

# Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project

## Citizens Advisory Committee

Thursday, November 20, 2008

6 – 7:30 p.m.

### **PMLR CAC Members Present:**

Rick Williams – CHAIR, Portland - Lloyd District Transportation Management Assoc.  
Heather Andrews, Bicycle Transportation Alliance (BTA)  
David Aschenbrenner, Milwaukie - Hector Campbell Neighborhood  
Lina Bensel, TriMet Committee on Accessible Transportation (CAT)  
Ray Bryan, Milwaukie - Historic Milwaukie Neighborhood  
Valerie Chapman, Oak Grove; transit rider  
Debbie Cronk, Portland - South Waterfront Neighborhood  
Barbara Demick, Oak Grove; Waldorf School  
David Edwards, Oak Grove  
Neil Hankerson, Milwaukie - Downtown business  
Frank Helmer, Milwaukie - Downtown business  
Michole Jensen, Milwaukie/Portland - Ardenwald-Johnson Creek Neighborhood  
Lance Lindahl, Portland - Brooklyn Neighborhood  
Ken Love, Portland - South Portland Neighborhood  
Valeria Ramirez, Portland - Portland Opera  
Henry Schmidt, Oak Grove CPO  
Joe Traverso, Milwaukie - North Industrial Area business  
Lynn Welsh, Milwaukie - Island Station Neighborhood

### **PMLR CAC Members Absent:**

Michael Gebhard, Portland - Sellwood-Moreland Neighborhood (SMILE)  
Teresa Langdon, Portland - Eastmoreland Neighborhood  
Rod McDowell, Portland - Oregon Museum of Science & Industry (OMSI)  
Susan Pearce, Portland - Hosford-Abernethy Neighborhood (HAND)  
Dee Walsh, Portland - Cental Eastside Industiral Council (CEIC)  
Dan Zalkow, Portland - Portland State University (PSU)

**Rick Williams (Chair)** starts the meeting. Rick reminds everyone that he was Chair of first phase of the PMLR CAC (Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Citizens Advisory Committee). Rick requests a Vice-chair position be created for the CAC because he is very busy serving on other committees right now. Rick tells the group that he is a transportation planner by training and also the Executive Director of the Lloyd Transportation Management Association in Lloyd District. He also owns a company called Rick Williams Consulting.

Rick continues by stating that the CAC is a great committee. TriMet staff, he says, is professional and encourage us to ask hard questions and staff go back and get the answers for us. I think you'll find these meetings informative and productive. Rick asks everyone at the table to introduce themselves. We are going to move Claudia Steinberg's presentation up to the first item on the agenda.

**Claudia Steinberg** presented the CAC roles and responsibilities.

Thanks for coming tonight. Look at the handouts. Conflict of interest sheet should be signed. We need to know if there are any conflicts so there are no surprises. Please read Committee Charge as well. We have 24 members on the CAC. Locally Preferred Alternatives were considered with the first CAC group, which was a smaller group. Now we are moving into the new phase and we want to broaden our committee and add new members to represent the whole alignment. We want representatives all along the alignment, but we also wanted a manageable number of committee members. We anticipate that this will be an 18-month process (see Committee Charge). Please designate an alternate for those times that you cannot attend meetings.

**Jennifer Koozer** is introduced as the CAC liaison and asked to keep an alternate list for the CAC members. Jennifer asked the committee to please update the contact list.

**Claudia Steinberg:** The CAC's role is to act as a sounding board for the community along the alignment. We want to know what your constituencies think. We want you to take information from the CAC meetings back to your neighborhoods. Please also invite TriMet staff to attend your neighborhood meetings. TriMet staff will make a commitment to attend. Information from your constituencies will be communicated to the PMLR Project Management Group (PMG) and the PMLR Steering Committee. We need your input and support on challenging decisions.

**Rick Williams** asks everyone to look in their packets for the handout on committee structure. CAC is advisory to the Project Steering Committee. Rick informs everyone that he sits on the CAC and Willamette Bridge Advisory Committee (WRBAC). He represents the CAC's consensus and concerns to the WRBAC. PMLR Steering Committee really listens to the CAC. See the CAC Future Work Program Considerations in your information packet, which is an amendment to the PMLR Locally Preferred Alternative Report.

