STATE OF MAINE

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

IN RE BLUE HILL FALLS BRIDGE

WIN 017712.00

Public Meeting At The Blue Hill Town Office

Reported by Robin J. Dostie, a Notary Public and court reporter in and for the State of Maine, on August 29, 2018, at the Blue Hill Town Office, 18 Union Street, Blue Hill, Maine, commencing at 6:00 p.m.

REPRESENTING THE STATE:	ANDREW LATHE
	MIKE WIGHT
	WAYNE FRANKHAUSER
	KRISTEN CHAMBERLAIN
FROM HNTB:	TIM COTE
	KEVIN BRAYLEY
REPRESENTING FEDERAL HIGHWAY:	EVA BIRK
	CHERYL MARTIN

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Jim Schatz.) Well, I think we can get started now. There might be a few more people coming in, but I'd like to get started on time. I'd like to welcome you all to this public session where we'll be discussing the future transition of the bridge.

First of all, I'd like to introduce the Bridge Advisory Committee of this wonderful group of people here on this stage, but for the past 16 months, a long time, we met at least once a month, sometimes twice, so there has been a number of meetings and I've never really had a pleasure to work with a group of such intelligent, hard working and insightful and sensitive people. There are a lot of issues, as you know, that we need to discuss and ferret out and much of what they've done in terms of questioning and advising the DOT and our engineer and the other significant parties has resulted in and created the presentation that you will see tonight. In essence what you're going to see is a Reader's Digest version of what we've gone through over these 16 months and we'll present to you the universe of options that are going to be available to us in the transition process. So we're not looking for new

ideas, but we are really trying to fine tune your comments, your questions your opinions on what you're about to see.

That said, I'd like to introduce the members of the committee and then ask them if they have any opening comments as well, but so we have -- I'll go alphabetically -- Mike Astbury, he's hiding back there. Deborah Brewster couldn't be here tonight. She had a meeting elsewhere. Lynne Clark, right here. John Chapman. And Bill Cousins couldn't be here as well, he's out at the fairgrounds keeping the dust down for you for the weekend. Vaughn Leach, right here on the corner. Don't back up. Steve Rappaport, who is not here at this time. I expect him to come in. Lori Sitzabee there. And Lori has also helped us put the stage together and serves a dual purpose and I'm grateful for that. Thank you, Lori. She helped freshen up the air so it's a little more comfortable in here than it might be outside. And then Karen Wyatt right there, who is a very key member of our committee and very, very -- and I think she has -- you have the attendance award. Anyway, it's been a wonderful experience and I would like to ask if there are any comments -- opening comments from the committee. They'll have time to comment.

So that said, I'd like to introduce Andrew Lathe who -- and his team. We've had, I think, an excellent relationship with DOT and they have been very patient and their knowledge is very deep and it was very helpful, so these aren't often the comments some people will give to our public servants, I know this as a fact, and I very greatly appreciate all of the work that all of you have done and I'd like to turn the meeting over to Andrew and we'll move this right along. Thank you all again for being here.

MR. LATHE: Thank you, Jim. I've got a few housekeeping items and I'll go through a brief agenda and some suggestions. There is a sign-up sheet at the front door. If you didn't get a chance to sign-in, we'll circulate our clipboard around and give you a chance to sign-in now, if you could, please. I just ask that you please print your name so the court reporter can get it correct in the minutes.

Let's see, a few handouts. One question I wanted to ask is how many of you got these in the mail? Good. A good turn out. Excellent. Yeah, we sent these all over town, so hopefully everyone got one of these. Also, at the front door is the Design Alternative Summary. Did you all get a copy of that

as well? A couple of things about the Design Alternative Summary, this is primarily the presentation that is online at the town of Blue Hill website or the town of Blue Hill, Maine website. I'm not sure everybody had a chance to look at that and as part of this you may want to take a look at that on the website.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah, I looked at it.

MR. LATHE: Great. Great. So this is -- this is very similar. There is a couple of modifications in here that we added some additional information in the back and we also added this Design Matrix at the center of the booklet. We're going to talk at some depth about it this evening. This presentation doesn't really follow -- the presentation we're going to show you directives. There is a little bit more information in this of the different design alternatives and options that we looked at. So don't flip through this thinking it's going match the presentation, it's not specifically designed that way, okay, but there will be some information that you can see up there. It's not in a specific order.

A few other things that we have out back, we do have comment cards. There is also one inside the

booklet, but if you want to send this in it will come directly to the Maine Department of Transportation. The ones out back are in an envelope, feel free to take any if you want to make a comment at any time after this meeting. Of course, with this one my contact information is also on the back, so if you send me this one, you've got to put the contact information in the back. So feel free to take one of these comment cards and fill it out and send it back to me.

A couple of other items out back, I bring these to all public meetings, these are land owner guides for anybody that may have property impacts. There is some information in there for you to take a look at. We bring these to all public meetings whether there are property impacts or not. We also have some civil rights information for the Department's Civil Rights Act of 1964, that's also back there as well. And I believe I've got some business cards, but my contact information is also in the booklet you have and it's also in the back in the flier that went out in everyone's mailbox.

A little bit about the agenda this evening, I'm going to go through the introductions. So we've got several people from the Department and Federal

Highway and then we're going to jump into the presentation. Tim will be responsible for the presentation. Most of that presentation is going to talk about the National Environmental Policy Act as well as reviewing this information handout that you all got a copy of. If you don't, let me know and we'll get you one. Also, we're going review the Design Matrix that's in the middle of the publication and try to familiarize yourself with that. There is a large printout in the back of the room as well. We're going to discuss the environmental, archeological and historical resources and at the conclusion we'll talk about the process moving forward which is part of the decision-making aspect. And at the very end we'll open it up for public questions and comments. I just do ask that you please hold your comments until the very end primarily because we may answer them during the presentation, but we really want to get through the presentation so that we have enough time for everyone to get their comments out.

So a few introductions. With me and our team this evening stage left I have Robin Dostie is our court reporter. We bring a court reporter to all of our public meetings to record public comments.

Also from the Bridge Program this evening I have Wayne Frankhauser and Michael Wight. They are the program manager and senior project manager for this project. And from our Environmental Office we have David Gardner, Kristen Chamberlain and Julie Senk. And representing Federal Highway this evening we have Cheryl Martin and Eva Birk. And HNTB will be giving the presentation this evening, they are Kevin Brayley and Tim Cote.

The meeting intent. The meeting intent is really to update the public of what has transpired in the last year. We met with the Bridge Advisory Committee. We had a meeting back here on August 3 was the last public meeting. This actually represents the fourth public meeting we've had in the last four or five years on this project. Also, to kind of restate the Bridge Advisory Committee goals we had at the start of this process about 16 or 18 months ago and then we kind of identified all of the options that are under consideration for the Falls Bridge. Those options include rehabilitation first and foremost as well as a replacement for an alternate alignment option as well. And then we're also going to provide an opportunity for you folks to make comment and ask questions on those options and

the impacts or potential impacts it may have on the resources in the area.

So we've had numerous public meetings with the Bridge Advisory Committee meetings and multiple design workshops with the Department of Transportation, Federal Highway and other agencies in regards to this project and we've got a wide range of topics. I don't -- I have a list with me and I won't go through all of them, but it's been a long, long process and we've -- we've looked at about everything we can to try to come up with the best opportunity at this location.

Bridge Advisory Committee goals. Ideally, it was to identify all project constraints to let us know, the Department of Transportation, what the communities concerns and issues are at this site location, identify problems and needs that you folks have, understand the National Environmental Policy Act. How are you guys doing? Do you understand the National Environmental Policy Act?

(Laughter.)

MR. LATHE: Also, they really wanted to challenge us, the design team, the Department of Transportation and HNTB on vetting all of the reasonable options that we're considering at this

location and advise us on the creation of this Design Matrix, which is just simply an additional tool that the Department uses to assess and come to a conclusion. It's not the sole model that we use, but certainly is a tool we use to select an alternative. Also, I wanted to support a broader outreach and hopefully get folks interested in the process with us to preliminary and final design of this project.

So at this point in time, I'm going to invite Eva up from Federal Highway and she's going to talk a little bit about the National Highway Policy.

MS. BIRK: Good evening everyone. Can you all hear me okay? Is anyone too hot? Not yet.

(Laughter.)

MS. BIRK: Okay. Well, I, first of all, as a federal official wanted to note that the only fan in the room is sitting directly behind me and I promise that no favors were given to me. It's behind my seat, but it actually is pretty nice. So my name is Eva Birk. I'm the Environmental Program manager for the Federal Highway Administration, which is located in Augusta. Federal Highway is the lead federal agency for this project and we use something called the National Environmental Policy Act or the NEPA process to form our decision-making preferred

identification or preferred alternative for this project. As part of this process, we work with our state partners at MaineDOT. Our information regarding options for both rehabilitation and replacement of the bridge superstructure and NEPA requires us to do a few things and you see on this slide here in rather small print we have to consider effects of the project on natural, social and economic resources. We have to mitigate for those effects. And lastly, requires us to make informed decisions that actually solve transportation problems, so all of that has to work together.

Later in tonight's presentation Kristen Chamberlain, who is also stuck in the corner but also has a fan, will go through the effects of the environmental resources that we've studied so far and provide some specific examples for exactly what we mean when we talk about mitigation.

So in terms of a project development time line -- next slide please. This slide just basically shows you how this fits into the overall project time line and the project outline overall. So our main point here is to show you that by design NEPA comes early in the process, so the purpose of the statute is to ensure that there is early and often

consideration of environmental impacts and agencies decision-making. In other words, after the NEPA decision is complete and after we get public comments taken after this meeting through September 29 there are still going to be decisions made about this project that affect this community and DOT is still going to listen to you at that point of the process.

So when NEPA ends, this is something that I had to ask a lot of questions about because I'm new to the Federal Highway Office, when the final design begins what does that mean? That means like what are the materials for the bridge, it might mean how many, you know, on a typical bridge project it may mean how many piers are on the bridge, what is the bridge going to look like, where will be street lights be, where is the public access going to be, is there going to be sidewalks, all those considerations can happen during the final design process and we are still listening during the final design, it's just after the NEPA process is complete and we move forward with a preferred alternative and some of those finer details get hashed out. So I just want to make sure clear that this is kind of the point in the process we are now.

Next slide. A quick note here to overwhelm

you with all of the statutes under the NEPA umbrella. It's important to understand that there are no additional federal permitting or approval processes happening somewhere in the background outside the information we're going to attempt to present to you tonight and that is because Federal Highway's NEPA processes encompasses a variety of statutes as you can see here. And I promise this is the only regulatory line which I'll read to you tonight, but our Federal Highway's policy requires us to the fullest extent possible to coordinate all environmental investigations, reviews and consultations as a single process and reflect the required regulations in the environmental documentation required by NEPA. And since we have many of our, you know, mandatory obligations under the statute delegated to DOT, Kristen Chamberlain has the fun job of preparing all of that documentation required by NEPA, but we just wanted to let you know that there is not some other federal funding process, some other federal engagement process that are happening outside this. We are consulting with, you know, parties under the Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, but we're doing everything at once and that's by, you know, per our regulations

to act and make informed decisions. We are early in the process, we engage the public, we try to get all of these documents in compliance with it as well before we move forward with a major undertaking of a project.

So in closing, I just want to address the question of why public involvement is important to us. Public involvement is more than simply following rules and regulations. It's important to us that people have the opportunity to debate issues, to frame alternative solutions and affect the final decisions in ways that respect the rules of decision-makers. We believe that knowledge is the basis of such participation. In other words, the public needs to know specific details about a plan or project, evaluate its importance for the anticipated costs and investment. So that is very difficult when we start to use jargon outlined in the 12 or so statutes here. So when we start to use jargon terms such as what's going to happen in final design, you know, what's going to happen with trusses and superstructures and substructures, what's going to happen with the National Historic Preservation Act, is there a resource that has an adverse affect, what does that mean. If you have questions about that

it's important to ask us. It's important to know that we only have an hour or two tonight, but you can come to me or for a historic preservation question you can come to Julie in the back of the room, if would you raise your hand, yup, and we can help you understand exactly what we try to boil down, what we have for resources and what's going to be affected with this project. So one example is adverse effects under the Historic Preservation Act, you know, that could be something to the extent of there is going to be, you know, under Alternative A, B or C some trees being cut down next to, you know, a historic resource that's been identified as a eligible for the National Historic Register, the wooded setting around that resource, around the house, around the site, around the archeological site that's part of what makes it historic, so the adverse effect is cutting down trees. It's important to understand the context of what is behind the terms that we're using and all of the jargon and all of the documentation and we can't do that in two hours tonight, but we can be available to answer questions after that.

