

## NCRF *PRE-PROPOSAL*

### PART I – PROJECT OVERVIEW

1. **Project Category:** Community Capacity Building and Planning
2. **Nature-based Solution:** ☒ Community Resilience/Risk Reduction Planning
3. **Coastal Hazards:** Ocracoke Island is part of a string of narrow, low-lying barrier islands that run parallel to the mainland. Over 90% of the Island is federally owned as part of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore (CAHA). The island is constantly and dynamically being reshaped by wave and wind action, causing its transportation facilities to be vulnerable to erosion, ocean overwash, shoaling, and flooding from increasingly severe and frequent high tides, hurricanes and coastal storms, particularly at the northeastern end of the Island (Hatteras Inlet). These processes threaten NCDOT's near- and long-term ability to provide transportation access to the Island. Rapid erosion at the northeastern end of Ocracoke has led to the loss of vehicle stacking lanes and the septic field at the South Dock Ferry Terminal; however, its location in a closely-regulated Ocean Hazard Area limits implementation of permanent erosion-control options; NCDOT and its partners have nearly exhausted these options. Moreover, shoaling (the deposition of sand and sediment) in Hatteras Inlet has made it too shallow to safely navigate, forcing major route changes that have quadrupled travel time, reduced the number of daily trips, and created significant logistical, tourism, and emergency-response challenges. Lastly, a two-mile long hot spot on NC-12 south of the South Dock Ferry terminal is particularly vulnerable to erosion and overwash from storms; NCDOT is regularly forced to close the road for emergency maintenance and repairs, which also impedes resident and visitor access to the Island. Ferry service to Hatteras Island is a lifeline for Ocracoke, providing access to goods, essential services, and medical care. It also sustains Ocracoke's tourism-driven economy by transporting many thousands of visitors annually, whose spending supports local businesses. On the Island, the safe and reliable operation of the NC-12 corridor between South Dock Ferry Terminal and the Village of Ocracoke is essential for access to Hatteras Island, maintenance of the transmission line providing the Island's electricity, and public access to CAHA and its natural/recreational amenities.
4. **Past Planning:** The project builds directly on the [NC 12 Task Force](#) evaluation of Ocracoke's NC 12 hotspot and NPS' [Climate Adaptation Study for Ocracoke Island](#), which examines long-term implications of transportation and coastal resiliency decisions under multiple scenarios. It also aligns with multiple NCDOT efforts, including feasibility assessments and corridor-resilience studies for ferry terminal facilities and roadway improvements for NC-12. While these efforts provide valuable research and stakeholder information, they have been completed in isolation and do not fully consider all lifecycle costs, economic benefits, and environmental impacts. An integrated and holistic study is needed to synthesize these findings and create an actionable and realistic interagency plan for long-term access to Ocracoke Island.
5. **Pipeline Project:** N/A
6. **Implementation Readiness:** N/A
7. **Proposed Solution:** The proposed transportation, access, and resilience plan is a holistic and community-driven initiative that will bring together agency partners, stakeholders, residents, and visitors to identify transportation alternatives that work *with* Ocracoke's natural barrier island dynamics rather than against them. By integrating nature-based solutions alongside infrastructure improvements, NCDOT will develop a realistic long-term vision of a safe and dependable transportation system, acknowledging that how people access the island fundamentally shapes where and how nature-based solutions can be implemented.
8. **Deliverables:** The primary deliverable will be a comprehensive transportation and resilience plan that will: 1) Create a science-based and multimodal portfolio of solutions (including on- and off-island elements) to ensure reliable long-term access to Ocracoke Island; 2) Integrate nature-based solutions with transportation alternatives to protect and preserve natural resources and enhance habitat and ecosystem health in CAHA; 3)

Complete a cost-benefit analysis that considers the full lifecycle of all improvements; 4) Clarify what shoreline stabilization and erosion-control actions NCDOT may legally implement at South Dock; and 5) generate public and stakeholder support for identified solutions through meaningful engagement and materials that explain the forces shaping the Island and decision-making. Specific deliverables are detailed in Part II.

