 **Richard Campbell** 12:16

OK.

Well, I'm. I'm interested in what Federal Highway has to say about it.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 12:21

We can provide you our documentation so you can see the rationale.

I think there may be some misunderstanding from the county's angle on for us, so we can have a call kind of outside of this meeting to discuss the nuances of Section 4 app, but happy to do that.

 **Richard Campbell** 12:41

I just know that the County Attorney's Office has always said that the the lake itself is part of the park and it's being used for recreational use.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 12:55

I think you know part of the driver is, is there right of way being acquired within a designated park boundary and also is there an activity that's occurring in the park that will no longer be able to occur after the project? And I think in general I'd have.

To go back to the exact documentation, but our conclusions were the answers were generally no for both of those, right?

So I don't.

I don't disagree that there are some things that have to be worked out with the county about flood pool mitigation and what have you, but there's not a 4F Nexus there.

Are you comfortable if we take that offline and discuss it in our next meeting with the county?

Back on meet again.

OK.

Let's move on the next design change.

Is that the Mckenzell report intersection with Aviation Parkway?

And this is a fairly minor change from an impact perspective, but it does change operations. We wanted to draw your attention to it.

So we have turned this into a quadrant loop, meaning we have removed left turns from Cremin and from Evan's onto Aviation Parkway. And in order to accommodate the.

Different travel movements.

We've added a small U-turn bulb at the end of the South Port Recreation intersection that the T intersection that now has U-turn bolt.

That's the dashed yellow circle area that comes close to, but does not encroach into the stream that was delivered there.

There also is gonna be just a little bit of widening on MC Crimmin as it approaches Aviation Parkway and then all the rest of the changes are striping.

And then some additional.

Design changes. We've done some more work at the location of NC 54 and Aviation Parkway in order to try to meet the design standards, but also account for some grading challenges and timing back into the buildings. Just as the designs have progressed and we have more inform.

From survey and other elements, these things are of course.

A continual process.

So these are just some of those elements.

So at the Soviet Parkway near NC 54.

Both on the West side by the Fire Administration building at Pew House and on the east side near the place homes, there is a change in impacts, but no new relocations.

And the Pew House property impacts that have changed.

We've been working with Shippo and have gotten to know adverse effect determination on that property and we're also working with the county capital preservation and the town of Morrisville on a landscaping plan in order to.

Help not only.

Address changes in landscaping caused by the project, but also add in some additional landscaping in order to improve the property.

We've added a medium break and dedicated left turn for truck access at the Dogwood Pop Co.

Business property that was a comment that came up during the public meeting.

I'm asking for some additional access for truck.

Turns in particular.

On the culvert side, this doesn't change CP2A because the locations in right now the sizes have not changed of our culverts, but we are looking at changing those to welded steel pipes, which is going to help with installation and reduce the impact during construction.

And then finally back to aviation, West of the railroad tracks, because of a request from the railroad, we have shipped to the sidewalks to about 10 feet.

From the back of the curb in order to get behind the gates instead of being in the gates that was actually designed.

That's now gone back and forth three times because of their ongoing design guidance changes.

That's fine.

We were able to accommodate it.

Any questions about any of those design changes?

OK.

Let's look at our audience minimization measure.

So before we do in your packet, you've had a narrative summarizing the impacts to different resources.

We provided that as a reference point so that you can see where we were at and that matches within the current CE. And then we also have a table that summarizes those impacts. And so we can come back to this, but this just level sets us so that.

We understand where we are at with our current design.

So just briefly, some of the impacts that have changed or are sort of notable in the in the coming conversations, cultural resources, as I mentioned, we have a number

adverse effect that does include several commitments including a landscaping plan on the Pew House and then recreational resources because.

We were able to pull off of like Crabtree and the park.

There's no impact to those properties.

We also were able to make a small design modification on NC 54 in order to pull off of Cedar Fork District Park from the property perspective, so no property impacts to the Cedar Park District Park and then Sarah Woody Jenkins Park.

Right now we're planning a small encroachment and.

Sort of reworking how their driveway access is.

That is not a Section 4 of impact because it was determined not to be a significant part and we are working with the town on any access changes to the park.

So section 4F right now or only section 4F resource is the Pew House and we have a de minimis conclusion on that property.