So with that, I think I'll hand it over to Tim to move forward and run through a lot of detail in terms of the different alternatives that we looked

at. But in general, I just wanted to make sure you understood we are available for any and all questions and the best folks I think to ask questions to are right behind me here. They have their PhD in how all of the statutes and other design alternatives work together and they have, you know, worked through that for longer than I've been at Federal Highway, so I look to them and ask them first and if you can't get your question answered there they can get you to the right professionals and experts to answer those questions. Thank you.

MR. COTE: Thank you, Eva. And good evening everybody. And I certainly echo those sentiments, the Bridge Advisory Committee has been very eager and engaged and have been very patient as we've worked through a tremendous amount of information. As has been noted already this evening, there is a lot of information and really too much information to go through in a single one hour presentation, which is what we're trying to target here. This handout, as Andy Lathe did mention, does have a good snapshot of information and some additional data in here. I did want to point out the Alternatives Matrix that we have because recognizing that some of the information on the screen especially for those in the back may be

a little bit hard to see and we're going to be going through the matrix because it's really at the heart of what this Bridge Advisory Committee and the Department and Federal Highway have been working towards for the last 16 months, so if you're not able to see on the screen perhaps the center page in the handout will be helpful.

So I wanted to start with what it is or how we approached this project fundamentally. The first was to come up with a purpose and need for the project. Why are we here? We worked with Federal Highway, MaineDOT and the Bridge Advisory Committee to do that but then started looking at the various options that achieve the goals of the project, solve the purpose, solve the need that brought us here in the first place, which is that the bridge is deteriorated and is in need of some sort of improvement, so we built two types of strategies here. The first were alternatives that preserve the Falls Bridge and those included in the bridge rehabilitation option as essentially as it stands today, the same roadway width, no sidewalks, we're going to preserve it in place. The second option is similar to that but with an added pedestrian walkway off to the side. The third option is to actually

complete the construction of a brand new roadway and a brand new bridge further up the Salt Pond and in doing so reroute 175 and therefore not disturb the Falls Bridge at all. It's our equivalent of a do nothing sort of approach in terms of not disturbing the structure. We also looked at options to replace the Falls Bridge and we looked at those options of an aesthetically enhanced girder. We recognize the nature of this site and the historic significance. It is a beautiful surrounding. It's a beautiful setting. The Department recognizes that and therefore we came in with a replacement option that included an aesthetically enhanced girder as well as a tied arch bridge, one that's somewhat similar to what's there now with a little bit different, more modern structure, different materials, but those are two bridge replacement options we looked at as part of this study.

So in general, understanding that these are the solutions, this is our sand box of options that we're looking at. We went through a process whereby we identified the criteria at the site, the constraints of the site, where are our property lines, where are the utilities. There are significant archeological resources nearby. There

are historic residences. We know that we have traffic safety and pedestrian safety to be aware of. What are those constraints because that really sets the stage for how we evaluate and compare all of these options that we've developed. From there, we've taken each of these options and we did them one at a time, we started with the rehabilitation option and we advanced from an engineering perspective and then sat down with the Bridge Advisory Committee, walked through this is what we're seeing, this is what we're finding. As you hear this, what are you thinking, what do we need to be considering, what are we missing, as a local perspective, what do we need to be aware of and we refined those options. And as we went through this we went through an iterative process for each of these options working through all five of them and essentially worked on developing this Alternatives Matrix and populating the matrix with that data.

This Alternatives Matrix is a snapshot of it that you see on the screen, it really is a tool and it's just a tool. It's something to help us. There is so much data it allows us to aggregate all of the data into a single place and get it in a snapshot. It's not the only tool that we used as part of the

evaluation, but it is a handy reference as we look through this. In the Alternatives Matrix it's arranged fairly strategically. Columns in the matrix are alternatives while the rows are evaluation criteria and we're going to walk through this.

So let's start with the discussion of the alternatives and walk through the matrix. That's what we'll be doing for the next half an hour or so is walking through the matrix and talking about the alternatives and why the data that's presented in the matrix is in the matrix and at the end of the meeting we want to hear from you, what you agree with, what might have we over-looked, what do you think might be different because that's such an important part of this process is getting input from the community so that at the end of the day an informed decision is made as to what happened with this project.

So as I mentioned, the Alternatives Matrix shown here, the yellow column, those two left most columns in the matrix are the bridge rehabilitation options. The two columns shaded in blue are the bridge replacement options. The columns shaded in green is the alternative alignment. This is building a new road and a new bridge somewhere else and just leaving the Falls Bridge alone. And then all the way

to the far end of the matrix we have a temporary bridge option. And this is not really a bridge rehabilitation or a bridge replacement option, but it's a traffic controlled strategy for what happens when the bridge is being constructed. Whether it's a rehabilitation or replacement there is some point in time where the bridge needs to be closed to traffic, one option is to build a temporary bridge alongside of the existing structure, that far right column captures the various factors associated with that.

So let's begin with the discussion of the bridge rehabilitation option. So as part of our evaluation the first thing we had to look at is what needs to happen with the bridge, right. So from a superstructure and for the non-bridge folks in the room the superstructure is the upper part of the bridge, essentially the part of the bridge that's shaded and colored here on the screen. We evaluated that to understand what's happening. We recognize that there is a fair bit of deterioration on the bridge. It's nearing 100 years old. It's seen a lot of cars in its day and it's also not too far off the water, which it does contribute to deterioration, but we also recognize, as I think a lot of you folks also have come to realize, the bridge has some load

capacity and its load capacity is not what is required by modern standards and hence the reason for the load posting of the bridge. So we know that as part of a rehabilitation project not only do we need to repair the deteriorated concrete and the rusting reinforcing steel, we also need to add additional reinforcing and concrete to get the capacity of that bridge up to a modern design standard.

So as we worked through that, we concluded a couple of key things. The first was that the portions of the bridge highest off the roadway the furthest away from the water where it doesn't get the salt spray as much, those portions of the bridge are actually in better condition. Those sections shown in green we believe that much of that concrete can stay in place. There are a couple of areas here and there that might need to be chipped and patched, but those green portions would be in pretty good shape. As we start moving down the deterioration starts to become more significant. So when we look at the tie girders -- excuse me, the hangers rather, the vertical part of the bridge railing as well as the entire bridge deck that carries traffic, the deterioration is so significant there that rehabilitation of that is really cost prohibitive.

And what that means is as part of a rehabilitation option these sections shaded in red actually need to be replaced as part of the project and that would include just chipping and removing the concrete and possibly removing some of the reinforcing steel and then replacing it as part of the project. The bottom portion, what we call the tie girder, the horizontal member, we need to have some significant concrete removal and then additional reinforcement added to the concrete girder.

So there is a fair bit of work that needs to happen on the superstructure, but rehabilitation is something that can be done. When we look at what this bridge section looks like as we approach it on the roadway this project would not change the width of the roadway. The 20 feet from curb-to-curb would stay as is. With the option that includes the addition of a sidewalk, we're essentially looking at adding a separate stand-alone pedestrian bridge off to the side of the existing structure. We did try to make it more integral with the existing bridge, but technically it was just not feasible from an engineering perspective for a number of reasons.

So that is the upper portion of the bridge, but the part that holds up the bridge is equally as

important and that's the portion that we call the substructure. In the substructure the portions that support the ends of the existing bridge now shaded in yellow, those would need to be significantly replaced. They're showing a lot of deterioration. The concrete is starting to what we call spall away. You can see the reinforcing steel. Much of that concrete needs to be removed. The stone retaining wall in the lower portion of the abutments, those would be preserved. And I want to emphasize that for all of the options that we're looking at, those stone retaining walls, those stone abutments are going to stay as they are today. We're going to maintain the hydraulic characteristics of the site and we recognize that's an important feature. That's something that was made clear as we worked with the BAC as part this project. So some work does need to be happen there, but those will be salvaged. The upper portion of the railings shown in red, those are too far gone and those will be replaced as part of the rehabilitation.

We do have some sections here, I'm not going to talk to them in a lot of detail. Essentially though, we see the existing stone and the existing stone abutments and retaining walls and we would

excavate the granular soils that are allowing water to erode through the abutments. Right now there is water passing right beneath the bridge and roadway and is washing some of those materials away. We would actually remove that granular material and replace it with concrete fill and this is going to be a very solid, long-lasting solution. So that is the rehabilitation option in a quick nutshell.

As we move on to the bridge replacement options, we also have a few different things that we've looked at. For the bridge replacement option, we're not constrained to a set roadway width. So one of the first things we talked about in the Bridge Advisory Committee is what does that roadway section look like, how wide is it, how wide are the lanes, how wide are the shoulders, is it a single sidewalk on one side with a more narrow shoulder or maybe we just have two wider sidewalks or two wider shoulders on each side. And we see those two sections, both of them are about the same total width from curb-to-curb, so we would go from 20 feet to about 30 feet and how that space is used is a little bit different with these two options. You see that this one we have 11 foot lanes with two 4 foot shoulders on either side; whereas, with the bottom option we

have two 11 foot lanes, more narrow shoulders, but we have a dedicated side lane. Each of these has an advantage and disadvantage when we talked with the Bridge Advisory Committee.

Having arrived at one of these two typical sections as options as we advanced forward we also looked at what type of structure we were looking at and we did develop a few basic architectural renderings. These are really meant to be very conceptual in nature. This is to help get a sense of what this might look like. So we have on the left-hand side a precast concrete structure and this would be a long-lasting structure. In this environment steel probably is not the right solution because of its proximity to the water. So over here, this is a concrete structure and it has some aesthetic -- some aesthetic fascia panels on it to give it a more pleasing appearance. On the right-hand side here we have a more modern what we call a tied arch. Here, the bottom portion of this structure would be concrete and the upper portions would be steel. Our strategy here in looking at the tied arch option was to find out what is the most cost-effective tied arch option that could be constructed here because we don't want to go into a

more elaborate structure and have it be ruled out on that basis. So essentially we went in with the most cost-effective solution and if that wasn't able to compete on its own merits then certainly a more expensive one probably would not either, so that's how we approached that. In terms of the substructure rehabilitation, very similar approach to the rehabilitation. So whether it's a rehab or replacement, essentially the same type of modifications and improvements are happening to the stone abutments -- to the stone retaining walls.

One thing that was a little bit different for the replacement option than it was for the rehabilitation option is we looked at two different construction methods. The first was conventional construction and this is what we see most often, the contractor shows up to the site, they bring their materials, they build their concrete forms, they place the material on-site, everything is stick built on-site sequentially. That is the approach that is necessary for the rehabilitation option just because of the nature of the work being performed. It's also a possible method for the replacement option. We studied it for both. However, with the replacement option we also looked at accelerated bridge

construction scenarios and these are scenarios where some of the materials show up similar to an erector set and they come preassembled, you bring them to the site to assemble. It's like going to IKEA and buying a bureau and assembling it in your living room compared to building the bureau in your basement, right. That is the analogy we can think of for that. The advantage of the accelerated bridge construction, it certainly is faster and has less impact to the public.

As we continue to -- and that is essentially the summary of the bridge replacement options. As you can see, these are fairly high on the conceptual level as part of this study but it did offer a very good technical discussion with the Bridge Advisory Committee.

As you move further to the right, we did look at this alternate alignment for a new roadway, a new bridge off to the side. This scenario we are about a half a mile south of the existing Falls Bridge, so in this map the Falls Bridge is somewhere over here at the outlet of Salt Pond. We were actually looking at building a new Route 175 and extending that across this property here that's currently privately owned, crossing the Salt Pond at

the narrows that is just up from the existing Falls Bridge and then connecting back into Route 172. In this scenario, this road becomes the state route and the Falls Bridge and the portion of Falls Bridge Road/Route 175 that are currently state owned become municipality owned and the municipality is responsible for maintaining it. This solution -- this option ends up being about a one mile long section of roadway that's being built as well as the construction of a 520 foot long bridge. By comparison, the existing Falls Bridge today is 120 feet long. So this is definitely an out of the box solution. It's actually one that came up through the BAC and working with the local community and they felt it was at least worth exploring, so that is one of the options.