9. **Community Benefits:** The project will deliver a realistic, flexible, and implementation-focused transportation strategy that integrates nature-based approaches to ensure long-term access to the Island that is resilient to erosion, overwash, and flooding. Access to this remote island is limited to air and ferry service, making this project critical to the long-term survival of the Island's community. The project will create myriad community benefits, from ensuring access to essential services and medical care; ensuring mail, building materials, groceries, and other goods can be delivered to the Island; and supporting the Island's economy which relies on tourist access to the Island.
10. **Fish and Wildlife Benefits:** The purpose of CAHA is "to permanently preserve the wild and primitive character of the everchanging barrier islands, protect the diverse plant and animal communities sustained by the coastal island processes, and provide for recreational use and enjoyment that is compatible with preserving the distinctive natural and cultural resources of the nation's first national seashore". The project will improve the quality and extent of natural habitats by re-wilding parts of the Island where existing transportation infrastructure is not sustainable or needed. This will benefit fish and wildlife populations, including 16 federally-endangered or threatened species, and the project will identify opportunities for the transportation solutions to work with, not against, barrier island dynamics and ecosystems.
11. **Scale/Transferability/Innovation:** The project's approach includes case studies and consensus-based decision making that can be expanded across other vulnerable segments of NC 12 and applied to other locations with similar resilience and access challenges. It is innovative in its integration of transportation planning with barrier island processes and sea level rise modeling, use of nature-based solutions in evaluating alternatives, and multiagency model that brings together federal, state, and local partners in a holistic and integrated decision-making model. Its science-based methods, regulatory coordination process, and public facing communication materials can serve as replicable tools for other coastal communities seeking to align access, hazard mitigation, and habitat protection on dynamic, storm prone coastlines.
12. **Long Term Sustainability:** The project is designed as a comprehensive, flexible and science-based study to guide future transportation and habitat-protection decisions for Ocracoke Island that supports resilient access, informs agency permitting and investment, and directs habitat restoration and resource management actions over the next 100 years.
13. **Key Partners:** Key project partners and stakeholders include the NCDOT, NPS, USFWS, USACE, NC Division of Coastal management, Hyde, Dare, and Carteret Counties, Cape Hatteras Electric Cooperative, Ocracoke Civic and Business Association, Southern Environmental Law Center, NC Coastal Federation, National Parks Conservation Association, UNC Chapel Hill Coastal Change Lab and NC Coastal Studies Institute.
14. **Communities Engaged:** The project will primarily engage Ocracoke Island's residents, business owners, and property owners as well as tourists and visitors to the Island. The project will also engage communities adjacent to ferry terminals and airports throughout Hyde, Carteret, and Dare Counties. NCDOT will engage communities through both in-person and virtual activities, including listening sessions, surveys, virtual town halls, open house workshops, and pop-ups at community events.
15. **Key Indicators:** FEMA ranks Ocracoke Island in the 99.78 percentile for [risk of natural and community hazards](#), making it one of the nation's most vulnerable communities. The Island is located in Hyde County, which is the 19<sup>th</sup> most economically distressed county in NC according to [NC Dept. of Commerce](#). According to [NCDOT's Transportation Disadvantage Index](#), Ocracoke Island exceeds the NC average for the following demographics: Age 15 and under, minority population, and Limited English Proficiency (LEP).
16. **Other:** N/A
17. **Other Uploads:** N/A
18. **Other NFWF Applications:** N/A

## ***NCRF FULL-PROPOSAL***

### **PART II – SCOPE OF WORK**

#### **A. Methods and Activities:**

Ferry service is the only public, year round connection between Ocracoke Island and mainland NC; the coastal hazards described in Part 1 have created imminent threats to NCDOT’s ability to provide this service. This project presents a unique opportunity to gain consensus amongst the Village of Ocracoke, CAHA, NCDOT, regulatory agencies, and other stakeholders to address this challenge and create an actionable long-term plan for access to Ocracoke Island. While most parties agree that the current situation is unsustainable, more analysis and coordination is needed to educate the public and move towards practical and executable solutions for long-term access that preserve and enhance the Island’s habitat and support the regional economy.

To do this, NCDOT proposes six main activities to create a realistic, implementation-focused, and community driven vision of the Island’s transportation system. that integrate nature-based solutions and work with Ocracoke’s natural barrier island dynamics.

**Task 1: Project Management (7.7% of budget):** Establishes the framework to guide and oversee the project, including development of a Project Management Plan and provides project oversight to fulfil NFWF grant administration and reporting requirements.

