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## TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

MR. KENNEDY: Okay. Good evening, everyone. My name is David Kennedy, John David Kennedy. It's my pleasure to welcome you tonight on behalf of the Maine Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration to this public meeting concerning the Frank J. Wood Bridge. For the record, I am going to note that this meeting is being convened pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act found at 42 U.S. Code 4332 and Federal Highway Administration regulations implementing that act at 23 CFR Code of Federal Regulations Part 771.

The purpose of this meeting is to receive public comment and input on the Environmental Assessment for this project dated February 22, 2018. All of you have probably already seen it. If you don't -- if you haven't, there are copies available for your review on the table there. It's also posted on the web at the MaineDOT website at maine.gov/mdot/env/frankjwood/.

I'm sorry? No? Okay. All substantive comments made tonight will be considered by the agencies. If you have any hard copy materials you want to submit as part of your comments, please give them to me, $I$ will mark them as an exhibit and the
transcriptionist will incorporate them into the record.

I'm going to begin with a brief introduction about myself and how tonight's process is going to work. I'm an attorney/mediator who works for the law firm of Eaton Peabody on Park Row in Brunswick. Prior to joining that firm, I was a Maine District Court judge for 10 years, the last five of which were spent primarily in the West Bath District Court. I have been hired by MaineDOT to act as a facilitator for tonight's meeting and my role is limited to two things; one, making sure that we have made an adequate record of this meeting; and two, making sure that everyone who has something that they wish to say will have a fair opportunity to do that. I do not have an opinion about the various alternatives that are being proposed and I have not had nor will I have any role in any decision-making about the bridge project.

With me tonight are Wayne Frankhauser, Maine Department of Transportation's Manager for its Bridge Program. David Gardner from MaineDOT's Environmental Office. And we're also joined by Cherry Martin, who is the Assistant Division Administrator for the Federal Highway Administration's Maine Division
office in Augusta. They are here to respond to any questions about the EA that might come up. If there is a need for any other particular technical information, we have some additional DOT representatives here who they may call on for additional information.

Let's talk for a minute about housekeeping. Tonight's meeting is being transcribed by our stenographer, Robin Dostie, over there. It's very important that we not speak over each other or in competition with each other. She can only transcribe one voice at a time. At any point, she may tell me that she needs a break. Transcriptionist's fingers get tired just like everybody else's and if she needs a break, we'll take one or if I need a bio break we'll take one. If you need a bio break, I'll note that the restrooms are down the ramp where you came in the front door. We've been asked by the school to limit ourselves to those restrooms. If you go wandering about the building looking for a different one you might set off an alarm, which would bring the meeting to its early conclusion, so please don't do that.

So we're set to close at 8 o'clock. We'll probably go a bit beyond that since we got a little
bit of a late start. I'm also going to note that we changed our procedure slightly to accommodate a log jam at the front and so not everyone signed-in. I have the sign-in sheets here. I'm going to pass them around and if you haven't already signed in, please do so. Also, if you have a cell phone or other device that makes noise of some kind, I would appreciate it if you would turn that off or silence it. So in order to ensure that everyone gets a chance to speak before we have to close, I am going to try and call on everyone once before taking multiple comments from any single individual. If your comments are lengthy or cumulative, I may ask you to summarize them and you have the opportunity to supplement your comments or to make any additional comments you think of after tonight by mail or email and I'll talk about that.

Now, I know and you know that this project is the subject of some controversy. I've had the pleasure of living and practicing law in Maine for 35 years. I've been at my own town's annual meetings and many other public events. I've always been proud of the fact that in Maine, unlike other places, people treat each other -- generally treat each other with respect and it's possible to disagree without
being disagreeable. I'm asking you to honor those traditions in your comments tonight and to not make any personal or personally offensive comments and to use tonight's event as an opportunity to address the substantive issues that you're all concerned about. If $I$ believe that someone is violating those simple rules, I'm going to intervene and ask them to have a seat and think about rephrasing their thoughts.

Hopefully, that will be all that's necessary and we can go on from there. If not, I will -- I do reserve the right to ask someone to leave if they're being disruptive to the meeting.

So we're going to begin with a brief presentation by FHWA and MaineDOT. After they make their initial presentation, I'll be back and request your comments or questions and we'll talk about the remainder of how that's going to work when we get to it. So I understand that Cherry is going to begin and I'm going to ask her to come up to the podium.

MS. MARTIN: Good evening and welcome to the public meeting for the Frank J. Wood project Environmental Assessment. As Mr. Kennedy mentioned, my name is Cherry Martin and I'm the Assistant Division Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration Maine Division located in Augusta.
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The Federal Highway Administration or FHWA is the lead federal agency for this project and we use the National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA process to inform our project decisions. FHWA has adopted the policy of managing the NEPA project development and decision-making process as an umbrella under which all applicable environmental laws, executive orders and regulations are considered and addressed prior to the final project decision. Conclusion of the NEPA process results in a decision that addresses multiple concerns and requirements. The FHWA NEPA process allows transportation officials to make project decisions that balance engineering, transportation needs and costs with social economic and environmental -- natural environmental factors.

During the process a wide range of stakeholders including the public, businesses, interest groups and agencies at all levels of government provide input into project and environmental decisions. The NEPA process for this project has been ongoing since November 2014. FHWA and MaineDOT initially proposed to prepare a categorical exclusion for the project. However, we decided to prepare an environmental assessment or EA after the April 2017 public meeting. The primary
purpose of an EA is to help FHWA decide whether or not an Environmental Impact Statement is needed and if there are significant impacts that will result from the proposed action. The Frank J. Wood Bridge project EA documents the purpose and need for the project; alternatives to the proposed action, including both rehabilitation and replacement of the structure and the no action alternative; identifies the preferred alternative; describes applicable social, economic and environmental impacts and coordination efforts with the public and government agencies. The purpose of this meeting is to receive comments and input on the EA.

So where are we in the process? We're right here where this arrow is pointing out. In the top of this slide is the general transportation process for a project development. You can see in that green block the NEPA process. Underneath the NEPA process here as part of the NEPA process we've developed the purpose and need, defined alternatives, assessed impacts and now we have circulated the EA for review and comment, so we're at the public meeting to receive your comments on this EA. And throughout this whole project development process, we --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: You'll have to speak into
the mic.
MS. MARTIN: Sorry. Throughout the entire project development process there is coordination and consultation with agencies and the public and that doesn't stop when the project is bid. It happens -it still occurs during construction. As you can see, Federal Highway and MaineDOT have completed a lot of work and coordination concerning the EA to reach this point. A couple of examples include we have consulted and met with consulting parties as part of the Section 106 process of the National Historic Preservation Act. We've also consulted and met with the National Marine Fisheries Service concerning Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act and the essential fish habitat. Again, the EA process will either support a finding of no significant impact referred to as a FONSI or indicate that an EIS is warranted. All environmental processes will need to be completed prior to the NEPA decision. Once NEPA is complete the process will proceed with final design and then construction.

Again, the purpose of this meeting is to obtain your input, comments, concerns and thoughts regarding the EA for the Frank J. Wood Bridge project. Also, substantive comments will be
responded to as part of the NEPA process. A substantive comment is one which supplements, improves or modifies analyses or corrects a factual error. Comments are being accepted until April 11, 2018 and as Mr. Kennedy mentioned comments may be submitted tonight, via MaineDOT's website, email or postal mail. And the website is up there, which also contains the EA. Handouts are available in the room with specific details on where to make comments.

I will turn the meeting over to Wayne Frankhauser, MaineDOT Bridge Program Manager, who will give a brief presentation concerning the alternatives considered.

MR. FRANKHAUSER: Okay. I'm going to take a few minutes to try to figure out how to work this mic so I can hold it and walk around with it and without getting myself too tangled up in it.

Okay. So my presentation is going to be a little bit longer. The purpose of my presentation is to go over the Environmental Assessment document that was just completed. There has been a tremendous amount of work that's gone into this and it is a packed document, so it's going to take me a little bit longer. I'll try to move through it as fast as I can because $I$ know everybody is very anxious to get
to questions. I've also been told not to hit one of these buttons because it blows everything up.

So I think you all know where the project area is, so I'm not going to spend much time on that. Obviously the bridge, the Bowdoin Mill complex, Fort Andross, the Brookfield Dam facility, Summer Street, Main Street and Route 1. I'm going to spend a little bit of time talking about the existing bridge and the condition of the existing bridge. So the current truss, 805 foot, three-span steel truss was built in 1931. It has quite a large volume of traffic. The average daily traffic is around 19,000 vehicles a day, so it is a very heavily used bridge, very heavily used crossing. The cross-section that's out there now consists of one 5 foot sidewalk, two 11 foot lanes and two 4 foot shoulders, although the last -- the outside, the exterior 2 feet of those shoulders are open grid, so it is challenging, I'm sure, for, you know, bicyclists to use that shoulder.

A little bit of nomenclature. A lot of the photos I'm going to show next about the condition, talk about specific areas of the bridge, so I have three slides to try to show you in a broader scale what I'm talking about. And I'm not going to spend a lot of time going over these, I'll just hit the
critical pieces. And a truss, this is what's referred to as the bottom chord of the truss, the floor system or the deck and so that's the riding surface and anything that's supporting the bridge deck that the, you know, the vehicles are using. The superstructure refers to basically all of the steel components, the abutments or substructure, the abutments and the piers or the foundation that the bridge is on.

The next slide is a little bit closer from underneath of the Frank J. Wood and gets a little more detail. This is the bottom of the bottom chords, one here, one out there. The truss gains its support by a series of transverse floor beams that span between the truss elements from side to side and then have stringers, which then span from floor beam to floor beam and what you're seeing up here is really the deck system. The next slide will go into a little bit more detail on that. This is denoting a fairly substantial utility attachment that's tucked up under this bridge.

So, again, a slide view of the bridge, the bottom chord, the verticals of the truss members.

This if you were to look in here is a floor beam that's spanning really from vertical -- from the
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truss member -- truss member from side to side. These are the stringers. These are what we refer to as needle beams or cross beams. The bridge out there now has a steel grid deck with the section of the outside 4 feet that $I$ mentioned earlier. So that's really -- I'm sure you all won't remember all of those, but as we go through the pictures I might -the next few slides on the condition, I might refer back to some of these just to try to make -- to show you where we're at on the bridge.

So how do we know so much about this bridge? It receives almost constant very thorough inspections. It is on a 21 month cycle for a very complete inspection, what we consider a hands-on or a fracture critical inspection where we spend about a week's worth of time going over every inch of that bridge hammering it, pounding it, looking for cracks, looking for rust damage. This process is required and that really came about after the 2007 collapse of the $I-35 \mathrm{~W}$ Bridge in Minneapolis. The requirements, the need to inspect this type of bridge really increased after that event, and justifiably so, there is a lot going on on a bridge like this. This bridge we figured a budget of about $\$ 30,000$ per year, so each of these inspections is in the neighborhood of
$\$ 60,000$ to accomplish just the inspection alone. So in June 2016, we conducted one of these fracture critical thorough bridge inspections and the condition ratings of the bridge were lowered from fair to poor based on what we found is really advanced, accelerated deterioration primarily of the floor system, everything below the riding surface or the deck surface of the bridge. That spurred a special inspection, another in-depth inspection in 2016 where our inspectors went out and took detailed measurements of the section loss, of the deterioration, of the steel so that an accurate analysis of the load carrying capacity or what we call a load rating could be done. And based on that, based on the condition that we found, primarily deterioration of the steel, it was posted at 25 tons or a 25 ton weight limit was put on the bridge and I'm sure many of you remember that.

So just a few -- I think I have three or four photos to show some close-up of the detail. This one is in because it gives a lot of detail about what's going on out there. This is the bottom chord of the truss. This is the vertical element of the truss. This is the floor beam that I talked about and this is the stringer. All these components are
connected with I venture to say probably thousands and thousands, but hundreds of thousand of these what we call riveted connections and that in the day in 1931 when they built this bridge is what they did. Instead of putting a bolt in there they put a hot rivet in and hammered it until it deformed on the cap and that's what holds the steel members together. As you can see, there are a lot of nooks and crannies on this bridge. There is a lot of place for debris to accumulate, which you can see here. There is a lot of area for rust to take hold and for corrosion to take place. One of the significant things we always look at in the first place, we always look when we inspect one of these bridges is this area right here. Everything that comes through the deck drains, through that grid portion of the deck or over the side of the bridge, that's all the snow, deicing chemicals, salt, sands, whatever it may be, tend to pile up in this vicinity and that's where the corrosion really takes hold. And this, again, is based on that, you know, one of those two most recent inspections, stringer here, floor beam going this way transverse across the bridge and this is just the edge of the outside vertical truss member and those are holes that have formed in that critical
connection. Now, it's the section loss to the extent like this that resulted in that 25 ton posting. Once this was analyzed based on what's left of the steel, it did mandate that we do lower the posting to 25 tons. And, again, as you can see down here there is a significant accumulation of debris down here. This is one of those -- so this is the bottom chord of the truss. This is the grid deck. This is that what I refer to as a cross beam or a needle beam that supports the -- that supports the grid deck. Those, in areas, are closer towards, again, the exterior or the fascia of the outside of the bridge are virtually gone.

