U-5811 - 4C Meeting-20261119_125958-Meeting Recording

November 19, 2026, 5:59PM

52m 49s

Headrick, Hannah S started transcription

Headrick, Hannah S 0:03

just a few moments. I just want to get a thumbs up from the group online. Can everybody hear us okay? Get a thumbs up or...

Anybody that we're waiting on, Jason?

I think J.D., but I just saw him on the right screen, so he'll be back. OK, we can get started. Yeah, so alright. Anybody from the environmental team or Army Corps that we're waiting on, right? I don't know.

We'll give him another moment and then we'll go ahead and get started and we can back fill him. Aviation Parkway.

Okay.

What?

All right, why don't we go and do that then? Well, thanks everybody for being here this afternoon. We're here for the CP4C merger meeting, which is the permit drawing review for the new 5811 project, which Aviation Parkway from NC 54 to I-40. This is being recorded and we'll go ahead and start with introductions. I'm Joel Perlin. I'm the NCBOT project management.

The project, and we'll go around the room here first. Ethan Bloom, Kimley Horn, NEPA. Rob Rivings, Division of Water Resources. Mitchell Wimberly, Division Five Environmental.

Ever Loving, Kimberly Horn, Project Manager. Dean, Kimberly Horn, Hydraulics. Eric Allsmeyer, Corps of Engineers. Teresa Gresham, Kimberly Horn, Environmental. Hendrick, Environmental Policy Unit. Right, we'll go down the line on Teams. Kevin.

Asamoah, Tevin N 1:54

Have an awesome more utility engineer.

Brooke Davis-USACE 2:01

Hey, I'm Brooke Davis with the Corps of Engineers. I'm just here to listen and learn.

Headrick, Hannah S 2:07
Either.
That's me, anything called, sorry, OK.

Caldwell, Ethan J 2:15
Ethan Caldo, NCDOQ, Gym Environmental.

Headrick, Hannah S 2:20
One.

Cao, Luan T 2:22
Lundgal State Reservation Office.

Headrick, Hannah S 2:26
First note.

Chris Snow 2:29
Snow, Wake County.

Headrick, Hannah S 2:32
Hey, Charles.

Smith, Charles R 2:37
Charles Smith Hydraulics Unit.

Headrick, Hannah S 2:40
The page count.

Collins, Paige 2:45
Hey, sorry about that. This is Paige Collins with Kinley Horn Environmental.

Headrick, Hannah S 2:49
Ashley Cox.

CB **Cox, Ashley B** 2:56
Ashley Cox, Geo Environmental.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:59
Candidate.

DH **Day, Hannah** 3:03
Hi, I'm Hannah Day with Kimberly Horn Hydraulics.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:06
Add an Eric.

EA **Efird, Adam** 3:09
Anna Meford, Kimley, Hornepa.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:13
Hey, the person.

FK **Faugerstrom, Kaitlyn** 3:16
Hi, Caitlin Foggerstrom, Kinley Horne Hydraulics.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:20
Chad hit it.

HD **Hinnant, Chadwick D** 3:23
Chad Hennett, Division Five Construction.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:26
Okay, just well.

JT **Jay Twisdale** 3:29
Jay Twist out, TGS Engineers, GESC on the project for drainage.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:36
Ed Christman.

KW **Kretchman, Douglas W** 3:39
Doug Roadway.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:43
**** Linburger.

LC **Lineberger, Nicholas C** 3:45
Nick Lineberger in CDOT Congestion Management.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:49
Julie Richard Richardson.

RO **Richards, Othalia** 3:53
Atholia Richards, EPA.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:56
Justin Rose.

RJ **Rose, Justin** 4:00
Justin Rose, Kinley Horn Erosion Control.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 4:04
Sure, sure.

SJ **Sherman, Sara J** 4:06
Sarah Sherman, NCDOT Project Management Unit.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 4:10
Linda Tulsa.

Tolson, London 4:12
London, Tollson, Kimley Horn Roadway.