***Methodologies:***

- The consultant team procured by NCDOT to complete the project led by an experienced project manager to oversee and manage all tasks.
- Ongoing coordination through a kick-off meeting and regularly scheduled coordination calls along with regular progress reporting to ensure alignment with NFWF requirements and efficient project delivery.
- Grant administration and reporting.

***Deliverables:*** Project Management + Communications Plan

**Task #2: Public and Stakeholder Engagement (30.9% of budget):** Implements a comprehensive and multi-phase engagement program to promote participation from residents, visitors/tourists, stakeholders, and partners to build consensus around a long-term transportation vision for Ocracoke Island.

***Methodologies:***

- Stakeholder and agency partner engagement over the entire project duration occurs via a Steering Committee composed of partners and primary stakeholders with decision-making responsibilities and/or relevant technical expertise; and small group stakeholder meetings focused on specific interests/topics. Includes close coordination with NPS to incorporate future environmental review and management requirements into the study’s methods and approach, as well as consultation with state and Federal regulatory agencies to establish consensus on the project’s purpose and need, define the study area, and support future decision-making.
- Public Engagement occurs over three primary phases; each phase will include public workshops and pop-up meetings supplemented by virtual engagement strategies:
  - Stage 1- Visioning + Condition Assessment: Information shared comes from Task 3, including best practices from peer communities; regulatory constraints and allowable shoreline stabilization approaches at South Dock; and an easy to understand matrix that lays out order of magnitude costs, timelines, implementation responsibilities, and other opportunities and constraints for various access strategies to inform next steps, informed by past studies and stakeholder engagement. Input sought includes travel needs; placemaking preferences (via visual preference surveys to inform alternatives development); community history and perspectives (through targeted listening sessions for longtime residents); and feedback on access strategies for further evaluation and study.

- Stage 2- Alternatives Development: Information shared comes primarily from Task 4 and includes visualizations and details of each alternative studied and seeks input on these alternatives.
- Stage 3- Draft Plan: Information shared comes primarily from Tasks 5 + 6, including plan recommendations and implementation strategies, and seeks input on the implementation strategies and the draft report.
- Ongoing and Virtual Engagement: Continuous public involvement and outreach efforts will be implemented through a combination of traditional, innovative, and virtual engagement techniques. This comprehensive approach will help NCDOT reach a wider audience and ensure inclusivity in the project's decision-making process. Ongoing and virtual engagement includes the development of a project website to provide updates and information, online public engagement, town halls and webinars at each stage of public engagement to involve non-local property owners and visitors, and information sharing via traditional media outlets such as newspapers, radio, and TV.

**Deliverables:**

- Public Involvement Plan
- Up to 6 Steering Committee meetings (up to 3 in-person)
- Up to 3 interagency coordination meetings
- Up to 10 small group stakeholder meetings
- Up to 12 public meetings (in-person) and 12 pop-up meetings (in person)
- Up to 6 Virtual Town Halls and/or webinars
- Online + paper comment forms and input survey at each stage of engagement)
- Project webpage + materials for traditional media outlets

Summaries of public and stakeholder engagement activities will be incorporated into the study (Task 6); meeting materials, and the public involvement plan will be incorporated into an appendix:

**Task #3: Planning and Environmental Considerations (12.4% of budget):** Gathers data and information from previous planning efforts to document the natural and human environment as a foundation for future NEPA documentation alongside additional analysis related to community access needs, CAHA management requirements, regulatory risks and strategies, and case studies of other island communities.

**Methodologies:**

- Conditions Analysis + Plan Review: Compile and synthesize existing data, models, and prior studies to document current and future environmental conditions.
- Community Access Needs Assessment: Identifies transportation challenges and priorities for residents, commuters, business owners, and tourists with consideration for education, evacuation and storm recovery, medical care, trash service, utility maintenance, and movement of goods (informed by Task 2).
- Legal + Permitting Analysis: Coordinates with USACE and NCDEQ to assess and document all regulatory constraints associated with shoreline stabilization and hardening at the South Dock Ferry Terminal, focusing on federal, state, and local regulations and permitting requirements.
- Case Studies: Reviews comparable island communities to identify strategies and innovative approaches for resilient transportation access. Lessons learned will be synthesized into transferable best practices relevant to Ocracoke's context.