These photos, again, this photo is of the bottom chord of the bridge. You can see the under bridge inspection vehicle that they use to extend up under the bridge to look at it. This is the utility support I mentioned, the bottom chord. This photo over here shows one of the diagonal braces that runs under the truss and the reason I included these two photos is because this really shows the rust that accumulates in between these built-up plates. That's what we refer to as pack rust. I believe as steel corrodes it expands up to 10 percent of its original volume. So as you can imagine it can take a very
little bit of rust on a couple of these plates to really expand those elements. In extreme cases, you can see on this member it's actually been held by the rivet, which is located right there, but is bowing out drastically in between. In extreme cases it will eventually pop and break those rivets out. This, although this is a more drastic photo, this is of more concern. These are secondary members. We consider them secondary members of the bridge. This is a primary member. That bottom chord carries a lot of tension on that bridge. It's an absolute critical element of the bridge. And, again, as it deteriorates and rust accumulates in there it is difficult to address. And this is, again, I've talked a little bit about rivets. Rivets were the state-of-the-art back in the 1930s, 1940s. I'm not sure when they went out of style to a bolted connection, but this shows what can happen, I know you can't see them in there very well, but as the corrosion occurs these are rivets that are starting to corrode and rot. This is one that's lost a lot of its section. Once that rivet corrodes and is lost then, you know, you've lost the ability to hold all these built-up members and elements that keep this bridge together together.
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So in addition to posting to 25 tons these conditions also spurred MaineDOT to do a repair to the bridge, so last summer we did a strengthening of various -- of the most critical components of the bridge below the deck with the expectation of that project that it would preserve the bridge for five years and it would maintain it at the capacity of 25 tons. The intent was not to extend the life. It was really just kind of a holding action for the bridge. And I did include one photo that was done by members of our Bridge Maintenance group that shows the complexity of this repair. Each one of these, these are the repairs that were done to replace steel that had been lost that had deteriorated or rusted away. So in order to do that, they will sandwich members with steel plates, remove those rivets and line up the plates, drill everything and then put a high strength bolt in. So this, again, is a -- let me make sure I get my bearings straight -- this, I believe, would be the floor beam and the stringer, so it's right in that critical connection where the stringer is being supported by the floor beam where you had seen in one of the previous pictures where there was a lot of loss in through there, so they added steel plates. A tremendous amount of effort.

As you can see, it's very complicated. It's very complex. Very difficult to gain access to. Each one of these rivets that's removed they will typically take a -- they will typically burn those out. They will stick a welding rod through them and then sheer off the head and then punch it out. Each one of those represents a significant effort just to remove the rivet, let alone to line up the plates and then fill it with bolts and tighten the bolts, so just one picture of that.

So now I'll get into a little bit more meat of the purpose and need of the Environmental Assessment. The first thing we did as part of this process is to complete a purpose and need or look at the purpose and need for the project and it's very simple. The purpose of the project is to address poor structural conditions and load capacity issues to all those things I just showed for the Frank J. Wood and to address mobility and safety concerns for pedestrians. Simple. It says a lot.

So from there what we did is we identified a series of options. I think we ended up having ultimately six if you count this no build alternative that would be investigated to see if they met the purpose and need, if they met the constraints for the
project. So we, again, looked at a purpose and need, which is standard -- excuse me, a no build alternative, which is really just a baseline for the project that assumes that nothing much is done to the project. The real meat of the alternatives consisted of two replacement alternatives or, excuse me, three replacement alternatives. We looked at a replacement on-alignment, a replacement just upstream and a replacement downstream. We also thoroughly investigated two bridge rehabilitation options, one maintaining the single sidewalk and one adding a second sidewalk. And this is just showing, you know, where they are. Of course, the ones, you know, the on-alignment replacement and the two rehabilitation options are right on the same alignment. Alternate 2, the upstream alignment located and caught this ledge outcrop and was able to be tucked in on the Brunswick and Topsham approaches fairly soon.

Alternate 5, the downstream alternative, we tried our best to tuck that in on the downstream alternative and then come in without doing a tremendous amount or having a tremendous amount of impact to the 250th Anniversary Park, which, again, is located right in this vicinity.

So then after identifying those
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alternatives, we really measured them against a really significant list of constraints or considerations. So on the natural resources we looked at things like impacts to endangered species, essential fish habitat, wetlands, water bodies, flood plains, hazardous materials. Under cultural resources we investigated historic, archeological, Section $4(f)$ resources. And one more, under social and economic we looked at things such as impacts to businesses, the safety or the impacts bicycles, pedestrians, traffic impacts, impacts to utilities. Kind of special in this project were impacts to Brookfield or FERC, it's the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, which governs the hydro facility just upstream, as well as right of way and the ever important cost factor.

A couple of those options fell off the table fairly fast. Alternate 5, the downstream alternative, we did a really, really complex model of the river as it flows down over the dam through that basin and then down past the Sea Dog restaurant and that restriction on the river and found to our surprise that water really has a hard time getting out of that bay and it tends to pile up in that corner by the Sea Dog parking lot. In fact, analysis
showed with the placement of piers and the location of a new bridge on the downstream side that we could get up to 6 feet of increase in water level during a flood event in that corner. And we absolutely did not -- my last slide is a photo of $I$ believe probably a 1930s flood and you'll see after you see that why we didn't want to go there at all. And it's also a much more challenging place to build. You're going down steep. The river channel tends to be deeper there. There is a lot more current. So in addition to the impacts, the flood and potential flooding impacts and the challenges associated with building down there that option was dropped.

And no surprise, the no build or the baseline alternative fell away. It just did not meet the purpose and need. Continued deterioration will quickly close that bridge.

So that left two replacements and two rehabilitation options. So after the thorough inspections and looking at the rehabilitation options, we came up with a list of items -- a list of repairs that needed to be done to the existing truss to meet the purpose and need, to improve its condition and bring it up to an adequate load capacity. And what we essentially concluded was that
basically the entire floor system needed to be replaced and that, again, was the -- with the series of photos that I showed and the severe corrosion there is no way to bring that back other than to pull it out and replace it. So it starts, and I'll go a little bit out of order here from the surface down, it starts with taking off the deck, replacing the deck, the floor -- the steel floor system that was those needle beams, cross beams, the stringers, the transverse floor beams, so essentially taking that entire deck off -- oh, and the utility hangers and replacing it. We also had minor repairs to do to the bottom chord, if there is such a thing as a minor repair to the bottom chord on a bottom truss, we do have some minor repairs to do that. And we also have a need to paint the structure and that should come to no surprise. The paint is in very bad condition. I will talk about this more later, but we did conclude that we needed to build a temporary bridge to maintain traffic during construction.

So two cross-sessions of the rehabilitated bridge. Again, you are working with the width given to you, so this is Option 3, which just provides the single 5 foot sidewalk as it is out there now. We would replace the concrete deck and remove that
outside 2 feet of grid deck providing a 4 foot shoulder, which isn't a prudent. We looked at the width of the travel lanes. Our travel lanes are usually 11 to 12 feet. Rarely, in extremely low volume situations would we go down to 10. In a situation like this, that would be two 10 foot lanes and a situation like this with the amount of traffic with 19,000 vehicles per day and the amount of truck traffic that travels over this bridge, we were not comfortable with going down to 10 foot lanes. Ultimately, we thought that, you know, with the size of a truck, with a small truck they are going to encroach on that line and even though you may have a paint stripe out there that is going to do nothing in reality to add that -- to give you that added width for the shoulders, so we opted for the two 4 foot shoulders and the two 11 foot lanes. And, again, the green is really highlighting basically everything that needs to come out. Instead of going back with steel grid filled with concrete as it exists out there today, we were going to put a composite reinforced concrete deck out there for durability and longevity.

This is Alternate 4. This adds the second sidewalk, the second 5 foot sidewalk. It still
maintains the same cross-section with the 11 foot lanes and 4 foot shoulders. Because of the added weight associated with adding this sidewalk the entire length of the bridge, although it doesn't show it clearly, this particular option did go with a lightweight deck, a deck system that we call an exodermic deck, which so happens to be very similar to the concrete-filled steel grid deck that's out there today. It is significantly lighter than, you know, a full concrete deck. It is more expensive, but due to the weight added here we had to reduce weight on the deck system, so this option does carry the cost of an exodermic steel half-filled concrete deck.

So now I'll move into the replacement options. Alternate 1 was a replacement on existing alignment. When we laid it out, it came out to be an 800 foot long multi-span steel girder bridge. Alternate 2, again, was the upstream alignment that hit the ledge outcrop just above the existing bridge. It turned out to be an 835 foot long curved multiple span steel girder bridge. And I hope I put cross-sections. I did. So this is the cross-section really for Alternates 1 and 2, and we decided that this should be the minimum, minimum cross-section for
a replacement bridge, a new bridge where we're not constrained by the width of the existing truss. So it has two 5 foot sidewalks minimum, two 5 foot shoulders minimum and then the two 11 foot lanes. And just to be able to visualize how this was going to fit in the on the upstream, we didn't necessarily need to do this on the on-alignment, just to visualize how this would fit in on the upstream alignment if we did do this rendering which shows, you know, that it is a fairly limited amount of impact on the approaches to the bridge, a little bit more on the Brunswick side than on the Topsham side, but it does happen to fit in. Again, a little bit more about the difficulty of building downstream, the downstream alignment that we dismissed would have impacted these properties, would have had to have construct pier units or substructure units in this deeper, faster water and then come in down here. And we -- again, we found that to be very challenging whereas this option took full advantage of some of the shallower water up in this vicinity and some of the protection that this ledge provides in the channel.

So next, I'm going to move into the alternative analysis, which is the heart of the

Environmental Assessment document. And just a quick disclaimer just for the sake of time, I'm going to hit this at a really high level. I picked out some of the factors that $I$ thought were the most interesting or the most influencing in my opinion. I would like to remind everybody again that the full Environmental Assessment is available online. There are some out on the table. And online there is also access to our preliminary design report, which is purely an engineering document that covers an incredible amount of information about these alternatives, about the analysis that was done, about the costs that we came up with, about the effort that we put in to investigate the rehabilitation and the replacement options.

So the first thing I want to cover is Section $4(f)$ resources. And through the 106 process, we did uncover a significant number of historic properties. We have the Summer Street Historic District, the Cabot Mill, the Pejepscot Paper Company, the Brunswick/Topsham Historic District, the bridge itself is considered historic and we also identified, and I mentioned it before, there is one park located on the project site and that is the 250th Anniversary Park on the Brunswick side. Our
replacement options do have impacts to these historic properties.

So next $I$ want to talk a little bit about user costs. And, you know, I think we all know the user costs. The costs to disrupting traffic don't necessarily add to the cost of the bridge project, but they are a cost to the public, to the users of the bridge and we use a traffic demand model at the Department that looks at the travel distance and the delay time to come up with a number that's associated with that impact. In this case, that analysis provided us with a number of $\$ 22,000$ per day for a full closure and I will talk a little bit more about that in a minute. Second, I wanted to talk about business impacts. This is a very -- two thriving communities, lots of business in this area. We know that anything we do on this bridge, any time we close it down, any time we slow traffic or close it it does have impacts to business. Those are extremely hard to quantify. I've probably been asked to quantify business impacts hundreds of times in my career and I don't know of any way to do it and I think the best thing we can do is acknowledge that anything we do on this bridge does have tremendous business impacts.

So the maintenance of traffic options that
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we looked at for this site were a complete closure with off-site detour, a single lane closure with staged construction, that's building anything you build in halves so you can maintain traffic on the other half while you're building the one half and then flip flop it. That kind of gets you halfway there. It allows you to maintain some, usually alternating one-way traffic on the site. Another is an on-site detour as opposed to the first. Instead of, you know, sending traffic on a different route around the bridge this would be to build an on-site detour at the location. This typically provides the least impact to traffic. You're typically providing two lanes of traffic very close to where they were crossing originally. And the third is to utilize the existing bridge and you do that by essentially building off-alignment. So, again, this would be the Alternate 2 that we talked about where we're building on a new alignment and able to maintain traffic on the existing bridge while we do that.

So this slide gets into some of the durations and the user costs associated with the different alternatives and with those different maintenance of traffic alternatives. So, again, Alternate 1 and 2 were the replacement alternatives.

The difference in 1 was on alignment and requiring a temporary bridge be built and Alternate 2 was the upstream alternative. And the total construction duration -- let me finish going across the top. Alternate 3 and 4 with a temporary bridge, so these were the rehabilitation options with a temporary bridge built to maintain two lanes of traffic. And Alternate 3 and 4 without a temporary bridge would be detouring traffic for a period curing construction. The total construction durations for these projects at the time when we looked at it and this is a really dynamic number because it really depends on when we advertise the project and when we can actually do the work. It's a seasonality. You can only do so much in the winter and there is also heavy restrictions for in-water work due to the environmental reasons. So, again, the Alternate 1 and 2 were three-and-a-half to two-and-a-half years and then the replacements were the neighborhood of three years.

