

Meeting: Steering and Stakeholder Joint Committee Meeting

Meeting Date: 11/16/10 - 2-4 pm

Location: Kittery Trading Post - Katahdin Room

- Update on role of Governors' Task Force/overall process going forward
- Update on new Memorial Bridge and Sarah Mildred Long Bridge processes
- Connections Study Draft Report: Discussion and opportunity for comment

**Maine-New Hampshire Connections Study
Steering and Stakeholder Committee Meeting
November 16, 2010 1-3pm
Kittery Trading Post, Kittery, Maine**

Attendees: Ken Herrick, Albacore Park; Linda Wilson, NHDHR; Steve Workman, NH Seacoast Greenway; Dave Walker, Rockingham Planning Commission; Leigh Levine, FHWA-NH; Marc Dixon, FHWA-NH; John Carson, Kittery Port Authority; Richard Candee, Portsmouth Historical Society; Rose Eppard, Portsmouth; Jamie Sikora, FHWA-NH; Laura Black, NHDHR; Peter Michaud, NHDHR; Gail Drobnyk, Kittery; Tom Reinhauer, Southern Maine Regional Planning Commission; Cathy Goodwin, Greater York Chamber of Commerce; Jon Carter, Kittery Town Manager; Gerry Mylrole, Kittery Town Planner; Josh Pierce, Seacoast Area Bicycle Routes; Roger Maloof, Portsmouth Naval Shipyard; Doug Bates, Portsmouth Chamber of Commerce; Steve Parkinson, Portsmouth; Bob Landry, NHDOT; John Butler, NHDOT; Bill Cass, NHDOT; Russ Charette, MaineDOT; Gerry Audibert, MaineDOT; Paul Godfrey, HNTB; Carol Morris, Morris Communications; Ben Ettelman, Morris Communications.

Meeting began at 2:04

Carol Morris: Welcome all and thank you for coming to this final Steering and Stakeholder Committee Meeting for the Maine-New Hampshire Connections Study. The meeting today has two parts. First we will discuss the draft final study report, which is an overview of what happened in the study from start to finish. This report is also available on the study website. We have a 30-day comment period and all comments need to be formally submitted in writing via email or mail. Our final discussion will be about what happens moving forward. Maine is taking the implementation process forward for the Sarah Mildred Long Bridge and New Hampshire is taking the implementation process forward for the Memorial Bridge. Bob Landry from NHDOT and

Gerry Audibert from MaineDOT will detail how that process will work moving forward.

I want to give an overview of recent events that have occurred since we last met. As most of you know, the TIGER II Grant was awarded for \$20 million dollars and that is the initial step in the funding process. Additionally, on October 5th, the governors of both states made an announcement that they would implement a task force to work on funding for these projects. The task force should have a comprehensive report to deliver in December.

Tom Reinhauer: How do we get information on the meetings for the task force?

Paul Godfrey: There are meeting minutes being generated but there is no website. I believe the next meeting is November 30th. We will find out and let you know the details.

Gerry Audibert: We can get the meeting schedule and send it to the group.

Richard Candee: I saw nothing about TIGER II in the final report. Can we put that in there please?

Carol Morris: We can put an addendum in the report; although I am not sure that is specifically related to the study.

Gerry Audibert: Any comments should be directed to Paul and then we'll decide what is appropriate to be included in the final document.

Carol Morris: Ok, I am going to turn the floor over to Paul and he will provide an overview of the draft report.

Paul Godfrey: As Carol mentioned, thank you for coming this afternoon. I am going to go through each chapter of the draft report. Don't hesitate to ask questions and make comments.

The first chapter is the executive summary that summarizes the entire 18-month process. We will incorporate TIGER II in there as well.

We have a chapter that provides a bit of background for the Study. There is an overview of the history and problems that indicated the need for the study. We understand that this study is about

documentation and this chapter goes into great detail about the background.

