

**Meeting: Steering and Stakeholder Committee Meeting -
Conference Call**

Meeting Date: 07/16/10 - 10:00 - 11:30 AM

Location: Conference Call

Update on Study Status

**ME-NH Connections
Steering and Stakeholder Conference Call
July 14, 2010 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
HNTB Headquarters, Westbrook, Maine**

Participants: Gary Beers, Nancy Stiles, State Legislator; Gail Drobnik, Kittery; Rose Eppard, Portsmouth; John Carson, Kittery; Steve Workman, MH Seacoast Greenway; James Horrigan, Portsmouth Conservation Commission; Bob Landry, NH DOT; Gerry Audibert, MaineDOT; Josh Pierce, Seacoast Area Bicycle Routes; Laura Black, NHDHR; Linda Wilson, NHDHR; Beth Muzzey, NHDHR; Ben Porter, Save Our Bridges; John Carter, Kittery; Stephen Kosacz, Kittery; Deborah McDermott, Portsmouth Herald; Roger Maloof, Naval Shipyard; Myranda McGowan, SMRPC, Carol Morris, Morris Communications; Paul Godfrey, HNTB; Benjamin Ettelman, Morris Communications.

Call began at 10:03 AM

Carol Morris: Thank you all for calling into this conference call in lieu of a Steering and Stakeholder Committee meeting today. The purpose of this conference call is to allow people to ask questions and make comments on the progress email that was distributed recently. I am going to open the floor for your thoughts and comments.

Jon Carter: Looking at the schedule of events and knowing that we are off schedule by a few months, it was my concern after reading the progress email that the role of the Steering and Stakeholder Committee missed a beat in being able to provide our recommendations on the alternatives, recommendations which would have been placed in the report. I thought the committees would be able

to make a recommendations to the two DOTs on the final two options that would go into the report.

Carol Morris: The discussion has been that when we got to this point – down to the last few alternatives - the final alternatives would be submitted to the DOTs, at which point they would have to sit down and find some common ground by balancing their priorities. *After* those discussions took place, we would bring their conclusions back to the committees for discussion. The progress report that the DOT will receive today contains all of the minutes from all of the meetings and the overriding opinion of the public is unmistakably clear, so in that sense the committee's opinions are absolutely a part of the report.

Gail Drobnyk: I'm concerned that the latest additions have not made it into the matrix that we have been given. We were also promised that we would have the matrix broken down between the Memorial and the Sarah Long Bridge.

Carol Morris: We have a draft of the matrix showing those, but to be honest with you we are at the point where the cost piece is a very important component and we do not have that yet. Once we get the costs into the matrix, it will be available.

Gail Drobnyk: My concern is that everything I have been hearing is that the MaineDOT is going to ignore the results of the study. They want to ignore the Memorial Bridge and that is the only thing they are willing to go along with. The letter in the Herald today is right on and we need to make a change in our government.

Carol Morris: Making a change in government is always an option. I can tell you MaineDOT has all of the information from the study and they are very aware of what the public sentiment is.

Gerry Audibert: Gail, that is not true. We have not made any decision. There are rumors that we only want a bike-ped bridge and I want to state emphatically that we have not made a decision and we will not make a decision until we have all of the data in front of us. I know that people are anxious but please bear with us while we weigh all of the information that we have been provided.

Gail Drobnyk: I am upset you will not sign off on the notice of intent for the TIGER grant, even though if the results of the study are not in accordance with the TIGER grant you don't have to go along with it.

Carol Morris: I am not sure whether that is fact, Bob or Gerry do you want to comment on that?

Gerry Audibert: I cannot comment on the TIGER grant as it is a decision that is made at the highest level; I am not privy to those discussions.

Carol Morris: I do not believe that that decision has been made as you have stated, Gail.

Gail Drobnyk: We need to have MaineDOT Commissioner David Cole or Governor Baldacci down here to let us know what is going on and as a Maine resident I am absolutely outraged by what is happening here.

Gerry Audibert: It's not that we don't want to talk to you; we don't have anything to say yet. It's premature for us to make any statement one way or the other. We are not ignoring the public sentiment; we are just waiting for the facts to come in.

Ben Porter: I believe there was an interview with one of the spokesperson of MaineDOT on *All Things Considered* on MPR. The spokesperson said that they would not be influenced by public opinion, how do you reconcile your statement with that statement?