So on the protected species there the the one unresolved. I think that's the bald eagle.

Sorry.

Oh, OK.

Well, what about the the bald eagle nest?

Can somebody remind me how far away that is?

Yes, I do have a slide here.

And all. So plus 1000 feet over, OK.

That's what I was thinking.

So it's it's if it's more than 660 feet, it's a non issue.

And they probably got the numbers from the near TR.

But yeah, 1000 feet is the closest, OK.

All right, we're good then great.

All right, so I'm kind of going through these one by one first.

Aspect widening approach that we had agreed to during CP3 was used and that was a good starting point.

But then we've also done some additional alignment shifts in strategic areas in order to reduce impacts to properties, environment and cultural resources.

RO

Richards, Othalia 19:56

Yeah. Can you go back to the previous slide for a moment?

So where would potential PCB impacts be evaluated under environmental impacts?



Headrick, Hannah S 20:09

That's something that we don't measure as environmental impact. It's something that we would be aware of to understand if there needs to be either construction requirements or mitigation that would be needed as part of the final design and construction process.



Richards, Othalia 20:27

OK. Will that be discussed later in the presentation or is that something once we'll discuss once you're further on in the design process?



Headrick, Hannah S 20:35

Let's go ahead and talk about it now, just to make sure it doesn't get forgotten. It's not a separate slide, so thanks for bringing it up. Just to bring everyone up to speed on the PCB conversation, NCDOT last year did an evaluation and concluded that based on their assessment, the chances of having PCBS by the Causeway. Are negligible enough that they didn't feel like any additional studies were needed and no requirements for the contractor would be needed. However, EPA is planning to do an assessment and evaluate. Do you wanna summarize your plans for that?



Richards, Othalia 21:16

Yeah. So we've talked about this internally and right now it seems that we're going to do is. Instead of doing additional testing before you guys get out there, what we're going to do is we're going to think about this from an engineering perspective and just provide additional oversight while you guys are there. Either EPA will do oversight while you guys are doing construction. Or we'll have a contractor provide oversight during the construction process.



Headrick, Hannah S 21:48

OK.
Yeah. Can you?
Can you speak a little bit more to kind of what that oversight role would be and what

you all would be looking for wanting to see from the contractor as they're building these improvements?

RO **Richards, Othalia** 22:05

So this is something we're still working out because this is just something that. This is in lieu of going out and taking additional PCB samples, so we haven't figured out exactly what the scope will be for the oversight.

Yeah, but we can. We can talk about that once I have more information of what about it more.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 22:29

Yep.

Is this something you would provide or is this something the contractor would be required to have a specialist to provide?

RO **Richards, Othalia** 22:39

I think we would provide that and we would probably have our own oversight contractor if I'm not going to be at the site myself.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 22:47

I think I tell you what we would want to do is make sure we're documenting well in our contract, any expectation we might have of the contractor. So if there's any additional or special ways we want them to handle PCBs, if they run into those or contaminate so.

RO **Richards, Othalia** 22:54

OK.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 23:00

So I think what could be helpful here is for us to coordinate with you a little bit more offline.

We can kind of explain kind of where we're at and I think we could also bring some of our construction folks and we can start having a conversation. What's what's important to y'all and then we can kind of see what what's the path forward, could we?

RO **Richards, Othalia** 23:10

Yes.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 23:15

Probably do need to have something in the contract documents to understand what that coordination look like between our contractor and.

RO **Richards, Othalia** 23:21

OK, also has does ncdeq not de dot have anything to say about potential impacts here?

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 23:34

That's out of my purview.

RO **Richards, Othalia** 23:36

OK.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 23:38

I don't know anything about PC PS on this and it's never been asked of us before.

RO **Richards, Othalia** 23:45

OK.

Well, I have a state counterpart for the the war transformer projects.

I think it's probably best going forward that we loop at the very least my state counterpart in on those conversations.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 24:02

OK.

Well, will you send me an e-mail with contact information?

RO **Richards, Othalia** 24:07

Yes, I'll put it in the chat.

Give me just a moment.



Headrick, Hannah S 24:09

I think, Ricky.



Richard Campbell 24:13

Yeah. Before we move on, I wanted to mention to Athalia.