The next chapter is an overview of the public outreach aspect of the study. Carol Morris has put together a list of all of the meetings that have occurred including Steering and Stakeholder Committee Meetings, Public Meetings and meetings with Consulting Parties. There is a general summary of each meeting, a list of attendees and the general sentiments of the audience. The complete meeting minutes for every meeting are included in the appendices as well.

The purpose and need chapter includes the statement itself and lists the needs and goals of the study.

We detailed the fatal flaw analysis process that we went through in the beginning. We went through a high level screening of every alternative. The basic premise was to ask whether the proposed alternative matched up with study purpose and need, was it financially and physically feasible and was it permissible.

Through this process, 63 alternatives were identified and analyzed. A very thorough and detailed list of these alternatives is included in the report.

At the end of fatal flaw analysis, there were three Memorial Bridge options as well as three Sarah Mildred Long Bridge alternatives that remained. After the fatal flaw process, we generated three additional alternatives that we added for consideration. Option 1 was to close the Memorial Bridge and evaluate a transit system. There were also two options for a hybrid Sarah Mildred Long alternative, one with a 5% grade and the second with a 6% grade.

Rose Eppard: I never understood why the new alternatives moved forward without moving through the fatal flaw process.

Paul Godfrey: Post fatal flaw we identified new options. The original intent was to run them through fatal flaw. It didn't happen because there was not agreement internally as to whether or not they passed fatal flaw. Additionally, there was some gray area regarding whether they met study purpose and need. Given the point where we were in the process, it seemed logical to include the options in the rest of the analysis moving forward.

Eleven alternatives made it through fatal flaw as being moved forward for further analysis. Please keep in mind these are not the final alternatives being recommended by the final report:

- **No Build Alternative:** Memorial Bridge Closed, Sarah Long Bridge maintained
- **4.** Memorial Bridge replaced, Sarah Long Bridge rehabilitated
- **5a.** Memorial Bridge replaced, Sarah Long Bridge replaced on alignment (2-lane)
- **5b.** Memorial Bridge replaced, Sarah Long Bridge replaced on alignment (4-lane)
- **6a.** Memorial Bridge replaced, Sarah Long Bridge replaced upstream (2-lane)
- **6b.** Memorial Bridge replaced, Sarah Long Bridge replaced upstream (4-lane)
- **7.** Memorial Bridge replaced (bicycle/pedestrian only), Sarah Long Bridge replaced on alignment (4-lane)
- **8.** Memorial Bridge replaced (bicycle/pedestrian only), Sarah Long Bridge replaced upstream (4-lane)
- **9.** Memorial Bridge replaced, Sarah Long Bridge replaced upstream with Hybrid
- **10.** Memorial Bridge replaced (bicycle/pedestrian only), Sarah Long Bridge replaced upstream with Hybrid
- **11.** Memorial Bridge closed, Transit system implemented, Sarah Long Bridge replaced upstream with Hybrid

Rose Eppard: The last meeting we had, we were promised that these would be broken out and analyzed separately so we could see that the Memorial bike-ped bridge failed. It never happened.

Carol Morris: These were broken out and they are included in the draft report.

Paul Godfrey: Yes, for the most part when you look at the evaluation matrix the bridge analysis has been broken into two where they could be. We said that in some situations, traffic analysis for example, the bridges had to be analyzed together.

The next chapter in the report goes over the bridge inspection reports. This chapter goes into great detail about the inspection reports on the Memorial and Sarah Mildred Long Bridges. Based on these inspection reports, all five of the Memorial Bridge rehabilitation options were removed from consideration. This chapter also provides the basis for

the assumption that the Sarah Mildred Long approach spans would be replaced in rehabilitation alternatives for that bridge.

We identified the evaluation criteria and the Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs). We identified a number of categories by which the alternatives would be measured:

- Structural Improvement
- Mobility
- Accessibility
- Planning Level Costs
- Historic
- Natural Environment
- Physical Environment
- Environmental Clearances

These MOEs are all consistent with the study purpose and need statement.