**Dave Unsworth** (TriMet Deputy Project Director) presents project status: preliminary engineering (PE) and federal funding process.

Dave thanks Claudia for her work with CAC and with the Locally Preferred Alternative. Dave comments that the CAC is the eyes of the community and we will look to the CAC as we enter the next phase.

Dave continues. Since July, when the Locally Preferred Alternative was finished, we have been doing lots of work. We submitted an application to our federal partners. That

application is asking permission to enter our next phase. Up to this point our designs have been about 5%, which means they are very conceptual. The Supplemental Draft Environmental Statement (SDIS) was also prepared.

Bringing the project to 30% level of engineering is the next step in the process. First we ask the federal government for permission to take this next phase. This is a major gateway for our federal partners and they/we take it very seriously. On July 31<sup>st</sup> we submitted all the required information to the federal government. (It's available for viewing on the TriMet website.) Tours and day-long meetings and project management oversight committee meetings have happened since July. The Project Management Oversight Committee (PMOC) Consultant team is paid to look over our shoulder. PMOC has produced three reports for the federal government. One report, for example, looked at TriMet and the region's technical capacity and asked if TriMet has the right budget for this project. In other words, can we do what we say we are going to do in the schedule we have given them?

Also because the project is over a billion dollars, the federal government asked us to do a formal risk assessment. Risk assessment looks at project uncertainties. The government asks questions like: what do you know about the bridge, the schedule, what do you know about the permitting process, have you done any geotech work to understand what is going on underneath the river, and how are foundations being constructed? From Dec 2-4, 2008 a formal risk assessment will take place with the federal government. The government wants to know how we are addressing risk moving forward. We will produce a document that says how we plan on doing that and attach it to the government's approval. Notification and approval have been pushed back from November 2008 because it has, for one thing, got to be approved by the congress and we've got a new congress and a new federal transit administrator as well. We expect to get permission to move into our next phase in late January, early February 2009.

We are working through all of the issues that were presented by the CAC. Bicycle crossings and ways to get to Park Avenue are examples. There is a long list of things we were asked to take a look at as we move into the next phase. City of Portland, City of Milwaukie, Clackamas County, Oregon Department of Public Transportation, and Metro have been working on monthly and sometimes daily basis to get ourselves organized.

Dave asks everyone to see the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Committee Structure chart in their packets and then he goes through the chart. There are two Technical Advisory committees (East and West) called TAC. Project Team Leaders (PTL) talk about issues they have to take upstairs from a policy standpoint. The Project Management Group (PMG) are the executive directors of the project and help us with policy issues. On top of that a Steering Committee made up of appointed and elected officials.

CAC influence goes to the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail (PMLR) Steering Committee and Willamette River Bridge Advisory Committee (WRBAC). Dave directs CAC members to PMLR timeline and goes through it. There are three major thresholds that we ask our federal partners to participate in. We ask permission when we go into final

design, after we are at 30% engineering, and then at the full-funding grant agreement phase. Construction begins after that summer of 2011, hopefully.

Dave thanks committee for being a part of this process.

**Bridget Wieghart** (Metro Transit Project Manager) presented the status of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) process.

Project manager at Metro for the environmental impact statement process. When seeking federal money we are required to detail all of the potential environmental impacts of the project. Air, water, noise, property impacts, transportation impacts, these all need to be fully disclosed to the public. In the draft EIS phase, we looked at alternative designs and disclosed those impacts and the CAC helped work through the communities' issues. At end of process this past spring and summer there was an official public comment period. During 45-day official comment period, all comments made during that time need to be responded to before entering the FEIS phase. We have now a locally preferred single alignment that we now must look at in more detail in order to realize the impacts and go through each of the comments that were made. We need to respond to every single comment that was made during the 45-day official comment period.

CAC helped us work through community concerns. Then official public comment period happens and then all these concerns need to be dealt with before the final impact statement is submitted. Now we look at more detail and responding to all the public comments. All issues large and small must be answered.