**Deliverables:**

- Community Access Needs Assessment and Conditions Analysis (Incorporated into study in Task 6)
- CAHA Management Considerations (Incorporated into study in Task 6)
- South Dock Legal/Permitting Analysis Technical Memorandum (Included as appendix to study in Task 6)
- Case Study Technical Memorandum (Incorporated into study as appendix in Task 6)

**Task #4: Alternatives Development and Evaluation (29.7% of budget):** Develop and evaluate up to five action alternatives. Each alternative will be primarily driven by changes to the location or infrastructure of the South



Dock Ferry Terminal, which is currently the highest frequency and most relied upon access point for the transport of both goods and people to Ocracoke Island, and at high risk of failure. The five locations under consideration include

*Methodologies:*

- Builds upon the conceptual design developed in the South Dock Feasibility Study for the Silver Lake Alternative, Silver Lake (Pamlico Sound) Alternative, Devil Shoals Alternative, and Existing Facility Improvement Alternative. A bridge from Hatteras Island to Ocracoke Island was identified as an alternative during the South Dock Feasibility study based on public input; conceptual design for this alternative will be completed as part of the project (Bridge) Alternative.
- Updates the Pamlico Sound Alternative and Devil Shoals Alternative to consider needed bicycle, pedestrian, and public transportation improvements, both on the island and at off-island ferry terminals, to support an access strategy that restricts personal vehicles on Ocracoke Island seasonally and/or year-round.
- Performs conceptual design of changes to NC 12 to accommodate continued maintenance of electric and fiberoptic utilities and public access to CAHA for portions of the Island northeast of the ferry terminal location in each alternative.
- Updates the Existing Facility Improvement Alternative to incorporate allowable shoreline hardening based on results of Task 3.
- Performs coastal hydrodynamic 2D modeling that accounts for sea level rise and geotechnical screening to support the development of the Bridge Alternative.
- Completes screening of feasible air transportation solutions for medical evacuation, storm evacuation support, and critical goods/drone deliveries.
- Updates each alternative to incorporate context-appropriate nature-based solutions and completes up to 4 renderings or photosimulations to help the public and stakeholders envision Ocracoke's future transportation system.
- Completes planning-level lifecycle cost estimates for each alternative that considers costs related to vessels, staffing, other operations and maintenance costs (including ongoing beach nourishment and storm response/emergency repairs for vulnerable infrastructure) and incorporates these cost into a benefit cost analysis to evaluate the full range of economic, social, and environmental costs and benefits associated with each alternative.
- Evaluates all alternatives for cost, constructability, travel times, nature-based solutions opportunities, environmental impacts, resilience to coastal hazards, operations and maintenance, economic benefits, access to medical care, and utilities.
- Denotes other alternatives that could be considered in the future, or that may be dismissed as "unreasonable" at this stage.

*Deliverables:*

- Alternatives Development and Evaluation Matrix (Incorporated into study in Task 6)
- Planning-Level Lifecycle Cost estimate spreadsheet for each alternative (Incorporated into study as appendix in Task 6)
- Benefit Cost Analysis Technical Memo + Spreadsheet (Incorporated into study as appendix in Task 6)
- Alternatives Evaluation Technical Memo (Incorporated into study as appendix in Task 6)

**Task #5: Implementation Strategy and Tools (10.6% of budget):** Based on all data collected and analyzed, the project will develop implementation strategies and tools to translate the study's findings and recommendations into actionable, fundable, and technically grounded steps for improving Ocracoke's long-term transportation access and coastal resilience.

*Methodologies:*

- Outlines the steps, sequencing, and partner responsibilities needed to advance long-term transportation, access, and resilience improvements for Ocracoke Island in an implementation Action Plan.
- Creates concise, visually accessible summaries of transportation alternatives and nature-based solutions that incorporate project descriptions, maps/renderings/visualizations, anticipated permitting requirements, lifecycle costs and benefits, implementation steps, and readiness considerations.
- Compiles a comprehensive list of potential federal, state, local, and private funding sources, with a focus on innovative approaches to project funding. Matches each funding source to project types identified in the study, with notes on eligibility, timing, and strategic positioning.
- Outlines planning level design criteria and references specific engineering standards applicable to the proposed transportation facilities and nature-based solutions. Criteria draw from NCDOT roadway and ferry terminal design standards, FHWA multimodal design guidance, AASHTO bicycle and pedestrian facility standards, coastal engineering best practices, and resilience frameworks addressing sea level rise, storm impacts, and erosion.