Based on study data, the Study Team dismissed the following alternatives from further consideration based on the following reasons:

- No Build alternative because it did not meet study purpose and need.
- Alternatives 5b and 6b because additional lanes were not needed within the study time frame.
- Alternatives 5a and 7 because of construction impacts.
- Alternative 8 because of its cost and additional impact in comparison to two-lane hybrid.
- Alternative 10 and 11 because they would not maintain or improve access to downtowns, would not improve bike or emergency access across the river, and would preclude future transportation alternatives.

Rose Eppard: What was the date that the last two alternatives were removed?

Paul Godfrey: During the final study process, between this summer and when we drafted this report.

We now have three alternatives that the draft report recommends to be carried forward:

- **4.** Full Memorial bridge replacement and rehabilitation of the Sarah Mildred Long Bridge.

- **6a.** Full Memorial bridge replacement and replacement of Sarah Mildred Long Bridge upstream.
- **9.** Full Memorial bridge replacement with Sarah Mildred Long hybrid upstream.

Gail Drobnyk: I recall that you said no houses would be taken with alternative 6a, what about with alternative 9?

Paul Godfrey: My recollection was that there was one property that was taken on the Maine side.

Gail Drobnyk: It includes a house?

Paul Godfrey: It includes a business property.

Roger Maloof: I thought alternative 4 would not be appropriate because we needed to open up the span between the towers for safe passage of oil and natural gas.

Paul Godfrey: When you look at the matrix, that is one of the downsides of alternative 4. It does not improve the navigational channel.

Roger Maloof: So why is that going forward?

Paul Godfrey: It is a balance. Alternative 4 is less costly and that is balanced against opening up the vessel marine clearance.

Rose Eppard: I thought there was a plan to move the opening to the center of the bridge under rehabilitation.

Paul Godfrey: Rehabilitation has never contained the opportunity to improve the opening of the Sarah Mildred Long Bridge.

Bob Landry: There was one option by the ACOE back in 1983, it did not move forward in our study.

Roger Maloof: The other two alternatives do improve the openings?

Paul Godfrey: As currently proposed there would be a 270' opening which is a sizeable improvement.

Paul Godfrey presents slide with graphic of Alternative 4

Paul Godfrey: In this slide you will see a graphic of Alternative 4, which recommends full replacement of Memorial Bridge and slightly widening it. An 11' lane with a 5' shoulder is being proposed. We are showing a 6' or 10' sidewalk on each side of the bridge as well. Sarah Mildred Long Bridge would be replaced up to the truss spans. The existing cross section would remain but it is being widened.

Gerry Audibert: On the Memorial Bridge you might want to talk about the Kittery approach span and Scott Ave. replacement.

Paul Godfrey: Yes, thank you, there is work assumed at the Scott Ave. Bridge.

Roger Maloof: How is a bicycle supposed to get across Memorial Bridge?

Paul Godfrey: It will be a solid deck, which is easier to ride on. It will have at least two 6' sidewalks, and possibly 10' sidewalks.

Paul Godfrey presents slide with graphic of Alternative 6a.

In this slide you will see Alternative 6a, which fully replaces the Memorial Bridge and replaces Sarah Mildred Long Bridge with a low level bridge upstream. That means it looks exactly like it does today and the advantage is having a 270' opening. There would be two 12' travel lanes with 6' shoulders.

Paul Godfrey presents slide with graphic of Alternative 9

In this slide you will see Alternative 9, which is a full replacement of the Memorial Bridge with an upstream replacement of the Sarah Mildred Long Bridge. This is the Hybrid Bridge Alternative, which would be mid-level height, approximately 86' off mean high water. The rail would remain at its current elevation and would be a single roadway deck with a 270' opening. It would be wider in the area that it opens to accommodate rails on either side.

Rose Epaprd: Will the bridge be two-tiered?

Paul Godfrey: No it is one tier. It has railroad tracks in the roadway deck.