Headrick, Hannah S 4:15
Organ with the person.

Weatherford, Morgan D 4:17
Morgan Weatherford Environmental Policy.

Headrick, Hannah S 4:20
The Wilter.

Wilcher, Seth (FHWA) 4:25
Hey, uh, Federal Highway here.

Headrick, Hannah S 4:29
Is in.

Zan, Thein T 4:31
Are things in with the geotechnical unit?

Headrick, Hannah S 4:34
Thanks again, everybody, for being here. Just reminded that this meeting is being recorded, and I'll turn it over to Risa to go over the overview. Good. We've made it through the introductions. Did anyone join at the end and not have a chance to say hello?
Just me. Hi. We have a review environmental coordination permitting.
All right, last meeting together was in September.
Today, we're going to be focused on the permit drawings and give you a minor amount of new updates.
This is the Aviation Parkway project from NC 54 to I-40. The schedule shows us.
Here, our last merger meeting together, right away plans in November and right away acquisition then starting this month as well.
Since the September meeting, there was a small wording change to the project

description in the step. We're now saying west of NC 54 to south of I-40 in order to reflect the actual impact limits more accurately.
The skew at covert site 1A was the skewer made the same, but the design was revised to flip the main flow barrels, which was a recommendation that came out of our CP4B meeting.
And on the flood pool mitigation area, we previously had planned to access that flood pool mitigation area through a temporary haul route, which would have been just to the west of Aviation Parkway. We've adjusted that so that the temporary route is now where the permanent
Aviation Parkway widening will be, thus eliminating additional temporary impacts to weapons.
I'm going to go through a couple of high level numbers here and then we're going to switch over and Ian's going to share his screen and go through the actual permit drawings. We have an overview graphic for anyone who is joining us virtually. This is a graphic that is not in your packet. And so if you want,
For reference during today's presentation, you may want to do a screenshot of this to be able to have on your secondary screen while you are watching the presentation on your primary screen. For those in the room, we have printouts of this graphic just for easy reference.
The totals of the impacts to jurisdictional features are in your packet and also listed here.
This is a very small adjustment from the impacts that were provided in the CP4B meeting as the designs were refined based on the discussion from CP4B.
We also have a stream buffer impact summary table. Again, that same information is in the paragraph in the packet. Is that does that include the total effects? It does. And we, one of the things we did differently between the CP4B and the CP4C is we've now broken out utilities into separate.
drawings and calculations, but these totals include both.
An update on the flood pool permitting with Wake County. We now have a memorandum of agreement with the county that was approved in mid-October and that flood pool permit process is progressing.
Is that actually called permitting? They call it a permit in the application process. It is, I don't know whether it uses the word permit, but they refer to it as a permit. That we have to submit to them that they approve, they give us a permit. It's kind of how they reference it. Okay, yeah.

Stop.
So we have all the same packets, updated versions of the same packets that we had last time. Ian will go through those. We're happy to pull up any specific plan sets that we don't go through if folks have questions today as well.
In?
Let me show my screen.
Can everyone online see my screen?

FK **Faugerstrom, Kaitlyn** 9:20
Yep.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 9:24
So unlike the 4B meeting where we only had 14 red line drainage plan sheets to go through, I was thinking for this one, we could have more of an open discussion on one of the plan sets at a time. So
For people that have had a chance to review and have questions or comments, I think we can have an open discussion on each of the four sets that we're going to be looking at today. If we need to go into specific sites and go over what's happening there, we can certainly do that. So for the first plan set,
that we're going to look at are, I guess, I'll give an overview of the four. So we have the wetland and stream impact permit drawings, the buffer impact permit drawings, and then the utility wetland and stream and the utility buffer. So those are the four that we can get through today. So the first one that we can start with
is the wetland and stream impacts. So from there, if you want to open the discussion, if anyone has any questions or comments that they saw while reviewing, or if we need to go to a specific site, we can do that.
I do have a request if we could, after we're done with this set, go on to the utility permit grans, because then that's all I need to see. Sure. Thank you.
Yeah.
I did have a comment on.
Sheet 4, which is another sheet 5, I guess.
Just, I couldn't see any place where they where it showed the stream flow direction on that, and that's always helpful when we're out and in compliance, so.
Just make sure that shows up, it might be covered up by something, but I saw it on the other drawings, so.