They will be excavating in the flood pool athalia similar to what?

Rdu is doing over there at Briar Creek.

And they will be excavating.

I guess they're to replace the culvert.

Under the Causeway.



Headrick, Hannah S 24:42

Yep.



Richard Campbell 24:43

So those are the the areas that, that.



Richards, Othalia 24:46

But.



Richard Campbell 24:48

But they would be excavating so.



Richards, Othalia 24:48

Hmm.



Richard Campbell 24:51

I'm curious why we would have RDU test.

The soil they're taking out of mitigation and not require dot to do that.



Richards, Othalia 25:02

Yeah, that.

That is going to require a conversation because so the the material that you're taking out is that going to be taken off site.



Headrick, Hannah S 25:15

Yeah. So this is part of the conversation that I, Ricky is spot on that there's a large amount of excavation happening.

There's also a large amount of build happening to widen the Causeway, and so the intent is that these roughly overlap.

We haven't gotten to that point in our phasing to understand what comes first, what's critical in terms of either relocating the cut, look, the cut Earth work to the widening of the Causeway or bringing it off site.

We we wrestled with this with contaminated soils on other projects.

This is just a different application of that.

And we hope there are no contaminated soils.

You know what dot has assessed that there are none.

And so this is a little bit of a backstop just in case, yes.



Richards, Othalia 25:55

But that's dot though.

Has I would.

I would prefer if we had a statement of concurrence from NCDEQ. At the very least on that.

And which again, this is probably going to be a full other conversation. I don't want to derail the presentation, but I think we need to start talking about that with NCDEQ.



Headrick, Hannah S 26:21

Can be used as a starting point to find the right person to.

I'll try to find out.

Yeah, yeah, I'll do what I can. OK. She at the counterpart she's mentions. So. So maybe that'd be. Yeah, I. Yeah, I'm outside of four O 1 issues.

I'm not familiar with these, but OK, very good.

Yeah. Thanks for bringing this up. And we will definitely start to set up those conversations.

OK.

So since we've talked about some of these design changes, we won't go into as much detail here as we look at each of the different places where we had reduced

typical or made other design changes in order to reduce impacts in front of the Pew House, but we.

Have a narrower median, and on the South side we have sidewalk instead of a multi. Use top and we shifted sidewalk to the back of the curb instead of having a grass strip between them.

All those things help reduce the amount of.

Impact on few house property, including getting the sidewalk.

Entirely off of their property, which is really important step for us in the adverse effect or no adverse effect decision.

The Lake Crabtree Causeway narrowing.

We have gone from a 23 foot median to a four foot concrete island and remove the northern sidewalk entirely.

So pedestrians would cross on either side of it and just use the South side walk or the South multi use path.

Overall, this median change minimized impacts to the lake and to wetlands adjacent to the lake.

On the northern sidewalk, along the entire project corridor, we had evaluated the option of using 10 foot multi use paths to be consistent with South side and per request of some of the local agencies but have gone from the five foot sidewalk in order to minimize property impact.

And strain crossings along that section.

The shift to the north of the Causeway eliminated impacts to major utility relocations and Section 4, and the RDU Authority property.

In our last meeting with you, we showed you the northern loop at the NC 54 aviation fiber.

Since then, we have shifted the loop further north in order to entirely get off of the pond. The pond itself is non jurisdictional, but it also eliminated a string crossing and just good to keep the water if we can, even if it's non jurisdictional.

Talking about the pond being non jurisdictional was their impacts.

And now you said there are any impacts upon but so the impacts under open water does not include Pond, Pennsylvania.

It would have actually.

Well, there are no impacts, but previously with the calculation included on the 8 for open water impacts.

Before that **** happened. Yeah, it would have. Even though they were not restricted

so.

If, if for some reason it goes back to impact in it, we need to keep those separate from the 404 impact. Understood. Yeah, yeah. Good. Good point there. Thank you. Thanks.

I mentioned this briefly.

This is not a very easy diagram to look at, but it is just South of Aviation Parkway along NC 54, the section that is sort of the Gray bar just next to the red area that's showing the roadway design as it ties into tropical and 54.

And we were able to steepen the slopes and tie that in a little faster so that we were able to get off of the park property entirely.