*Deliverables:*

- Implementation Action Plan + up to 15 Cutsheets (Incorporated into study in Task 6)
- Funding Resources and Design Guidelines (Summaries incorporated into study in Task 6, detailed information incorporated as appendix).

**Task #6: Study Development (8.6% of budget):** Create a comprehensive transportation, access, and resilience report that incorporates the analysis and information gathered in Tasks 2, 3, 4, and 5.

*Methodology*

- Develops the study in accordance with best practices for transportation and resilience planning studies, emphasizing clarity, transparency, and support for the decision-making process. Organizes content to clearly link existing conditions, community needs, alternatives development, and evaluation results, ensuring logical progression from problem definition to recommended actions and implementation strategies. Synthesizes technical analyses into plain-language summaries, supported by maps, graphics, and comparison tables that make tradeoffs and outcomes easy for both technical and non-technical audiences to understand. Includes iterative internal QA/QC and targeted agency review checkpoints to ensure consistency and technical rigor.

*Deliverables*

- Draft study (internal NCDOT review, targeted partner review)
- Final draft study (broader stakeholder and public review)
- Final Study

This project strongly addresses all NCRF program priorities and evaluation criteria as follows:

**Nature-Based Solutions:** Embeds context-appropriate nature-based solutions in the development of all alternatives, including an evaluation of where infrastructure removal or relocation can restore natural processes and expand habitat. Task 5 includes the creation of cutsheets and design guidelines to support continued integration of nature-based solutions in subsequent design processes.

**Community Risk Reduction:** Directly addresses Ocracoke Island’s extreme vulnerability (99.78th percentile FEMA risk) by creating and evaluating multimodal transportation alternatives, informed by future conditions modeling, to identify alternatives that will minimize the impacts of coastal hazards on the Island’s economy and support community access to medical care, jobs, and educational opportunities.

**Fish and Wildlife Benefit:** Incorporates natural resource considerations into alternatives evaluations and seeks to reduce stressors on coastal ecosystems and create opportunities for habitat enhancement.

**Community Impact and Engagement:** Implements a robust, multi-stage engagement framework that ensures inclusive participation from residents, visitors, business and property owners alongside local stakeholders, advocacy groups, and state and federal partners.

**Partnership:** Demonstrates strong partnership with a broad range of local, state, and federal agencies through the convening of a steering committee with broad representation to guide the project and interagency coordination to create a strong foundation for future environmental review and permitting.

**Budget + Cost Effectiveness:** Frontloads documentation and analysis of the purpose and need, affected environment, and feasible alternatives to support future environmental review under NEPA and build consensus on a path forward with resource and regulatory agencies. Costs are commensurate with a similar study of NC 12 in Dare County, awarded through a USDOT PROTECT grant, and were prepared by a consultant with expertise in coastal planning and feasibility studies based on a detailed scope of work.

**Transferability and Communication:** Includes a clear plan for communicating project information to partners, decisionmakers, and stakeholders; case studies to identify transferable best practices and innovative solutions; clear design guidelines that can help other coastal jurisdictions implement nature-based solutions; and implementation tools like cutsheets to translate findings into future project development phases

**Long-Term Sustainability and Adaptive Management:** Considers the feasibility of transportation alternatives under future climate scenarios and resilience needs while strengthening partnerships and identifying future funding mechanisms and strategies.

**Scale/Comprehensiveness:** The effort is comprehensive in geography (island + mainland access points), modes (ferry, roadway, aviation, multimodal), and systems (transportation, ecology, economy). It integrates prior studies into a single actionable strategy that addresses access, resilience, habitat, and community needs on a system-wide scale.

## B. Implementation Timeline and Milestones:

NCDOT anticipates kicking off the project on April 1, 2027, and completing the project on or before December 31, 2029.