So those are the rehabilitation solutions. The next thing was to look at -- the next thing was to look at having reviewed the bridge rehabilitation, the replacement option, we looked -- we spent a fair bit of time talking about maintaining traffic on the site. This is going to be quite a bit of work, construction will be ongoing for quite a bit of time. There is a potential that the bridge is closed to traffic for an extended period of time. Certainly

rerouting vehicles and sending them elsewhere during construction is an option, but it's not the only option. We do have the scenario where we can build a temporary bridge on-site and we looked at that and evaluated that with the Bridge Advisory Committee. And what we have here, and this is in the handout packet, it's the second to last page in your handout packet, but what we're showing here is a snapshot of the project site. This is an engineering drawing, so please bare with us, but what you can see is this is the primary Route 175 roadway. The dark shaded area is the permanent footprint of a possible rehabilitation or a replacement option, right. So these dark gray shaded areas are locations where the new roadway would be, the side slopes would be -- whether it's a rehab or a replacement it would be very similar. We also have some lighter gray shaded areas and these are what we call temporary impact areas. We have some temporary impacts that are required for the contractor to simply access the site. The contractor needs to be near the bridge to be able to access it and work on it. So what that requires is this working area here and then a temporary bridge off to the upstream side of the Falls Bridge. The reason why we are on the upstream

side of the Falls Bridge is because there are some very significant archeological sites to the south -- excuse me, to the northeast quadrant of the project site that really requires that we avoid that location, so it really pushed us to the western side or the Salt Pond side of the bridge. We do have some archeological resources here. We have the Luskey site, which is a Native American archeological site as well as what is thought to be the John Roundy site, which is John Roundy was the founder of Blue Hill and this is thought to be the foundation of his original cabin when he came to Blue Hill. So we do have some sites of significance here, but as we worked through this process we found an alignment for a temporary detour off to the Salt Pond side was the most appropriate. So we weighed that, the pros of and cons of that and built that into the Alternatives Matrix.

So those are the alternatives. A lot of data. That was a really quick snapshot. The next step was having gone through all these alternatives to now start to populate data in the matrix. So we want to move through and start looking at the rows in the matrix, okay, and that's what we're going to do next. So each alternative was assessed based on a

series of criteria, groups of criteria, right, and those are listed here on the screen. So at the very top we have a general description and a few basic facts about each alternative. What is the alternative you're looking at? It's essentially the general features of it. From there alphabetically we developed several groups of criteria such as aesthetics, cost, environmental impacts, property impacts, schedule, and we worked to populate this matrix with the data that was available to us basically in this evaluation. Some of this is qualitative. It's based on numbers and facts. Those are pretty easy criteria to develop and evaluate. Others, as the BAC will attest to, are more qualitative in nature and what one person thinks is a positive may not be what the other person thinks is a positive. So what we've done is we've done our best to color code this based on what was thought to be the most desirable versus those that are viewed to be less desirable, right, and we recognize there is some subjectivity to this. We're interested to hear what we've gotten right and maybe what we need to reconsider as part of this project.

So let's look through that matrix. So we'll start at the top with the description. So for each

of these options and as we walk through this matrix you can see that we're highlighting just this top section and we've done a little blowup here so folks can see it more clearly. We'll walk through this matrix. We'll go down these rows and I'm going to point out what as working with the BAC we found were the key differentiators between the options. So starting with the description the key factors and the differentiators as we worked through this came down to the roadway width. That was the major difference for the options. For the rehabilitation option, we have a 20 foot wide roadway, maybe we have a sidewalk, maybe we don't. With the replacement option we have a 35 foot wide roadway and how we use that roadway is not yet determined. The alternative alignment, obviously the new roadway is built to our new standard. With the Falls Bridge, nothing changes that.

The other key differentiator here with the options is the service life of these solutions. Any new structure that would be constructed on the site would be designed to have a minimum service life of 100 years similar to the existing bridge. Hopefully we can get a little bit longer service life, but 100 years is certainly a good minimum to start with. The

rehabilitation, however, because the bridge is already advanced in age even if we went in and did a rehabilitation it wouldn't be practical to expect to get 100 years. Based on the experience of, you know, ourselves, MaineDOT, 50 years is probably a more likely time frame for an additional life that we could get out of this and 50 years from now this process would repeat and what happens in another 50 years, we'll leave that to our successors.

Aesthetics. I'll note here intentionally there is no color coding because we recognize that beauty is in the eye of the beholder. The major differences though that came up were tree clearing was the first one. With a temporary bridge and building that structure to the upstream side there will be -- there will be more tree clearing and an option that puts truck traffic somewhere else on a local road detour. The other differentiator is the impacts to the view of the Falls Bridge. As you're driving the road, you crest the hill you can see the Falls Bridge and the Falls Bridge is essentially your view, whereas you also have a view from the Falls Bridge when you're driving across and you want to look out from the bay. A rehabilitation structure keeps the Falls Bridge there. The bridge itself is

pretty, but it does in some ways obstruct the view of the bay compared to a girder bridge which doesn't have anything overhead and it opens up your view of the bay, so there were some differences there. We talked through them with the BAC and we tried to put some colors to it, but decided, you know what, we'll just let the public judge for themselves what is more desirable and what is less desirable.

We also had a couple of local interest comments. The BAC really, really exercised -- we recognized coming in there is a really strong emotional attachment with many folks between the bridge and what it means and the historical significance to the community. We've tried to capture that. We've tried to recognize that as part of this and I hope folks do recognize and see that.

The next criteria is community impacts. Those are things like if we reroute Route 175 somewhere else and then the town takes ownership of the road, what does that mean financially to the town. The biggest one to this community impacts were that infrastructure cost. If the town now becomes the owner and responsible for maintaining this, you know, what are the impacts of that, but also the emergency response time specifically to solutions

that it was looking at a temporary bridge and how that could affect response times versus if you don't have a temporary bridge and you're detouring traffic off onto a local road and what does that mean. The different options whether it's rehab or replacement will take different amounts of time to construct and therefore will have different amounts of community impacts. So when we look at the rehabilitation option that will be the slowest construction solution therefore would have the greater impact to travel times and to emergency response vehicles while replacing this is going to be somewhat faster, but obviously if you're building a temporary bridge, you know, that becomes perhaps less of an inconvenience.

Continuing down the path, we have community interests here. We're looking at bicycle accommodations, pedestrian accommodations and how the facility accommodates them. The existing rehabilitation -- the rehabilitation option certainly has less ability to maintain bicyclists and pedestrians without the sidewalk. If we add the sidewalk it is a little bit better, but we still have a narrow bridge with narrow shoulders and with a new bridge we have -- we have a wider structure and available corridor.

One of the things that did get pointed out was a local interest comment, which is there is a lot of people who visit the project site, a lot of kids who go swimming, they go to view the falls or stop by the site. Providing some additional space in some way for the community was viewed as being valuable and important based on the feedback from the Bridge Advisory Committee meeting, so we did note that here in the matrix.

Continuing to move down the matrix we have cost and here there was three major things that we looked at and all of them were fairly noteworthy. The first was user costs. And by user costs we mean the cost associated with each of you when you travel from here down to Brooklin, if you have to go some alternate route because of construction what is your time line, how much are you paying in mileage, the wear and tear, you know, buying new tires, those sorts of things we tax in terms of user costs and we assess that based on the number of vehicles traveling on the anticipated detour as well as travel time and how long that takes in terms of how long that construction is in place. So we see various values here ranging from about $3 million for the rehabilitation solution because it's potentially in

place for a long time in terms of user costs. And then replacement options, where depending on whether it's conventional construction, it's about a half a million to accelerated bridge construction would be about $300,000 and this is really just how long each of you are traveling and going someplace else.

These values are noteworthy, but it's also noteworthy that if a temporary bridge were put in those travel costs would be reduced because now instead of going perhaps the long way around you can still go on your normal route, but you might have to wait at a temporary signal because the temporary bridge would only be one lane wide. It would only be signalized and you can only go in one direction at a time. There is some delay cost there, but those are things that we did look at.

Additionally, we looked at initial construction costs, what might it cost to build each of these structures. Certainly these are conceptual engineering estimates, but for the rehabilitation option it was about $8 million construction cost is what we estimate. It's a very complex undertaking to relocate a structure of this type. If we add a sidewalk, you know, at a minimum the cost would be about $8.3 million and a separate sidewalk or I

should really say a separate pedestrian bridge along the side of it. The replacement option is more conventional construction, contractors are accustomed to it, it's simpler construction and, therefore, as I think most of you expect, it's more cost-effective. The replacement option ranges from about $4.6 million for a conventional construction solution to about $5.2 million to do it accelerated construction. There is a premium associated with asking a contractor to do something in a small amount of time than normally would be required. You have to pay crews overtime, maybe work a few night shifts, there are costs associated with that.

The alternate alignment, that's a lot of roadway to build. It's a mile of roadway. It's a 500 foot long bridge. That one was $14 million to build the alternative alignment. And then for all of these options that we looked at and went through the temporary bridge analysis we found that adding a temporary bridge to these solutions would add about $800,000 to the cost of the project. So those are some of the basic construction costs we had to develop.

Additionally, we look at what's called a service life cost, all right, what's the cost over

the entire lifetime that we have this piece of infrastructure in place, how much is it going to cost, right. It's like the cost of ownership for your car. Some brands of cars have a lot more maintenance and they cost you more in the long-term whereas others you may know are more efficient to maintain. It's that same concept. So with the rehabilitation option because it only has a 50 year service life and 50 years needed to invest another significant sum of money that gets rolled into that 100 year evaluation period that we're looking at and there the rehabilitation option was about 15 1/2 at $15.7 million. The replacement option with a more modern structure it's a, you know, we anticipated it will be more durable and doesn't have to be replaced again in 50 years, so those service life costs are about $7 million. The alternate alignment still maintains a pretty high cost at just under $20 million. So I did want to spend a little bit of time walking through that. There's a lot of data. Again, at the end if you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

From here, we're going to talk about environmental impacts. It's really a significant part of the project. Kristen Chamberlain is going to

come up and talk about a lot of these evaluations that we have to think of in terms of environmental resources on the site.

MS. CHAMBERLAIN: Hi, everyone. Thanks for hanging in there on a hot evening. Like Tim said, I have the joy of presenting the matrix within the matrix. If you'll note the page after the centerfold matrix there are a couple of tables that specifically talk about environmental impacts, historic and cultural resources as well as natural resources.

So I'll try, again, to summarize at a pretty high level what we've assessed to date understanding that if folks are more interested in specifics, feel free to contact us here tonight after the meeting or in the future to get move information if something strikes your interest.

So we've done some identification of natural resources on the site and we all know there are fresh water and coastal resources at the site and there is quite a diverse range of species. We've done -- we do work ourselves, but we do reach out to state and federal agencies to see what they have for information and there are some local folks who also captured some the species of interest. So when we assess each alternative to try to characterize the

natural resource impact, generally fish and wildlife, they fell into a couple types of impacts. One of them is permanent loss of contact converting a coastal wetland to non-coastal wetland and adding a structure where there was not a structure there that is something that we consider permanent impact. Temporary impacts are things that maybe last the duration of the project but over time might revert to their original condition. For example, we might have something in the water that might cause noise or change the water quality enough to have a species, a fish species or a bird species not be in that area while we're under construction. We might discourage feeding adjacent to the bridge during construction or we might produce noise enough for a seal to go someplace else or for the ducks that we know occupy the area next to the bridge in the winter to maybe find a different spot to be during that time of year.

So when we tried to lay out all of the alternatives that you heard about tonight and draw some type of comparison for fish and wildlife species we came up with a few points that you can take away from that table. One, that each of the alternatives had a potential to impact fish and wildlife in the area. The in-water construction activities for the

online replacement and rehab alternatives are fairly similar because the abutments supporting the structure of the bridge will remain and the in-water work associated with rehabilitation and on-site replacement would be quite similar. The permanent and temporary footprint of the rehab and replacement alternatives are also quite similar. The real, I guess, change would be from the alternative alignment that would introduce a new road where there isn't one now with associated impacts and a larger footprint than those that are -- that we looked at for rehab and replacement on-site.