Downtown Milwaukie concerns re: impacts mentioned. Proximity to schools and churches, traffic issues. We are developing a scope of work that will allow us to do that. In addition, we need to respond to a number of permitting issues for federal and local agencies that include Willamette Bridge project and other bridges in the corridor. They will look at impact on quality of water and impact on sensitive species and wetlands, for example. Impact on parks will be considered and historic sites impact will also be considered. Bridget directs everyone to the handout. She states we are now refining the Locally Preferred Alternative and updating the methods. Refining will finalize details like stations locations and the type of the bridge. Next step we will analyze the impact. We get into the heart of this when TriMet gets permission to enter preliminary engineering. Then we get into defining mitigation: i.e. how do we address the impacts issues that we discovered. An example is how to deal with a noise impact. Do we build soundwall or choose another way to minimize the impact of the noise. We work closely with TriMet and other agencies to define those mitigations. Then we develop the FEIS document after this and the FTA and other resource agencies (USCPA) review it carefully and comment. We then address those comments. Biological opinion is significant because we have a number of permits that we will be seeking. There are a number of river crossings so that will be required in order to publish and get a record of decision for the FEIS. Hoping to have complete FEIS by spring/summer of 2010. Claudia and Jennifer will work with the CAC to identify which issues you want to hear more about as we go through the process.

**David Aschenbrenner:** Can I have a complete list of the impacts in the report?

**Bridget Wieghart:** We can give a summary to you of the major topic impacts.

**Leah Robbins** (TriMet East Segment Director) presents an introduction to the PMLR East design segment.

Leah states she has a long history with the south corridor. Four generations of family in Milwaukie and Clackamas Counties. She knows the south alignment well.

This portion of the segment splits at 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue (and Division). We tried to keep all the issues around the Willamette River Bridge and transit area in west segment. The design of the alignment all the way to Park Avenue is for purposes of preliminary engineering (PE). We are working to get approval to enter into PE. We are getting all the legwork completed so that we can start strong as soon as the FTA approves. We've looked at contracting methods for this job and have set up the design in such a way that it supports future contracting methods. We are splitting our design efforts in the east segment into two primary segments; east Portland that ends at the county line and south of the Tacoma Park and Ride and the other one is the Milwaukie/Clackamas Counties section. Those two sections would be two separate construction contracts. We also have two Park and Rides, the Tacoma Park and Ride and the Park Avenue Park and Ride. We believe those lend themselves to future design-build projects and so we are working through the PE.

With regard to the southeast Portland section some of the key things we are looking at early in PE and some of the tough issues are the 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue streetscape and the station location on 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue. We want to firm these up and there were some comments in the LPA documents about that. We'll be looking at station conductivity in the southeast Portland stations. We'll also be doing some traffic analysis and a truck access study around Brooklyn Yard. It's not just about the Union Pacific, it's also about the industrial users down there and making sure 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue still works once light rail is in place.

Then we have some significant structures in east Portland segment. There is retrofit of Powell overcrossing, two pedestrian bridges over the railroad: one near the Clinton Station and one near the Ryan/17<sup>th</sup> Avenue Station. Down at Johnson Creek near the Tacoma Park and Ride we have a structure over Johnson Creek and there are some environmental concerns there. We are going to bring the Tacoma Park and Ride to a level of design so that at the end of PE we can be ready for the land use actions that would be required to permit the project early in final design.

Now let's move to the Milwaukie/Clackamas Counties segment. The proximity to the Union Pacific is a big issue and we are working through the design and liability issues with them. Job number one is working on an agreement for operation purchasing part of their right of way and operating adjacent to their rail system. Some key structures along the alignment are the long structure in the North Milwaukie Industrial Area adjacent to the Tillamook branch as well as the Kellogg Wake ODOT 99 East River Road 26. It's a long structure at the south end of the line. We have shared crossings throughout the east

segment with Union Pacific and in the Milwaukie area we'll be looking at the supplemental city measures. We'll be working with the city to adopt some improvements there to mitigate horn noise and other noise issues that are part of the SDEIS. We'll also look at the significant design activity at the Lake Road Station and we are working closely with the city of Milwaukie with regard to their south downtown planning and their consultants CES. We want to be sure that both of our design efforts are supportive of each others' ultimate goals and that our light rail plan can be part of that planning process. My marching order for the east side segment is getting to Park Avenue. We have significant cost issues that will ultimately be part of the weighing of options. Our project partners from the technical level all the way up to the CAC and the PMLR Steering Committee level will be coming here with some difficult challenges to make some decisions.