Probably there someplace.
Looks like they are turned on. It's just, it's gray right along the, I guess that's this center line survey for the stream. It's making up a different color.
Yep, absolutely.
Would change them to, like, blue or something like that would be helpful, 'cause that typical, yeah, I would like to, yeah, it would be blue.
Anybody online having anything else you want to talk about with Sheik?
Or does this set in general, we can bounce around to a different site?
I did want to look at.
She got 13, which is probably thirty-two.
The.
I guess I'm just wondering about the jurisdictional status, making sure that we're clear on it of the...
The channel is running parallel to the railroad track. It showed up off as blue on like on the.
CP2 or B drawings.
Yes, I didn't notice it before, but...
Well, not sure what there's anything we particularly need to do about it, but I just wanted to make sure that wasn't just something that got missed or...
Button.
For us.
Holly has her hand up. Can you expand on that or do you have another question?

RO **Richards, Othalia** 14:08
I had another question. I don't have this, these drawings in front of me, but do they cover sites?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 14:10
But.
So.

RO **Richards, Othalia** 14:22
Sorry, sites 7, 8, and 9. I'm interested to know what permit.
Okay, could you guys hear me?

Headrick, Hannah S 14:35
Yeah, we can. Yeah, so 7, 8, and nine are covered on this one. That has to deal with the causeway or the impacts caused by the causeway and also the flood pool grading.

Richards, Othalia 14:37
Okay.
Okay.
Are you guys able to send me those permits?

Headrick, Hannah S 14:59
Yes, any of these drawings that we have.

Richards, Othalia 15:01
Yes, please.

Headrick, Hannah S 15:03
Yeah, we can definitely do that.

Richards, Othalia 15:05
Okay, so I'm, so I believe when we discussed in some e-mail traffic in the spring that there would be some enhanced mitigation regarding the PCBs in Lake Crabtree. Are those in the permit for this area or is that a completely separate?
thing.

Caldwell, Ethan J 15:33
There aren't PCBs in Lake Crabtree.

Headrick, Hannah S 15:33
Yeah.
Yeah, Othalia, we, you're not going to see anything in regarding PCBs in these permit drawings. We're currently working through our field testing out here to understand what our plan is regarding the mitigation area and what we'll be doing with the soils as a part of this project.

Richards, Othalia 15:44
Okay.
Mhm.

Headrick, Hannah S 15:57
That's not covered in these permit drawings because it's something we're still working through.

Richards, Othalia 16:02
Okay, is it possible, and again, just let me know if this is not the right space, is it possible to be a part of those conversations as a remedial project manager? And perhaps my NCDEQ state counterpart, who's also the project manager for the ward site?

Headrick, Hannah S 16:23
Yes, we have flagged we need to coordinate with y'all. We've been in a data gathering phase and it's just taken a little bit longer than we anticipated. So we do still plan to coordinate with EPA and NCBEQ on this topic. We just need to gather a little bit more information and make sure we understand the area as well as we can. And then we'll reach out to y'all.

Richards, Othalia 16:29
Okay.
Okay.
Okay, that works. All right, thank you.

Headrick, Hannah S 16:47
Yeah.
Thanks for the question.
Eric, going back to site 10 here, so if this is a JS here, then...
They probably need to have some.
Some impacts along here, because we are. I don't think I don't think it is, but well, I doubt it is, but I just want to make sure. It's probably a storm kind of a storm water or water feature, but not something that's jurisdiction. I guess, Mitchell.