So when we looked at things that we should really take a hard look at when evaluating which alternative to select those came up as well as the difference in severity of the impacts for the alternatives really relate to the overall disturbance on the site, the footprint of that, the duration of construction and whether a temporary detour is constructed, those are kind of the main points that jumped out at me when I was looking at all of the data we've collected to date.

We put years into cultural resources and historic properties. We know there are several properties in the area that are historic and

protected under Section 106 of the Natural Historic Preservation Act, specifically the bridge and the adjacent property known as Wakonda and Arcady make up the Blue Hill Falls Historic District. In addition, we have three important archeological sites adjacent to the bridge. So the affects here that we considered earlier have particularly adverse affects, it's not as bad as the word implies, what we're talking about are changes, where there is going to be changes to the properties, changes significant to them that define them as historic and there are varying degrees of changes associated with each of the alternatives. We spent a lot of time on this particular issue. There is a lot of supporting information. Julie in the back has spent a lot of time really looking at these and the properties and what makes it important, so we invite you to get more information about that if you'd like. I'll try to keep it high level for now.

So what's shown in the slide are essentially the potential effects from the alternatives, the overall project effects meaning there is an adverse affect or a change to one of the properties that is historic in the project area and that results in an overall determination for the project. So like I

said, there is a lot of information. I'll try to pull a few key points from the matrix within the matrix. And all of the alternatives for archeological resources, the Nevin site is avoided. Some disturbance of the Luskey site is required for the rehabilitation on-alignment and replacement option. And the Roundy site has the potential to be impacted if a temporary detour is constructed.

So in terms of different levels of changes to the project in the historic district there is an obvious one for the rehabilitation option would maintain the existing bridge, so a little bit less of a change to the historic district. However, all of the alternatives except the off-alignment at a new location would require some level of disturbance on the Wakonda site, which is considered a change and that is kind of that's why the overall determination for the project is listed as adverse. So this is a technical item, so please feel free to ask for more information on this if you would like.

And finally, the replacement off-alignment would avoid historical impacts at the existing bridge site assuming that the Blue Hills Falls Bridge and the District would remain in tact and that means the bridge has to be maintained in its current condition

through here. So the final design had to do with avoidance of renovation and mitigation. So NEPA allows, which Eva mentioned earlier, they require us to consider impacts in our decision-making and it's a good faith effort to avoid impacts and minimize things that can't be avoided. The alternatives that we presented to date represent our best effort to avoid and minimize. There are going to be some impacts that are unavoidable. So some of the ways that we'll look to further minimize those impacts during preliminary and final design, I have some examples of those and they seem to be a little bit similar between the fish and wildlife. For fish and wildlife we would try to limit interaction with the fish and wildlife that we know are using the area by avoiding certain activities when we know they're present. We try to use in-water work windows. We try to adjust the construction sequence and try to do things at certain times of the year where certain species are not around if we can. And then overall, we try to minimize our construction duration and in-water activities.

For both cultural and natural resources it's to our advantage to look for ways to reduce permanent impacts and divert our footprints, that means in the

water and also on the land and to minimize removal of vegetation and this is both for fish and wildlife and historic properties. And as I mentioned, it's likely that not all of the impacts -- we won't be able to avoid all of the impacts. There will be some that are unavoidable and for those we'll consult with state and federal agencies and members of the community to make sure we have the best information and if necessary try to provide mitigation for those impacts. For wetlands and wildlife, examples of mitigation might be monitoring and utilizing construction and best management practices, maybe even an offset of loss of function and values either off-site or with some type of in lieu fee payment. For cultural resources we might consider formal documentation of historic properties, interpreter panel, informational booklets, recovery of archeological artifacts, those are types of things we've done on similar projects with, I won't say similar resources, but the same types of historic resources that we're talking about.

So in addition to the alternatives, we welcome public comment which is also important on ways to avoid, minimize and also mitigate any impacts from any alternatives that are unavoidable. So

tonight, we're really trying to collect information that would inform us on which alternative to select and then specific to environmental impacts we would continue to take comment through preliminary and final design for the selected alternative. And now I'll turn if back to Tim.

MR. COTE: All right. Sorry for the technical glitch folks. That may be the computer's way of saying it's getting a little bit warm in here and we need to wrap it up. The good news is we're getting near the end, so to bear with us.

So that was the environmental part of it. That section you'll notice was grayed out in the matrix. In your handout the page after the full matrix summarizes that environmental information.

So as we continue our march down the matrix through these evaluation criteria, the next category was other, right. This is our catch all category for things that don't fit under other areas. These are sea level rise, right. The tendency for the sea level to come up over time has been demonstrated and the options have been designed for that as that comes up. All of the options were judged to have the ability to accommodate sea level rise whether it's a rehabilitation or whether it's a replacement option,

the thought is that the bridge would probably come up somewhat providing some additional clearance underneath the structure.

Another point of interest for the Bridge Advisory Committee was could we possibly relocate some of the utilities on the existing bridge or on the bridge. Some of the telecommunication lines could potentially be relocated on a replacement bridge. The electrical lines would likely need to stay overhead. For a rehabilitation option, all of those lines would likely stay on poles on the side of the existing bridge, so a couple of things were brought up as points of interest as we went through the project.

Next was property impacts, both permanent impacts from when we build the roadway, it's a little bit wider and those slopes get extended out and there is potential for property impacts with that, but also temporary impact and these are impacts that are needed for a short period of time as the contractor accesses and builds the bridge, but also to build a temporary bridge alongside. Those impacts are for the period of two years or so and then that property is then, you know, given back to the land owner as part of that. So we looked at the difference in

impacts in both -- all of these options from both permanent and temporary. They're fairly similar whether it's a rehabilitation or a replacement option. The biggest difference that comes in with the alternate route there is approximately, this would be, what, 10 acres of permanent property impacts for that new road that would be associated with that in the new bridge. Also with the temporary bridge solution obviously some additional temporary impacts would happen to build that new structure on the Salt Pond side of Route 175, so that has an effect as well.

Safety. This was an important topic to the Bridge Advisory Committee is community safety. And we put this into two categories, the safety for motorists driving down the roadway and the safety of pedestrians who are out on the site or bicyclists who are out on the site. The rehabilitation option is viewed to have less ability to satisfy some of those concerns whereas we're stuck geometrically with a more narrow roadway. Certainly there is some ability to provide a separate sidewalk off to the side with the rehabilitation solution and we still have that narrower roadway in the final condition. The replacement option obviously is a modern structure

with a much wider roadway and that's used to accommodate those better. The alternate alignment solution, the alternate alignment is built to modern standards, but, again, no change is really significant being made for Falls Bridge and things will essentially be unchanged at that location.

Lastly, as we get to the bottom of the evaluation -- the evaluation matrix is schedule, right. And the key factors here were how long does it take to built the project, how long is traffic impacted because those numbers might not necessarily be the same and then how much night work might be estimated. So from a construction duration standpoint, and I'm going to speak in generality, the rehabilitation project would be more intensive, more detailed and therefore would take longer and it would also require the longest impact to motorists while the temporary bridge was built. The replacement option could be constructed with conventional construction in probably about six months less time. If we used accelerated bridge construction that overall duration doesn't change but the impact to traffic does. So what we're looking at here with the replacement option, conventional construction we might have a 9 to 12 month window in the replacement

option where traffic is on a temporary bridge or detoured somewhere else, whereas the accelerated bridge construction that reduces to about two months potentially. For a rehabilitation it's 18 to 20 months. It's just a longer process. With the alternate alignment and building a new road someplace else and a new bridge somewhere else traffic is used to the flow on the Falls Bridge as it is today. And then certainly with the temporary bridge, you know, a lot of those traffic impacts are handled on-site and it's an inconvenience but traffic is not being rerouted elsewhere, so we've got some evaluation criteria, some facts, figures built in here in terms of a schedule impact.

So that brings us through the matrix. It's a lot of information and I'm sure there will be questions and the Advisory Committee will take questions at the end. But to wrap this up, I'm going to hand it back over to Andy, who is going to talk about where we're going from here. Andy.

MR. LATHE: Thank you, Tim. We're almost there. So I'll talk about moving forward and then also how you guys can reach out to the Department to make comment. Moving forward, right now, we're going to receive public comments that may influence the

final preferred alternative selection to about September 29. In early October, we hope to meet with the Bridge Advisory Committee and go through all of those public comments and decide at that point in time if revisions to the Alternatives Matrix that Tim has gone through need to be changed or updated or modifications made to it and once we have kind of put all of those comments together on the Design Matrix the Department of Transportation will sit down with Federal Highway and with using the Design Matrix and all of the other research we've done over the last 18 months sometime in the October, November time frame most likely we'll select a preferred alternative.

So opportunity for public comment or input, that's tonight. Also, in addition to this evening there are comment cards in the back of the room, take a few with you so that if you have a comment later in the week and you want to send it to us that would be great. Also, if you go to the town of Blue Hill's website there is additional information on the agenda meetings and our presentation to the Bridge Advisory Committee are posted there. There is also a website which is shown here, so this is the town of Blue Hill website to go and look at any of the presentation information we've done in the past. And below here

is a link that's on the Blue Hill website or you can take this pamphlet here and in the back of the pamphlet and it will send comments directly to me at my office and I also have my email address on the comment cards in the back. So if electronic communications aren't going to work for you, also the Bridge Advisory Committee members are behind us, feel free to chew their ear, they will bring those comments back to us in October as well, but it's great if we can get at least a written comment so that it becomes part of the public record.

I'm getting ready to open this up to questions and comments, all that I do ask is that you please raise your hand and when I call on you please just state your name for the court reporter so that she can get it correct in the public record. Also, one speaker at a time please. It's helpful for the court reporter if there are no cross-conversations going on. And, again, if you feel uncomfortable getting up in front of the public and asking a question or making a comment, feel free to use the cards to reach out to us. So at this time, we'd love to hear your comments and questions. The one in the blue shirt. Sir.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tim Seabrook.) The

abutments like you said would stay --

MR. LATHE: Sir, can I get your name, please?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Oh, Tim Seabrook.

MR. LATHE: If you could speak a little louder, it's hard to hear in here.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Tim Seabrook. My question -- I have three questions. The abutments you say are going to remain the same width regardless of what -- the way the bridge is dealt with. If it stays the same way with rehab or it expands as this other version it's going to be wider, is that true?

MR. LATHE: That's correct. What we --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tim Seabrook.) Okay. How much wider is it going to be?

MR. LATHE: Sure. I just want to add one comment too that we're trying to address also the potential for sea level rise here --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tim Seabrook.) That's my second question.

MR. LATHE: -- and extending the width. The intent is to keep the abutments in their existing condition or improve them, but in order to accommodate the sea level rise --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tim Seabrook.) Yup.

MR. LATHE: -- and raise the bridge you'll likely see a similar concrete wing wall that will go on the top of these, so kind of a knee wall will go on top of the concrete abutment to raise the roadway on the approaches to meet the bridge elevation.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tim Seabrook.) How high?

MR. LATHE: Upwards of 2 to 4 feet.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tim Seabrook.) 2 to 4?

MR. LATHE: Yup.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tim Seabrook.) Don't you need more than that?

MR. LATHE: Well, we're looking at 4 feet.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tim Seabrook.) 4 feet, okay.

MR. LATHE: Sea level rise, we want to keep it under the bridge decking, so ideally we're looking at a 2 to 4 feet range in elevation.

MR. COTE: One of the things we also recognize is those sites of significant archeological significance. The higher we bring the roadway, the further those slopes spill out into those sites of significance and it starts to require the addition of a retaining wall and other things to keep those slopes off those sites and that's part of the balance equation as we evaluate that more in

final design.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tim Seabrook.) So is that -- I mean, I'm envisioning driving down there and the road is going to get wider over the bridge, so what's going to happen coming to the bridge? Is it going to be like an hourglass?

MR. COTE: Yeah. Kevin, do you recall what the roadway width approaching it right now is?

MR. BRAYLEY: Right now, it's 20 feet curb-to-curb on the bridge and then you have shoulders that are about 3 feet.

