

Montana Transportation Commission

July 25, 2013 Meeting
Missoula, Montana

IN ATTENDANCE

Kevin Howlett, Transportation Commissioner, Chairman
Barb Skelton, Transportation Commissioner
Rick Griffith, Transportation Commissioner
Carol Lambert, Transportation Commissioner
John Cobb, Transportation Commissioner
Mike Tooley, Director MDT
Pat Wise, Deputy Director MDT
Dwane Kailey, MDT Engineering
Lori Ryan, Commissioner Secretary
Lynn Zanto, MDT
Kevin Christensen, MDT
Tim Reardon, MDT
Ed Toavs, MDT
Jolynn Eggert, MDT
Shane Stack, MDT
Ben Nunnallee, MDT
Kevin Slovarp, City of Missoula
Chris Kelly, HDR
Helena Orendain, Missoula
Monica Wessal, Missoula
Ed Childers, Missoula City Council
Bob Luceno, Missoula
Melinda Barnes, Helena
Jean Belangi Nye, Lolo
Reggie Morrison, Missoula
Alex Taft, Missoula City Council
Nancy Wilson, Missoula, HD 97
Bob Jaffe, Missoula City Council
Fred Stewart, Missoula
Bob Schweitzer, Missoula
Dave Gray, Missoula
Laval Means, Missoula
Kirby Campbell Rierson, Senator Baucus Office, Kalispell
Virginia Sloan, Senator Jon Tester, Kalispell
Wes Delano, 5th / 6th Reconfigurations, Missoula
Caleb Kasper, 5th / 6th Reconfigurations, Missoula

Please note: the complete recorded minutes are available for review on the commission's website at http://www.mdt.mt.gov/pubinvolve/trans_comm/meetings.shtml. You may request a compact disc (containing the audio files, agenda, and minutes) from the transportation secretary Lori Ryan at (406) 444-7200 or lrayn@mt.gov. Alternative accessible formats of this document will be provided upon request. For additional information, please call (406) 444-7200. The TTY number is (406) 444-7696 or 1-800-335-7592.

OPENING – Commissioner Kevin Howlett

Commissioner Howlett called the meeting to order. After the pledge of allegiance, Commissioner Howlett offered the invocation. After the invocation Commissioner Howlett asked those in attendance to introduce themselves to the Commission.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes for the Commission Meetings of May 21, 2013, June 4, 2013, June 25, 2013, and July 9, 2013 were presented for approval.

Commissioner Griffith moved to approve the minutes for the Commission Meetings of May 21, 2013, June 4, 2013, June 25, 2013, and July 9, 2013. Commissioner Lambert seconded the motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimously.

Contract Awards

July 11, 2013 - Letting

Dwane Kailey presented the Contract Awards to the Commission. Gallatin County Commissioners joined the discussion on a conference call for this portion of the meeting. There were nine projects for the Commission's consideration.

1. *East Belgrade Interchange-North.* The Engineer's Estimate is 19,155,707.61. There were five bidders. The low bid was Knife River Corp. out of Belgrade. They bid \$16,400,782.85. They were 14.35% under the Engineer's Estimate. There was a zero percent DBE goal and .7% participation. Gallatin County Commission agreed that it should be awarded to Knife River. They asked that the Transportation Commission to consider using any funds available after completion of the project for local construction of connecting roads or on Secondary 205. They requested that any left-over money would be used locally. Commissioner Howlett said the Commission would take that into consideration. That is not a practice that is traditionally done, but we will take into consideration.
2. *Custer to Hysbam.* The Engineer's Estimate was \$11,944,210.88. We had three bidders on the project. The low bidder was Riverside Contracting out of Missoula. They bid \$10,641,259.00. They were 10.9% under the Engineer's Estimate. There was an 8% DBE goal and there was 14.8% participation.
3. *Fall Street – East.* The Engineer's Estimate was \$7,278,101.65. There were four bidders on the project. The low bidder was LHC Inc. out of Kalispell. They bid \$2,766,377.81. They were 61.99% under the Engineer's Estimate. We asked them if they were comfortable with their bid. They reviewed it and discovered some material mistakes. They sent us documentation outlining those mistakes. One had to do with the channel excavation. They had incomplete data. They also miscalculated the amount of material they were going to have to place in order to set up their operation. They followed Section F of the bid proposal. The Department recommends that they be allowed to withdraw their bid and that no action be taken on their bid. The number two bidder, Roll Excavation, has been contacted and they are happy to do the project.