It'd be helpful to label it as something jurisdictional, I don't know. So it's not. Does it have a jurisdictional label?
Yeah, it's not shown with the JS line style. It's just, it's not, it's just, yeah, it looks like, I mean, I don't know exactly what's there, but there's a lot of times when they go out there and just do the printage features, they'll just put lines and things on them and, you know, we're not in control, so...
That, so to speak, because it's a drainage feature. Yeah, well, at least you know about it, so, but thinking when they are under construction, you can tell it's not.
And.
Anything that is jurisdictional, we try and we make sure that they have the JS line style turned on, and then we go.
basis that it doesn't say JS on that line stuff and it wasn't jurisdictional or isn't jurisdictional.
That's fine. Thank you.
Then I also just want to make a comment about the impact summary of the last two pages. Yeah, yep.
I guess you got.
The you got the totals for each page, but not.
Totals, total totals, got the subtotals, not the total. I don't, it's not necessarily a problem, it's just usually that's how it is on these when there's more than one page of.
Impact summary, so I just...
I guess, again, just make it clear that that's what we've got here. It's not.
Then, of course, we got also got a little bit of...
It's just hand-clear and impact for utilities to add to these two, so...
And those totals will be in the application, the permit application, but would it be helpful if they were also in here so that there was a direct correlation? Well, generally, well, the utility things will be on the utility set. Right. And then the hand clearing, I think we had.
Trying not to get confused with working on three at one time. I think there was a notation maybe that we talked about putting the summer sheet on the note in the notes section, maybe for the inquiry. Instead, because we don't have really column for inquiry, but if you're talking about.
I mean, you do have a commentary. Well, I...
I thought you were talking about utilities, but which we do, yes. I was thinking about

buffers, never mind. So I'm with you. But as far as the totals go, generally we can put another drop-down line of the actual, so that all. Yeah, because sometimes they... They get this one here only looks like it's maybe one page though. So usually the grand total at the bottom of this page should be all of it. Is that not what you're. There's 2 pages. There's 2 pages. One of the second page just has one site on it. OK, yeah. So on the bottom.
I pull roll down to the buffers. We can set something down like in this area that says grand total. Yeah, it just says, yeah, and then just another bar along that sheet or if you can just use what's already there and just, you know, look up.
Yeah, I think that would be helpful to, yeah, I mean, usually if there's more than one sheet, then the second sheet actually has the grand total of all of it.
Thanks, that's helpful. Yeah. Thank you.
I have a suggestion on these various box cohort sites in general. They often have like rip rap in the channel, but the inlet and outlet for very good reason in this area for vertical streets.
I've recently noticed some projects that, and I couldn't find this in either the details over the plan sheets themselves, but like keyed in riprap into the bed so as not to block it. I think I've seen in some
some of my division level projects where they actually make that written on the permit so that they can make sure the construction produced. Maybe I'll put in the details. I couldn't, I kept looking to see if there was any mention of that.
I thought it was on here when we discussed forms. Yeah, that one. I know we discussed it. Yeah. I mean, I just says, I think it was on there. It's just like matter of just trying to find it so that I can refer to it because I just want to verify that it's definitely there or, you know. Right.
I'll see the wording on the details.
Yeah, yeah, the the intent is totally to key it in. Oh, I got it, because there's no lots of water. Yeah, I think in our details with when we when we mentioned the class 1 riprap, I think if we just put key it in next to that, you could, you could there, or like I said, I have seen it like on the vision level projects, I've seen it actually on the sheet right there.
Like in this detail, like something. Yeah, like right there. Yeah, sometimes. In fact, I'm pretty sure I just saw one this week that did that. So either way, however it makes it obvious for, you know, just make it clear. I'm good with that, but.
Appreciate it. Thank you.