MR. COTE: But away from the bridge, it's actually a little bit wider away from the bridge. So the new typical section is going to provide additional width and it's probably going to be about 6 feet wider out-to-out than the existing bridge. One of the things we recognize is that tied arch, and we're talking about a replacement scenario here --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tim Seabrook.) Yeah.

MR. COTE: -- so with a tied arch that's a pretty discouraging structure, right, that's about 3 feet wide at its base and our new modern structure doesn't require that much width. All of the supporting elements are underneath instead of along the side, so we can use some of that to now serve as

roadway instead of load carrying structure. So that allows us to provide a wider roadway while only expanding a slight amount on the structure itself. And we also recognize that there is a lot of people who hang out on the bridge, that is the attraction, so --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tim Seabrook.) Right.

MR. COTE: -- in that way providing a little bit of extra width there seemed to make sense as we worked through with the committee.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tim Seabrook.) Right. Right.

MR. COTE: But we did -- we did have this traffic here. You can see that, you know, to accommodate that extra width you can see that we're sort of cantilevering out, if you will, a cantilever off the edge of the existing structure, to put 30 foot wide structure on top of a 24 foot wide something else needs to happen --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tim Seabrook.) Right.

MR. COTE: -- and that's what we're showing here. And whether it's on one side or split equally on both sides that is part of the next design phase --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tim Seabrook.) Right.

MR. COTE: -- if that was to go forward, but that's the concept we'll be looking at.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tim Seabrook.) But the entries to this place for land before it and after it will be impacted as well.

MR. COTE: There will be some taper as we flare into it. It will taper into that, yes.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tim Seabrook.) So, yeah, it makes sense to me. Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Jim Schatz.) You had the next question right behind you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: More of a comment. Jennifer Green, Water Research Institute. That area is not only interesting for standing waves and kayakers, but it's also very, very interesting from the standpoint of fluid dynamics and how it flows. Standing waves, the trains of water seas and all kinds of stuff, so it is a site that I take people when we have water conferences and we have had international water conferences and have hung out there a lot, so it's very interesting from that point of view, so the sidewalk will be really wonderful and a lot less dangerous.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Dick Evans. As part of this process has any consideration been given in

addition to the causeway between the bay and the build?

MR. LATHE: Yes, we looked at that causeway. Repairs to that causeway, if necessary, would not be part of this project specifically. That causeway and the road over it is the responsibility of the Department of Transportation's regional forces. Recently the regional forces have been there about a week and a half, two weeks ago, looking at that structure we found that the actual outlet barrel underneath where it's only 4 feet wide and 4 feet tall and the stacked stone were in very good shape. We are looking at some of the wire guardrails along there as well as the -- if there is any room for any potential work on the slopes. The slopes are very steep. They seem to be very sound. If you get out and walk around or I don't know if anyone has been walking on the causeway, it's pretty narrow and not a great walking site through there, but there is beach areas on either side. If you were to look down at a shallow time of the tide you'll notice there is not a water -- not a lot of rocks that have spilled down into the waterway, so those -- those shoulders are holding very well.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Dick Evans.)

(Inaudible.)

MS. BIRK: Andrew, we're having a little trouble hearing in the corner, so if you want to come up front there is a microphone here as well and then we'll also try to repeat the question.

MR. LATHE: Yeah, the microphone won't reach terribly far.

MS. BIRK: You'll have to make a long walk up front.

MR. LATHE: I'll hold the microphone, but I think this is as far it goes.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Dick Evans.) My question was about the width of the causeway and we're having the same issue with the width on the bridge.

MR. LATHE: Correct. We would not be correcting the width of the causeway with respect to this project. I am not looking at increasing the width of the causeway. It would likely become a significant -- potentially significant right of way impacts if the wing walls are widened to correct that in there and you start getting up with water and potentially on the slope of the causeway as well. So we haven't done a lot of investigation into widening that roadway and wouldn't do so as part of this project.

MS. BIRK: And to the gentleman that just spoke, could you state your name, please?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I stated it earlier, Dick Evans.

MS. BIRK: Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Avy Claire. I -- if the alternative route is built, how will that Falls Bridge be used?

MR. LATHE: So the question was if the alternative route were constructed, how would the existing Falls Bridge be used. Does anybody from the Bridge Advisory Committee want to make a comment?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Jim Schatz.) Well, I -- I could make a comment. In terms of the -- if the assumption is that the town would take responsibility for that it would obviously be an incredible expense not only to have an ongoing responsibility for the bridge itself but for that part of 175 that will no longer be 175 it will become a town road, so it's not something that I imagine the town would be excited to take on.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Avy Claire.) I understand. What we would use it for if we take that on?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Jim Schatz.) It needs to

be maintained. In essence, I think DOT -- first of all, you know, if they transferred it to another entity, whether it be the town or not, that they would have to recondition it and that would be another cost which we probably didn't go over in detail on this matrix, but so there would be a cost to that. And then the entity, the town or whatever, would have a responsibility to maintain the -- have maintenance responsibility over the -- over that structure. And then of course we would --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Avy Claire.) And then so we would be able to have cars go over it?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Jim Schatz.) If we would use it as town road we would have to meet all those standards. If we decided to make it a park and block it off and then you would have access problems with people at either end, so it would probably be a town road so you would have to maintain it as you would any other town road.

MR. COTE: So this is an item that's not yet totally defined and there is a couple of different paths that could take place. Initially, the Department would invest a small amount to do some basic repairs but nothing near the level of investment that we're talking about. It would be the

minor stuff that's needed to address any immediate life safety type things for passage. From there, it would be two solutions. The bridge could either stay open posted for load and then as the DOT continued to inspect the bridge biannually because it's open to traffic, even though it's a town-owned and maintained piece of infrastructure, at this point, the DOT will continue to inspect it and it would reach a point that the bridge would continue to deteriorate if the right level of investment wasn't made and so the load posting was lowered and lowered and lowered until the bridge is eventually closed. The other option is to simply close the bridge to traffic right off and whatever happens with it then is subject to discussion and that was not something that was decided as part of this process. It was just recognized that there are two possible branches of the decision tree there that could be taken.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Avy Claire.) Thank you.

MR. LATHE: John.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Chapman.) Did you not say before that the ownership and responsibility of the causeway would also transfer?

MR. LATHE: That's correct.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Chapman.) It would

become part of Falls Bridge Road.

MR. LATHE: Yes.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah, the name is Gerardi. I used to live on 116, so it was right across the bridge. It's a really neat ecosystem. The fish in Salt Pond is different, the fish in there and the lobster are different and I'm just -- I want to know who is going to do the full evaluation of changing the width of the walk -- the abutments to allow the water in and out because that's a real tough calculous because you're a trying to factor in ocean rising 3 feet in the next 50 years, that can really -- that influx and deflux of water is one of the reasons why it's a worldwide destination to watch that. How is that factored in there?

MR. COTE: Thus far it's not expected -- those geometries, that geometrics with the bridge in terms of the width of the existing stone abutments and the openings is not expected to change significantly as part of this project. So these modifications that we're talking about to provide the wider roadway is happening up above at the very top of that structure, so that's not going to continue down to the water as well.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Michael Gerardi.) Well,

I know, but if you were to widen the entrance about a foot that would change the empty and filling times of the entire causeway.

MR. COTE: But we're not changing that.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Michael Gerardi.) But the way of the world is we have some climate change, we don't know why, I'm not going to get into that, but can you protect it somehow because let's say the sea level is a foot in the next 50 years, the deflux would take so much longer unless you widen it and it floods downstream down over to South Street, has anyone looked at environmental studies of that?

MR. COTE: And we haven't because the scope of this project is to improve the Falls Bridge, it's not to preserve the ecosystem per se. We recognize the importance of that, but as far as the scope of this project is getting this piece of infrastructure to be in service and maintained to serve the community that's just not within the scope of what we're doing.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Michael Gerardi.) Let me suggest this, to take down a tree bigger than 3 inches I have to go get approval, so I can't believe you haven't done that study. I have waterfront property, I can't take down a tree bigger than 3

inches, so how can you take on a project that's not yet environmentally secure and geologists and oceanographers to do the study?

MR. COTE: Yeah, and perhaps we can -- and I'm probably going to maybe kick this to Kristen and maybe I'm not understanding. Is your impression that we are changing the size and opening that the water goes through to get into the Salt Pond?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Michael Gerardi.) You're not addressing it.

MR. COTE: So is your understanding that that's not changing as part of this or are you --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Michael Gerardi.) I think it is changing and you're superficially addressing it and I don't think there has been a full ecosystem evaluation of a very unique, pristine part of the world and I am just concerned. And I think for as part of the state -- I'm from out of state, but I have property here, you are insufficiently evaluating the impact on the ecosystem and you should go deeper into it and see how you can protect it. I can't take a tree out bigger than 3 inches.

MR. COTE: I appreciate the comment. Perhaps we can talk about it in more detail after the meeting. Kristen, do you have anything to add?

MS. CHAMBERLAIN: I think we should talk in more detail later and try to understand the question a little better. That would be helpful.

MS. BIRK: Yeah, a little bit more information if you're interested. In particular when you say ecosystem, are you addressing the, you know, the salt marsh habitat itself or fish species in particular or maybe a little bit more info would be helpful to understand.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Michael Gerardi.) All of the above.

MS. BIRK: Okay. Great. Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm Dick Marchuetz from South Blue Hill. I'm wondering if there is a fire beyond the bridge on the peninsula south of the bridge or a bad accident, can two pieces of emergency apparatus, say a fire apparatus going toward the fire and an ambulance coming back, can they cross each other on the bridge replacement option at the speed limit?

MR. COTE: I believe the answer to that question is yes.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Dick Marshuetz.) Yes.

MR. COTE: So you're asking is the replacement bridge going to provide a roadway wide

enough that two vehicles can pass each other at a reasonable rate of speed without having to slow down, I suspect, as they do today on the Falls Bridge.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Dick Marshuetz.) Well, they can't today.

MR. COTE: The answer to that question is yes.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Dick Marshuetz.) Thank you very much.

MR. LATHE: I will add that if there is an on-site temporary bridge option considered it would be a single lane bridge. It would be able to carry all legal loads, but obviously two vehicles are not going to be able to pass at the same time and a temporary bridge would be a single lane option.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: My name is John Candage from South Blue Hill. My family has two businesses down there, a retail business and a wholesale business. Unless a temporary bridge was built, I think the retail business would be over with in two years. The wholesale business would operate inconvenient. And there are other things, there is another galley that's opened up down there. There is all sorts of rentals, which it might not be as inviting if you have to go to Brooklin to come to

South Blue Hill, so that's one thing. The second thing I haven't heard here this evening at all is any indication that during the two years that you're building the bridge that you're going to have boat traffic through there and there are boats during the summer that go through there all of the time. Sometimes there are boats in the fall. When it becomes fall season they go through there. I know two fishermen that go under the bridge and lobster in the early part of the year in the Salt Pond. Would the temporary bridge allow for boat traffic?

MR. COTE: I think the goal would be to accommodate that, obviously with some limitations and there may be some -- as far as boat traffic, the goal I believe would be to replicate the existing clearances that are there now. Passage may be a little more narrow. Those are challenges that will be faced whether it's a rehabilitation or a replacement option, so at this point we have not dug deep into those evaluations, but generally speaking as a goal the first step in this is is there a way to accommodate that boat traffic and, if so, if it's reasonable to do so the goal is to accommodate it.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Candage.) Would the temporary bridge accommodate all traffic? I'm

talking about a 53 foot trailer and tractor.

MR. COTE: Yeah. So the temporary bridge would be designed to carry all legal loads that can travel on Maine's roadways.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Candage.) Good.

MR. COTE: Whether it's weight or length, it would be designed to accommodate that.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Candage.) I think that from my standpoint, I would be very much in favor of having a temporary bridge. The other thing I haven't heard this evening at all from the committee or anybody is anything about the fish that travel there that are --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: The what?

