**Sample Merger Summary:**

**CP 2, Detailed Study Alternatives Carried Forward**

INSTRUCTION SHEET – DELETE THIS PAGE BEFORE FINALIZING THE PACKET

This CP2 Merger Summary Example and Guidance is to be used for all projects in Merger.

This instruction sheet is intended to assist the writer and should not be included with the CP2 Merger Summary submittal. For additional information please see the [Merger Guidance](https://connect.ncdot.gov/resources/Environmental/EPU/Merger/Documents/Merger-MOU.pdf#page=45).

**Hidden Text/Guidance**

This document uses the “Hidden Text” feature of Microsoft Word to assist the writer in in the creation of a CP2 Merger Summary. Hidden text can be enabled and disabled by going to File > Options > Display and then check/uncheck Hidden text. It is highly recommended you enable the guidance text if this your first time working in this document.

The purple hidden text explains the type of information needed.

The red Example Text sections provide example language. This language is not intended to be copied and pasted exactly as stated and should be modified to change the specifics as it pertains to your project.

The blue text are hyperlinks to guidance.

**Format**

Use text formatting (i.e. font, size, bold, italics, etc.) specifically as presented in this template. Follow the header and footer format as shown.

Insert Summary Date

**Meeting Summary**

INSERT STIP DESCRIPTION

INSERT COUNTY(IES)

INSERT STIP No.

INSERT DATE/TIME of the Merger Meeting

**Meeting Attendees**

**List federal Merger Team Members first (USACE first federal listed), followed by state Merger Team Members, followed by NCDOT PM and staff, followed by consultants. Use an asterisk or some other superscript to denote those who attended by phone.**

Example Text

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Organization | EMAIL ADDRESS |
| Hans Kohler | USACE | Hkohler@usace.mil |
| Joseph Schmeaux | FHWA | Josephschmeaux@fhwa.gov |
| Michelle Jordan | NCDWR | Mjjordan@ncdeq.gov |
| Alex Trout | NCDOT | Alex.trout@ncdot.gov |
| Paula Simon | FDG & Associates | Mpsimon@fdg.gov |

\*Attended via phone

**Start by mentioning who led the meeting, introductions, and who presented the project materials. Also include the meeting purpose**.

Example Text A meeting was held on [Insert date], to discuss and reach concurrence on Merger Process Concurrence Point 2 (Detailed Study Alternatives Carried Forward) for STIP Project [insert bane and description]. NCDOT distributed, on [date], an informational packet to the participating agencies and team members for their review prior to the meeting.

Hans (USACE) began the meeting with a brief summary of the purpose of the meeting, and introductions were made by each member of the group present or participating via telephone. Following introductions, NCDOT project manager, Alex, turned the meeting over to Paula of FDG & Associates. Paula then provided a PowerPoint presentation (attached) on the project’s location, background, and existing conditions. The following summarizes the main topics discussed.

**The discussion summary should list each substantive question raised by Merger Team members and provide documentation of the response. If the response includes a future action item, it should be included in the summary and in the action item section. All CP 1 items can be discussed in one section or divided into Need, Purpose, and Study Area Defined.**

1. ***Project Overview Discussion:***

Example Text Paula provided a review of the logical termini, project location, and completed activities. This corridor is critical for commuter traffic between Rush and Dorchester Counties. The project includes four miles of I-92 mainline widening from US 163 to NC 84.

Paula also recapped Concurrence Point 1, touching on the primary and secondary purposes of the project. The primary purpose is to address capacity deficiencies and improve north-south mobility in northern Rush County. Secondary purposes are to address older interchange poor physical and geometric conditions. The project will also support plans to improve traffic flow for high-speed, regional travel. A desired outcome will be to improve safety at high crash locations with the added capacity and interchange reconstructions.

Since CP1, the study team completed the Phase I (Base and Future Year No-Build) traffic analysis, which allows the progression into the Phase II traffic operations (Build) analysis. The team also developed functional roadway and rail designs to comparatively screen various interchange forms for environmental impacts. The impacts summaries (matrices) are included in the packet.

1. ***Detailed Study Alternatives Carried Forward (CP 2) Discussion:***

Example Text Of the alternatives considered, the No-Build and the Improve Existing Roadway (Build) options are recommended for detailed study. Paula noted the elements of the I-92 Build Alternative includes the I-92 mainline and interchange design options. Most of the mainline widening will be within the existing right of way. In some areas, additional right of way may be required. There are resources along the mainline that the team will seek to avoid or minimize impacts to with the best fit alignment placement. Paula also noted that Work Zone Traffic Control (WZTC) will be consulted regarding the project design.

Paula reviewed the project with a “worst case scenario” footprint of 10-lanes and noted areas with constraints such as Exit #68 and Exit #70. These are particularly challenging areas due to historic resources (listed and eligible), including a cemetery, park, and greenway project.

The team concurred that the DSAs are: No-Build and I-92 mainline widening best fit. The team is carrying forward all design options included in the packet. Following public meetings in the summer, the team may be asked to look at additional options, so the team will come back at CP2A with impacts for preliminary level design and additional design options if any were added.

1. ***Avoidance and Minimization Measures Discussion:***

**The summary should include any avoidance and minimization measures discussed during the meeting.**

Example Text NCWRC asked if the widening would impact the proposed Porter's Fork Greenway.

*Paula responded that additional study will be required to determine potential impacts to the greenway. Initial concept designs proposed shifting the alignment westward towards the greenway to avoid the cemetery on the eastern side of I-92.*

NCDWR noted the public boat launch approximately 100 feet south of the I-92 bridge over Wiggins River.

*Paula responded that NCDOT was in discussion with the City regarding maintaining the existing boat launch access.*

1. ***Next Steps/Schedule Discussion:***

**The summary should include any items discussed during the Merger meeting that pertain to subsequent concurrence points, a timeline for major deliverables (traffic analysis, public meetings, etc.) and an estimate of when the next Merger meeting would take place. If concurrence is not reached, or if there are outstanding items to be clarified, this should be discussed here.**

Example Text The Phase B traffic analysis is underway, with an anticipated completion date of December 2020.

Schedule:

Public Meeting – Summer 2021

Technical Studies/Tech Memos – Ongoing

CP2A – Fall 2021

Design Public Hearing – Winter 2021

CP3 – Spring 2022

NEPA Document – Summer 2022

Right of Way – FY 2024

Let - 2025

***Action Items:***

**The action item discussion should include the action, responsible party, and when the action is anticipated to take place. If an action item was resolved prior to finalizing the meeting summary, it should be indicated, and that information included in the action item discussion.**

* Example Text PMU will send a DocuSign for Merger Team concurrence within 3 days.

Please direct any comments or questions to [insert name and contact information].

Attachments:

CP 1 Signature pages

Figure 1 (Study Area)

.pdf of Merger Presentation (if applicable)