The following chart summarizes the proposed project schedule by calendar year quarters:

- Q1 = Jan – Mar
- Q2 = Apr – Jun
- Q3 = Jul – Sept
- Q4 = Oct – Dec

| Milestone                                                | 2027 |    |    |    | 2028 |    |    |    | 2029 |    |    |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------|------|----|----|----|------|----|----|----|------|----|----|----|
|                                                          | Q1   | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1   | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1   | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |
| <b>Task 1. Project Management</b>                        |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| Project Kick-off Meeting                                 |      | ◊  |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| Bi-Weekly Coordination Meetings                          |      | ◊  | ◊  | ◊  | ◊    | ◊  | ◊  | ◊  | ◊    | ◊  | ◊  | ◊  |
| <b>Task 2. Public and Stakeholder Engagement</b>         |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| Public Involvement Plan                                  |      | •  |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| Steering Committee (up to 6 meetings)                    |      | ◊  |    | ◊  |      | ◊  |    | ◊  |      | ◊  |    | ◊  |
| Agency Coordination                                      |      |    |    |    | ◊    | ◊  |    | •  |      |    |    |    |
| Stakeholder Engagement (up to 10 meetings)               |      |    | ◊  | ◊  |      | ◊  |    |    |      | ◊  |    |    |
| Public Engagement                                        |      |    |    | ◊  |      |    | ◊  |    |      |    | ◊  |    |
| Ongoing/Virtual Engagement                               |      |    |    | ◊  |      |    | ◊  |    |      |    | ◊  |    |
| <b>Task 3. Planning and Environmental Considerations</b> |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| Conditions Analysis + Plan Review                        |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| Community Access Needs Assessment                        |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| South Dock Legal and Permitting Analysis                 |      |    | •  |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| Case Studies                                             |      |    | •  |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| <b>Task 4. Alternatives Development and Evaluation</b>   |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| Conceptual Design/visualization                          |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| Lifecycle Cost Estimating                                |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| Benefit Cost Analysis                                    |      |    |    |    |      | •  |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| Alternatives Evaluation                                  |      |    |    |    |      |    |    | •  |      |    |    |    |
| <b>Task 5. Implementation Strategies and Tools</b>       |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| Cutsheets                                                |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| Implementation Action Plan                               |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| Funding Resources                                        |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| Design Guidelines                                        |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| <b>Task 6. Study Development</b>                         |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| Draft                                                    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| Draft Final                                              |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      | •  |    |    |
| Final                                                    |      |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |      |    | •  |    |

◊ Meeting • Technical Memo/Report (incorporated as appendix to Study)



**C. Monitoring Project Impact:**

Beyond specific NFWF metrics identified for this project, other measures of success will include:

- % of Steering Committee members participating in at least 4 Steering Committee meetings (Goal = 100%)
- % of favorable public comments received on draft study (Goal = 80%)

**D. Project Team & Partners:**

These partners will be formally convened upon notification of award.

| Primary Partner                                    | Key Personnel                                                                                                                                               | Qualification                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| NCDOT                                              | Division 1<br>Division 2<br>Integrated Mobility Division<br>Ferry Division<br>Aviation Division<br>Environmental Policy Unit<br>Environmental Analysis Unit | Extensive grant management experience and expertise in multimodal transportation and integration of nature-based solutions and environmental modeling into transportation alternatives<br>Active participant in NC 12 Task Force |
| National Park Service                              | Dave Hallac, CAHA Superintendent                                                                                                                            | Co-lead for Ocracoke Adaptation Study<br>Oversees Cape Hatteras National Seashore<br>Active participant in NC 12 Task Force                                                                                                      |
| US Army Corps of Engineers                         | TBD                                                                                                                                                         | Coastal engineering, waterway management, and hazard mitigation expertise<br>Federal authority over shoreline alterations or channel modifications adjacent to Hatteras Inlet                                                    |
| North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality | TBD                                                                                                                                                         | Principal cabinet agency for environmental protection in NC<br>Oversees state coastal management policies and laws, including the NC Coastal Area Management Act                                                                 |
| Hyde County                                        | Kris Noble, Hyde County Manager                                                                                                                             | Local expertise in economic development and hazard mitigation for infrastructure projects expertise<br>Serves on the North Carolina Coastal Resources Advisory Council (CRAC)                                                    |
| Southern Environmental Law Center                  | Julie Youngman, Senior Attorney                                                                                                                             | Legal, regulatory, and policy expertise in coastal environmental issues<br>Active Participant in NC 12 Task Force                                                                                                                |

**E. Other (Optional):** N/A