Gerry Audibert: As Carol has stated throughout the process, we clearly listen to the public but it is not ultimately a popularity contest. We have noted the public sentiment involved in this study. There are a lot of parties not directly involved in this study who may have a vested interest in the MaineDOT's spending in excess of 200 million dollars on this project, as that is a large percentage of the MaineDOT's available bridge funds for the immediate future. There is a lot of need in this state and not a lot of available funds and that require us to be very careful in the decisions that we make.

Carol Morris: If the DOTs over time were to only make funding decisions based on popularity, it would be an impossible situation because unfortunately there is not enough money to go around. The MaineDOT is listening to you and I believe that the spokesperson for MaineDOT said that public sentiment would be a factor but not the only factor.

Ben Porter: Gerry could you give me an indication of the top five alternatives in Maine's eyes?

Gerry Audibert: No, not until we receive all the information. There are some environmental and historic impacts that we have not seen and we need to take everything into consideration before we form an opinion. There are some historical considerations that the Maine SHPOs need to look at. Again, we understand the desire and impatience but we are waiting for all of the facts.

Nancy Stiles: When do you expect those facts to be in?

Gerry Audibert: We are getting them, we received new cost data late Wednesday and we will be meeting with NH DOT soon as well.

Ben Porter: Same question to you Bob, what are NH DOT's favored alternatives?

Bob Landry: Everything we have been hearing is that we need two bridges to cross the Piscataquis River for all of the reasons that we have established throughout this study.

Stephen Kosacz: So we need only two bridges, not three bridges?

Bob Landry: Three with the high level bridge

Gerry Audibert: I want to clarify that Maine has not taken a position yet on the number of bridges.

Stephen Kosacz: Alternative 11 (public transit and hybrid bridge alternative) was floated at the most recent stakeholders and steering, and the transit system was extremely unpopular by all parties yet it is still on the list. Can whoever is in charge of that tell me why these options are still on the table?

Paul Godfrey: As you are aware, neither the popularity alone nor the lack thereof is enough justification to keep an option on or off the table. We are currently providing to MaineDOT and NH DOT all of the data derived from every alternative and each set of data goes through an extensive evaluation. Again we all want to make sure that all of the facts are correct. Maine and NH are working hourly every day to make sure the information provided is correct.

Deborah McDermott: Paul, you had said that the transit alternative analysis was to be completed already. Is it completed?

Paul Godfrey: As of this point the revised assessment of the transit alternative has not been delivered to the DOT, I expect it to be done shortly.

Carol Morris: To clarify, the first version was sent to the DOT on time as we promised at the last public meeting. We have received comments back on that draft, Paul Godfrey is reviewing and responding to the comments, and it is close to being completed for resubmission.

Ben Porter: The email says that MaineDOT and NH DOT favor some of the alternatives, but we have not reached agreement as to which would be favored by both DOTs. I had asked which has been favored and received no answer. Carol, could you tell us which MaineDOT favors?

Carol Morris: Gerry was very clear in that MaineDOT is not willing yet to choose one, but throughout the process they have been very forthright in that MaineDOT's priority is upgrading the Sarah Long Bridge for reasons we have discussed at length. NH DOT has made it clear that the Memorial Bridge is their priority and this is a point that the two DOTs have not been able to reach consensus on at this point in time. They will have to move forward and reach consensus for action to be taken.

Stephen Kosacz: Assuming that neither state can come to an agreement, is it conceivable that NH could say that Memorial Bridge is of higher value, and focuses on the Memorial, and Maine does the same with the Sarah Long?

Carol Morris: It is my understanding that that is not legally viable as both states own the bridges jointly.

Gerry Audibert: Both states own the bridges jointly; whatever agreement is made is typically funded 50/50 with federal assistance. There will be discussions once we get all of the data. We want to reach an agreement and move forward.

Ben Porter: Alternative 10, the bike-ped option, is the only alternative that includes a non-vehicular bridge. The issue of the process for funding is unique enough that the funding process should be considered in the analysis. Does it make sense to even be considering the bike-ped option since we don't have a clear picture of the funding?

Paul Godfrey: One of the opportunities we have had is to identify the top tier of alternatives and currently alternative #10 is in that top tier. There are pros and cons for all alternatives. The barriers that may exist to funding will become clearer as we move forward. Anything that is more challenging in terms of funding will be addressed.

Ben Porter: I'm not sure I got an answer.