The specific traffic impacts. Alternate 1 and 2, again, had relatively short single lane closure periods and this was primarily to tie-in the approaches to the bridge as we construct it or to switch back and forth between the temporary bridge and the temporary alignment and the new bridge.
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Alternate 3 and 4, the rehabilitation was very similar. This was the one that provides the temporary bridge, so it had -- as expected, it had a very similar traffic impact. The closure resulted in about a 20 month full closure period. The user cost associated with that, and that's based on that $\$ 22,000$ a day, so there is .9 million for one, a little over a half million dollars for Alternate 2; again, about. 9 for 3 and 4 with the temporary bridge. The full closure though had a total user cost in the neighborhood of $\$ 13 \mathrm{million}$. significant. So based on this number, we are recommending that we do provide a temporary bridge or build on a new alignment so we can maintain traffic on-site. That type of alternative has something in the $\$ 4$ million range, so can you see there is obviously a huge difference there. And, again, this is just the user cost. This does not pick up, you know, those less direct costs such as impacts to businesses.

Another factor that we weighed heavily were safety improvements. As you saw in the cross-sessions, the replacement bridge allows us to provide connectivity for sidewalks and avoid mid-block crossings. This is a major safety
improvement that we were looking to achieve. There are connecting sidewalks on the approaches now. When we typically come to a site like this we will look to put back two sidewalks to make that connectivity to prevent safety concerns associated with people having to cross -- to randomly cross the road. It also provides the two 5 foot shoulders that provide adequate room for alternate uses for bicycles. It also improves the overall safety. It results in a more dependable bridge. I alluded to the rehabilitation. There are very time sensitive and high impact things that will need to go on in the future on a rehab. When you paint that bridge -when you paint the truss bridge that's a process that takes in the neighborhood of six to eight months and has significant traffic impacts associated with it. With that truss no matter how good we do on the rehabilitation now it will continue to deteriorate. We will have to do that thorough inspection every 21 months and there is always a high probability that we will find a new things that need to be addressed. So overall, the bridge replacement we felt provided a more dependable safe bridge.

This is a subject that I have not talked about. I'll just quickly mention it. A fracture
critical bridge is a bridge -- is a steel bridge that if an element of it fails it is subject to a serious failure. A modern steel girder bridge has five or six or seven girder lines that all provide support to a structure. If one of those is impacted the bridge is likely to stand. Certain elements, not all elements, of a truss, and I stress the importance of the bottom chord on the truss, if a member of that bottom chord -- if part of that bottom chord of that truss were to corrode or get damaged there is a possibility that that truss could fail. So this is a couple words, but it is a big deal for us at the Department of Transportation in the bridge world in regards to safety for bridges.

Dependability. And I talked about this a little bit ahead, Alternate $3 / 4$, will require future traffic disruptions. There are a series of work that needs to be done. There are future paint projects that we anticipate a replacement or a rehabilitated truss would need to be painted every 20 years and that's because there is no way for us to physically remove all of the rust, all of the pack rust from that truss so the new paint job in all of those intricate details of the truss just does not last as long. So this somewhat speaks to the need to get in
there every 20 years or so and do an extensive and expensive paint project. Again, the fracture critical. The replacement -- the truss bridge also would require future deck replacements and some pretty substantial work. The replacement alternatives, we look -- when we design a modern bridge we look at 100 year design life. We've been using modern materials and modern techniques. We feel -- we comfortably feel that we can design a replacement bridge to last 100 years with minimal, much less maintenance. So overall, you know, a much more dependable structure than the past truss bridges.

Cost. We looked at cost from several different standpoints in the investigation of both the rehabs and the replacements. We looked at the initial cost. That's the cost in 2019 to do a project to rehabilitate the Frank J. Wood Bridge or to replace the Frank J. Wood Bridge. We also looked at life cycle costs. And this is -- and, again, these are all really tools for us to get a feel, you know, cost weighs heavily in our decisions so we like to look at it from a few different factors. Life cycle cost is an attempt to try to bring in future cost to the project, future maintenance costs, future
inspections costs, future repair costs. And what it does is through financial principles it tries to bring future dollars back to present dollars. The downside is it assumes that you are taking that money and investing it. It uses discount rates, inflation rates, interest rates and assumes that a Department of Transportation is going to invest money. Department of Transportations don't invest money. We spend every dime we can get and then we need more. There is no way we invest it. So it is a factor, but it is a difficult factor for us to look at. A measure that we like to look at a lot more is what we call service life cost, which is really just a cumulative cost. In year one, if it costs \$13 million to replace the bridge and then in year 20 it costs $\$ 4$ million to paint it, we just tally up all of those costs over the life of the bridge and we feel that gives us a truer representation of what the financial need for this bridge will be over its life.

And that's exactly what that table is. And I will try to get through this as quick as I can. So these are the replacements. The rehabilitation options. Again, I talked a little bit about the 100 year service life, the replacements, the rehabilitation. We did look at a -- we started out
looking at a 30 year life. We did increase that based on input we received to a 75 year life. Essentially what that did is it incorporated more future repairs that need to be done to the bridge in order to get it to last longer. It needs an additional paint project. It may need some additional inspection, so on and so forth, and those are simply summed up in the cumulative costs. This is the initial cost. This is the up front cost of that specific project that you're proposing to do and they're all fairly reasonable. Alternate 1 on alignment was 16; Alternate 2, that's the up river alignment was 13; and then, you know, between the single sidewalk and the second sidewalk as you would expect it went from 15 to 17. Where we really start to see the difference is in, again, that cumulative cost. We can build this bridge that requires very little maintenance. We can use corrosion-free reinforcing steel in the concrete. We can use modern steel coatings. We can use better detailing practices that just don't have all those crevices and nooks and crannies and rivets that corrode. Oops, I thought I hit the wrong button and was going to close it down there. So that cumulative cost over 100 years for a replacement really sees a really small
increase; whereas, the cumulative costs for the replacement see, you know, more than double over these. That is -- again, that is to pick up the cost of future paint projects, future deck replacements, future inspections, yearly maintenance costs. It is unfortunately a rather expensive proposition to keep a bridge like Frank J. Wood in operation. And I am not going to go into this, this is just the average yearly, so it's the life and the cost is divided out so we can get a measure of what the percent increase was and as you can see the projected percent increase for the rehabs is considerably more. And this was a really -- as far as we were concerned was an extraordinary difference in price.

This, I threw in at the last minute. This is not Frank J. Wood. This is Deer Isle/Sedgwick Bridge. This is a suspension bridge. This is a significant bridge for MaineDOT. We do spend a tremendous amount of money on this bridge and we are constantly repairing it. Its deck system is, again, a built up and riveted steel truss, steel system very similar to the truss that's at Frank J. Wood now. This bridge was painted less than eight-and-a-half years ago. And this I put in to demonstrate the complexity or the problems with pack rust and the
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rust that you cannot remove from a structure like this. So after eight-and-a-half years, we are also -- we are already starting to -- we have gone well past the initiation of rust and are now starting to see some additional section loss. You can see some loss of the rivet heads. All of this pocketing and pitting here is where part of the process of painting a bridge, you know, just like when you paint your house you can paint and scrape, but when you paint a bridge they blast it. They shock blast it down to bare, bright steel. When that's done, it will find any imperfections in steel. It will expose these dimples, these rust -- these rusted areas. It will clean that rust off and this is what's left. So, again, after eight-and-a-half years and that's why when $I$ said we are estimating that we will need to paint the Frank J. Wood rehabilitation process every 20 years, this is why I'm extremely comfortable saying that. Again, after eight-and-a-half years, in another 12 years and another, you know, 10 years this bridge will need to be painted as well before you start getting the section loss again before you have to start replacing members or load post it.

So a little bit more on the funding needs. I mentioned that we saw the cost increase from the
replacement to the rehab as an extraordinary measure and the reason we say that is we never have enough money to do our work. A few years ago, we did an analysis of our bridge needs in the State of Maine and concluded that we needed about $\$ 140$ million a year to keep bridges kind of status quo. Actually, it was to reduce structurally deficient bridges on our highest used roads over a period of time and we determined that we needed $\$ 140$ million a year for that. Our current funding levels are around \$120 million, so a significant shortfall. This is for bridges. If you look at bridges and roadways this is much greater. It's a much different picture. Based on this, MaineDOT is constantly having to make very hard decisions on where we spend our money and every time we do it's with the understanding that there is going to be a less used, lower volume bridge that will need to be posted, removed without replacement, albeit probably not with 19,000 vehicles a day, but it is an impact to the public and I'm sure we've all seen these as we're traveling around the state. It is not uncommon now to see a sign, a post -- a weight limit posting sign for a bridge ahead as we're traveling Maine's rural roads and this in a nutshell is the reason why.

So second to last slide. In summary, the Environmental Assessment identified the impacts of all those varieties, all those different options, both replacements and rehabs, looked at, you know, all of these different criteria and based on the information and the assessments we've done, as Cherry mentioned, we started approximately three years ago, so based on our three years of analysis we have identified our preferred alternative for this project as the replacement on the up river alignment.

So that is it for me. And I don't know if you want me to turn it back over to you for questions. And this is the slide I was alluding to on why we don't want to mess with the hydraulics in this location.

MR. KENNEDY: Thank you very much. Are you good?

MS. MARTIN: Good.
MR. KENNEDY: Okay. All right. So I'm going to open the floor for questions and comments. And just to give me an idea, would everyone who is intending on commenting please raise their hand? All right. So we'll try and fit everybody in. And, sir, you seem particularly anxious, so I'm going to begin with you. Could you tell us your name, where you're
from and in terms of your town and if you're representing a group what the name of the group is.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: My name is John Graham. I'm the President of the Friends of the Frank J. Wood Bridge. I live in Topsham. I own a building on Federal Street in Brunswick.

MR. KENNEDY: All right. Very good. So what would you like to tell us?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Graham.) So a ton of things, but to try to be brief and wrap this up, this process started in 2015. MDOT came out with a preferred alternative with an upstream in April 2016. At that time, the purpose and need statement was a bridge improvement. It was not until that August that we found out that the bridge rating went down. The point being, that was not mentioned in this presentation or any of this that the initial decision to replace this bridge was well before all those rust pictures and all those, quote, unquote, fracture critical issues that have came up with the -- in the bridge deck. So we can sit here and do a very similar presentation and say all that -- the majority of that other than the one bottom chord that needs to be fixed is all going to be eliminated. Most of that rust is going to disappear and they're going to put a
new deck on for $\$ 11$ million. So 4 million of that is a temporary bridge. And some of the misconceptions that have been up here is that the bridge is going to be closed down for three years. MDOT just very clearly said they're going to put a temporary bridge. Our bridge is posted. The fastest way for our communities to get legal loads back on that crossing is with a temporary bridge, not waiting the two-and-a-half years to put a new alternative up there.

The purpose of the EA is to fairly weigh out options so that Federal Highway and other agencies and the public can look at all of the alternatives equally. The fact that they chose an alternative early and then use their reason they chose is information that came after that point is suspect in my mind. It looks like you have an alternative that you want and then you figured out how to get that alternative to come out to be your correct
alternative. When it comes to really redoing this bridge there is no question that it can be done, that it is feasible, and that's what the $4(f)$ really asks. Is it feasible and is it prudent? So we know it's feasible because T.Y. Lin and MDOT have told us it's feasible. They just sat up there and did their
presentation and that for $\$ 11$ million that bridge and be rehabilitated for 75 years. Now, is it prudent? This is where they really work hard. I have not seen service life costs used in any other preliminary design report. They just did one on the bridge in Lewiston, not mentioned service life at all. They compared the life cycle costs. That's the industry standard. That's what everybody used. So the question is why did we decide to use service life of cost if it wasn't to just boost up the appearance of what it is for the long-term cycle costs?

Now, I love the maintenance that you guys plan on doing on this bridge. It is awesome. If you had done that for the last 60 years, we would not be standing here. If somebody can tell me when that bridge was last painted, it was not 20 years ago. So you can't tell me that you're going to rule out this option based on a Cadillac plan of future maintenance that's unrealistic when you guys can, one, say we have no money, so we're -- but we can't do it. It's just unrealistic. And on the new bridge, you can't design a bridge for 100 years with a poured concrete deck on steel without having to redo that deck. When you paint that bridge, which you say you're going to do two to three times, there will be road closures.

We've seen that. They just did the one on the highway. They did close a lane to do that. When you pave a bridge there is traffic disruption, so saying that there is no traffic disruption for a new bridge but there will be continued traffic disruption for an old bridge is just -- it's taking the extreme of both sides and trying to use both of them to win the same argument. It just -- it doesn't work. Now --

MR. KENNEDY: All right.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Graham.) Just a few more things. To just talk about what we don't know about the new bridge, the height of it. All of these drawings in here and none of them shows how tall it's going to be. We know from these flood pictures and from the design that it can't be loaded. They're actually moving it upstream up on another higher level of the water and they are putting -- there is no longer a truss. The weight is not being held up above, it's not being held down below. So in their reports they say 9 to 12 feet. How tall is that going to be above our deck that we envision right now? So all these little pictures out here, they make you think that the deck is going to be the same height. It can't be. It has to be 8 or 10 feet, possibly higher than that, $I$ don't know, but that
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needs to be answered in the alternatives.
MR. KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you. Sir, you also look particularly anxious, so I'll turn to you next.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Curtis Pilchard.) I
don't know if I'm particularly anxious, but I know that time is ticking by and I know there are a lot of people that want to speak, so $I$ will be brief.

MR. KENNEDY: Thank you.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: My name is Curtis Pilchard. I live on Roberts Hill Road in Topsham.