Gail Drobnyk: Do the pros and cons page note that the hybrid bridge would preclude any future passenger rail travel over that bridge?

Paul Godfrey: Yes, it does talk about the fact that it can only serve one mode at a time.

Roger Maloof: Have you thought about where the sidewalk entrances and exits are going to be?

Paul Godfrey: All of the alternatives show the Memorial Bridge as having bike shoulders and sidewalks. None of the Sarah Mildred Long alternatives have sidewalks; they have 6' shoulders.

Gail Drobnyk: I have seen people walking and using bicycles across the Sarah Mildred Long Bridge.

Richard Candee: The rehabilitation of the Sarah Mildred Long would retain the sidewalk that's there now?

Paul Godfrey: It would retain the safety walk; it's not technically a sidewalk.

Richard Candee: Did anyone ever figure out what the cost savings in operations with the hybrid is as opposed to Alternative 6a?

Paul Godfrey: Quantifiably no. We are talking about reducing the number of openings by 75%.

Bob Landry: The majority of the cost is in the actual personnel.

Paul Godfrey: There are travel delay costs that were calculated and they were factored in. By reducing the amount of times the bridge is opened per year there will be travel-time savings. We did calculate that savings and factor it in.

Gerry Audibert: Right now we are only looking at the peak traffic hours, so we are understating the benefits of reduced congestion at other times of the day. In the follow-up study we'll look to include that information.

Gerry Mylrole: Was there an alternative that looked at increased rail transit use?

Paul Godfrey: Alternatives 4 and 6a don't preclude that opportunity. But we have not looked at another Amtrak line running across this bridge. With Alternative 9 the roadway would have to be moved down to accommodate rail.

Russ Charette: Another point is that the rail right of way north of the naval shipyard no longer exists.

Paul Godfrey: There was not an identified plan at this point in time to accommodate the expansion of rail.

Josh Pierce: For the Sarah Mildred Long Bridge, with 6' shoulders, are bikes still illegal on that or would it become permissible?

Paul Godfrey: The study does not get into whether current prohibitions will be lifted. That would be evaluated at a different time.

Bob Landry: We felt for safety reasons it wasn't something we could do with the current configuration. In our preliminary discussions it's something we will look at with 6-foot shoulders.

Josh Pierce: We would want to look at how to get bikes onto that bridge as well.

Bob Landry: Yes, you've got Market St. and the connector, which helps. I'm not sure if it's illegal on the Maine side of the bridge, but one of the big reasons is the safety of the workers, if they step out and a bicyclist goes by they are in danger.

Linda Wilson: In the fatal flaw analysis, didn't criteria include that an alternative couldn't preclude future transit options such as passenger rail? If that were true would that remove Alternative 9 from consideration?

Jamie Sikora: That was a goal not a criterion.

Paul Godfrey: Yes, it is rare that an alternative meets all goals and criteria. When you read the pros and cons, that concern is identified.

Ben Porter: The lack of the existence of a right of way on the Maine side could be interpreted as something that precludes the transportation as well.

Paul Godfrey: Yes, that is correct.

Tom Reinauer: The replacement of the Memorial Bridge got the workers up and out of the roadway and relocated the control area. Do

both of those replacement options here remove workers so they do not walk out onto the shoulders?

Bob Landry: On the Memorial Bridge we are looking at the control house being in the south tower. We are looking at moving the gate tender storage houses outside the walkway to give you the full 6 feet and to open up the sight line. They will be walking on the sidewalk but it will be 6 feet wide as opposed to a 4 foot minimum at the houses today.

Gerry Audibert: A lot of the details have yet to be defined. There will be a public process during the final design phase.

Jonathan Carter: The change out of the traffic lights at the Market St. cut over, they were backing up traffic so badly they were removed.

Bob Landry: They were installed as part of an I-95 project, when exit 7 was closed. They used the bypass as a detour. Once the project was complete they were removed.

Jonathan Carter: There is still a lot of back up.