And this is standard dot practice by using head balls and wing walls, we can in order to shorten the culvert lengths to reduce the impacts to the strings.

And a couple slides here on the flood pool mitigation area.

So as we were talking about earlier, because we are filling into the flood pool, we will be doing a mitigation efforts as part of this project and we have gone through two steps in order to identify the vast mitigation area that would minimize impact.

So the first step was to identify the location of the mitigation area.

Which quadrant?

Of the Causeway.

We would want to put it in.

That was important because we were looking at all four quadrants, each one sent pros and cons, some impacted wetlands, some impacted open waters.

We looked at different options for sizing them and sort of situating them differently and what we found is that this location would have the fewest impacts to wetlands and it was contiguous with a project, which is important for constructibility. And it was still far enough away from our.

Eagle nest.

To be satisfactory.

And then once we have that area, we did some reconfiguring of it, including going out and looking at Portland and streams a couple of times as we were looking at the different potential configurations.

And So what you end up with is a bit of an odd shape, but the shape is intended to have the right amount of area to match the fill that's gonna go into the flood pool.

And so it's a calculated area and we also try to minimize the amount of well.

So we kept sort of.

Like relumping it in order to get off the wetlands and onto the uplands area as much as possible.

There's still a little where we had to have the access Rd. come in and where we couldn't avoid having it come up by the lake private tree itself, but most of it is on the uplands and so we really are very happy with how we've been able to.

Minimize the impacts through that process, which was collaborative with a lot of different disciplines at dot as well as with Wake County.

Any questions for discussion about the Fomentation area?

So the the temporary construction easement that's shown on the map is that.

Pretty much where the impacts are gonna be to the wetlands.

That that's correct.

It covers the limits and ones we've talked about with Wake County is that the ACS Partners project would construct all these improvements.

So regrading on the floodplain offsetting and then they would donate that that lane would go back to what county to maintain and own after the project?

OK.

So there's some area on the business, northern part of that that's within your study area, flood mitigation area, but not.

Being impacted, that's correct.

Is there a reason that you can't use that instead of impacting the wetlands?

Or yeah, so that actually that that kind of northern lump extension was actually our first draft.

So what we've done is we ran this mitigation area more parallel to the roadway and then we realized we were really impacting HWC which is that wetland area that kind of runs close to the road there.

So that's what Teresa's talking about. We wanted to get off WC, so we did.

We kind of moved more.

To the top left of this graphic away from WC.

The only impacts now from WC are the roadway widening impacts that temporary construction Rd. we do have impacts to WS which is the wetland area along the lake, but that's that's required because one thing we haven't mentioned is we're offsetting for flood pool. But we're also offsetting for.

Segment storage fill as well. So we do have to exhibit some beneath the water and that's that's where there's WS impacts.

Yeah, WS impacts are.

So I'm looking at the the Orange Line crosses right through basically the middle of WC.

The future saying the only impacts are fibre to axis, round and winding.

That's correct and.

Pull up a more detailed grading sheet that would be helpful to kind of see more of the design, but essentially that the orange dash that you can see through WC that is purely for the roadway widening to so this is one of those trade-offs of now that.

We're winding to the north and you impact WC more for that roadway, but we're not gonna then be adding more impacts on top of that just for the mitigation.

You've moved the mitigation area off of WC. Got it?

And the impacts to WS are pretty much necessary because of that settlement storage.

That's correct. And also just yeah, sorry.

And also just thinking about kind of this is a this is a pocket.

It's not just like we're trying to design and so it becomes kind of challenging of not making it like an inlet, right?

That kind of the water flows down and back up too. So we're trying to be thoughtful about what is our grading and how does it.

Work well with the existing creating a link.

OK, so other than the the fill from the roadway?

It's pretty much gonna be excavated to below the water surface elevation, that's correct.

Some of it for the seven storage, which is a smaller piece and the focal elevation is gonna be I think it's at 276, which is about 9 inches above the normal pool water elevation.

So one thing we're working on right now, that way County hasn't seen yet.

This is what we'll be working through them with. Their permitting process is we do have lands, grading and revegetation plans.

So we'll grade out the area and then we have planting plans to go back in that area.

Yeah, to stabilize it.

OK.

I think what you told me is good for for 4A, but when?