**Ray Bryan:** When we know for sure if the line will extend to Park Avenue?

**Leah Robbins:** By the end of preliminary engineering.

**Ray Bryan:** So we'll know in 2009?

**Leah Robbins:** Probably by spring of 2010.

**Lance Lindahl:** Where will the alignment cross McLaughlin by River Road?

**Leah Robbins:** Alignment is set. We are taking a look at the impacts of different designs at the crossing area.

**David Edwards:** Will extension part of the alignment decision overlap with CAC's tenure as a Committee?

**Dave Unsworth:** It's happening in steps. During PE there are a series of steps. There are things that we are not sure about that come at end of preliminary engineering. Our intent is to get to Park Avenue, but it's going to be difficult with budget.

**CAC member** (woman??): Just a comment. I know we struggled a lot about that crossing at River Road and McLaughlin. The city has now changed the traffic pattern there, which is something that the CAC discussed.

**Citizen** (Man): What is latest on horns at Munroe, Washington and Harrison? Is there a promise that they will not be sounding?

**Leah Robbins:** The project is looking forward at the kinds of supplemental measures that would allow city to apply for quiet zone. We are setting the stage and working with the Union Pacific and City of Milwaukie to do this.

**Citizen:** Are quiet zones in your budget and are capital improvements part of your project or would Milwaukie have to do that?

**Leah Robbins:** The crossing improvements would be part of our project. The biggest cost are crossing improvements.

**Another citizen** (yellow jacket): What about truck traffic in and out of the Brooklyn Rail Yard? I used to drive a truck down there and want to know what you have planned.

**Leah Robbins:** I mentioned briefly before that there would be a truck access study in relation to 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue. It studies all primary entrance and exits. We are trying to do a study that is detailed about all truck movements of all businesses including the Union Pacific. So we know if the businesses can continue to work with the project.

**Rob Barnard** (TriMet West Segment Director) presents introduction to PMLR West design segment.

Rob states that he knows the west side very well. He worked on the OMSI project and the Tram.

Rob talks about Construction Manager General Contractor (CMGC) model. This means we bring on a contractor halfway through the design to help us with evaluating, estimating project.

For the Willamette Bridge we will do a design-build contract. This is a good model for staying on schedule. Benefit because you can overlap design and build to help stay on schedule. In other words, the building can begin while design is still taking place. For example this schedule helps with the Willamette fish window, which is 122 days. If you miss you have to wait till next year at July 1<sup>st</sup>.

We also want to be sure we've got some restraints for the design builder. Some elements we want to be fixed and there are some elements that you want to allow the design-builder some flexibility. But we want to be sure that the picture we show to the public is accurate, for example details on the railings, how it looks underneath, how the piers look, and how the bridge is illuminated. We want these things to get carried forward and actually built. Details that don't affect how the bridge looks and functions are where there are opportunities for the contractor to be creative. So we want a balance of fixed elements and non-fixed elements in the project. We have opportunity to save money and be innovative on the non-fixed elements.

We have some early action items we are working on that include recommendations from the CAC and City of Portland. Lincoln Harbor, the elevation of South Waterfront, I-5 access, and location of streets are some examples. These all have action items that we'll bring to the CAC as we move forward.

So basically we have one part of the project which is a CMGC project and on the river side, a design-build project. I've got a consultant team I'm bringing in December for the land side and a consultant team for the design-build piece. We are going to do up to 30%

and then go out and get a design-build contractor. Therefore, we'll have two consultants teams on the west segment for PE.

**Dave Aschenbrenner:** What about the east side of the bridge?

**Rob Barnard:** It's part of the west side group. From PSU to OMSI handled by the west group. How busses go, bike paths etc.

**Michole Jensen:** When will bridge design be presented?

**Rob Barnard** goes to slides: Rob says that the universe of bridges needs to be narrowed down to find a viable few. You want to go out to the public with what you know will work. We did that by doing a Request for Proposals (RFP) for architects and engineers. We then hired a premier bridge architect, Miguel Rosales. We also went out and got a premier bridge structural engineer, HMTB. They build premier bridges all over the nation. We wanted the architect to be equal partners with the engineer, not one prime and one sub-contractor.

Bridges are our identity in Portland so we wanted a good process. Vision statement is to build a bridge that embodies the Portland aesthetic, is functional, and affordable. Our challenge is to balance all three of these things.