Paul Godfrey: The intersections in these alternatives will be designed to accommodate year 2035 traffic levels ensuring whatever levels of back-ups are there are within acceptable levels.

Steve Workman: I do not think we should be building any transportation infrastructure that is not multimodal. There is no compelling evidence why it shouldn't be included on the Sarah Mildred Long Bridge. We are doing a significant replacement so there is an opportunity to do a cantilever path that could accommodate both motorized and non-motorized users safely.

Gerry Audibert: To clarify, there is an environmental documentation that will have to occur before design. Your point is well taken. We cannot just jump into design at this point.

Steve Workman: We are at a transition point because time is of the essence, we have money coming in and you have to be ahead of the ball. We also have a serious administration change happening in Maine in particular. I would like this document to accurately reflect the thoughtful discussions we've had on these issues.

Russ Charette: You can send Paul Godfrey that comment in writing.

Carol Morris: And if the question is will the input in this study be carried forward, the answer is yes.

Gerry Audibert: Please take comments and submit them formally in writing so we can address them in the document. That is a good stepping-stone.

Gail Drobnyk: So moving forward, will people who have interest be included in the stakeholders committee for the Sarah Mildred Long Bridge?

Gerry Audibert: Yes, and we will touch on that in just a bit.

Paul Godfrey: Both Maine and New Hampshire Governors announced on October 5th that they would assemble a bi-state bridge funding task force. They are looking for funding mechanisms for all three bridges. The task force will include three members from each state and will produce a report for the governors by December 15th. Between now and then they will have two meetings held at Maine Turnpike Authority (MTA) in Portland, and they are open to the public.

Carol Morris: We will get meeting information out to you folks.

Paul Godfrey: In the final report you will read about the three alternatives being recommended. It is recommended that they be separated for independent section 4(f) and NEPA analysis. New Hampshire will take the lead on Memorial Bridge and Maine will take Sarah Mildred Long Bridge. There will be a public process included in both. Federal highway will review this information and determine what level of NEPA analysis will need to take place.

All comments received will be recorded and responded to in the document. The final report will be issued in December.

Tom Reinhauer: Which office of FHWA will be reviewing the document?

Paul Godfrey: Both, Maine and New Hampshire divisions are jointly reviewing this.

Linda Wilson: The Connections Study is a planning process and is not subject to NEPA analysis. Is that correct?

Paul Godfrey: It is. The document is not a NEPA document but its information is intended to be part of the NEPA process.

Linda Wilson: The information that has been generated is available to the NEPA process. The report recommends the No Build alternative be dismissed and the Memorial Bridge rehab alternative be dismissed. Yet for NEPA documentation, they will both have to be considered. I am concerned that the public is going to be confused when the connections study comes out with certain recommendations and the NEPA study will have to repeat the same work.

Paul Godfrey: Linda, you are correct, we documented that the No Build option did not pass fatal flaw. We are simply providing a recommendation with that information at hand.

Jamie Sikora: FHWA has no official approval yet, but it is stated in the document that some alternatives are recommended for dismissal. As Paul Godfrey noted, they will be evaluated further as required under NEPA.

Paul Godfrey: If there is an opportunity to better describe that process then we should do that.

Linda Wilson: Yes that will be useful to all parties.

Jamie Sikora: It is stated in several places throughout the document but we can be more clear on that.

Paul Godfrey: These documents can be technical and overwhelming so if we can include something that makes the process better understood then we should certainly do that.

Carol Morris: The best way to describe it is that there are a whole series of checks and balances on a federal level. It's not a straight process from this study to implementation.

Paul Godfrey: Chapter 9 does a reasonable job describing that process, but point well taken and we can make that more clear.

Jamie Sikora: This is a fairly new process as this is a very intensive planning study.

Paul Godfrey: I am anxiously awaiting your comments and questions because we want this document to be worthy of all the hard work that's been done.

Cathy Goodwin: Up until this point the three bridges have been discussed jointly and now we're going to split them up. How are the two departments going to make decisions?