Mr. KENNEDY: I'm going to stop you right there. How do you spell your last name, sir?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Curtis Pilchard.)
$P-I-C-A-R-D$.
MR. KENNEDY: Thank you.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Curtis Pilchard.) You're welcome. As a resident and also in my capacity in representing retailers across the state, I run the Retail Association of Maine, I feel that I have been fairly knowledgeable about this project for a number of years. I've attended more than one of these meetings. I have read a number of the reports. I feel that this has been a very open and public process and I appreciate the opportunity to share my
views and folks who are listening to all views on this, but I've come to the conclusion that the Alternative 2 replacement is the right idea. The idea that it's going to last for 100 years and it is a substantially lower cost than any kind of rehabilitation is one of the driving issues that brings me to that decision. But also since $I$ work with retailers in business and have for almost 20 years of my career, I can tell you that although you can't quantify those business impacts as was discussed, they are going to be significant and the fact that if the rehabilitation results in a 20 month closure of the bridge between the two sides there are going to be dramatic economic impacts to businesses and that's one of my driving decisions as well.

I work up in Augusta. I am aware of the other project that's going to be taking place in Hallowell this summer and a number of the retailers there are concerned about the closures that's going to happen even though that is a very necessary project that needs to happen as well. Some of my members live and work up there and they're trying to take efforts to mitigate those changes.

And I'll just close by saying that, you know, a little bit of the -- the irony is not lost on
me that we're holding this meeting here at Mt. A, which is also going to be torn down and replaced across the parking lot and there wasn't this uproar about keeping this high school. Granted, this is not as old as the Frank Wood Bridge is, but I also recognize that the Frank Wood Bridge is not the original bridge in that location. I look forward to having a new, safer bridge that my family can better use and better connect the two communities. Thank you.

MR. KENNEDY: All right. Thank you very much. Sir, would you like to go next? All right. I'm going to just help you adjust the microphone.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Kevin Hoffman.) Thank you.

MR. KENNEDY: Great. Would you please identify yourself as well?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: My name is Kevin Hoffman. I live in Topsham. I'm not affiliated with anybody. I've been -- this is the second meeting I've been to. And I think the guy doing the presentation is MaineDOT; is that right?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Kevin Hoffman.) And you, Miss?

MS. MARTIN: Federal Highway Administration. AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Kevin Hoffman.) So you have these meetings and $I$ don't know if you've really considered any of the input from the community. You said that you did all kinds of architectural and aesthetic assessment, but you didn't say what you did with that and most of the people are here -- maybe not most -- I agree with everything the first speaker said, but a lot of people here really like the character of the old bridge and that's what we don't want to lose.

## (Applause.)

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Kevin Hoffman.) And then you spent a lot of time showing pictures of rust that we all know is there. It's like showing a bunch of hungry children after some natural disaster in some far away place. We know there is problems with corrosion on the bridge and it's old, but we also like to have the aesthetics and character of our town. And you can replace a bridge, you didn't consider the aesthetics in your replacement options. You only considered a flat deck. You could replace a bridge with modern materials, modern construction techniques and keep the aesthetics of the truss bridge without as much maintenance. You know, you
take the cable stay bridge in Boston was built with all kinds of aesthetics. It's a big landmark now. The top of it is shaped like the Bunker Hill Monument and if you at some future date had it corroded and somebody said we have to take it down there will be an uproar. That bridge doesn't have a big span problem. It doesn't require a cable stay, but someone decided, probably someone in the bed who had a cousin doing the project got a big budget to do this big cable stay bridge when it could have been an under deck supported bridge. You could do a bridge here that has the aesthetics that we like and is still a modern, safe bridge and that's all I have to say.

MR. KENNEDY: Thank you very much. Let me just ask if there is anyone else here who has a physical limitation of some kind that would like to be called out of order? I know we all want to have a chance to comment and we're all going to have to be patient, but beyond that is there anybody else who has some physical limitations? Okay. Ma'am, why don't you go ahead next, please.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: My name is Annie Carter.
MR. KENNEDY: And how do you spell your last name?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Annie Carter.)
$C-A-R-T-E-R$.
MR. KENNEDY: Okay. Please go ahead.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Annie Carter.) I attend Mt. Ararat High School and I also go to Region Ten and I'm in the welding and metal fabrication program there.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: We can't hear.
MR. KENNEDY: Okay. Can you get just a little closer to the mic?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Annie Carter.) Sorry.
MR. KENNEDY: Good.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: My name is Annie Carter. I go to Mt. Ararat and I also attend the welding and metal fabrication at Region Ten Technical Institute in Brunswick -- Technical High School, sorry. I'd just like to first criticize the fact that the EA was presented in a way that is clearly biased towards the new alternative bridge.
(Applause.)
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Annie Carter.) I also -I didn't see any picture of cracked concrete or anything like that on any other bridges. There was just a lot of pictures of rust on multiple bridges not just the Frank J. Wood Bridge. And the rust
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looked very bad in the pictures, but it was very thick gauge plate and I just don't think it was -- I think it was very clearly biased. Thanks.

MR. KENNEDY: Thank you. All right. Is there someone from this area who would like to speak next? Ma'am, please come up. Do you want help with that?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Ann Carroll.) Thank you. Can that be heard?

MR. KENNEDY: Sounds good.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: So my name is Ann and the last name is Carroll, $C-A-R-R-O-L-L$. And $I$ am on the Friends of the Frank J. Wood Bridge in that group. And I am also from Summer Street, which is one of the historic districts that's being profoundly, profoundly impacted by the suggested new bridge.

First of all, as you can all see, it curves right out so that it really, really -- it's like having it come right into your neighborhood. I think the suggested steel girder is somewhat -- maybe somewhat smaller, but about the size of that screen there, am I correct? So that what we're --

MR. KENNEDY: Well, do you want an answer to that or would you like to keep going with your time?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Ann Carroll.) Well, it's

9 or 13 feet and I'm not sure how high that screen is, but at any rate, it's a brontosaurus of a beam -MR. KENNEDY: Uh-huh.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Ann Carroll.) -- which
now we look through the very, very handsome and iconic Frank, you know, the bridge as it exists. We can look at the old mill, you can look down the river. It's a very beautiful historic district and what will happen is this enormous steel beam will come right around. I'm not sure that anybody solved the question of lights that will pour into our neighborhood. I'm not sure anybody has studied the sound, the increase of sound from trucks, from motorcycles, from vehicles, especially on top of such an enormous steel structure. One speaks of saving business, but a viable neighborhood like that is an incredible resource. It's really lovely. It's not only historic, it's a very vibrant neighborhood that takes care of each other that, you know, we don't have enough of that in our world and we're willing to throw it away for I'm not sure what, but something that is certainly much, much uglier than what we presently have.

MR. KENNEDY: All right.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Ann Carroll.) I hope
we're not going to throw it away.
(Applause.)
MR. KENNEDY: Thank you. I'm just going to just ask Wayne if he would, Wayne, you may not be able to answer this, but if you can do you have an estimate as to how wide the new girder system would be and/or how much higher or lower the deck would be as compared to the current?

MR. FRANKHAUSER: I'm waiting for an answer from T.Y. Lin on the depth of the girder. Okay. So T.Y. Lin International is the design consultant that we have on board and we'll look that up.

MR. KENNEDY: While they're looking, let me just make one non-substantive comment. When I met with DOT about this engagement, I had some of the same questions and some of what they've told me is that without regard to whichever one of the options are taken that a lot of these questions remain to be determined in the final design process and there will continue to be additional opportunities for public comments as the final design process proceeds.

MR. FRANKHAUSER: So the girders are 8 to 10 feet. They are a hunched girder, so they're varying from 8 at their thinnest depth to about 10 at their deepest.

MR. KENNEDY: Okay. And the height of the deck, do we know that?

MR. FRANKHAUSER: That would add about another foot to the bridge, so it's --

MR. KENNEDY: A foot.
MR. FRANKHAUSER: Yup.
MR. KENNEDY: Okay. So for those of you who didn't hear it the girders are estimated to be from 8 to 10 feet in height depending upon where you measure them and it's anticipated right now that it would add a foot of height to the deck. Sir, would you go ahead next?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm Curtis Neufeld, that's Curtis with a C, Neufeld, N-E-U-F-E-L-D. I live in Topsham, I own a business in Brunswick and I drive across that bridge at least twice a day, sometimes more. I enthusiastically support the upstream replacement option. The fiscal speaks for itself. The maintenance cost for that would be deferred to our children over years. I have children who I hope to stay in the community and I would not like to saddle them with the $\$ 200,000$ additional maintenance costs. I also think that it's money that's coming out of the state programs that could impact the potential closure of another bridge that would be
unnecessary if we do the fiscally correct thing here and replace an aging bridge. It's 86 years old. Infrastructure is designed with a service life and I think this one's life is essentially up. The advancing rate of deterioration has been noted. I also think that the new bridge is considerably safer with the wider shoulders, the double sidewalks and the improved lanes with the added observation ports will really provide an opportunity for folks and pedestrians to look at the river. I appreciate the work that's been done by the Bridge Advisory Committee, which was formed with officials and residents from both towns to examine how the bridge could be aesthetically enhanced as well as some of the other improvement opportunities including adding an observation port to the Centennial Park. And I think they've got some great ideas on how that can be coming a more pedestrian friendly area than they could find to the one sidewalk on the bridge.

And the safety factor -- I'm an engineer and the safety factor of a bridge that is very critical and could rapidly deteriorate and cutoff these two communities I don't think can be stressed enough. I think that the Waldo/Hancock bridge that severed the communities up there at the Penobscot Narrows and I'm
sure that had one of those unmeasurable impacts on the businesses up there for a long time. And as a member of the Chamber and as a member of friends and people who have restaurants, the idea of losing the connection between these communities would be extreme. So it's fiscally prudent to not saddle future generations with a high bill -- an ongoing very high bill for the sake of our own personal desire to have an aesthetic. Personally the idea of getting rid of all of the superstructure and being able to see the mill buildings on both sides, both that mill and the Cabot Mill, that to me is much more attractive than a lot of steel superstructure on this bridge and I look forward to a much more open view. Thank you.

## (Applause.)

MR. KENNEDY: Thank you. I'm going to ask for a volunteer. I don't know if someone would be willing to help us and close those doors. I think it might be a good idea. We have some neighbors who are making some noise in the hall.

Okay. So it's 7:30. We're not going to hold this precisely to 8 o'clock, but we've got a lot of people who want to comment, so I am going to remind you, and we've heard good comments from people
who both support the refurbishment option and support the replacement option, so to the extent that you're going to repeat something that's already been said, I would just ask you to keep your comments to a summary fashion. Ma'am, would you go ahead?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you. Yeah, Kathy
Wilson. I live in Brunswick. As a matter of fact, I was born in Brunswick and my uncle was the first one to drive across that bridge the night they opened it. He probably had a couple of drinks. So it is not the original bridge. Actually -- and I've watched it be repainted many, many times in my life. I think it's ugly. It's a rusty piece of junk in my mind and it blocks the view of a beautiful river. I remember when the river stunk and so much has been done to improve the river and now when we look out at it we see this big green and rust hunk of something going across there and it just in my mind totally ruins the look. That was the flood of '36, I believe. My father had a thousand pictures of -- I remember the river flooding up close to the deck and everything, but I think a new bridge is the only way. I also ride a bicycle. There is no way in the world -- I just corrected myself, there is no way I will ride across that bridge on a bicycle. The sidewalk is too
narrow and it's for people. And the lanes for the cars are -- well, there is that grid on the side, that's just asking -- that's asking to be in trouble. If you slip even a little bit you're going to dump yourself and there is a lot of people who don't ride across the bridge because of that. I also -- I won't say that I -- I don't think this has been a prejudiced process. I have been to almost, not all, but I've been to many of these meetings. All the little ones, all the big ones and I've heard, you know, everything from one side to the other. And I do understand some people want to feel -- they feel they love the bridge. Change is hard for anybody. I have often said if change wasn't hard there would be more divorces, but that's just a little -- I think we need to get in -- we need to be safe. I'm on the bicycle and pedestrian committee in Brunswick and stuff and we've looked at this over and over again. We've looked at many places. This bridge is just not safe and to try to say it is --

MR. KENNEDY: You know, ma'am, I think a lot of us would like to go have a cup of coffee with you, but I am going to ask you to kind of wrap it up.
(Laughter.)
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Kathy Wilson.) So to
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wrap it up, I am totally in favor of the new upstream bridge and --
(Applause.)
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Kathy Wilson.) Thank you and that's it.