Rob says he wants to make an important point. Bridge study is about type. Type is not fundamental to height. The height issue will be brought on later when the civil/land engineers are on board the project. Height is the next level that is discussed when the preliminary engineering team is in place.

Type has more to do with clearance. Clearance (distance between piers) is now 600 feet.

Rob discusses the narrowing process speaking first about the universe of bridges and talks about the issues that were being considered with regard to the bridge type choice.

- **Cost:** Initial and life-cycle cost (maintenance)
- **Risk:** Cost escalation risk on superstructure; foundations and geotechnical; designs risk; bid risk; schedule risk; in-water construction risk; permitting risk (navigational and environmental)
- **Fundamental Performance:** number, location and size of piers; seismic performance; model optimization of section; user comfort (deflection and vibration).
- **Architectural:** proportion and scale; experience on greenway, walkways, and river; experience crossing the river on the bridge.
- **Urban Context:** Portland core values, traditions, and symbolism; compatibility with existing context; reflection on current technology and innovation.
- **Greenway:** vertical clearance; width of span over greenway; column to abutment span; greenway trail user experience

- **Environmental/Sustainability:** e; pier proximity to environmental impacts during construction; resource use –availability of local materials; in-water piers near contaminated media cap
- **Bridge Operations:** line of sight between modes; OCS integration, complexity; emergency response on bridge; extent of inspections; access for inspections
- **Miscellaneous:** utility duct bank integration; pier proximity to existing subsurface utilities; accommodate asymmetrical loading; accommodation of curved greenway spans
- **Opportunities:** ability to treat stormwater on bridge; addition of wildlife habitat on/under bridge; additional fish habitat near bridge; habitat enhancement at staging site; incorporate alternative energy.

These criteria were considered for each bridge and then were narrowed down from many to some. Now we are at some trying to get to the few. Rob introduces the five bridge types that the WRBAC has narrowed down: Wave Frame, Tied Arch, Through Arch, and two types of Cable Stayed.

Rob shows slides of the bridge types and notes that the concrete structure is shown in grey and the steel construction in white on the slides. The Wave Frame, Tied Arch, Through Arch, and two Cable-Stayed, one has two piers and the other has four. Rob shows different views of the bridges from areas in, on and around the bridge site.

Rob shows slide chart that reveals that all the bridge types have opportunities and challenges. Rob introduces the work of the National Contractors Group who looked at risk in the following categories:

- Foundations
- Material (substructure)
- Material (superstructure)
- Schedule
- Design
- Fabrication/Erection

*Foundations:*

Conceptual method developed minimizes risk and is the same for all bridge types.

*Material (Substructure):*

Will be made of readily available concrete, which will provide a lower cost and schedule risk. Will be the same for all bridge substructures.

*Material (Superstructure):*

Tied and Through Arch types:

Superstructures made from readily available, standard steel.

Wave Frame:

Only bridge that uses high-performance steel, which is available from only one source in the U.S. Material sizes at upper limit of availability, higher cost, volatile pricing.

Cable-Stayed types:

Have concrete sub and superstructures, which can be made from readily available concrete.

*Fabrication/Erection:*

Tied and Through Arch types: (standard steel superstructure)

Has moderate schedule and cost risk.

Wave Frame: (High-performance steel superstructure)

Complex, highly-technical welding, higher cost and schedule risk

Cable-Stayed types: (concrete superstructure)

Lower schedule and cost risks

*Schedule:*

Tied and Through Arch types:

Moderate construction duration.

Wave Frame:

Longest Construction duration

Cable-Stayed types:

Shortest Construction durations

*Design:*

Tied and Through Arch types:

Conventional design. Complex steel to concrete connections. Moderate cost and schedule risk.

Wave Frame:

Prototype design. Complex steel to concrete connections. Non-redundant structure. Higher cost and schedule risk.

4-Pier Cable-Stayed:

Conventional design. Complex construction of cantilevered walkway. Moderate cost and schedule risk.

2-pier Cable-Stayed:

Conventional design. Lowest cost

Rob Comments that the next step is getting to the viable few bridge types. This month we are doing cost and risk analysis. Then we will meet with WRBAC in December and then we'll come back and meet with the CAC in January. Then we will get the CAC and WRBAC feedback and take it back to the Steering Committee.