MR. LATHE: The fish that travel through the causeway or through the site.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Candage.) There is elvers, there has been attempts to get alewives running through there, napp will run up in there, stripes has run up in there.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Sturgeon are in there too.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Candage.) Pardon?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Sturgeon I understand run through there as well.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Candage.) Yeah? I

haven't seen those.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: This right here is the one that's addressed all those.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Candage.) Is that right? I haven't heard anything on it. One thing that I'm -- I'm in the industry, so I have a little knowledge of it. I'm a little worried about construction during March, April, May, June in those waters interrupting the elver flow. That is a considerable amount of money that people that are lucky enough to have a license are able to do up at Carleton Stream and the Salt Pond. And I'm concerned that when the elvers are running that construction could interrupt it and my understanding is that there are -- some people believe that like alewives that elvers return to the stream that they came from, so if we interrupt that for a couple years it may be a problem of having that fisheries enter the Salt Pond and I hope that some consideration would be taken especially in-water work during periods of migration. I guess that's all I have to say.

MR. LATHE: I've got just two comments. In regards to fisheries and in-water work windows, we would be looking at an in-water work window between November and March. Is that --

MS. CHAMBERLAIN: Yeah. So we are aware of the use of the area by those species. We have a number of consultations that we'll have to do with state and federal agencies. Some of them manage those species that you referenced and we -- on most local projects end up with a recommended work window for in-water activities between November and March to avoid interaction with those species. And one consultation in particular it really, really pushes us to avoid March through the end of July, so that's definitely something that will carry in a lot of our construction duration and construction sequence computations once we pick an alternative. It's definitely something that we talk a lot about. I spend most of my day talking about fish and when we're going to do that. Thank you for your comment.

MR. LATHE: And another point I want to make is that whether it's a rehabilitation or replacement option at the site of Falls Bridge there will be cranes set up and construction activity going on, so traffic at the site will be interrupted at times. There are going to be times it will be unpassable because they're lifting things over the causeway. There will be times when activities will be limited here because it's a construction site, so there are

implications to the public which may require us to make local activities become limited.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Jim Schatz.) And if I could ask a question that -- John brings up a good point. You said he stated a preference for a temporary bridge and that goes along with a longer building period of 8 to 12 months in some cases. Would others prefer that as opposed to the accelerated building where we're talking about a 60 day window where the bridge is closed but other than that it operates as it is now whether it's rehabilitated or replaced? Are there thoughts on that? Yes.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Hi. My name is Ann Luskey. I live at the Wakonda property. First, I just want to thank the committee for all of their dedicated work. I know that you all have been doing this for many, many months. And the state, I appreciate all of the thoughtful process that's gone into this and how much you have worked to look into all of the different options. I would prefer to rehabilitate the bridge. I understand that it's more expensive and more timely. Just from a personal level, I love the bridge. It's something that I look at every day, so I have a great connection. But I

would like to request that given the degree to which Wakonda, the Roundy site and the Luskey property will be adversely changed. I would like to be brought into the conversation in a more meaningful way. And I'd really appreciate seeing a drawing of the anticipated impacts not only of just the temporary bridge, which is very impactful on my property in a very adverse way, so it would be great and very helpful for me to understand how the property -- how my property and all of the valuable -- the Roundy site and all of the archeology and the environment and all of my trees will be impacted, so a drawing would be really helpful. Thank you.

MR. LATHE: Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Scott Howell.) Yeah, I would like to know --

MR. COTE: Sir, could you state --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Scott Howell. I notice that the cost estimate for the two replacement bridge concepts were the same. It wasn't -- it wasn't a difference in that. There is -- is that just because there is -- we're so far away from the design or is there -- are they actually equivalent? Is the girder bridge and the tied arch bridge thought to be the same in cost?

MR. COTE: The cost that was presented in the rehabilitation columns, we have two columns there, one was for conventional construction and one was for accelerated bridge construction. Both of those are based on building a aesthetically enhanced girder bridge. To do a tied arch bridge there is an additional cost premium to that --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Scott Howell.) Okay.

MR. COTE: -- but both of those -- that's why they are fairly similar because we were looking at conventional or accelerated construction and there is not a significant cost between those.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Scott Howell.) Like a percentage for the tied girder bridge over the tied arch?

MR. COTE: The tied arch bridge is about $7 million.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Scott Howell.) $5 million --

MR. BRAYLEY: 4.2 and 5.2.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Scott Howell.) Okay. Thank you.

MR. COTE: In the back.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm Ellen Best. I live in South Blue Hill and I certainly wouldn't have -- I

work in town and the impact on me wouldn't be nearly what it would be on the Candage family, but I do have a seasonal rental in South Blue Hill, but I'd like to state a preference for the accelerated construction option and a fairly short-term interruption of the traffic flow. I understand there is always going to be some problems with the -- with the construction over an extended period of time, but that, you know, really interrupting the traffic flow for a much shorter time period seems like a much better option to me, so that's -- I'd like to see that.

MR. LATHE: Thanks for your comment. I just want to add that the accelerated bridge construction option is only an option if the bridge is a replacement of the bridge, so the rehabilitation option would be a much longer construction process. Yes, sir.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Maybe I'll just jump in as another South Blue Hill resident and say I actually think the -- I am more or less indifferent between whether there is a temporary bridge or an accelerated bridge construction. I guess I would, like Ellen, probably lean toward -- Scott Miller, Blue Hill -- lean toward the accelerated one because there is less impacts on the adjacent properties, but what I would

find kind of unacceptable and a huge problem would be conventional construction with no temporary bridge. That's a -- from my perspective, that's a huge problem and you see it reflected in your numbers in the user cost of more than $3 million. A chunk of that user cost would be borne by, you know, my neighbors.

MR. LATHE: Thank you. Other questions and comments? In the back, yes.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Veronica Robertson and I'm for the accelerated bridge project and let's get this done as quickly as possible in the safest manner as possible. I work in Bangor. I commute every single day and it's going to be an huge inconvenience and expense and wear and tear on my car. Not to mention, I live on the Wharf Road, we have a lobster industry, people need to get these perishable goods out in a timely fashion and these fishermen are counting on those lobsters being sold and getting out of there, so I go for the fastest least expensive alternative.

MR. LATHE: Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Judy Roundtree from South Blue Hill. Is there an appreciable difference between what would be prefabricated sections and a replacement bridge and the kind of work that you

would do to rehabilitate? Prefabricated things that are faster sometimes make me nervous. Do you understand what I'm saying?

MR. LATHE: Sure. Quality control sort of aspect?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Judy Roundtree.) Yeah.

MR. LATHE: Faster is not necessarily better.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Judy Roundtree.) I understand you had discussed this at another meeting, but.

MR. LATHE: Do you want to --

MR. COTE: Sure. It's interesting, you know, going faster sometimes gives you the impression that it means the quality will suffer, but in the case of bridges it's actually somewhat the opposite. So what happens is they would build these girders in an enclosed environment likely at some shop in a very controlled environment where it's easier to build things within tolerance to get materials, the concrete, the right quality of the concrete placed. You're not having to ship concrete from Bangor or wherever onto the project site and at that point the concrete is already trying to set up, you're not dealing with those same instances. You do have to

join the materials together at the site and that's something that we as engineers think about carefully, but there have been significant advancements in that industry in the last decade particularly, but there are some really good state of the art materials where it's shown that some of those joints are actually a higher quality product than the actual beams themselves. So in the case of this, we don't anticipate that there would be any reduction of quality in the bridge. In fact, there may be a slight increase in quality of the bridge if you do it accelerating construction.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Judy Roundtree.) Thank you.

MR. LATHE: What I'd like to add too is that any accelerated bridge units that are constructed would be built by plans and specifications and the Department of Transportation would have an inspector at these plants as they're fabricating them, so we would be supervising all of that.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Jim Schatz.) There is a question back here. Go ahead, sir.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Michael Gerardi.) I just wonder what the room feels about the aesthetics of the replacement bridge, do they like the tied arch or

the more contemporary structure? I think the tied arch bridge would fit the need of the aesthetic beauty of and history of the bridge. Does that factor in?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I agree. I would like to see a tied arch and go that route.

MR. LATHE: Can I get your name, please?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Jack Titcomb.

MR. LATHE: Sure. So as we look at all of the options we're going to be looking very hard at the rehabilitation first and foremost as our first stop on picking a feasible option for construction. When we start to look at the other options all of them will need to compete with each other based on public needs, engineering needs, needs of the site and the cost. So aesthetics will certainly be a local need that will play into this, but all of the options will compete on an equal playing field.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Jim Schatz.) You had a question in the back there. Did you have a question?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Me? Oh. Hi. I'm Charlotte Wier. I live in the Wakonda residence. I would like to state that I prefer absolutely no temporary bridge because it has a huge impact on my house and the -- and all of the wildlife and our

trees and the archeological sites that are right next to our house, so please no temporary bridge.

MR. LATHE: Thank you for your comment.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Jim Schatz.) Anybody else want to take a stab at any of these options? Don.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Don Mallow, Blue Hill. It just seems like a lot of money expended for a 50 year patch job. I really think at this point it really would -- and I am an architect and I would like very much to preserve that old bridge, but I think it's time to really be realistic about it and realize that that bridge should not have good money thrown after it. I think it is time to just say goodbye to that beautiful old bridge and replace it with something that's solid and that will last a century and I think that's very important. I would ask one thing to consider and that is that as we have to think about waters rising possibly like -- not possibly, but will happen. The pressures on the abutments are going to increase and the real issue is when it's going to come into affect and to raise those with only 60 feet for the water to get through. That is not going to change, but the pressures are going to be increased dramatically against that, so I think it would

behoove you to do some computer modeling. The granite looks very pretty and very nice, but I don't know if it's really want you want to hold onto. I think you should study the abutments very, very carefully.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: John Chapman from the Bridge Advisory Committee. Can you go back to the picture showing the rehabilitation of the abutments? If you notice on the right-hand picture there is two red lines that go vertical --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Don Mallow.) Yup.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Chapman.) -- and the intent there that we have been told is the engineers expect to pin and stabilize those stones --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Don Mallow.) Right.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Chapman.) -- to bedrock --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Don Mallow.) Correct.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Chapman.) -- in anticipation of your concern.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Don Mallow.) So it is in anticipation of increased pressures?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Chapman.) Yes.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Don Mallow.) Oh, really.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Chapman.) So

instead of a pile of rock --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Don Mallow.) I thought it was just to stabilize them as they are now.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Chapman.) Well, it is to stabilize them as they are now, but to support them in the future as well, so it's not just during the construction process as I understand it.

MR. COTE: That is correct.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Chapman.) It's meant to be forever.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Don Mallow.) They were considering an increase in height of water, do you know that?

MR. COTE: Conceptually we've given that thought. This is a concept. We need to go through engineering. One of the things that is showing in these rock anchors that go vertically down through the retaining walls and anchoring that into the bedrock --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Don Mallow.) To rock, that's right.

MR. COTE: Yeah. So that's what we want to do is fill this thing with concrete so it weighs a lot and then physically anchor it to the bedrock below. The thought is that this is going to be a 100

year substructure in this location because we want to ensure that whatever is holding up this bridge will be solid. So we understand that and we haven't gotten into the details and design yet. We're just not there yet, but it's certainly on the docket of things to evaluate.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Tom McLaughlin. You also might mention what you have in previous meetings that some of it as suspected does not sit on bedrock presently.

MR. COTE: That's correct. So portions of the abutment as the gentleman pointed out actually are not founded on bedrock or not believed to be on bedrock. There is actually some soil between the bottom of the foundation and the bedrock and that soil is being eroded away, which is leading to some destabilization of the abutments, so this proposed solution addresses that. So we're creating a belt and suspenders approach where we're providing multiple load paths to get the weight from the structure down into the ground recognizing the limitations of the site and the limitations of the existing foundation.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tom McLaughlin.) Thank you.

MR. COTE: I'm sorry, we've got a comment from --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Mike Astbury.) Yeah, I came here and sat down and it's been hot and I wanted to at least earn some of my keep. I thought that this whole process that we've been through was nearing the end, but I see that with the questions and things that are brought up, some of which we've addressed and heard from, but it sounds to me like there is more exploration to do and we'll be getting together a few more times here in the future. I had some different -- some definite criteria when I joined this committee and my first criteria was whatever happens there I want it to be safe. Passing the two emergency vehicles, if they're going slow enough happens, but when you come down over those hills and you can't see the car coming or the vehicle coming from the other side, you don't tend to put the brakes on as much as you tend to let the car or truck glide down over the hill, so that's a very great concern. The width of the bridge, the rehabilitation of the bridge is not going to do anything to help that situation. I also want to say that no matter what we decide or what the MDOT eventually decides will be the best remedy something is going to happen

to that bridge. If it's left to the town, it's going to be a great expense to clean it up when it starts falling away, which it will. And whatever time that is whether it's 10 years from now or 50 years from now it's going to impact the population of people in Brooklin and South Blue Hill and people in Blue Hill and trying to get to Brooklin and South Blue Hill, so I think rather than kicking the can down the road and passing the buck that we should be looking at taking care of that bridge rather than the alternative of having the town have it in an alternative route is going to be a very expensive one, which basically just postpones the problem that we will end up having to take care of.