When permit comes in, we just need some detail about how you minimize impacts.

Absolutely. OK. I think this is a good time to also bring up and hopefully kind of address some of Ricky's concerns as well.

Is that NCDOT sees a lot of this mitigation as a right of way in permitting coordination, and that's when we really like to nail down cost.

Who's paying for what?

So that would be applied for permit all that is settled at this early stage and and and merger, we still feel like there's a lot of unknowns and a lot of variables that we need to nail down before we can come to.

Agreement. I hope this group agrees with that.

 **Richard Campbell** 36:56

Yeah, well, that was going to be one of my questions and comments later. But since you brought up right away acquisition.

I noticed.

On a earlier slide, September right away plans October.

Acquisition and the discussions we were having with Tracy, all the mitigation stuff was going to be worked out prior to right away because if y'all wait till right away and don't have this mitigation stuff settled the right way, acquisition is going nowhere.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 37:27

Yes, Sir. We understand that. And and we are working hard to try to get that all that nailed down.

In fact, we probably will have to submit a schedule change request from our original right away date that that is showing on our documentation.

So, you know, get VR.

We're working through it and then we look forward to getting with the county again to continue with our negotiations.

And the right of way is a multi year process and so if needed we'll start on the right of way acquisition on the West side.

And be working through with those property owners while we're working through these questions with the county before we come to you with the right of way questions specifically.

 **Richard Campbell** 38:06

OK.

Well, that's fine, but the right of way acquisition recently I was involved in with the

NC 540 project. The county was given 30 days to consider an offer.
So as I said before, that won't work with this project.



Headrick, Hannah S 38:22

Understand. Understood.

Yeah. We appreciate that feedback, Ricky.

We'll make sure that we talk to our agents and make sure they're aware of the the constraints that the county has.

All right. So in summary, the resources that we have been able to avoid impacts to include the pond, the Cedar, Forestry Park, Lake, Crabtree County Park and the bald eagle nests.

And then we've been able to minimize the impacts to the other resources that are along our corridor in addition to property owners and access and other things that we would be considering.

Which gives us a summary list of items that we've discussed that would be on the concurrence form.

So let me now pause and open it up.

Are there minimization or avoidance measures that we haven't shown that anyone around the table would be interested in discussing?

For a landlord, the first question.

Does anyone have any concerns with the way that any of these points are written on the concurrence form? Or any other reason not to sign the concurrence form today?



Sarzaeim, Parisa 39:45

This is Paddy star from DWR. I have a question about stormwater.

I know that the current stage of project does not require.

A full storm water design or any kind of like detailed storm water management plan.

But I thought this is an appropriate point in the process to make sure that the adequate space is reserved for the future storm water treatment or any kind of like control measures.



Headrick, Hannah S 40:15

No.



Sarzaeim, Parisa 40:15

So I just wanted to ask if the site layout includes a dedicated space for stormwater practices.



Headrick, Hannah S 40:25

It's a great question.

I kick it off and then Caitlin and Jordan, if you guys can chime in as well.

So yeah, we're right now in our design process working through. We've already submitted redline drainage plans, but we're making some revisions based on some of the things we've done on today.

And so we're we're working on the drainage plans, getting all the proposed final conditional layouts developed.

We're also actively working on our original control plans right now. Just looking at how we're phasing the construction and then where can we have some of those.

Storm water treatment points along the corridor right away is challenging, and there's not a lot of options.

But we are looking for every option we can for places to deal with stormwater during construction.

Caitlin, what else would you add to that?



Sarzaeim, Parisa 41:04

So I just wanted to kind of in the process, are you using seldom catalog and BMP's toolbox?



Headrick, Hannah S 41:15

She's so little.

Seldom catalogs seldom catalog.

Caitlin, help me out here.



Faugerstrom, Kaitlyn 41:21

Yeah, currently we are not.

I don't believe we are scoped currently for that within this project. As Everett mentioned, the the right away is really tight along this corridor.

So we don't really have a ton of room for a lot of VMP design or sort of going down that rabbit hole, but.

That's certainly something we can continue to discuss throughout the project.

SP Sarzaeim, Parisa 41:46

OK.

Absolutely Yep. I would be happy to to work on that with you.