Paul Godfrey: The answer is that it will be considered as it should be and that information will be forthcoming in the next couple of weeks as the DOTs sit and evaluate

Carol Morris: How the alternatives are funded will be part of the DOTs' discussions and will be available to you folks soon; we just don't have that information right now.

Jon Carter: It appears that since the last meeting a major decision has been made that anything that is done for the Sarah Long Bridge would be done off-line. That is a milestone decision, am I correct?

Paul Godfrey: The only exception to that is alternative #4, which is the Sarah Long rehabilitation. The rest of the alternatives that are in the top tier are off-alignment, yes.

Jon Carter: When we looked at off alignment options, we had additional impacts on the Kittery side and I believe the Portsmouth side as well. Are those impacts part of the cost analysis?

Paul Godfrey: Yes they are.

Carol Morris: I want to clarify that no decisions have been made in regard to property acquisition.

Jon Carter: I remember that the off line affected part of a neighborhood.

Carol Morris: It would take a small slice of their existing land. That is a very sensitive point so I want to be very careful not to overstate any effects.

Paul Godfrey: The upstream alignment is very immediately upstream. There is the opportunity to get back to the existing alignment in a relatively short amount of distance when the bridge meets with land.

We understand that there is an additional impact but the range is moderate enough that we believe, and to be clear this documentation is still being finalized, but we believe the range is within a reasonable and acceptable distance for homeowners.

Gerry Audibert: The reason the on-alignment alternatives were considered inferior to off-alignment options are because of the positive effects on traffic during construction.

Stephen Kosacz: It seems to me we have two different time frames. I'm not clear why the decision on both bridges needs to be made so quickly. The Memorial Bridge needs immediate attention, and the Sarah Long has more time. What's the pressure on making a decision at the same time?

Carol Morris: From a traffic capacity standpoint, all three bridges need to be looked at as a single entity because we need to make sure we can accommodate all of the vehicles that will cross the river over the next 25 years. If we decide to go ahead and rehabilitate the Sarah Long in a certain way, that could change what the Memorial option would have to be.

Paul Godfrey: Yes and all modes of traffic are considered, including evacuation routes and emergency access. The need to look at this holistically is the correct approach. Once a determination of an alternative is made, it is possible that we could approach that recommended alternative in different time frames.

Ben Porter: On alternative #4, the rehabilitation of the Sarah Long Bridge, the point is the timeframe issues. Would a rehabilitation of the Sarah Long extend the lifetime of that bridge, and if so by how many years? Would it not then put the three different bridges on three different expectations of end of lifecycle so we don't have this problem in the future?

Paul Godfrey: Good point, the question is if Sarah Long is rehabbed, to what extent is it rehabbed and what life expectancy would be made out of it. The response is that is currently being prepared by HDR so we can make the decision on that alternative.

Ben Porter: It seems to me that assuming the costs work out, if there was a way you could wait on the Sarah Long, it would buy us time to work through some issues in the Seacoast region. It might give everybody more options to consider for the future.

Carol Morris: That is the one Sarah Long option that does not enhance the shipping capability of the river, which is a big issue.

Ben Porter: Yes, it is a big issue, but it doesn't eliminate the possibility for improvement, it puts it off. The concept is not to say no to the Hybrid Bridge but to put it off.

Gerry Audibert: I think the I-95 Bridge probably needs major rehab in about 30-40 years, which might be when the Sarah Long needs another major rehab. That timing is something we would want to look at.

Ben Porter: I am suggesting that someone takes a look at the timeline. We need a staggered end of life for these bridges. The rehab looks like an interesting option to pursue.

Carol Morris: The timing issue is a point well taken.

Stephen Kosacz: There may be confusion in Augusta that we in southern Maine are insensitive to the problems the state has with the other transportation projects; I would like to dispel that notion. We are saying that we should back ourselves out of this corner where we have to fix both bridges. We all like the hybrid alternative, but money is the issue. If cost were not an issue, we would not be sitting around talking about this. The economic analysis shows that people who use the Memorial Bridge are on longer trips, not just local trips. I'm repeating my belief that the transit is not a viable option.

Carol Morris: So the alternative you are suggesting is waiting?

Ben Porter: I'm not asking for you to consider an additional alternative, I am asking you to put in the alternative an option to look at a timeframe. It might work for some of the alternatives to look at a prolonged timeframe. It may not work for all alternatives, but it could work for alternative 4.