MR. LATHE: Anybody else want to make --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Hi. Ann again. Ann Luskey. Your comment made me wonder about the speed limit. I know just because I live there that people don't obey the speed limit. People drive very fast approaching the bridge and then after they've crossed the bridge accelerating in front of my house and I'm wondering if there will be -- if the bridge was made more safe, which of course would be ideal, will -- I would imagine people will increase their speed. One of the things that slows people down is knowing that

they're going to bottom out if they don't slow down. And the large trucks, you know, slow down and everybody slows down to go across the bridge, which is a good thing. I -- so I am concerned that with the improvement of the bridge that there would be increased speed and more people driving faster and not obeying the speed limit and would the speed limit change or would it be maintained?

MR. LATHE: Sure. I certainly appreciate your concern. I don't think the speed limit would be changed. At this point the speed limit through that zone is 20 miles an hour, so a speed study would have to be requested to make any changes and that would be requested by the town and the speed limit is already down to 20 and that's as low as that could go. So unfortunately, the side effect of making something smoother, flatter, wider and safer also has the tendency to induce a different driving pattern and that also means higher speeds, so the best we can do is we can't really -- we only have so many tools in the toolbox to affect driver behavior. So the best we can do really is to make the road safe for the traveling public as best as we can at the site and with a replacement option that would be wider and either a shoulder at grade or a raised sidewalk and

with the rehabilitation potentially a sidewalk to get pedestrians off of the bridge. We're trying to make it safer for all users at the site.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Jim Schatz.) Gene.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Gene Martin, South Blue Hill. I live right over the bridge at the top of the hill and it's eight miles around for me. But I came here to defend rebuilding the bridge and looking at all of the facts I think I could live with that arch bridge and having the bridge closed for 60 days or so and it's a lot cheaper. I think, you know, if you look at all of the facts that's the way I'd want to go. Thanks.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Jim Schatz.) Thanks.

MR. LATHE: Anybody have any comments or questions for the Bridge Advisory Committee?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tim Seabrook.) Yeah. You're saying the arch. My question is is the replacement bridge -- Tim Seabrook again. It's going to be the arched bridge, the metal arched bridge, right?

MR. LATHE: It would be end cable and concrete.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tim Seabrook.) Yeah. Are those arches structural or are they just

cosmetic?

MR. LATHE: They would be structural. We would not want to engineer something that's strictly cosmetic in nature for the safety of putting the arch back in place.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tim Seabrook.) Well, the other bridge design you have, this cosmetic, the cement has cosmetic placards as you see on the website.

MR. LATHE: Sure.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tim Seabrook.) So that's my question --

MR. LATHE: Yup.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tim Seabrook.) -- is the arch bridge is more reminiscent of the existing bridge now because it's arched? The support systems go diagonal and not down, but they are an intricate part of the design; is that true?

MR. LATHE: That's correct.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tim Seabrook.) Okay. Because that's important to me. I don't know if aesthetics is as important.

MR. LATHE: Correct. We agree.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tim Seabrook.) I prefer the arch.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Tom McLaughlin, South Blue Hill. Aesthetically, the bridge before the present one had the very similar resemblance to that tiered structure, so aesthetically in terms of history and sense of place it's kind of curious that lineage of those three different bridges, the third being the proposed new one.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Don Mallow.) No, but the other consideration is a composite bridge of concrete and steel you're putting in the makings problems with steel in a corrosive atmosphere. You've got salt air and you've got steel and you're going to be painting that bridge over and over and over.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tim Seabrook.) That's just the nature of the salt.

MR. LATHE: It is a maintenance concern.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tim Seabrook.) It certainly is.

MR. LATHE: Any other comments from the Bridge Advisory Committee on the aesthetics?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Chapman.) Not a question on aesthetics, but just a point of observation. One of the impacts on the safety of that bridge is the transverse component, the big headers, if you will, that cross over the roadway,

those do limit your vision to oncoming traffic. They -- you can't see things at times. Another vehicle approaching or what not. I don't know if there is any feeling as to that continued impact with the tied arch structure versus a modern, you know, a modern alternative, I guess.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Scott Miller.) Can I ask the DOT to describe -- I guess I'm a little concerned that some people who haven't been deeply involved in this process may not appreciate some of the -- some of the subtleties. For example, the sidewalk may sound nice but just to be clear that would only be -- there would only be a sidewalk on the Salt Pond side and it comes at the expense of a shoulder on the bay side. So anybody who wants to sit on the bay side and take pictures of Eider ducks is going to be, you know, standing on a 1 foot shoulder. So just to be clear, you know, you need to understand the focus is on the design and that may change or moderate your views on the -- on the -- see the sidewalk to the bottom.

MR. LATHE: Yeah. So there is two different options as far as road configuration. The one on the top has two 4 foot shoulders that are at grade, so you have white lines on the side and there will be

room for pedestrians and bicyclists, but they will be at road level with moving traffic. The other option below that shows a 5 foot sidewalk, which is a typical ADA wide sidewalk, but the shoulders are only 1 foot, so that sidewalk would be up on the Salt Pond side, as Scott said, and you would have a limited shoulder on the outlet side, so those are kind of the two different road configurations we'd be looking at with a replacement option. The issue -- one of the issues with the sidewalk would be it's typically not the Department's responsibility to maintain the snow removal in the wintertime. It would be a town responsibility to maintain a raised sidewalk and typically raised sidewalks are something that connects to other sidewalks and there are really no connectivity on either side, so those are things to consider versus an at grade wider shoulder or an individual raised sidewalk.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Scott Miller.) The second thing I wanted to raise was in terms of the rehabilitation of the existing bridge my sense from the previous meetings were there were -- nonetheless there were going to be a number of changes to the bridge that will be apparent that will affect the aesthetics and I'm thinking, for example, of metal

inner guardrails. I think you described how patching the concrete, you know, it's not going to match. It will be evident patches. And then on the earlier maybe one or two slides earlier there is that big red section where you were going to replace a big chunk of the bridge. Yeah, there. My question there is, and I don't think I've really heard the answer to that was, are those red portions going to be replaced with identical castings or are they going to be replaced with something else? And, again, I think people who love the existing bridge should understand what they're getting at the end of the -- what they should expect to get at the end of rehabilitation.

MR. LATHE: Sure. So a couple of comments on the rehabilitation option. The guardrail -- the bridge rail that's there now that's in red, the actual railing itself, the rail on the approach that's concrete there is really three different types of existing rail on the bridge now that are not crash worthy. So when we look to rehabilitation to replace the guardrail -- the cast in place guardrail, it will still be a cast in place guardrail but it would be designed to modern design standards, so it would not look exactly the same. It would be a variation. Also, the current guardrail, especially the bridge

rail, doesn't support the hangers, the vertical members that are there, the green and the red, it doesn't support them so a vehicle could actually strike the hangars and cause damage to the bridge. There is not a mechanism there that's currently protecting those, so we want to take a look at providing some sort of rail that could protect those members as well. So similar but not exact.

Oh, and you mentioned the -- yeah, go back to the -- yeah, the other one, Tim, please. Yeah. So where we would replace the -- the bridge deck itself would be completely replaced. The knuckles on the end would receive some major rehabilitation. The red would be completely replaced. The green would be patched and repaired. There would be color variations between cast in place concrete that comes off the truss. A person will come and mix up mortar and cement into a bucket and applying it to the surface of the green areas. It's not going to have a uniform appearance necessarily throughout and certainly some of the concrete that doesn't have to be patched will have more of an aged look, a patina look than the rest of it, so it's not as if it's all going to be painted white and it all matches. It's going to be a little different variations of color

and shading.

MR. COTE: It's because of the texture difference with the surface as well. You know, the new concrete will likely have a relatively smooth finish because it's freshly formed versus the concrete that's been there for 100 years and its weathered and the very top surface of the concrete that exists is falling away leaving the rough stone sandpaper like surface, so there is some color variation but also some textural changes too.

MR. LATHE: Anything further?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Avy Claire.) Is it being raised too?

MR. LATHE: Yeah, so as we discussed earlier, so below the yellow knuckles right there, those bridge seats, those will be completely replaced and raised upwards of 2 to 4 feet so that bridge deck is going to come up 2 to 4 feet. It will help on the approaches a little bit because right now you come down the hill on the south side and it's kind of a kaboom, kaboom and that will take some of the curse off of that, but we'll have to feather out that elevation change in height over the course of the approaches as well so it will get back into the existing grade. So, yes, you would see that concrete

below the yellow instead of being 2 to 3 feet tall, you know, it would be upwards of 7.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Don Mallow.) The shoulders as you leave the bridge and approach the bridge, a 4 foot increase in height is going to be very difficult to match.

MR. LATHE: Well, 2 to 4 feet --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Don Mallow.) It's going to slide right over.

MR. LATHE: 2 to 4 feet at the bridge and we're going to taper it off as quickly as we can. Yes, those shoulders -- those rip rap slopes on the shoulders can certainly encroach out more than they do now, but -- so Tim has got a diagram there now, the darker gray may not show upgrade, but it may -- in the booklets you have those would be the extent of the toes of the new slopes that's up there whether it was a rehabilitation or a replacement.

MR. COTE: So for this graphic here what we're showing is you in essence have about 300 feet -- 350 feet of approach work on either side and that is assuming that we raise the bridge 4 feet, which is probably the most we'd look to raise it if even that much. The reason we can tie-in so quickly is that when we raise it we're just simply flattening

out the curve and we're not chasing, you know, we're not chasing the grade, so we're able to tie-in reasonably quickly. There are some fill slopes we need to balance and understand and the team is very aware of that.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Don Mallow.) The concrete and abutments come in pretty fast on the shoulders.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tim Seabrook.) But it's a logical concern at the same time, I mean, how the hell are you going to do that?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Candage.) I think it was either two or three years ago we were in this room and we were deciding what we really liked about redoing the bridge. One of the things I brought up at that time was the detour. Have you thought any more about the detour?

MR. LATHE: We have -- we have looked at a detour that we utilize state routes 117 to 175 takes you down across the bridge. It's like a 20 mile loop around.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Candage.) So you're not utilizing the Hales Hill?

MR. LATHE: It would not be our intention at this point in time to sign the Hales Hill Road as a

state detour --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Candage.) Great.

MR. LATHE: -- but people are going to travel in the direction they want to travel.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Candage.) Oh, yeah, I realize that.

MR. LATHE: So two of the options that we've kind of looked at as opposed to a 20 mile detour from one end of the bridge to the other utilizing state routes involved either that temporary bridge off to the side or accelerated bridge construction. If it were to be a replacement option that would limit the detour.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Chapman.) Andrew.

MR. LATHE: Yes.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Chapman.) I believe there was discussion, and I'm not going to speak for the selectmen for either Sedgwick or Brooklin, but there was discussion that they could actually post those roads and that would be their right and their responsibility and therefore they could keep heavier loads off those roads.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Vaughn Leach.) And they've already done it. It's all posted. They've just got the signs covered up, but they're there

right now, but the process has taken place.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Chapman.) Sorry.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I can't hear what's happening.

MR. LATHE: So there was discussion on another project in Brooklin for the Benjamin River Bridge in which the towns of Sedgwick and Brooklin were concerned about the bridge over the -- on the Hales Hill Road. It's a town-owned bridge. It actually splits between both towns and they have concerns about the condition of that bridge and potentiality of additional increased traffic over it because in that event the Benjamin River Bridge could actually be a detour route for traffic is my understanding. I'm not the project manager of that project, so I don't have all of the details, but both towns looked into putting signs at either end posting their road. So both Brooklin and Sedgwick I believe is doing that. I'm not sure they completed that. I know there has been some discussion and there may have been some signs, but I'm not sure that they actually followed through on a road posting for Hales Hill Road.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Jim Schatz.) If there are no other questions...