I think we could probably add it to both locations, probably estimated 100 tons, and then class one, and then just put like key it in here. Yeah, key it in or countersunk is a good word, yeah, yeah, and a lot of times, which I think having that verbiage is very helpful.
So I'm not saying don't do that, but a lot of times we'll have the normal water surface elevation triangle in the detail. And then you can tell that the rock is, the top elevation of the rock is actually under that normal water surface elevation symbology.
Okay, okay.
I believe your detail does cover the...
The burial, so that part.
Anything else from anybody online?
We're also at the table here.
Go ahead.
So, um, you would like to move on to utilities if we could appreciate it? Yep.
The utility wetland and stream, the utility buffer, or both of those.
Balance streams, so.
So I think this was, we only have one sheet for the utility, wetland and stream site 5. And our impact here from the utility easements is hand clearing in the wetlands. That's just beyond what the mechanized clearance is for the roadway filled, right?
Correct. Yeah. So in the...
In the wetland and stream, the non-utility set, it will be mechanized clearing up until that, up until the easement line for the roadway portion, and then in the utility easements is the hay clearing.
Anybody online have any questions about the utility permit drawings?
I think that's the last thing that I need to be concerned with with reviewing. Is there anything else anybody want to discuss with me before I leave? One quick question on this hand clearing for utilities. I do see that
Duke has a proposed poll down there.
Do we have an idea of what their access is going to be to get down there with equipment to install that bulb?
Or this already.
They will be out there before our project. I know, but if they go through and hand clear and then try and drive any sort of heavy equipment through the wetland and soil aversion, it's hand clearing all things without mechanized clearing.

So, do we need to identify a route that's acceptable for the? Well, I just want to know, like, has it been built into, is there a route other than, because I mean, when we get out there to oversee the utility construction, we can say, you can't drive through here, but we need to know that there is a possible way to get down there. So we have, they will be out there before. We also have the wetlands.
in our roadway easement as mechanized. So if they access through that and install their lines, you know, only in that utility easement. Yeah. Coming up on the bottom, sweat yourself. Right. Yeah. And that's what my, like, is that a possibility? I mean, I know you aren't a utility company, but to park out there and what's out there now is...
Coming that direction, the possibility without.
then you push in over to Gray Road to get down. Like, I don't know what the target is down there.
It sounds like you're asking us to coordinate with Duke to try to identify how do we have the least impactful install here. I mean...
Not really coordinated. I guess just have someone look and know that it's feasible to access without driving through the hand clearing area. I just look at it.
based on elevation what the site looks like. Just based on professional judgment, is there an option for a truck to get down here with a pole and install it? I know.
Well, I know once you get down to the wetland, it's going to be relatively flat. Coming off the existing roadway, I would have to look and see what that slope is coming off of it. Right. That's what I was curious. Yeah. There's always the concern, even if they go through the part that's mechanized clear in front of the road, if it's the road construction has started, that means it's absolutely.
I said, no Mission Control, like it's not there yet. There's no lagging of where they can and cannot go in, so it helps them out for a compliance.
Yeah, that would have to be hopefully our field utility coordinators. They are supposed to loop us in and we'll get out there with Duke prior to them getting started to discuss this. And if they're going to have to blaze a path through the mechanized clearing for the project, then we're going to require them or sub. Three.
some other contract to maintain urgent control. Right. And Division right is clearing this advance and establishing the urgent control measures prior to Duke. So we've committed to that to avoid Duke having to do that. So I would imagine the urgent control measures are already out there and Division had done the clearing. So that