MR. KENNEDY: All right. This gentleman is next.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: My name is Chuck Carroll. I live in Topsham. I live with my wife, Ann, and I am also a member of the Friends of Frank J. Wood Bridge. I thought we were here tonight to talk about the Environmental Assessment and I listened to the presentation by DOT and there was virtually nothing about the environment whatsoever. In fact, what the Environmental Assessment says is that the selected Alternative Number 2 has by far the greatest impacts on the environment in all respects and I'll talk about one in particular. This is not disclosed in the agreement -- in the draft. When that is curved up it will go over the waters that lead to the fishway, which goes up the side of the power plant and into the water above. It is clear from correspondence from the National Marine Fisheries and from internal correspondence that we have seen that there is some information that building that in that
way will change the quality of the water, change the shadowing, change the light and so on and so forth and have an outrageous impact upon the waterway, on the fishway. Brookfield, which owns the dam, they said, and rightly so, that if that is the case they will not pay to refurbish the fishway. The fishway does have to be refurbished. In fact, Brookfield has to enter negotiations within the next few years with the Federal Energy Regulations Commission. There is a potential risk out there, a potential hazard of several millions of dollars that would come from damage to the fishway caused by Alternative 2. If the DOT had really wanted to build a new bridge and really wanted to preserve the environment, Alternate 1 looked to me like it was a quite an easy one and would not affect the environment anywhere near the degree that Alternate 2 does. So there is a major feature in there that has some false impacts that I don't think are noted or not included in any of the numbers. The second one is, and I can say this very briefly, none of the information on the elevations, on the way that the bridge is to attach to the approaches, none of that is covered in any great detail in any of the material. There is some information, but not by any means enough for an
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outside member of the public to evaluate. Thank you.
MR. KENNEDY: Thank you, sir. Sir -- or, ma'am, I'm sorry. Go right ahead. Tell us your name.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Nancy Randolph, 14 Munroe Lane, Topsham. I will be brief.

MR. KENNEDY: Good.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Nancy Randolph.) So I actually have served on the Town Council in Brunswick and the Board of Selectmen in Topsham. I have served on committees, economic development committees on both towns. I have served as the spearhead for the rehabilitation and the fundraising for the swinging bridge, so historic districts, historic things, I've worked on. I am absolutely for a new bridge to serve us all well.
(Applause.)
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Nancy Randolph.) Three things. One, we did the swinging bridge. Anyone that thinks that any -- any guesstimate of price it will always cost more if it's an old thing because once you've started picking it apart it falls apart. We know. The swinging bridge cost more than we estimated. The other thing is ask a member of the Board of Selectmen here in Topsham and on the Town

Council in Brunswick, $I$ got to know almost all of these businesses and it won't affect Brunswick as much, but it will effect the Topsham businesses for the longer time, so therefore the new bridge. Now, the other thing is I'm also on the River Walk Committee where we're working on a two-town loop that actually connects using the swinging bridge and I hope the new bridge because $I$ want people who are walking, people who are bicycling and people who are riding in cars and trucks and other vehicles to be safe. I want a bridge that isn't for the 21 st Century and that's it.

MR. KENNEDY: Thank you, Ma'am. (Applause.)

MR. KENNEDY: Sir.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: My name is Peter Quesada, Q-U-E-S-A-D-A. I live in Freeport and my brother and I renovated the Bowdoin Mill in Topsham. I have four comments on the margins of the Environmental Impact Statement. First, we are very concerned for future marketing for our tenants about the difficulty of managing the process of change and construction disruption to everybody and believe that Alternative Number 2 is the preferred alternative because nobody likes change and it's the one that keeps everything
just the way it is until the very end of the project and I think that's a significant advantage versus disruption early on making people think the project lasts longer in terms of the adverse effect on them.

Second, exiting our project onto Main Street is a difficult job because there's limited sight lines looking down the bridge and you can't really see traffic coming across the bridge.

MR. KENNEDY: I've experienced that.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Peter Quesada.) Some people wait too long and other people go too soon. It's a dangerous situation caused by the same frustration as different manifestations. This new orientation of Alternative Number 2 will provide vastly improved sight lines giving people more time to process and I think will really help smooth the traffic in and out of our project, which is good for our project and is also good for people who are walking and driving on Main Street. It will, I think, improve the visibility of the crossings on both sides of the street helping to integrate the downtown.

Now, this one I really care about. I am an avid bicyclist. The bicycling in Freeport and Brunswick is spectacular. The bicycling here and in

Bowdoinham is spectacular. Not many of the bicycles that I -- I bike 100,200 miles a week. Not many of us are willing to cross this bridge and I think that there is a significant and growing economic impact to our area from bicyclists and I don't have proof, but anecdotally I meet people from -- coming down from Montreal, people coming up from Boston, there are a lot of people that come here because the biking is so good and the people are so good relative to other places letting people bike. A 5 foot lane is really what you need yet we see give a guy 3 feet, that doesn't mean 3 feet is enough because you're 2 feet wide, you would never ride 6 inches away from a curb on that road with a 4 foot lane, if you hit the curb you're going down, you're dead. So that pushes you out. I don't really like people going by me fast, so we don't use that road. With a 5 foot lane they will and I think it will have an unmeasurable but increasing positive economic impact on our whole community. Thank you for doing this. Thank you for not flooding our project with Alternative Number 5. (Applause.)

MR. KENNEDY: All right. Thank you. Sir, tell us your name please.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: My name is Dan Plumer. I
live in Topsham.
MR. KENNEDY: How do you spell your last name?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Dan Plumer.)
$P-L-U-M-E-R$. Just one $M$.
MR. KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Dan Plumer.) I'll keep it brief. I'd like to point out that when our representative here from the Maine Department of Transportation was going through his presentation, which was very thorough and I'm sure everybody in this room regardless of opinion was very grateful of that, there was a slide toward the end that was a white background with a black table listing the cost to build each of the bridge alternatives along with the estimated service life cost and the life cycle cost. I wrote down a quote here that I noticed that I heard while you were speaking, you said, in regards to the cost of building each of the bridges, I quote, they're all fairly reasonable. To the Maine Department of Transportation, clearly the most significant factor in this process is the cost. Budgets are extremely difficult to balance and prioritize and so the cost is the biggest factor. To hear a representative from the MaineDOT suggest that
all of the options are, quote, fairly reasonable, suggests to me that rehabilitating the bridge we can't count that out because of cost. Thank you. (Applause.)

MR. KENNEDY: All right. Thank you. Sir. AUDIENCE MEMBER: My name is Henry Heyburn. My last name is $H-E-Y-B-U-R-N$ and I'm a Brunswick resident.

MR. KENNEDY: Very good.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Henry Heyburn.) I wanted to say -- well, first of all, I've lived in Brunswick 30 years and in that time I've served on the Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, which I co-chaired, and I'm now on the Board for the Bike Coalition of Maine. And I'm not here in any official capacity from the Bike Coalition of Maine, but I do serve on that board. I also have a really strong interest, I'm a historian and I'm a member of a group that advocates for the preservation of our architectural -- industrial architecture in the United States. But and so I really -- I really thought long and hard and I still am -- I think about this a lot. I'm also an avid cyclist and I've come to the conclusion at least in my mind that Alternative 2 makes -- to me, makes the most sense and that was not an easy conclusion to
arrive at, but some of the reasons I -- that led me to that were the one -- just the safety
considerations for cyclists and pedestrians. The gentleman before me alluded to the number of cyclists he sees in town and it's true. Brunswick and Topsham are connected to three major national bike routes, the East Coast Greenway, the Northern Tier Bike Route from Anacortes, Washington to Bar Harbor, Maine and the Atlantic Coast Bikeway from Bar Harbor down to Key West. So in summer you'll see huge numbers of bicyclists in this area from all over the world and I've talked to many of them. So and I guess I am also -- I know that there are -- the costs are not finally determined, but it seems like the cost of a -- to maintain the current bridge would be more than the cost of a new bridge. I'm really concerned if a new bridge is built I'd like to see the narrowest possible lane so that --

MR. KENNEDY: The narrowest possible?
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Henry Heyburn.) The narrowest possible lane to slow traffic.

MR. KENNEDY: And can $I$ ask you to clarify that? Do you mean the vehicle lane or the bicycle lane?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Henry Heyburn.) The
vehicle lanes as a way to promote slower traffic and to not have as big a structure perhaps overall. I'd also like to see real attention given to just -- to a bridge that people would look at and remember so when they come to this area they would leave thinking, oh, that's really memorable. It may not be a bridge from 1931 that has the historical significance, but is a bridge that is unique and memorable and fits the place and the history in some way, so those are the considerations that are important to me.

And lastly, this is -- I always kind of think about this, as $I$ was standing up getting up to talk I don't really -- I don't get that nervous speaking in public, but my heart was pounding a little bit and that's mainly because I saw friends I've known -- people I've known for a long time get up and express views, some of which were in agreement with mine and some of which weren't and so I just wanted to say that I do look forward to having conversations with those people and I appreciate their views and that they're here and I hope that we can continue this process in a way that is constructive. Thank you.
(Applause.)
MR. KENNEDY: Thank you. I would -- as the
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moderator, $I$ would just like to echo that last thought and say that this meeting has met my best expectations as to how it might go and everyone has -- the comments on both sides of the debate have been thoughtful and useful and civil and I really appreciate that. It's made my job a pleasure. Ma'am.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: My name is Emily Carter and I live in Topsham and I work in Brunswick and I walk to work and I've probably walked over that bridge at least 4,000 times. So I want to address pedestrian safety and I guess I could call myself an expert because I've probably walked it more than any of you. And my only safety issue is when they don't plow the sidewalk and I think that will happen regardless of a new bridge or an old bridge, so I would love to see money go into that. And --

MR. KENNEDY: Would you mind if I just stop you right there and just ask DOT when Miss Carter is done to clarify whether that's a state or local responsibility. Go right ahead, ma'am.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Emily Carter.) I would like to mention to the cyclists that I think you're welcome to hop off your bicycle and walk alongside me on the pedestrian sidewalk to get across the bridge.
(Applause.)
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Emily Carter.) I would also like to say that $I$ work in the largest retail store in Brunswick and I probably talk to the most tourists. I've worked there for 10 years and I talk to a lot of people who have newly moved to the area and I think I have a really good sense of why they come here every year and why they choose to move here and I don't want to disregard aesthetics as being incredibly important to why they come and one of the comments I hear very often is that to them it feels like going back in time and it's something that they've lost in New York, they've lost in Connecticut, they've lost in Massachusetts and we still have it and it's a treasure to us and I think we should value it and $I$ think we should care for it. (Applause.)

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Emily Carter.) Thank you.

MR. KENNEDY: Thank you. Wayne, could you respond on the question of plowing?

MR. FRANKHAUSER: Sure. Clearing or plowing of the sidewalk would be the responsibility of the towns and municipalities in the future. So with that said, it's understood that they're going to
concentrate on cleaning their roads first and they usually will pick up the sidewalks later, so there is usually a delay. It is often easier to clean a more exposed sidewalk than it is a sidewalk that's located in behind truss elements, so.

MR. KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you. Sir. AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm Matthew Porter. I live in Topsham. I don't represent any group. I cross the Frank J. Wood Bridge between two and four times a day for work going into Brunswick and that is the worst part of my drive. It's very unsafe and I hate driving on it. I'm really excited for Alternative 2 and that will also encourage me specifically, I would bike more into work if I have access to safer bike options because I've ridden across that bridge and I will never do it again.

MR. KENNEDY: All right. Thank you.
(Applause.)
MR. KENNEDY: Sir.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes, good evening. My name is Hunter Gilpatrick and I live on 24 Maple Street, which is on the side of the Frank J. Wood Bridge. I've lived there for 39 years, so I've seen about almost half of the life of the Frank J. Wood Bridge and I've seen it dying for that length of
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time. We are dealing, I think, with end of life issues as Wayne has pointed out with the Frank J. Wood Bridge, so I'm in favor of Alternative 2 because I think aesthetics are a matter of opinion and I agree with the earlier speaker who said that the aesthetics are seeing the river and the iconic buildings would be less impaired by not looking through the rusty truss of the Frank J. Wood Bridge. So that's my opinion and I would ask that if you want to look at bridge technology look at the Carlton Bridge, 1921 it was built, an engineering marvel at the time, but look at the brand new bridge, it's a concrete bridge built by flat iron. They carry people very efficiently and safely across the Kennebec River and they're side-by-side, make your choice on which the most beautiful and which is the most functional and which is the most cost-effective. (Applause.)

MR. KENNEDY: Thank you, sir. Ma'am. AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Susan Williams.) Okay. Can you hear me?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Susan Williams, Harpswell and I'm not affiliated.

MR. KENNEDY: Okay.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Susan Williams.) Okay.
And thank you so much, your presentation was thorough. I also think it was a bit biased. I can't imagine it's, you know, it's easy to not have a bias when you know all of the technicalities involved, but I am weighing in on the bridge and I can't remember the number but it was the one that rebuilds the one that we have now that we love, some of us. And it also gives the -- I think you said it's a composite lightweight second walkway that would be my vote. For me this discussion is a question of expediency versus soul and I can understand the way the world is going, so much focus is with money and getting around quickly. It seems to be tearing at, to me, the fabric of the beauty and the artistry of our community. If there is any way that we can arrange to rebuild the one we have or put in a new structure and facilitate an extra walkway that would be my choice.

The second thing $I$ want to say is that it's a very romantic hot spot. Walking at night it's quiet. It's -- we're sort of like the Niagara of the east or something after a big rain. We have people strolling on honeymoon. I mean, honestly, if you haven't been there at night you need to walk and
enjoy the birds swooping down and catching fish in their beaks and if the new one, Number 2, were to be put in, if I understand this correctly, I've been studying it for a while, it looks like the curvature of the new bridge would cover up the natural rock falls; is that true?