There is a lot more work to do after you pick the type of bridge. When we go into PE there will be even more refinement. The details that will give the bridge its character as a motorist, train rider, pedestrian, etc. will happen then.

Questions in response to Rob's presentation:

**Valerie Ramirez:** You rushed past the moveable bridge option. Can you talk more about that?

**Rob Barnard:** Moveable was 170% of budget for just construction alone so was dropped from being viable.

**Citizen (yellow)** Where are we with where the bridge takes off and lands on each side of the river?

**Rob Barnard:** This is a preliminary engineering issue. At this point, we've made all of the abutments the same for the bridge types. The final details of the stations at South Waterfront and OMSI are PE issues.

**Dave Unsworth:** Alignment River partnership actually fixed the alignment of the bridge. Choice of alignment was part of the Locally Preferred Alternative.

**Rob Barnard:** There will be minor adjustments on how abutment meets the street, but the alignment issue is settled.

**Yellow citizen:** What are the locations of those two points on either side of the river where the alignment is settled?

**Rob Barnard:** North of Portland opera and OMSI on the other side.

**Ray Bryan:** How was the Wave Frame design proposed? Specifically for this site or was the architect shopping it around?

**Rob Barnard:** There is a similar version in Germany. German version is solid steel plate with ribs for reinforcement. Our version has new structural system with girders and struts. German version at 140 meters is less than half the span of the Portland version.

**Rick Williams:** We'll get another report on bridge at next meeting of CAC. We are ahead of schedule. Just a couple things for housekeeping. Is having the meeting here in this building alright?

**David Aschenbrenner:** There is not enough room in this room.

**Jennifer:** Please park in lot and on Mall Street. We want to avoid taking business spaces and neighborhood spaces.

**Rick Williams:** Next CAC next meeting in January OK? The next meeting will be the third Thursday of January. Rick also says he's chair because he was appointed and he doesn't have a conflict of interest, but he would like have a vice-chair. Rick is currently serving on a lot of committees. Send Jennifer or Claudia an email if you want to do act as Vice-chair. We will vote in January meeting if there is more than one person who wants to do it.

**CAC member in purple coat:** CAC is cheerful about moving forward. Does economic environment influence this project at all?

**Dave Unsworth:** Expects in two-three years when construction starts we will be moving forward at better economic time.

**Barbara:** Will we be getting a CAC notebook to keep our notes and paper?

**Rick Williams:** Yes, I think we will. Let's move to public comment.

**Claudia Steinberg:** We'd like to offer a tour of the alignment to new committee members. Existing members can join again as well. Please contact Jennifer if you'd like to do it. Let's do it during daylight.

**Rick Williams** Thanks everyone and reminds them that their voice is really heard on this committee.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

**Wayne (Last name Rick may know):** What is the timeline for resolving the maritime issues for the bridge i.e. bridge height and horizontal clearance?

**Rob Barnard:** In preliminary engineering.

**Wayne (Last name Rick may know):** Also, there has been a rumor that the City of Portland is advocating to move the Clinton Street Station north to Powell to NW Natural gas location.

**Dave Unsworth:** Conclusion from City is we've got it in right place. It was dealt with in Locally Preferred Alternative review.

**Valerie Arakelian** (17<sup>th</sup> and Holgate business owner): I'm here representing my family and 20 other families and businesses. We own the property directly across the street at 17<sup>th</sup> and Holgate. We've been affected by Holgate plaza takeover by TriMet. We'd like to have both TriMet stations be put on the same side. We'd also like a traffic study. We are concerned about taking all of the roadways to have the right lane turn for the heavy trucks. We don't need it because they have plenty of room. Please also build sidewalks

to minimum when you (TriMet) develop the property. We are also concerned about the bike path on other side of Holgate. They do not think that very many people will use it because intersection is dangerous. Please think about this because we tenants to not want to leave. We want to stay.

**Ed** (citizen) What if the cost of the bridge is so prohibitive that we won't be able to get to Park Avenue?

**Rob Barnard:** Our guiding principle to get to Park Avenue. We hired the National Contractors Group to get the best cost estimate just for this purpose.

**Claudia Steinberg:** At the January CAC meeting, the bridge will be a major topic.

**Rick Williams** closes meeting.