Carol Morris: The assumption that we are assuming we need to do everything at once is not true. There is an understanding from both DOTs that we would not be able to do everything at once and that will be part of the conversation.

Steve Workman: Are bike-ped considerations being fully looked at as primary aspects of the cost analysis, or are they only being looked at as minimum considerations?

Paul Godfrey: The alternatives that we identified as having bike-ped connectivity will certainly have full connectivity. The magnitude of the cost is not likely to change the ranking of the alternatives from most to least expensive. We know the cost and it is not likely to influence the alternative.

Rose Eppard: Is bike/ped integral to the replacement of the Memorial Bridge, or once we get a design will bike-ped go by the wayside?

Paul Godfrey: The opportunity to further enhance the alternatives to incorporate greater bike-ped connectivity has been identified as important throughout the process. We understand that it is viable and the order of magnitude cost will not change that.

Linda Wilson: Everything we have heard about transit includes the importance of building ridership base in order to support the infrastructure. We have heard loud and clear that the users will not use it. That should be a big stop sign if people say they won't use it.

Carol Morris: The proposal on the table is for it to be a no-fee transit system.

Linda Wilson: That's what I mean, a no-fee transit system will require a subsidy. The reason that rail service is not viable is because there is not a sufficient fee-paying ridership to make it viable. This does not seem to be a place where transit would work.

Paul Godfrey: Understanding the high cost of the alternatives, our charge is to understand if transit could be viable from a cost perspective over the long term when compared to a build alternative. Understanding the information and agreeing on that information will help us understand if it makes sense. If it's the right answer, we don't know yet and that is part of the information that will be evaluated moving forward.

Stephen Kosacz: The transit system is a viable solution for the two years or 18 months during the time that the Memorial Bridge is being re-constructed. I think that will prove to some degree that it is a solution for a period of time, but it is not a long-term solution. Who are the people that decide which alternatives are going to be finalized?

Carol Morris: I'll let Bob and Gerry answer, but we have said many times it is a combination of the two DOTs, and in this situation it is very likely that both states' DOT Commissioners and governors will weigh in.

Gerry Audibert: That statement is correct.

Rose Eppard: Have we determined if there is homeland security money available for the Sarah Long Bridge because of the train and the need to remove nuclear waste?

Carol Morris: We have been told from the beginning that there is not, but we have heard from legislators over the past couple of months that that should be pushed back at a bit. I do not believe any action has taken place on that front as of yet. I believe there is no legal requirement on their part to provide funds.

Paul Godfrey: The Naval Shipyard does not own the rail line, PanAm does. PanAm and the Shipyard have an agreement where the Naval Shipyard pays PanAm to use that rail line.

Rose Eppard: It is my understanding that the Sarah Long Bridge has been kept alive because of the railroad.

Carol Morris: That is not true. But it is true that the rail line has added a complication in terms of designing a new bridge, that is, if the rail were not there it would be a simpler structure. But it has been determined that that bridge is an important part of the infrastructure in terms of capacity needs.

Stephen Kosacz: Certainly the cost of a midlevel bridge is substantially different than a midlevel hybrid bridge that accommodates rail transit. I think it is imperative to explore this issue. If the navy yard has some sort of agreement with PanAm, where is the requirement that the rail line must exist on the bridge?

Bob Landry: That is an agreement that dates back to 1938 or 39 when the Sarah Long was originally replaced. When we get a selected solution we will look more closely at funding opportunities. I don't see who pays as making a difference on selecting an alternative.

Stephen Kosacz: I think who pays for what is a crucial factor in our decision process. The Sarah Long Hybrid alternative may have a higher

traffic throughput and lower operating costs, but I think that the Route 1 Bypass is not a viable alternative if the I-95 bridge is congested.

Paul Godfrey: I have not indicated that any route is a viable alternative to the I-95 Bridge.

Ben Porter: I believe that is a statement that Gerry Audibert made at the last meeting.

Gerry Audibert: I meant that it could serve as a backup for truck traffic. Without that backup route, the detour for incoming freight would be rather extensive.

Carol Morris: We are talking a short-term, emergency backup.

Stephen Kosacz: Alternative 11, does that satisfy the traffic capacity? Also, alternative 4, have you done any projections on the reduced vehicle usage of the bridges based on more viable and thus increased bicycle and pedestrian transit?