MR. FRANKHAUSER: On that upstream location it would it most definitely shift the location. It would cover up portions. It would also open up the view of other portions of the falls. The very lowest falls are actually under the existing bridge, so.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Susan Williams.) I guess
I'm not totally convinced of that. The way it is right now is so incredibly beautiful. I've never seen anything like it and when I walk out there with my partner, David, and we do it all times of the year, it's dark. You were mentioning the lights in your neighborhood, it's very subtle and very dark so you actually get to see the night sky and you can see the night life honestly and lovers walk there hand-in-hand all times of the year. It's very beautiful and I would hate to see us lose that. People tell me -- I came here as a child from Missouri, I moved here because of things like that bridge and I bought property in Harpswell. I'm now a
property owner, my first home, and I'll tell you, Brunswick is special. It really is. It's an artists community with international restaurants.

And I don't want to take too much time, but the one last thing for people who like to stroll after so many automobiles and different parts of our world have been veering into crowds and killing pedestrians, even in beautiful little European towns and some in America, having those heavy girders between the traffic and the pedestrian walk is essential. You cannot just have a flat top and expect pedestrians, bicycles and trucks to co-exist. That's my last point. Thank you.

MR. KENNEDY: Thank you.
(Applause.)
MR. KENNEDY: Sir.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm Wes Thames. I am here representing Priority Real Estate Group that's actually at the north end of the bridge.

MR. KENNEDY: Would you say the name of the group again?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Priority Real Estate Group.

MR. KENNEDY: Thank you.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Wes Thames.) With all of
the alternatives we've worked with MDOT to come up with -- we're the most -- probably the most impacted private piece of property with the redesign of the bridge and we're going to lose parking spaces, we don't -- we will lose places to put snow. We, you know, the aesthetics of our parking lot will change, but we've worked with MDOT and they've been very good to work with as far as talking about the design that less impacts us and so I'm just sitting here saying that the group has been very open with us and very representative of our needs as well as the community right around the Bowdoin Mill complex. And I personally -- I support for Alternate 2 as well because we watch every day out of our windows people walking the street, people trying to cross the road and right in front of our facility there is a crosswalk right at the Summer Street entrance, but people tend to want to cross the road right at the end of the Frank Wood Bridge and there is less visibility there as ever as far as sight line up the bridge and so I'm -- we support it and so we hope it's done. Thank you.
(Applause.)
MR. KENNEDY: Sir.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you. I'm Greg

Paxton, Executive Director of the Maine Preservation in Yarmouth, Maine where I live and work. Our mission is to strengthen the cultural and economic vitality of Maine communities and I wanted to comment on the quality of the comments that have been made tonight as well. I think it's been a very high quality set of comments made on both sides and it's been actually very interesting to listen to.

We support substantial MDOT investment in this important crossing. And, of course, Maine Preservation listed the Frank J. Wood Bridge as one of Maine's most endangered historic places last fall in 2007. It's one of the largest active truss bridges in the state, 805 feet. It does connect bookends of two rehabilitated historic mills. And the deck, of course, is weakened and we all can see that, but other than the bottom chord everything we saw was the deck and otherwise the truss system itself remains very strong. The bridge was built not only to carry cars and trucks but actually to carry urban trolleys and coal trains that weigh more than 10 times the current weight of cars and trucks. So the trusses and over-designed gusset plates were really built for far stronger use than is currently required. And we believe if painted its bright
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appearance would make it once again of interest such as the -- such as it was as the subject of historic post cards of the area. And recent developments in bridge paints have helped create a much more longer lifetime for these than prior treatments and with touch-ups they can last as long as 40 years.

In April 2016, when this project was announced this bridge was declared by MDOT to not be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and it wasn't until two months ago that it was determined individually eligible for that, so -- for the Register, so that aspect of this has changed.

Maine's largest industry is tourism and communities are recognizing the rehabilitation of their historic resources is a proven economic strategy and are benefiting from increased interest in their community from visitors, new families and business investors. This is a proven trend that's happening throughout the country. People and businesses are locating to these communities because of their historic character and preservation is a crucial part of the economic future not only of this area but of the entire state. 78 percent of all U.S. leisure travelers participate in cultural and/or heritage activities and heritage travelers typically
stay 50 percent longer and spend 36 percent more than other tourists according to -- all that according to the U.S. Travel Association.

Since 1999, Maine has lost 47 historic Warren through-truss bridges, 23 of them listed are eligible for the National Register and the question is whether Maine citizens are getting the full lifetime of our existing bridges. Vermont has a different approach. They look at their historic bridges as an asset and an attraction and they assign --

## (Applause.)

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Greg Paxton.) -- they assign 100 year expected lifetime to existing bridges that are substantially rehabilitated and a shorter lifetime to new bridges than Maine.

At present, whether or not the bridge is replaced the deck certainly does need to be replaced and they all do periodically in a bridge.

MR. KENNEDY: Sir, how much longer -- how much more do you have?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Greg Paxton.) I've just got this.

MR. KENNEDY: Okay. You go right ahead.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Greg Paxton.) Thank you,
sir. Since MDOT's estimate for repair was done by a firm specializing in building new bridges, an estimate by an engineering firm that specializes in rehabilitating bridges would be more accurate. In our field, we see this all of the time where very expensive estimates are thrown out initially for projects that end up costing substantially less and if rehab is chosen more jobs will be created locally from repair than from purchasing new material from elsewhere.

So we also agree that a 10 foot travel lane would allow for the 5 foot bike lane and 6 foot sidewalk. So we are very interested in option Number 3 and out of great concern that the bridge be repaired but we do it in a fiscally and financially responsible approach not only for this bridge but for all of the historic bridges in Maine.
(Applause.)
MR. KENNEDY: Thank you. So it's 8 o'clock and we have seven people waiting and I'm going to cut the public comments off after they've spoken. And -no, I'm sorry, you can't get up now.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Steve Stern.) Come on!
(Several audience outbursts.)
MR. KENNEDY: No, I'm not going to -- I'm
not allowed to --
(Several audience outbursts.)
MR. KENNEDY: I am going to -- I'm going to
tell you how to submit your comments in writing.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Steve Stern.) No!
(Several audience outbursts.)
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Steve Stern.) That's totally unfair. He had more than 30 minutes to give us his bias. And she's done this before.

MR. KENNEDY: Hold on. Hold on. Sir, hold on. Don't leave. Hold on.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Steve Stern.) You are totally unfair and you know it.

MR. KENNEDY: Sir. Sir, don't leave. This lady who gets to overrule me has done that.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Steve Stern.) Thank you. (Applause.)

MR. KENNEDY: You should thank her?
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Dave Colt.) We do!
MR. KENNEDY: I'm sorry?
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Dave Colt.) We do thank her.

MR. KENNEDY: All right. Good. So, sir, would you go ahead? I've lost track of who is next. Sir, you're, I guess, next in line.
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AUDIENCE MEMBER: Good evening. My name is David Douglass, two S's. Resident of Topsham. I'm also the Chairman of the Board of Selectmen for the Town of Topsham.

In June of 2016, the Board of Selectmen adopted a resolution that supports the replacement of the Frank J. Wood Bridge with Alternative Number 2 and we stand resolute in that decision from that time. Today we were asked to come here and talk about environmental impacts and one of the things you talked about is this -- the current Frank J. Wood Bridge has been shedding paint and metal into the river for years and $I$ live to talk about remembering the smell of that bridge. I distinctly --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (David Douglass.) Kathy. Sorry, Liz. Your sister is right there.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yup.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (David Douglass.) I distinctly remember going across the bridge and always remembering and having that horrible smell in that foam and that was not just the bridge by any means and I understand what the problems were, but that's not there any longer. If we continue to keep this bridge, no matter what moves have been made in
paint this bridge is going to continue to rot away as it has over time.

Talking about the historic nature of this bridge, when I think of the historic area that this bridge abuts I think of the two mills on either side. The Brunswick Mill is over 100 years older than the current bridge and the Topsham Pejepscot Mill is 60 years older than this bridge. In fact, this is the nineth bridge at least that has been in this area. Prior to the Frank J. Wood Bridge the bridge went right down through the center of where Pejepscot is today and that was Topsham's Main Street. The decision was made long ago of what's affecting neighborhoods when Topsham had their buildings taken away and destroyed for replacement of a bridge. Alternate 2 does not take that -- will not do that and it will be the least problem replacement that we have.

And then cost. This cost is not going to be borne by the town of Topsham specifically and it's not going to be borne by the town of Brunswick. It is going to be shared by everybody in the State of Maine. The Frank J. Wood Bridge would not be in this position today if our bridges were upkept. They are not upkept and there is no -- there is not a person

Dostie Reporting
7 Morrissette Lane
Augusta, ME 04330
(207) 621-2857
that can say with a straight face that they believe the state will upkeep no matter what is kept there. The budget does not allow for that. So you can go ahead and --

MR. KENNEDY: Sir, can I ask you to summarize the remainder of your remarks?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (David Douglass.) Yes. Keep the bridge and when are we going to get the new one.
(Applause.)
MR. KENNEDY: There you go. Sir.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Hi. My name is Peter Baecher from Brunswick.

MR. KENNEDY: Would you spell your last name, please?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Peter Baecher.)
B-A-E-C-H-E-R. I really don't have an axe to grind on the new versus the old. I'm kind of a fan of bridges. I always read about them. I'm going to visit my daughter in a couple of months in San Francisco and so I'll be sure to see the Golden Gate. I wouldn't expect something like the Golden Gate to be out on the river here, but I do think that bridges have an important civic component and I just -- it's jarring to me the alternative. And I can understand
the reason to replace, you know, like I said, I don't have an axe to grind on that, but what you've chosen to replace it's an overpass, you know --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Susan Williams.) It's ugly.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's a highway. (Applause.)

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Peter Baecher.) It's a highway overpass. My dad was an engineer and he does some -- my mother used to crucify him how he didn't have artistic ability. But really, I think that's my only gripe here. And if you drive down to Boston you see the Whittier Bridge that they've just built there, you know, something like $I$, you know, just giving it some thought, you know, or giving it a little bit more attention. You're connecting two important historic things. I'm not opposed to new, but I think the new one -- I'm probably years late in this because I haven't followed closely enough, but your new design $I$ think is pretty dull and unimaginative.
(Applause.)
MR. KENNEDY: Thank you. Sir.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Hello. My name is Cory King. I'm the Executive Director of the Southern
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Midcoast Maine Chamber, which represents Bath, Brunswick, Topsham, Harpswell, as far north as north as Richmond, as far east as Wiscasset. I've just got a few points here. One, our Board of Directors evaluated this project as business owners in both communities and overwhelmingly passed a resolution to support replacement over a year ago because when our board evaluated the options they found that Alternative 2 is the lowest cost option over the life of the bridge, it lasts the longest and is the safest option for pedestrians and cyclists.

Now, I do want to say something too about the business impact and you can't imagine the impact on businesses even if it's not 20 months. If it's 10 months or six months, the impacts will be devastating. Just the idea of traffic concerns will end up rerouting tourists, create sales losses, you'll have job losses, tourist losses. If anyone drove through Warren over the summer and you saw how desolate that downtown was when they had a construction project going on. When you look at the businesses in Hallowell and what they're scared of. We're already having some conversations in the chamber what kind of special events we can do for Bridge Days or whatever we're going to call it to
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drive more business to down to those businesses that are going to employees.

Also, there is something that a lot of people don't know about small businesses. You can't imagine how many businesses that you love are so close to their bottom line. You can't imagine -(Applause.)

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Cory King.) -- what a loss of 5 or 10 or 15 percent of their sales will mean. The fact of the matter is we're probably going to lose some employees in the area and we're probably going to lose some jobs in the area no matter what option we choose, so whatever the least impactful option is for closures and rerouting and retrafficking is the one we should do and that's why I believe in Alternative 2. Thank you.
(Applause.)
MR. KENNEDY: Thank you. Sir.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm Dave Colt from Harpswell and that's C-O-L-T like a horse. I am, maybe I shouldn't say it, the President of Colt, Inc. that's incarnate since 1940. And beyond that, I have to say I have to go back and clap on the shoulder and shake the hand of the odd man out here I guess will be two of us who said narrower, slower, please.

Whatever is done about that bridge, and I'm rather partial to the one we have, whatever is done about that bridge anything that results in slapping down a very efficient piece of the Jersey Turnpike is hellish and anything which will leave the bridge a place where people can bicycle in safety, walk in safety, enjoy some kind of relationship to the river life below and, yes, slow down so we do not worship at the shrine of 0 to 60 in 6, anybody? No, we won't. Room and zoom bring in the ultimate rhyme doom, but you have to live a long time or a while to feel that. That's all.
(Applause.)
MR. KENNEDY: Thank you. Ma'am.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Good evening. My name is Larissa Darcy and I am the President of Brunswick Development Corporation and I also live in Brunswick and work in Topsham immediately across the bridge, so I too cross this bridge at least one or twice or four times a day or more. I want to first of all thank MDOT and all of the people that have worked on this project and the immense amount of time and investment that you've made in researching all of these alternatives and coming up with Alternative 2. There is no question for safety, for business impact, but
the beauty of the views that we're going to be able to enjoy with this new bridge design and the lifetime that we're going to be able to look up the river, look at these beautiful buildings is tremendous. So I want to thank you, I want to thank all of the people who have been here tonight and spoken passionately for their views, but we do need to move forward. We need to look at economic development and, again, enjoy the beauty of the river and not the metal trusses that are rusting away. Thank you.
(Applause.)
MR. KENNEDY: Thank you. Ma'am.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm Susan White. I live on Bridge Street in Topsham. I have --

MR. KENNEDY: How do you spell your last name, please?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Susan White.) W-H-I-T-E.
MR. KENNEDY: Okay.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Like white.
MR. KENNEDY: Well, I need to check.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Susan White.) I have two letters from local businesses that they would like me to read.