Paul Godfrey: That is a great segue, I will turn this over to Bob Landry.

Bob Landry: We will continue to work together to make decisions. New Hampshire DOT will be responsible for the environmental documentation for the Memorial Bridge and ensuring that these standards are implemented. It's recommended that this project be carried forward with the design-build process. On November 23rd a public meeting will be held in Portsmouth to go over the schedule and design process. This Thursday we have an effects meeting to discuss the impacts associated with the no build, rehab, and replacement options. We are working on cost as well.

Jamie Sikora: Are you going to have a conceptual plan for replacement?

Bob Landry: We have some photo renderings we are working on for the meeting. In terms of the process for Memorial Bridge, we want to do design-build but we have to see if it's something we can even do in New Hampshire. Anything that costs over \$25 million for design-build, has to have a public hearing and have 30 days for comments. We are recommending design-build because we think it will save us a year.

Cathy Goodwin: You take the bid step out?

Bob Landry: The key is taking the design step out. So we hire a team before a design is decided upon.

Paul Godfrey: The typical process is New Hampshire and Maine hire an engineering firm and they prepare plans. Those plans then go on the street and contractors bid on them. With design-build the state hires a firm to design 30% of the plans, then the states select a contractor/engineering team. They are then responsible for providing a more complete set of plans, but in the meantime the process is already started so physical work can begin.

Gerry Audibert: The team that gets selected is a design consultant and a contractor. They identified the elements that can be designed quickly, and the construction can start while the rest of the bridge is being designed. It saves a lot of time. There is more risk, so the difficulty is making sure we define the scope of work accurately, and we want to keep it open so the progressive thinkers can include things like lightweight materials. We have done two major bridge projects in this manner and both were very successful; one nationally acclaimed.

Roger Maloof: Are there representatives of the city who will endorse the design-build process?

Bob Landry: The councilors of Portsmouth and Kittery and state senators have been invited to the meeting tonight as well as the meeting next week. Everyone is in favor of getting this done as quickly as possible. In terms of design we have heard that people are interested in a similar looking bridge to the Memorial today. We need to make sure that some of the details are ironed out so that longer-term maintenance is cost effective. From a visual sense, we are looking for something that looks very similar to what exists today. As far as the bike lane, we are trying to make sure the 5' shoulder will work. If it works I would assume it would accommodate bikes.

Paul Godfrey: If you have thoughts and input relative to the Memorial Bridge design, those should go to Bob Landry.

Jonathan Carter: Is it the November 23rd meeting that you will discuss recognizing the impacts of closure and how to deal with it?

Bob Landry: That will be a second meeting. On the 23rd we will look at the schedule of the design-build process. A later meeting will talk about a construction schedule. There are a lot of suggestions about how to deal with that process going around.

Roger Maloof: Will there be any talk about a ferry to move people around?

Bob Landry: Someone suggested it and I passed it on. The comment I heard during the first bidding was it is extremely expensive.

Paul Godfrey: Under design-build, the detail of what a shuttle system is can be left up to the contractors. Whether it is a ferry or a bus is based on the contractor.

Roger Maloof: I would think the public needs input on that.

Bob Landry: We got a lot the first time and I'm sure we'll get it again. The ferry was \$3,500 a day for 19 hours. To buy a van that was ADA accessible with a hired driver was a lot cheaper than the ferry.

Ken Herrick: Where and what time is the meeting?

Bob Landry: 6pm, Tuesday at the Foley Council Chambers in Portsmouth. Please feel free to call or email me with any questions.

Roger Maloof: How long do you think this project is going to take?

Bob Landry: We had 18 months of closure under the rehab, we think it could take less with the replacement, but we cannot commit to that as of yet. This is something we are looking at. This becomes mute if the ongoing or future inspections close the bridge.

Roger Maloof: The inspection may say that the bridge will need to close earlier?

Bob Landry: That is always a possibility.