should then prepare the way for Duke to do it in a way that's
Minimize the impacts.
Do we already know any sort of schedule? Like how do we know how long dudes going to be out there before the red waste construction starts? It depends on the area, but technically they were trying to start in fall of 2027 and fall of 2029 is the lead date. So it could be up to two years difference. I think what our intent was with the division gets out there, does erosion control for utility work, and then there's erosion control measures certainly for the Rd. widening. It's going to have to be a multi-phase approach. Yeah, so this all must be the division installs, erosion control, does the clearing utilities goes out there, then we maintain it almost until like a permanent vegetation stance.
close it out and then reopen it for the roadway. So hopefully because that's DST coordinated DST, hopefully that's a little easier to manage, but we can absolutely take a look and try to imagine what do we think the way they're gonna access this pump is. I just don't want to get out there and have permitted hand clear and say, so the only way we can get out there is to drive this equipment through, but we just hand clear. Totally.
Yeah, understood.
Just for everyone's awareness, from the Division Five perspective, so this is going to be kind of a pilot project in a sense of clearing and doing some of these erosion control actions. So, it's not only have a good best practices, but take notes for any lessons learned that we might want to pass along to the division when we do this for bigger projects that are coming down.
Got it. They're considering, hey, if this goes well or if they've learned things, how would we? Got it. Okay, that's at least the, as of now, that's what the discussions have been, but yeah, that's all.
Good question, Mitch. Appreciate it. Eric, did you see any of these channel improvement impacts that there would be mitigation required?
The reason I'm asking is some of them has ditches and rocks and things coming in different areas is the key with the rock that's been used key in that we use.
But if it's countersunk, then that would be a requirement. And you know, they're disturbing it for dish lines or maybe pipes coming, you know, things coming in other than that. So, but it's usually those will be on the bank.
They might actually go on below for the high water, but they're not. They're not permanent loss, so I should be OK with those. I just want to ask about we can look at

it. Maybe. Yeah.
Because there were, there was a couple that there was a lot of things going on, and so I just wanna know, sure.
I didn't notice anything to bring up with that. Do you want to look at one? Make sure. Sure, we can do that.
Just kind of cut through my.
Starts here.
Like I guess site, site 3 would be one of them.
Of course, there's no like natural, you know, when they take out things, but that rock, I mean, it's gonna be...
Not vegetation or anything right there afterwards, anyway, so...
I'm sorry, where are you talking about? Well, I'm talking about the two 18 inch RCP pipes coming in, the 15 inch RCP pipe coming in. There's a bunch of things happening right there. And so coming into that area and if it
You know, it's, I guess, not only the counter sub group rep, but it's other things coming in. I just want to make sure that
other flows of water into that and other structures wasn't going to change the mitigation scenario in those areas. The good thing about those structures is the way I'm looking at them, it looks like they stop just outside high water.
Right, right.
They actually have inches, right? Yeah, and I guess it would be a lot more concerned if there wasn't any hardening of the string bank there, and they...
to a certain extent, but...
Yeah, usually that's.
Pretty simple, it just here.
dumping it on top of the bank or cutting it into the bank.
It's usually they're only cutting in if it's a natural.
Yeah, and we usually don't have to see that many things going in, so I just wanted to, you know, make sure that that wasn't going to be an issue when...
We have proposed mitigation for that, so appreciate the question, but yeah, it shouldn't be a problem. OK.
I will also say from just a drainage outlet perspective, the
The rip rap that is for the channel should be the only rip rap that's there. That's going to be the outfall stabilization for those smaller pipes that are coming into it also.
So those won't have, you know, separate pads that I go on top. Is that the same

thing out there for five?
Not coming through from that wetland into there.
Yeah, this one, that's actually a good cache. This rip wrap here should, the rip wrap from the dish should stop when it reaches the class one rip wrap from the channel improvements. Yeah, so that should be clipped there for sure.
So, with that pitch line that's coming in.
Is the expectation that the bottom elevation of that ditch line is at the same elevation as the stream bed? Or is this going to outlet a little bit higher, almost like a regret bed thing that like spill down some of the bed sterilization? Yeah, I think it's going to come in a little bit higher.
I mean, I would have to check the grade and elevation of that pitch, but from... Looking at it, I think it's supposed to come in a little bit higher on the bank there.
Okay.
With that being said, if it comes in a little bit higher, then I think it makes sense to, like you were saying, trim the ditch riprap out of the pipe structure riprap. If it was coming in at the same elevation, I think it would take more work to carry that ditch into the streamline, probably trim it the opposite direction. Gotcha.
Have you mentioned it, 'cause when I personally, but then I tried that was temper change, so I got.
And.
Anything else on the department drawings or anything I need to address before I leave?
Thank you. Appreciate it.
Thanks, Eric.
Any other comments or questions on the other sets from anyone online or?
In the room today?
Question for you, Eric. What in our permit application, what would you want to see on the floodplain pool area?
we are accounting for some of the impacts for the, you know, for that area on the, including the construction impacts. But I mean, do you want to see the construction plan? I mean, what, what do you need to see anything on that storage area or what?
All up.
What's that? It's all up one you talking about?
Well, I mean, it's for, you know, the full plane storage, so we, there is a plan to construct it and that kind of thing that's.