MR. KENNEDY: All right. I'm not going let you read them. If you want to summarize them quickly
we'll put them into the record.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Susan White.) Can I submit them?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Susan White.) Okay.
Sylvia Wyler, she owns Wyler's on Maine Street in Brunswick and she also owns the Lamont Block building on the corner of Maine and Pleasant Street and she completely supports and believes in the rehabilitation of the historic bridge. The structure stands as a welcoming landmark linking Brunswick and Topsham and it will only continue to foster the character and attractiveness of the town. And Sharon Smiley, the owner of Local Market and Cafe at 148 Brunswick. She also supports the rehabilitation of the Frank J. Wood Bridge. Thank you.

MR. KENNEDY: All right. Thank you. Would you hand me those, please. Thank you. So those are marked for the record as Exhibits 1 and 2.
(The requested documents were marked as Exhibit Numbers 1-2 by Mr. Kennedy.)

MR. KENNEDY: Sir.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: My name is Doug Bennett, B-E-N-N-E-T-T. I'm a Topsham resident and I'm a member of Topsham's Lower Village Development

Committee. I've followed that. I want to make simply two brief points. I've followed this bridge controversy from the beginning. I think I've come to all of the meetings. I have found MDOT and the Federal Highway Authority to be enormously fair, conscientious and thorough in their work. There have been ample opportunities for public input and comments, those have all been available to anyone who wanted to read them. And I want to thank them, I think it's been a remarkable process and I think we ought to all solute them. I'm sickened at the comments about unfairness and bias. I don't think those are warranted at all.

The second thing I want to say is for me, I agree with the many comments that have been put forward about why Alternative 2 is best, but one that I haven't heard is what's historic about the site is not the current bridge, the nineth, at least, that's been there but the crossing itself which has been used for lots of purposes, used as a site for Indian fishing, used as a site for economic activities of all kinds, mills, et cetera, and what we need in building a new bridge is also historic display of all of the bridges that have sat at that site and the various economic and social purposes to which that
site has been put. With the coming of a new bridge we'll have views of extraordinary beauty where the beauty is at that site is of the river itself, not the bridge.
(Applause.)
MR. KENNEDY: Thank you. Sir.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: James Phinney Baxter
White. I am from Topsham.
MR. KENNEDY: $\mathrm{W}-\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{E}$ ?
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (James Phinney Baxter
White.) Yeah. It's not very common. So I'm consulting party member. I am a member of the Friends group, it's the Friends of the Frank J. Wood group. And I'm also a consulting party for my own small business in Topsham, Governor Baxter, LLC.

So first $I$ want to say is that this building is not eligible to be on the National Register of Historic Places. And the second request that $I$ have or statement is that $I$ would like you to ask Miss --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: We can't hear you.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (James Phinney Baxter
White.) The second statement I have is I would like you to ask Miss Cherry Martin on your right of Federal Highway to allow the consulting parties a higher standing at this meeting and to give us more
time to speak as they are afforded that right in the Section 106 process.
(Applause.)
MS. MARTIN: This is a general public meeting and we have specific meetings with the consulting parties. This is a general public meeting for anybody's input and it doesn't mean that a consulting party is allowed more time at this particular meeting. The consulting parties are afforded many opportunities. We have separate meetings, we provide information to the consulting parties and I -- it's just not appropriate to have consulting parties allowed more time than anyone else in the general public.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (James Phinney Baxter White.) I see no use in speaking further then. MR. KENNEDY: Good. Please sit down, sir. Sir.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you. My name is Bruce Van Note. That's capital V-A-N, space, capital N-O-T-E. I am a member of the Topsham Planning Board and I'm the owner of a 1903 Victorian on 15 Elm Street here in Topsham where I'm 24 years into my 10 year repair plan. Some lessons learned from that; one, that history is very cool, and it's worth
working on.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Nancy Randolph.) Talk into the mic.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Bruce Van Note.) Is that my friend? Yes, I can't speak at anything without Nancy Randolph interrupting at some point. Anyway, history is very cool. It's more work than you think once you get into it, it's a little unpredictable and my retirement home will be new. I am also the Chair of the Brunswick/Topsham Bridge Design Advisory Committee and I've had the privilege of working with 17 members appointed by the Topsham Selectmen and the Brunswick Town Council on both sides of the bridge and $I$ just want to thank them for their service. There hasn't been a better group of people I've ever got to work through and I think if you came to some of those meetings you can find that we can put the soul into the bridge along with the rational.

I'd also like to thank DOT for their work. I think it's been well said, this has been a very fair and well-considered process. This may be the longest historic consideration process that DOT has ever done. And I'd also like to thank the town staff that's been supporting that, John and Linda, I couldn't have done it without you. And I'd like to
thank the Friends of the Frank Wood Bridge because their passion has caused everyone to slow down and really think about what you're doing, think long-term, think about the importance of history and, so thank you for your efforts.

First, on the straight kind of obvious benefits it's been hit a lot, so $I$ won't spend hardly any time on them. If you're a straight engineer or an accounting type, this is pretty close to a no-brainer in terms of cost, lower initial cost, lower life cycle cost, lower life cycle service cost. It will have two vehicle lanes, two bike lanes, it will have wider sidewalks. There will be less traffic impacts during construction and long-term, just overall the new bridge will be safer and less disruptive.

But I'm here to challenge on the second element that $I$ think people who think rationally just go, well, there you go, you know, math is going to drive you to a new bridge. I'd like to challenge the idea that a new bridge can't be something we all love because $I$ think if you get into it $I$ believe we will love this bridge and more importantly the site. We will rediscover the site. As was said before, it's not about the bridge, it's about the site and this
new bridge has a low profile and you get to experience the site much more. It will transform what is currently a long, green, rusty tunnel into an open platform where we can all see the bridge. It will be better for bikers, it will be better for pedestrians, it will create better connections all the way around and it will better connect with us to the site, we will better connect with either other, it will better connect two great villages and so all in all, I think we will love that new bridge. And I know there is differing opinions, I certainly respect them and I hope that that same passion people can come and we can join together and start looking forward and working towards historic mitigation on the new bridge.
(Applause.)
MR. KENNEDY: Thank you. Sir.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm Scott Hanson, H-A-N-S-O-N, and I live in Topsham. I'm an architectural historian and a member of the Friends of Frank J. Wood Bridge. I want to address this idea just mentioned that it's not the bridge that's significant but the crossing. In fact, the bridge has been determined individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, not the
crossing. So the bridge is historic. It's not in dispute.

Our group did a Freedom of Information Act request of $M D O T$ for documentation for correspondence related to this project. We got thousands of emails. We got lots and lots of interesting things. We're flattered by how much attention they gave us, but I have one email here $I$ would just like to quote from because I think it addresses the question of bias very clearly. This is from Joel Kittredge at MDOT to Norm Baker at T.Y. Lin, Friday, April 22, 2016. Norm, as discussed, please, existing bridge slide, please look through the images for the absolutely worst, ugliest, restricted, most corroded, et cetera, and use that. That is in bold. Another point, remove bridge drains from proposed new bridge section. To make that one look better. See if getting rid of green frame color on existing bridge section slide reduces the visual width. There is no question that this process has been biased and there are many, many documents to back that up and we look forward to seeing where we end up to determine what happens.

MR. KENNEDY: Thank you.
(Applause.)
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AUDIENCE MEMBER: Good evening. My name is John Shattuck. I am the Economic and Community Development Director for the town of Topsham. Shattuck, and I ask you to spell it carefully, S-H-A-T-T-U-C-K. Two quick points. There has been a lot of talk about what the level of public support for one option or another is, but I'd like to recite just a brief list of the organizations that have come out in formal endorsement of Alternative 2, the replacement bridge in the order of which they were adopted: The Topsham Lower Village Development Committee; the Southern Maine Midcoast Chamber of Commerce representing hundreds of businesses and thousands of employees in this area; the Brunswick Development Corporation; Topsham Development Incorporated; the Topsham Board of Selectmen; the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee of Brunswick; and the Bicycle Coalition of Maine, which represents thousands of riders across the state. And those four town committees represent more than 25,000 -- actually more than 30,000 citizens who elected the folks who appointed those committee. The support for this is broad, it's deep and it's been carefully considered.

And now $I$ will put you all to sleep with a
very brief look at the numbers. There has been some complaint about using service cost, service life cost as a comparison of cost as opposed to life cycle cost and this is the part where you'll go to sleep. Life cycle costs take the cost of any iteration of work on the bridge, for example, $\$ 4$ million for painting, and uses that same cost now, 20 years from now, 40 years from now, 60 years from now. Anybody that's bought a car or a grocery cart you knows that the prices in our current environment, our historic inflationary rate about doubles every 22 or 23 years, so using the same price going out only makes sense if you apply no discount coming back. And unfortunately, the life cycle cost use current costs going out over 75 or 100 years and then discounts them. Service life cost use those current costs, which is fair if you don't then discount because you're -- if you increase it for inflation and then discount it for present value you'd come in the same place, present cost. So the comparison there is 2 to 1.75 years of rehabilitation work on the current bridge would be twice as expensive as 100 years of maintenance cost/service cost on the new bridge.

MR. KENNEDY: Okay.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Shattuck.) And
that's one-third less time.
MR. KENNEDY: Thank you. Ma'am.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Nicole Lepera.) I
honestly didn't know what $I$ was going to say, but $I$ felt like coming up here. I don't like change.

MR. KENNEDY: Could you identify yourself first?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Nicole Lepera.) Oh, I'm sorry. Nicole Lepera, Topsham, Maine. I don't like change very much either, but one time I did make a change. I have moved all over the place and I remember the first time $I$ saw this area and I drove across that bridge and it wasn't the river necessarily, it was the bridge itself, I thought, wow, you that is really -- I love this bridge and I turned around and went back over the bridge.
(Applause.)
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Nicole Lepera.) I think I drove over the bridge maybe five times I said, you know what, I'm going to move here, and I did. And it's 10 years ago that I moved here and I have spent one heck of a lot of money in this town, so they just wanted me, so you have to think about the other ways money is brought in, people moving here, tourism, the impression it makes on people the first time they
come here. I would not have moved here had it not been for that bridge as silly as it sounds. That's all I have to say.
(Applause.)
MR. KENNEDY: Thank you. Sir. AUDIENCE MEMBER: Hi. My name is Gavin

Englar, $\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{G}-\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{R}$. I work as an architectural designer. I have for over a decade now in Portland. My wife and I were looking for a community to settle down in and about four years ago we decided on Brunswick in part due to the two mills and the Frank J. Wood Bridge and the walkable districts and the economic -- just how wonderful the two communities are. I'm a member -- I'm on the Board of Directors for the AIA Maine, which would be the American Institute of Architects and also on the AIA Design Committee. I think that I'm -- I think I'm informed about design and certainly -- I said this three years ago at a meeting that the proposed design is wildly inappropriate for joining Topsham and Brunswick. (Applause.)

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Gavin Englar.) The number one aesthetic criticism that $I$ hear that I've heard for years now, I've seen it posted on social media, I've seen it written in newspapers and I've
heard members of this audience say tonight oooing and ahhing over the photos showing the worst locations of rust on the existing bridge. All of the complaints go back to that rusty old bridge, that rusty hunk of steel. When the bridge is rehabilitated it won't be a rusty hunk of steel, it will be a beautiful structure.
(Applause.)
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Gavin Englar.) I also want to point out that all of that rust is on MDOT's hands for failing to maintain that bridge for its life span.

## (Applause.)

AUDIENCE MEMBER: And if history in that regard teaches us anything, I think it's fair to say that whether it's a new bridge or the existing bridge that maintenance going forward will be questionable because, well, just look at all of the bridges throughout the State of Maine. The functional criticism of no bike lanes and safety, that's a really odd one to me because that's the safest bridge for pedestrians that I can think of primarily because the pedestrian walk is outside of the superstructure --

> (Applause.)

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Gavin Englar.) --
therefore there is a physical barrier between pedestrians and vehicular traffic, something that is totally missing from the new design. A simple 8 inch, 9 inch curb --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Susan Williams.) That's right.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Gavin Englar.) -- will not protect pedestrians in the new design. In terms of cyclists' complaints about the width, we saw in the proposal that the rehabilitation calls for wider bike lanes on both sides. I, for one, am a cyclist. I have friends that own bicycle shops, I have no problem biking across that bridge and I have no problem taking the entire lane for safety. You're given that ability as a cyclist, so I just don't buy that argument.
(Applause.)
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Gavin Englar.) The purpose of this meeting also, I thought, was to talk about the Environmental Assessment, so I'd like to point out something that was missing from MDOT's spreadsheet. Although, I appreciate the life cycle cost column that was included I didn't see an embodied energy column, okay. So let's talk about
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sustainability. The most sustainable thing you can do is reuse what's existing and that can be buildings, that can be infrastructure. Embodied energy, go home and look it up if you don't know the term, but it takes into account every bit of energy that went into producing something new all the way from mining the materials, trucking it to a manufacturing facility, the manufacturing process and all the way to its end home which will be a new bridge. The embodied energy for the new construction as opposed to rehabilitation is so much significantly more it's drastic to me that it wasn't included in your discussion. Yeah, you didn't even talk about the Environment Assessment.