Paul Godfrey: We have determined that all alternatives can work from a traffic capacity standpoint. Some alternatives work better than others, but generally speaking all alternatives meet need from a traffic capacity standpoint. Shifting to non-vehicular transit is something that the traffic models take into account, and we included that.

Rose Eppard: In the final report, if the final recommendation is something that didn't pass fatal flaw, will that be stated?

Carol Morris: All the alternatives left on the table have passed fatal flaw.

Rose Eppard: I don't believe that, when can I see that?

Carol Morris: It will be in the draft report, which will be out hopefully in two to three weeks and available on the website.

Rose Eppard: So we are going to see a matrix that shows that these alternatives have passed fatal flaw.

Paul Godfrey: All alternatives have to pass fatal flaw. Any alternative on the evaluation matrix will have passed the fatal flaw analysis.

Carol Morris: There is a misunderstanding about the fatal flaw analysis

and the draft report. These are two separate bars. All of the ten alternatives had passed the fatal flaw analysis. Alternative #11 has not completely passed the fatal flaw analysis; it is in the second round of analysis. Until that is accepted the status of #11 is yet to be determined.

Gail Drobnyk: So there is no way to file a notice of intent for the TIGER grant?

Carol Morris: That is being talked about at the DOT Commissioner level and we have until the 26th to file a pre-application.

Gail Drobnyk: I heard Chellie Pingree state at a recent meeting, in disagreement with what Gerry Audibert said at the last meeting, that she did not believe there would be additional stimulus funding coming after this round of funding.

Gerry Audibert: She was referring to resource recovery act funds (ARRA); we are hearing there will be additional funding for TIGER-like grants.

Rose Eppard: Maine has pushed this can down the road until the Memorial Bridge is going to be dead.

Beth Muzzey: Can you remind us how 106 and 4(f) fit into the fatal flaw analysis?

Carol Morris: Those are state and federal guidelines that surround historic infrastructure and it is a separate process that will run a little longer than this study, but we are preparing all of the required documentation for that and we hope to have that completed by September or October.

Beth Muzzey: How do they fit into the fatal flaw analysis?

Paul Godfrey: They are included in the fatal flaw analysis and in the draft report as documentation. The level of information that is required for each is included in both sets of documents.

Beth Muzzey: As a historical review agency, it is difficult to review the Memorial Bridge Rehabilitation as we have not received that data yet.

Paul Godfrey: Absolutely, the justification for why we believe that the Memorial Bridge rehabilitation is no longer a viable option is based on

the bridge inspection report. The documentation will be in the draft report and sent to the DOTs for review as well as to the review agencies.

Beth Muzzey: When?

Paul Godfrey: Within the next couple of weeks.

Linda Wilson: The top tier of alternatives that we have been presented with do not include rehabilitation alternatives for the Memorial Bridge, yet the historical review agencies have not signed off on that yet. It will have to be addressed.

Paul Godfrey: All of the rehabilitation options did pass the fatal flaw analysis and were carried forward for detailed evaluation. The information based on the outcome of the bridge inspection showed that rehabilitation for the Memorial is not a viable alternative. That paperwork is being filed and all agencies have to review that. All alternatives are still subject to documentation and approval. We think we have adequate facts to make these assumptions, but ultimately the documents need to be signed off and approved at all levels.

Carol Morris: The difficulty is if we waited to get full documentation from everyone, it would be taking a lot longer and cause even more frustration. We move ahead with what we believe are assumptions that are clearly documented, but for which signoff has not officially occurred.

Beth: Will the cost analysis figures be attached to that?

Paul Godfrey: Yes, once they has been agreed upon.

Stephen Kosack: Could you summarize where we are today and what the next steps are? And has what we have said today made any difference in what the DOTs favor?

Carol Morris: We have made a lot of progress in the past few weeks as we have moved from ten alternatives to five. Both DOTs need to agree on the supporting facts and then they need to agree on what a solution could be moving forward. At that time we will report those discussions back to the Steering and Stakeholder committees. We are at a point where the DOTs need to take all of the data from the Study Team and the public and find an answer.

Jon Carter: Is the draft report is going to be presented today to the DOTs?

Carol Morris: At this point it is a progress report, because it doesn't contain some aspects of a draft report, such as the costs.

Jon Carter: So over the next two to three weeks the cost will be added as well as the other historical considerations? And at what point will both the states have sufficient data to move forward?