in dealing with Wake County and maybe these guys could speak a little bit more, but I didn't know if you want any further information on what's on these plans showing the impacts for the wetlands on the fringe for that area.
If you say 8 and 9. It's like a supplemental information kind of thing, I guess. It's all part of the project, so it's all part of the permit drawings. Right. Yeah, I mean, it's on the permit drawings, but I didn't know as far as any information on. Like, do you want to break out maybe differently or?
like there's like a vegetation plan or the construction plan of it. If you'd want to see anything like that, I mean, that's I guess the storage areas. I got the answer for you on that. So the vegetation plans are the construction plans. All the detail is within that. Because I don't know, digging up things, we're going to vegetate much, but you know.
The grading retention plans have plantings for the entire excavated area.
Yep. So most of it is not like below water, but we do have both wetland plantings and then we also have kind of upland plantings as well. And while separate from permit drawings, I guess it would probably be beneficial to provide those in the application.
That is, it would just be kind of a supplemental thing, Eric, because we've covered the impacts as related to jurisdictional impacts for the construction of the roadway and that that brought into our...
area from the wetland, fringe wetlands, it's a bloody.
When they're doing the storage area, those have all been included in this. I just didn't know if you needed documentation information on what's.
going to be happening now. So on the permit drawings, it's not saying it's being revegetated, but there are on the construction design plans that it is. It's a different set of plans. Like permit drawings here just show the excavation in wetland. Right there at site 8 versus site 8, in between site 8 and site 9, and that's what we're.
That's all a large excavated area to offset what pool mitigation and it's excavating some of the wetland and there's a completely separate.
drawing set, if I'm not mistaken, that's a full revegetation plan for that area. Okay, I guess I guess I kind of assumed that that was going to be low, very high water in normal circumstances, not today. Yeah, there's a portion that's below the normal water level.
but most of it is uplands, and so we're actually getting it lower, getting it closer to water levels. So during flood events, it will definitely be underwater. So we chose to

plant things accordingly, but most of the time it will be put it's dry. Yeah, okay. Yeah, so I guess, can you just put a note on the...
For my drawings, and it will be.
vegetated.
And these this vegetation is mainly for stabilization, not for. Yeah, that's right. So just got to have something that's actually going to take.
pick up one. Yeah, I guess it is. It is a minimization measure too. Yeah. Rather than just need it to come up with whatever.
So, yeah, I guess that would be good to know, please.
Is it going to play a riparian mix or wetland mix?
I include this in the current package. I mean, you don't have to, you know.
I have a feeling you could with the unpredictability of water, maybe a mixture of both. That's what I was thinking, a fifty-fifty, so, fifty-fifty, yeah. If it didn't rain, the wetlands seemed to take another drought. I want to say it was, it was more than just sea, wasn't it? It was 5, 5, 50 meters.
Yeah.
There you go. Yep. Sorry, I'm pulling the detail up. Oh, I see. Yep. So these are the planting details.
On the left, um, something with live states.
And look at stream bank my things here on the right.
Go 2 pages, just so we get our bearings especially. So, this shows the actual limits of the plantings.
So, we got a legend up top, and so we got that legend.
So we've got lower bank plantings, those would be more submerged, and then we've got upper bank plantings and upland plantings. So kind of make sure all of that's in that packet.
Yes, if you could put a note in the permit drawings referencing these plans.
And then I'm thinking about whether those need to be actually being permitted, but I don't think so, because it's not it's not really a requirement.
And then so it should be helpful to like a supplemental kind of, you know, I don't know how long.
5 pages looks like so. For me, as long as somewhere in the back page, you know, we do have a perfect condition so it's clear wetland areas need to be stabilized with vegetation. But other than that, we don't get much flexibility. Yeah.
Yeah, it should be in the permanent application.