BJ Bendl, Jordan 41:46

Yeah, but I I can chime in as well.

Yeah, there was some initial discussion at one of the outlets of a of the potential for a detention pond that was that was low on the priority that NCDOT did not want to maintain detention ponds as part of this project. In addition to that.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 42:09

You can.

BJ Bendl, Jordan 42:14

So the the BMPS that will be used will be grass swales mostly.

SP Sarzaeim, Parisa 42:20

OK. Thank you.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 42:27

I have a suggestion for a wording change that may help with the 4F confusion.

Let me forward that and bring that there.

Is that coming back?

So this is the if you I pulled up the White County map.

I got GIS mapping and so you can see if you take the time to go there and again we can follow up with accounting for documentation.

There's a boundary where it transitions from what's designated as the park to what's designated as the flood control part of of the lake.

Could you share that for you to share the screen?

It might take a little work 'cause I OK? That's that's OK. Keep going. So the minor right away that will be acquired for the culvert work is within the park. The parcel that is designated for flood control.

And so that's what we're basing that on.

So I think the wording just needs to say avoid Section 4 of impacts too late Crabtree

County Park.

And going back to four.

Details here.

So you got those two parcels again?

141 decimated as a part, and so the theoretical paper says it has to be the primary purpose and primary purpose is related to properties. Primary function has intended to be managed and the secondary activity similar to park activities do not constitute primary purpose within the context.

Of Section 4 app. So the way Federal Highway is looking at it is.

The lake has a boundary whereas designated as Park resource, and it has a boundary. Works.

That's made as a ***** troll resource.

And the the work that's being done the right way is being acquired is within the the flood control portion.

So it's not subject to four app, but obviously subject to all the the flood control flood pool considerations.

So that's how we reached our conclusion and hopefully that spells it out a little better. Once I had a chance to dig in again and again, we can send that documentation. But I think the wording here it'll help to just.

Make sure we're just on at the far, so it's clear.

Great. All right. We've made that change.

Thank you, Seth.

And just last caveat, even if we were generous and said, you know what, forget what.

I just said we're still gonna call it a four up resource. The activities are not gonna be.

In fact, they'll be the same after the product is before, so there's not, to me even a reason to discuss being more liberal with our our definitions there.

 **Richard Campbell** 45:11

Seth, can you send that information to Wake County?

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 45:14

Will do.

Yep, will do. Thanks.

 **Richard Campbell** 45:17

Thank you.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 45:19

Any other recommended changes to the inference form?

I'd just like to ask Amanetta and Renee and Travis, particularly if they have any comments or questions about the foresee.

 **Somerville, Amanetta** 45:34

This is Iamanetta.

I think you guys have addressed all my concerns. Thanks.

 **Wilson, Travis W.** 45:40

The Wildlife Commission can concur.

 **Gledhill-earley, Renee** 45:45

A historic preservation offering car.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 45:51

Everybody in the room here, Rob and Gary and Seth Roll.

Great. OK.

Sure. Yep. I have one thing I noticed that the package this doesn't affect for a, but I noticed the package.

You start talking about the impacts to open wires, strings and wetlands, and and can we also start getting estimates on buffers? Whenever I see you get them into?

Yeah, yeah, I mean.

Not right now.

You you can get it, but you know later, maybe by 4B. But you know, just to keep those in mind, I like to make sure on projects that are buffer basis that those are.

Thought of earlier than later.

Yeah, absolutely.

We have, I think that information.

You just not sure what document it, but yeah, we'll start putting it in the merged packet.

Yeah. Thank you.

We do have sunscreens, so in Appendix BI, think in the water resource summary. We have included some streams that have no impact through the stream, but we are impacting the buffer.

So at least they're listed in the table, so right?

OK. Any final discussion or comments before we close out?

See before a discussion.

Let me go ahead and add one final thought.

So just like many other NCT routine projects, funding is a factor for this one.

So I just want to make this team aware that if there are any changes to the project based on funding as new estimates start coming out that we'll maintain transparency with this group. Obviously let people know what what is changing.

But I expect that any changes that will be made will be less impactful, not more impactful.

So at least rest assured that we will do our best to maintain.

OK.

Thank you all.

● **Headrick, Hannah S** stopped transcription