You know, are we a community that doesn't care about sustainability? Are we a community that doesn't care about our historical landmarks?

Multiple people have gone up tonight to say this bridge was one of the reasons they came here. Tourists come here for the very reason that other parts of the country don't have these historic infrastructure presence that we have. Topsham and Brunswick benefit from these things on a regular basis. They have for decades. We already have what so many communities want and are trying to get back
because everything has given way to the automobile, okay. We want to keep our pedestrian friendly downtowns.
(Applause.)
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Gavin Englar.) The highway bridge that is proposed is the opposite of that. That gives --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Susan Williams.) It's ugly.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Gavin Englar.) --
everything from --
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Susan Williams.) It's ugly.

MR. KENNEDY: Hold on. Hold on. I'm going to ask to you leave if you can't keep your -AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Susan Williams.) Okay.

MR. KENNEDY: -- comments to yourself.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Susan Williams.) All
right.
MR. KENNEDY: Go ahead, sir.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Gavin Englar.) The
highway bridge is just that. Let's talk about the safety. There are concerns -- people are all concerned about the safety and we need to get rid of this bridge because it's unsafe. The new bridge will
be more unsafe for pedestrians because it's so wide there is no -- there is no calming factor, which the existing bridge already has. It's an experiential crossing. It slows people down. You can clearly look through the open trusses. People with houses on Summer Street can look right through that structure. You cannot look through a 10 foot tall eye section, okay.
(Applause.)
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Gavin Englar.) I just want to close by saying they're -- going back to my main viewpoints, the criticism for the existing, it seems like everyone is in favor of Option Number 2 for two reasons, safety, which I just addressed, and the rust, which I already addressed. Just forget about those two components and assume that when the new -- when the bridge is rehabilitated those aren't issues any more, all right, what do -- and then see how clearly this bridge -- how important it is to our community and, you know, someone was talking about, you know, not passing on the cost to the generation. I'm from that generation, sir, and I don't mind investing in very important pieces of infrastructure to our community.
(Applause.)
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AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Gavin Englar.) That's all I have to say.
(Applause.)
MR. KENNEDY: Thank you. Sir.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: My name is Steve Stern, S-T-E-R-N. I live in Brunswick and I am a member of the Friends of the Frank J. Wood Bridge. I apologize, but I've been cutoff a number of times. I am a consulting party to this process and there have been at least two times that I haven't been included because things weren't appropriate, so it's not fully working. I thought this meeting as well as all of the meetings were about the 106 process. We all have different opinions. I can't say what's beautiful and what isn't beautiful, that's not what the meeting should be about. The Brooklyn Bridge was one of the instigators of the Historic Preservation Act of 1966, which led into the 106 and the $4(f)$ process and I'm not sure that's been followed. I don't think anyone did it purposely, but it hasn't.

The meetings started in November of 2015. They came with one alternative. They were supposed to give alternatives under the 106 but there was only one. And then because we heard that and at the April 2016 meeting we rose up and we came up with some
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hopeful suggestions and that's what we're here for. The whole purpose of the 106 was to get together and come to find things that make everybody happy. So I can answer some of the questions. The concern about the bridge coalition, I'm going to read you something, the National Association of Transportation Officials say lanes of 10 feet are -- in urban areas are -- they have a positive impact on street safety without impacting traffic flow. So that means for all those that are that concerned, I don't care which bridge you prefer, the bicyclists will have a 5 foot lane and there will be a 10 foot lane on the bridge for safety. There should be no doubt about that. That's a national organization that promotes that.

As for the as for the community, I just don't understand the businesses. First of all, three times here it was stated that there is going to be a secondary bridge to prevent impedance of traffic, so how can you bring that up? Secondly, Ed McMahon, who is a major contributor to urban planning, I don't know his exact title, but he's consulted with a number of town organizations he basically says successful communities are distinct communities. The more towns in Maine come to look like every town in America, the less reason to go there. Saving -- (Applause.)

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Steve Stern.) So if you don't think that has an impact on the economy to all of the small businesses, $I$ guess you shouldn't be in the small business world. Saving the historic buildings of Maine saves your economy, towns -tourists won't go into a city or town that's lost its soul. So first of all, I hope we haven't lost our soul. Secondly, and maybe lastly, we have an engineering report that we've paid for that contradicts some of the costs and some of the assessments of the Maine Department of Transportation and we hope that the Federal Highway Commission looks at those and compares and it will make some fair assessment between what we were giving here and what are other possibilities.
(Applause.)
MR. KENNEDY: Thank you. Sir.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: I guess I'm it, huh.
MR. KENNEDY: I think you are.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: My name is Bill Thompson.
MR. KENNEDY: Oh, no, you're not. Go ahead.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Bill Thompson.)
T-H-O-M-P-S-O-N. Topsham. I'm also Vice Chairman for Board of Selectmen for the Town of Topsham. I
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would like to say that the board has -- that was alluded to by David Douglass earlier has not once but twice supported the replacement of the bridge and this is a point that I will point out that the Town of Brunswick Town Council thus far has remained silent two, three years later.

The one point that no one talks about is -well, the number they came up with is 19,000 cars a year. 19,000 cars a year today. What is it five years from now? What is it 10 years from now? We had the high speed bypass on 196 that was supposed to be two lanes each way and a bus route is now one lane. When the bridge is shut down it's backed up all the way into Brunswick because we have BIW traffic. BIW, the biggest employer -- almost the biggest employer in the state is going to increase their employment. Now, people say the bridge is going to bring people up here towards them, yes, it is, but it's not going to hold 19,000 cars a day. We, the Town of Topsham, did a projection from MDOT, 4 percent a year. 4 percent a year, so just pass that out, 4 percent a year started at 19,000. This was all part of trying to make the lower village more accessible. It was not. We had to scrap it because MDOT wouldn't support it because of the amount of
traffic and we cannot afford a million dollars to do traffic improvements down there so people do cross the street. The bridge will improve things down there or keep the flow down. It's better for cyclists. I'm a cyclist. I've ridden across the bridge. It's unsafe. Those who want to ride too close to you, you either get hit by a car or you get hit by a girder. I think in my personal opinion is in 10, 20 years from now, yeah, if this, for example, if the original bridge stays in tact we're going to have so much traffic and so much gridlock that it's going to being looked at as a poor decision. Thank you.

MR. KENNEDY: Ma'am, I believe you have the last word. No, I'm sorry. I'm going to keep going, but let's try and wrap it up. Go ahead.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: My name is Mary King. I live in Bath and $I$ sit in Kennebec County sometimes and look at the new bridge and I notice one thing about it, almost no one ever walks across that bridge. And I try to bring my grandchildren part way up over by the train station to look out over the new store and all of that, it was extremely frightening because --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can you move closer to the
mic?
AUDIENCE MEMBER: We can't hear you. AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Mary King.) Oh, I'm sorry. It was extremely frightening and I think I was putting their lives at risk there, so it's not an intimate or particularly aesthetic experience being on the Bath Bridge, although it does curve nicely when you see it from the town.

I would like to draw your attention to a situation in Elizabeth, New Jersey where they are installing a super ship port and the local community was extremely upset because they realized the devastation it was going to cause in their community and so at least as you may know they preserved that big bridge, which they say is an icon. I mean, every time they came up to Maine from DC, you know, there was that bridge and $I$ don't know how long it's been there, I think the turn of the century, the last century, and they -- they respected the feelings of the people of Elizabeth and they altered that bridge so that the curve way is arched up over and they maintained the structure of the bridge, so much that you can see that for quite -- miles from 95. I think these icon parts of our community are extremely important for our feelings of commitment to our
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community because they are different from other communities and I think this bridge is one of those things and I just want you to know that I am from larger Maine, mainly Bath, and I feel very committed to this bridge. Thank you.
(Applause.)
MR. KENNEDY: Thank you. I hesitate to say it, ma'am, but you might have the last word.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Susan Wilson.) I just wanted to come up just very quickly, I think people have been very nice in sharing their feelings and expressing their feelings --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Who are you?
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Oh, I'm Susan Wilson. I live in Brunswick. And I want to thank everybody for expressing their feelings and when people say you are or are not listening to the feelings or the opinions of the people it usually is one of us that says that when we don't think they're agreeing with our opinion, so I would say everybody's opinion has merit. And I would just say I like old things and I like new things and I don't think new things are necessarily soulless and I don't think all old things are perfect. In terms of the rust issue, all things rust even after they've been repainted, but I don't
hate rust, but I'm just saying rust will -- rust never sleeps to quote someone people my age might remember. So I just want to thank you for holding the comments.

One of the things the public may or may not know is there is the Design Advisory Committee that was mentioned here that did do some renderings and drawings of some of the ideas for what a new bridge might look like and there is not a final design to my understanding, but $I$ believe there will be no matter what happens community input into the soulless or soulfulness of whatever would be built, so I don't think these drawings you see here are exactly what would be an end product, so I think that.

And as far as the environmental part, I did scan most of what $I$ could and I thank you for putting all of that information in there and I thank all of my neighbors for coming. There are those that agree with each other and those that don't.

MR. KENNEDY: Ma'am.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: So I just have a very short statement to read.

MR. KENNEDY: You can, yes.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: My name is Betty Leonard and I'm from Brunswick. I was born in Brunswick,
grew up here and have retired here. After graduating from college in Maine, I lived in a number of other states, Europe and Asia. These experiences have made it clear to me that historic preservation is a priority everywhere on this planet and an economic engine for tourism. Brunswick appears -- I was away for many years and when I came back, I was shocked by the great losses here in Brunswick --
(Applause.)
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Betty Leonard.) -- and they include many historic buildings, the train station, churches and even our fabulous town hall. Very, very short sighted decisions made with business interests in mind all about money, okay.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: All about money.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Betty Leonard.) All
about money here. So I -- I want to suggest to you that generations of Brunswick and Topsham residents have traversed this bridge and I'm certainly one of them. I personally have crossed the bridge to work in the Pejepscot Paper Company right there for four summer to pay for my college education. Many, many residents have done that and Topsham residents have traversed the bridge going to the Bowdoin Mill. So we all have a collective memory here. It's -- this
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bridge is terribly, terribly important to us.
Now, a couple of other things I need to mention. I'm 77 years old and --

MR. KENNEDY: Congratulations.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Betty Leonard.) -- and I ride my bike over that bridge all of the time and have no problems. No problem.
(Applause.)
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Betty Leonard.) And just one more thing I need to mention to you, I lived in Rhode Island for a number of years and worked there and I watched Rhode Island rehabilitate Newport. It was a dump. And then I watched them move two rivers in downtown Providence. Providence was even worse. And now it's the tourist mecca. They're calling it the Venice of the north. So I think sometimes business interests, sometimes political interests get a little confused because they're thinking short-term. Brunswick has lost a lot, so has Topsham and it's time to start thinking about saving things that really mean something to all of us.
(Applause.)
MR. KENNEDY: So first of all, thank you all for coming. Second, thank you for your patience. And third, please remember that if you have other
thoughts you can submit them to the Department either in writing or by the web. There are self-addressed stamped envelopes and forms out on the desk in the hall if you want to use them. If not, as I said, it's maine.gov/mdot/env/frankjwood/.

I do want to just say one other thing, I am not sure, I think it was Shakespeare that said beauty is in the eye of the beholder. A lot of people have different views but the design will continue to be worked on no matter which one of these alternatives is selected and I hope that you all will continue to bring your good ideas to that process. Thank you again.
(The requested document was marked as Exhibit Number 3 by Mr. Kennedy.)
(Meeting concluded at 8:46 p.m.)
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In Sylvia tyler
I live in Harpswell and own Wyler's at 150 Maine st. in Brunswick. I also own the historic Lamont Block Building at the corner of maine a $\frac{1}{4}$ Pleasant streets.
I completely support and believe in the
rehabilitation of the historic
Frank $J$ wood Bridge.
The structure stands as a welcoming Land mark linking Brunswick ant Topshan
It will only continue fo foster the character and attract wees, of our
towns. Sn/vian wines of our
Sylvan hi
tin Sharon Smiley I awn local market + cafe at 148 maine st Brunswick. t would like to reinstate my support to rehab the frank J. Wood Bridge and the efforts if the friends group.
thank you
Strensumy

I am completely in favor of the FWB being rehabbed. It has a long history and exhibits a style of construction no longer being built. I wonder if part of the support of its being replaced by a contemporary style is coming from the younger generation. They have not lived with over many years and are surrounded by new styles, so don't have any attachments to it. Another reason I am opposed to a new bridge is the placement of it. It will curve significantly towards the falls, which will cause it to cover the large outcroppings of granite below the falls. That aesthetic view of mother nature will disappear. If the old green bridge is gone, there is no going back. This is an opportunity to save a wonderful, historic and major structure. Don't forget the Old Town Hall. It was raised during the time of Urban Renewal in the 60's. What a loss that was to Brunswick's landscape. I don't know anyone who doesn't wish we had done otherwise. Let's not be guilty of repeating our mistakes. It's our last chance!

Mary Alice Treworgy 3/28/18