I probably just included in the permit drawings to be sure.
Like not the set in there, but just notations on the permit drawings or the set included inside the permit drawings or as separate from making this much more difficult than it probably is. I would say put a note in the permit drawings where it's going to be revegetated and referring to the vegetation plan and then include the vegetation plan in the.
Applications. OK, I gotcha. This is a separate. I gotcha.
Excellence, good question.
Try not to let you leave. Chris, want me to do that spot. Chris has his hand up as well. Chris, do you still have a question or?

Chris Snow 47:55
So I'm a little out of my depth here covering for Mark Hamlet, but I don't know how broad the person's question was about what to include or what not to include about the flood pool, but I know the comments that came back from the county on the mitigation,
part of this was the cut feel has to be exact. And all those notations have to be there. And we may be talking about a completely different set of plans, and I'm sorry if we are, but just the cut and fill stuff is really important to the county.

Headrick, Hannah S 48:33
Yeah, hey, Chris. Yeah, we have those comments. I think I provided four additional comments earlier this month. We were actually working on the common responses earlier this week. We wanted to see if there was any additional comments that came up in this meeting, but we're planning to resubmit those either tomorrow or early next week. We had no issues with any of the comments. Essentially, it was more of a documentation exercises, so none of the numbers are going to change, but
Yeah, I did have a couple of comments of trying to move some stuff to different sheets, so it's a little bit easier to understand what's included, what's not. But yeah, we're planning to resubmit shortly, assuming there's no other comments from the county on this call.

Chris Snow 49:09
Thank you.

Headrick, Hannah S 49:31
Yeah, the question is for Eric before he truly leaves us.
So really, I just want to just ask the design team, is there anything else, any questions for the group that you have or ready to turn in permit drawings?
No, I mean, at this point, we've...
We already received two round of comments from Deanna Mitch also.
Heather and then Jay, who's on the who's online right now, so I think after we get these incorporated, we'll be ready to send out our final set and.
Yeah, go ahead, go ahead.

Zan, Thein T 50:23
Yes, this is things with the geotech unit. Is it a good time to ask about the rock blading and the slope question?

Headrick, Hannah S 50:36
Sure, go for it.

Zan, Thein T 50:37
Yes, we noticed that we have a...
Rock Lady.
The listed now that are on the side of the lake, crab tree, it is 2 to one slope.
And with the rock plating, we can use 1.5 to one. So the two to one, is that needed for other reason? Or is it like if 1.5 to one is like a doable, like for just technical standpoint, it is? And then will you all
Would like to use 1.5 to 1.

Headrick, Hannah S 51:18
So I believe the reason we have two to ones is because we were matching what's happening on the other side of the causeway, the existing slope elevation.

Zan, Thein T 51:26
Right.

Headrick, Hannah S 51:29

I would say at this point, our design is pretty far along. And so two to one with rock lighting is probably where we need to be on this color lighting. I don't know if others feel differently, but yeah, I understand we can go maximum, you know, more steep on those slopes, but two to one is already there. And really the rock lighting was less about trying to steepen the slopes and more about
shoring up the edge of the causeway, much like it's stabilized today.

Zan, Thein T 51:54
That's good. Yes, that's all we have, so we can, you know, go ahead with the two to one, because we are finalizing on it. Thank you very much.

Headrick, Hannah S 52:03
Sure.
So I think we do have everything we need for permit drawings, so we need to revise or resubmit and pass it over to y'all and let us know whatever else is needed to submit the application.
Sounds to me like we're ready to adjourn the meeting, but I don't want to.
Send anybody short. Is there any last call for parting thoughts either online or in the room?

Headrick, Hannah S stopped transcription