MR. LATHE: Any comments? Anything you guys want to ask the public?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (John Chapman.) Please tell us anything you want. I mean, we welcome any comments.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Elsa Niehoff-Gurwin. And I guess at this point nothing has been brought up about an alternate route and obviously it greatly impacts me as well as my brother's property because you're taking 10-11 acres. Do I gather that this cost, the fact that Blue Hill probably does not want to take on the Falls Bridge and the road, are we still dealing with this?

MR. LATHE: Sure. So the alternate alignment option sort of represents a no impact option to the Falls Bridge, so up until the 29th of September we'd like to get everyone's comments on the impacts to the resources in the area, not just at the Falls Bridge but at the potential new crossing where your property is located. Once we receive all of these public comments, I will sit down with the Bridge Advisory Committee and decide if there should be any additional information to the Alternatives Matrix and hopefully in the month of October or early November I would say whether that's a viable option

any longer. I wish I could tell you tonight, but I'm not at that point.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Elsa Niehoff-Gurwin.) I mean, obviously that hasn't come up and we are talking about building and impacting the water and the environment at two locations now --

MR. LATHE: Yes.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Elsa Niehoff-Gurwin.) -- so we still don't know if there are any archeological issues, you know, with Shellman or whatever on their property as well.

MR. LATHE: And that's an excellent point. I'm glad you brought it up. Our investigation of archeological and historical resources on the alternate alignment is very, very preliminary. The Maine State Historical Preservation Commission has looked at maps and records of that area and they assume that there is evidence of some nature, but they've not done the due diligence that we have with the Falls Bridge. We've gone up and done several archeological digs to identify the extent of historical resources there, so in order to consider an alternate alignment we would have to bring in the Maine Historical Preservation Commission and they would have to go down there and do exactly what

you're saying. Perhaps there is, you know, an archeological concern on that site in there, which is a game changer, but I appreciate you bringing that comment up because we haven't gotten to that extent yet.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Elsa Niehoff-Gurwin.) And also you're talking about another bridge and usually in Columbus, Ohio where I live most of the time, you know, bridges are not friendly to the environment and in the water and the surrounding, you know, you're now a 500 foot bridge and you're now going to have more people stopping on two bridges to get out and take pictures or look or -- and I know that you did a curve on the east side but then you T in on the other side and that is a blind elevation change and I don't know if you're doing a light there or you're going to do a stop sign somehow or...

MR. LATHE: Sure. And I can toss this to Tim and Kevin as well, but our look at that site is very preliminary. We have not done an actual survey and set it up and put boots on the ground and actually done survey. We've just looked at topographical maps. There is going to be a lot of investigation that would need to be done to accommodate that. The way that that option kind of

landed primarily is because it's the next narrowest point in the Salt Pond.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Elsa Niehoff-Gurwin.) And it was also brought up to you by a citizen initially.

MR. LATHE: Ah, yeah. Essentially it's been brought up by -- I'm not sure how many, but it's been brought to the Bridge Advisory Committee and there have been other ideas from the locals that just didn't happen to make it onto our watch list because primarily because it isn't at the Falls Bridge. So as we look under that umbrella what we want to do is look at what's the least impact we could do to that bridge and one of those options is do nothing to it and put the traffic somewhere else.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Elsa Niehoff-Gurwin.) Right, but it impacts me because you would have the embankment starting from my back door at the screen with a new embankment.

MR. LATHE: Yeah, that is your house right there.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Elsa Niehoff-Gurwin.) Yeah. And my leach field. You're taking part of the leach field.

(Laughter.)

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Point that out.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Elsa Niehoff-Gurwin.) It's just right there.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Jim Schatz.) And one thing you have to understand one of the most frustrating things for me in my role is that initially we were told that the role of the Bridge Advisory Committee was to narrow down the options and maybe come up with a preferred option and very quickly that changed because it was the feeling that the whole process should take place including what's happening tonight before we -- or they arrive, we arrive, at a preferred option. So you've seen and pointed this out that from a practicality point of view there may be just things taken off the table for just logically, but none of us even though we may think that way cannot say the process is over and I'm frustrated with that because I think we've heard so much and learned so much that I think we can expect the outcome to be a little more --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Elsa Niehoff-Gurwin.) And just for conversation, a lot of what it is was about, you know, an alternate, I mean, a new construction and like, you know, an arch that goes back to the metal arch that was a little more angled

in those days, but I just want to say that.

MR. LATHE: Thank you very much for your comments. Do you guys want to make any comment on the alternate alignment?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Scott Miller.) Can I ask a process question? My understanding was that I think it's Maine law required, maybe it's federal, requires DOT to have a public hearing to discuss their preferred alternative and my understanding, if I understood it correctly, was that you had to kind of identify alternatives, lay it out for the public maybe 30 days'ish before a public hearing and then to have the hearing. Since you haven't identified the -- have I got that sort of generally right or wrong? And if I've got it generally right, when are you going to identify the preferred alternative and I presume there will be a further public hearing to solicit input on that rather than today's one, which is kind of, you know, here is a bunch of things we might do, you know, tell us what you think.

MR. LATHE: Due process --

MS. MARTIN: Well, I'll address this. Really under the NEPA process we don't want to just make a decision and then bring it to the public. We want to have public input throughout the

decision-making process. It helps us to make an informed decision on what is the best option to satisfy the transportation needs, try to minimize impacts, looking at costs, engineering and all of those aspects. So this has been a pretty intensive process to be able to understand how each of these different alternatives will all meet the purpose and need for the project and what kind of ramifications that they will have to the environment and to cost and so that's why we're asking you to provide your comments now to help us to really identify what is the best solution in this case for this project. And then I think it's under state law that there is a requirement when there is a, and correct me if I'm wrong, when there is a preliminary design report done, which typically identifies a preferred alternative, I believe at that point in time you would normally hold the public meeting.

MR. FRANKHAUSER: Yeah, and I believe in the last slides that Andrew pointed out we are planning on coming back to another public meeting, you know, after we've worked through this process of coming up with a preferred alternative between the Department of Transportation and Federal Highway and the Bridge Advisory Committee, you know, once we've narrowed

this down and come up with our recommendations we will be back --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Scott Miller.) Okay.

MR. FRANKHAUSER: -- so you will see us again.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Scott Miller.) So if, you know, lightening strikes and you decide to go the alternative route, Elsa will have plenty of -- and her neighbors will have plenty of opportunity to weigh in.

MR. FRANKHAUSER: Absolutely.

MR. LATHE: Any other comments or questions? Are there any questions of the Bridge Advisory Committee?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Rebecca Wentworth.) Just a point of clarification. Is there any point where the -- where we vote on this or --

MR. LATHE: No.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Rebecca Wentworth.) Right. That's what I thought.

MR. LATHE: Could I have your name though, please?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Oh, Rebecca Wentworth.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: What was the question?

MR. LATHE: If there was any point at which

the community votes on the preferred alternative and the answer is no. The selection of the preferred alternative will be made in conjunction with the Department of Transportation and Federal Highway. The Department will make that final decision.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Mike Astbury.) I just wanted to say that throughout this process even though it's tedious we've had a lot of good expert opinions and advice and work by all of these people over here that presented us with a lot of facts and taken our silly comments sometimes and turned them around on us. They're a good group to have working to get the best solution.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Jim Schatz.) Well, everybody have a great Labor Day weekend. Thank you for coming and you know how to get a hold of me.

MR. LATHE: Enjoy the weekend.

(Meeting concluded at 8:15 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Robin J. Dostie, a Court Reporter and Notary Public within and for the State of Maine, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings as taken by me by means of stenograph,

and I have signed:

_/s/ Robin J. Dostie_____

Court Reporter/Notary Public

My Commission Expires: February 6, 2019.

DATED: September 10, 2018

MAINE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Blue Hill, Falls Bridge Informational Public Meeting
August 29th, 2018

ATTENDANCE SHEET

NAME	PHONE NUMBER	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Scott Miller		scott@ustiger.net
Elsa Niehoff-Garcia	614 309-5781	engrrf@aol.com
H. Bergheimer		sensfam2@gmail.com
Jennifer Greene	207-266-8595	jgreene@waterresearch.org
Margaret Hannah	(207) 374-3508	margarethannah@gmail.com
Jane | Don Millett	207-400-0558	mymquilter@gmail.com
Lesley Litwiller	207-374-5709	LLitwiller@roadrunner.com
Robin Wilder	207-374-5601	rgwilder@eros.com
CHRIS DOYLE	917.608.2756	chris@chrisdoylestudio.com
TIM HOULIHAN	646-369 8993	thoulihan@sfc.edu
Val Libby	207-374-5036	Val.Libby@gmail.com
Elsa Marshall	207-669-5099	
Chris Packard	374-2723	cpack@rcn.com
Bonnie Preston	374-3636	bonniepreston@earthlink.net
David Stearns		
Terri Litcomb		
Greg Bush	3059265001	publicbush@gmail.com
Michael Gerardi	973-464-3357	michael.gerardi@emcare.com
Amy Claire	374-2433	amyclaire@gmail.com
LORI HARROP	200-255-0884	lori@Harropmail.com
Scott Howell	207 610 0104	lorenzodow@gmail.com
Rebecca Wentworth	207 479 15 20	rebeblake@gmail.com
Blaise deSubrow	207-374-5012	desbrow@gmail.com
Wendy Ritzer	374-5591	waritzer@yahoo.com
Ellen Best	374-2786	ebest54@gmail.com

MAINE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Blue Hill, Falls Bridge Informational Public Meeting

August 29th, 2018

ANN LUSKEY
203 304 8437

ATTENDANCE SHEET

NAME	PHONE NUMBER	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Dick & Carla Evans	(207) 374-3796	
Cynthia E. Ray Robertson.		
Hugh Nazor		HUGH@NAZOR.NET
Linda Murnick		lmurnick@mac.com
Hanna + Kim Henderson		
ROXANNE JANSEN		
C. H Naylor	374 2810	haylorfarm@midmaine.com
Linda Tarlow	249-6898	lindatarlow@gmail.com
Fred Helcher	374-5485	
Hannah R. Britt	874-9943	
Richard + Nancee Freeman	374-1018	
Donald King & David McDonald	202-420-1824	
Melanie Leach	207-266-9660	BHDBooks@myfairpoint.net
MARTIN SAVALCHAK	207-374-2974	
E. S. Wright	374 5016	SWright6390@AOL.com
Madelyn Woods	374 2135	mwoods@shawinstitute.org
Annette & Bill Condon	374-2421	
ROBERT EBERLY JR		
Robert G. Chase JR	374 5489	
Bob Slayton	598-6078	
Doris + Bill Webb		
Agnes Gallagher		
April Chapman		
JAY & CLAY MARSH	374 5730	3MARSHJay@GMail.com
JACK Titcomb	812 5709	

MAINE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Blue Hill, Falls Bridge Informational Public Meeting
August 29th, 2018

ATTENDANCE SHEET

NAME	PHONE NUMBER	E-MAIL ADDRESS
ANNETTE & JOHN CANDAGE	374-2421	
BILL MULLIKEN	374-3763	WEM3RD@gmail.com
Don & Barbara Mallow	374.2134	donaldmallow@yahoo.com
Anne Berleant	374-2341	anneb@pbp.me
DAVID LUTYENS	374-3786	david.lutyens@gmail.com
Jennifer Greene	266-8545	jgreene@waterresearch.org
Lisa Gerardi	973 714 5825	Lisahg5@gmail.com
Michael Gerardi	973 464 3351	michael.gerardi@emcare.com
Holly Paxton		jh0501@gmail.com
MARGARET HANNAH	(207)374-3508	Margarethannah@gmail.com
THOM MCLAUGHLIN + DEE SEYMOUR	207-374-5839	DOLORESSEY@YAHOO.COM
Sarah Pebworth	207.479.4741	sapebworth@gmail.com
Richard Marshuetz Mindy Marshuetz	207-374-3858	RJMemail@aol.com MSKat22@aol.com
Matthew Jennesse	614 562-0710	mjjoutdoor@aol.com
Nick Nicholl	207 266-1857	nick.n.nicholl@gmail.com
Wayne Frankhauser	207-557-8924	wayne.frankhauser.dr@maine.gov