Carol Morris: We are hoping they will have everything they need within the next week or so, and they will in the subsequent weeks work towards making a decision.

Linda Wilson: It seems to me that we started out two years with two states disagreeing and we are still there, if they cannot agree can FHWA provide a mediator?

Carol Morris: FHWA has acted in an advisory capacity throughout this process and helped the study move through some of the stickier points. I believe the DOTs will come to a decision without having to refer to an FHW mediator.

Paul Godfrey: Facts are wonderful things, having all the information will provide clarity for the departments and make this decision easier for them. If we do determine that there is not enough separation among the remaining alternatives, we may need to work to evaluate these to a more detailed level such as an (environmental assessment) EA process. But we are hoping that will not be the case.

Deborah McDermott: What is an EA?

Paul Godfrey: This is a feasibility study. After this study, there will be required environmental documentation that is needed to move ahead with construction, regardless of the outcome. If there is a clear consensus, a more streamlined documentation approach can be used. If there is not a clear consensus, potentially a more detailed process such as an EA would be deemed necessary and possibly a more rigorous EIS (Environmental Impact Statement) would be needed.

Deborah McDermott: Can you clarify what those are?

Carol Morris: There are three categories and every federally funded project has to move forward with one of the three determinations and

processes. There is categorical exclusion (CE), an environmental assessment (EA) and an environmental impact statement (EIS), and those are in order of complexity and detail with an EIS being the most complex.

Deborah McDermott: Who would do that assessment?

Carol Morris: Consultants for any major project do that work. On the matrix, we have included that as a consideration.

Gail Drobnyk: I am concerned with alternatives 10 and 11 based on public safety. There would be no evacuation routes.

Paul Godfrey: Your point is correct; those alternatives do not score as well in the evaluation matrix compared to alternatives that provide access at all points. It is being considered in conjunction with all of the other criteria.

Gail Drobnyk: When will we see the updated matrix?

Carol Morris: We are hoping in two to three weeks depending on how things go in the next two weeks.

Gail Drobnyk: And it will be broken down into separate categories for the two bridges?

Carol Morris: In all the categories in which they can be separated.

Steve Workman: We would like to hear directly from Commissioner Cole. I understand that he may not want to comment but we want to hear him and for him to hear directly from us. The Stakeholder Committee has invested a lot of time and we could help sell this to the community. If we are feeling alienated there will be a problem, and there will not be a level of support from us.

Carol Morris: I'm sure Gerry has talked to the commissioner about that and as we get closer to the end of the study I am sure he will make sure he hears it again.

Gail Drobnyk: I agree with that, and we would like to hear from the governor as well.

Bob Landry: I will bring these comments back to Commissioner Campbell.

Jon Carson: I feel as though MaineDOT favors alternative 10 and 11.

Carol Morris: It is time for the DOTs to take the information and work this out.

Ben Porter: Last year there was a 25 million dollar project to build bypasses around Caribou and Presque Isle?

Gerry Audibert: Yes, that was a federal mandate, not a MaineDOT decision.

Ben Porter: And a 100 million dollar project in Wiscasset?

Gerry Audibert: Yes it is estimated at \$85 – 100 million.

Carol Morris: And that is expected not to be built for ten to fifteen years.

Ben Porter: So you are beginning land acquisition?

Gerry Audibert: Yes and that was an EIS, and it has been under development since 1995.

Ben Porter: The thing that occurred to me was that the common term in these projects is the word bypass. I understand the need to move commerce around these communities. My observation is to question whether the bypass mentality is consistent with an overall economic development message.

Gerry Audibert: I would like to clarify that; we are not in a bypass state of mind. The Wiscasset project has been going on since the 1960s or 70s, and that is a severe bottleneck for the entire midcoast region. The northern Aroostook County study is a federal mandate, not something that we selected on our own. Those are just two examples and if you look at what MaineDOT spends you would see that it is very balanced. It is unfortunate that both bridges here need attention at the same time and that is something that we want to avoid in the future. Everywhere we go we hear that we are not spending money the way that we should and it is a problem and it will continue to get worse as we have a deficit in federal highway funding. From what I hear, funding will become more grant oriented rather than formula-oriented, which it has been in the past. Again, a \$200 million dollar project is a huge project.

Carol Morris: Thank you for calling in today folks, and we will continue to keep you updated moving forward.

Meeting adjourned 11:30