Roger Maloof: Could it stay open just for pedestrians and bikes?

Bob Landry: Probably not, the condition of the members probably will not be safe for pedestrians loads.

Paul Godfrey: Now Gerry Audibert will talk about the process for Sarah Mildred Long Bridge.

Gerry Audibert: Maine would support that safety concern regarding keeping the bridge open for bike-ped only.

As most of you have read we have the three alternatives under consideration. We have a consultant under contract to do a 30% design. This is to look particularly at the hybrid option because it hasn't been done before. Along with that we will look at cost and refine them. We expect the costs to be in this week and available to the task force shortly after with a technical report to follow. Lifecycle costs will follow that and that document should be available by mid-December. From there we would begin the environmental process. Even though Maine is taking the lead on Sarah Mildred Long and New Hampshire on Memorial, we will continue to work together. We are under the

assumption that currently that Sarah Mildred Long will fall under categorical exclusion (CE), but we need to get the go ahead from FHWA to move forward.

Cathy Goodwin: Are you doing this for all three scenarios?

Gerry Audibert: All three unless we decide we can dismiss an alternative based on new information, cost for example.

Cathy Goodwin: So you will know cost very quickly?

Gerry Audibert: Yes. There is urgency on moving forward with the Memorial Bridge. The Sarah Mildred Long has about 7 years of usable life left, however there are efforts ongoing to understand the impacts. We want to dovetail the two efforts and that will be a discussion to be had at Thursday's meeting.

Russ Charette: The inspection reports determined that the I-95 bridge needed re-decking. What was the timing on that?

Bob Landry: There was a call to do pavement on the high level I-95 Bridge. Maine is doing concrete cores on that to see the condition the decking is in, from that we will learn what the life expectancy is. We are hoping it's later rather than sooner because it's about a \$50 million project. We also have the sound wall going up on the New Hampshire side. We need to keep in mind how to get around during all this construction. The Albacore Connector should get done prior to Memorial being closed.

Roger Maloof: Let's say the Memorial gets condemned. The contractor has to provide transport, what if condemnation happens prior to the contract being given?

Bob Landry: We need to look at that. There have been no indications that will happen, but we should start thinking about that just in case.

Cathy Goodwin: So with the issue of multiple reconstructions going on, when will you have that piece of the schedule down?

Bob Landry: January or February.

Gerry Audibert: We cannot do both bridges at the same time without huge traffic impacts in the area. The timeline is still to be determined, partly because of the financing piece. There may be a portion of work

that can be done. The task force recommendations, and the reaction to that by Maine legislature remains to be seen. We know we have \$20 million and we know we need \$200-\$300 million for both bridges. Funding is a huge issue for both states.

Paul Godfrey: This process is new territory, but given the condition of the bridges and the funding challenges, everyone is working diligently to put together a plan that makes sense.

Gerry Audibert: We will post the report once it becomes public. In the meantime Bob Landry and I will continue to talk strategy and move forward while addressing NEPA.

Steve Workman: Can we use the existing mailing list once the support staff of this study is gone so we will stay informed about reports and meetings?

Gerry Audibert: That is my intent, to keep people informed.

Jamie Sikora: We are doing something similar for the historic consulting parties.

Gerry Audibert: We had a conversation with Maine SHPO and they had tried to call in on a previous meeting. We have submitted our effects documentation. Our process is different than NH SHPO. We do have a cooperative agreement between Maine SHPO and FHWA where we will conduct the initial determination and then our SHPO agrees or disagrees. FHWA ultimately has the final say.

Jamie Sikora: This is a bi-state project and that is unique.

Gerry Audibert: Consulting Parties need to be informed at the same time.

Bob Landry: It is a tough enough process to do it one state, but with two states who do it differently, it is complicated.

Paul Godfrey: So again, the report is out, Carol Morris has copies. Thank you for your time and effort. All comments are due to me within 30 days. All comments will be responded to in the final document.

Meeting adjourned at 3:06 pm