The other thing I'd like to point out is that our Engineer's Estimate appeared to be a little high. There is one big item on this project which is about three or four million dollars of the total price. During the project development phase that quantity was expressed in cubic meters. We figured it would be hard to measure that material in place so it was changed to metric tons but we didn't adjust our price accordingly, thus the inflated the Engineer's Estimate. The adjustment would have been in the \$4 million range. Commissioner Lambert asked if the Commission needed to act on the request to withdraw their bid. Tim Reardon said the appropriate thing would be to segregate this project and vote on the withdrawal request at the end. Commissioner Howlett agreed they would segregate it and vote on it at the end.

4. *Lambert – East.* The Engineer's Estimate was \$2,830,424.60. There were four bidders on this project. Ernst Inc. out of Forsyth was the low bidder. They bid \$2,599,948.49. They were 8.14% under the Engineer's Estimate. There was a 2% DBE goal and 3.2% participation.
5. *Montana Avenue – Billings tied with Laurel Road – Billings.* The Engineer's Estimate is \$2,427,876.40. We had two bidders. The low bidder was Riverside Contracting out of Missoula. They bid \$2,684,432.05. That is 10.5% over the Engineer's Estimate. There was a 4% DBE goal and 4.8%

- participation. This project was .5% out of our guidelines. This is an urban project and it looks like we estimated a little bit low. There is documentation of that.
6. *Moon Creek – 9 miles SW of Miles City.* The Engineer's Estimate is \$464,774.73. We had three bidders. Sletten Construction out of Great Falls was the low bidder. They bid \$350,770.50. They were 44.53% under the Engineer's Estimate. There was 0% DBE goal and 4.05% participation.
 7. *Montana 35 Junction – South 206.* The Engineer's Estimate is \$177,894.10. We had three bidders. The low bidder is Montana Landing Inc. of Great Falls. They bid \$164,178.70. They were 7.71% under the Engineer's Estimate. We had no DBE participation.
 8. *Rumble Strips.* The Engineer's Estimate is \$101,806.50. We had three bidders. Imark Traffic Services out of Billings was the low bidder. They bid \$118,208.50. They were 16.1% over the Engineer's Estimate. There was 0% DBE participation.
 9. *West of St. Regis.* The Engineer's Estimate is \$77,518.75. We had two bidders. H&L Construction was the low bidder. They bid \$90,081.41. They were 15.9% over the Engineer's Estimate. They are a DBE Firm so there should be 100% DBE participation on this project.

Commissioner Griffith asked the Department their position on the request from Bozeman East Interchange folks. Director Tooley said the request has been made and we're reviewing it. The overall cost should come under all contingencies and bids but there is a substantial amount of interstate maintenance money that has gone towards this project and we need to look at reimbursing that fund among other things. Commissioner Griffith said they needed to separate the issues. One is that we're asking for your concurrence with letting this and the other is what was not expended because it's come in under the Engineer's Estimate. To the best of my knowledge we've not ever said we were going to award the total amount to an individual project; we've not done that. We've put it into other projects that reach that priority status. So I think specifically the question is do they concur with the recommendation to award the bid. Is that right? Commissioner Howlett said no; we've already heard that from Kevin. The difference with this one is there were a couple of earmarks and other additional monies over which we had no direct control. So the question is what happens with that. Director Tooley said that is the correct question. There are earmarks, there's the type of grant, there's a number of different funding mechanisms including IM that came into this project and that's why it's going to take some time to wade through all of that.

Commissioner Griffith said he was interested in the commitment given to the area – surely it was on the Tiger Grant and that's not ours to direct. Lynn Zanto said we do have a funding agreement with Gallatin County and there was a priority in terms of the funds. This is a local project; it did receive SAFETEA-LU earmarked funds and the Tiger Discretionary Grant. Federal discretionary funding is provided first then there is local and airport funding secondly and then Interstate Maintenance is the last funding source. That is the agreement. We don't know if there will be change orders so we don't know what kind of savings there will be. Commissioner Griffith asked if Interstate Maintenance was the \$10 million set aside. Lynn Zanto said yes.

Commissioner Griffith moved to approve the staff recommendation for the July 11, 2013, Letting. Commissioner Lambert seconded the motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimously.

**Agenda Item 1: Bridge Rehab on I-90
I-90 Nemote Creek Culvert**

Lynn Zanto presented the Bridge Rehab on I-90, I-90 Nemote Creek Culvert to the Commission. MDT is recommending a rehabilitation project for the Nemote Creek Culvert located on Interstate 90 (I-90), about 2 miles northwest of Tarkio. The culvert shows some severe deformation that has existed since at least 2006. A fix would ensure the long-term stability of the fills. The deformations appear to be outside the travel lanes and the risk to the public is low.

Summary: MDT is requesting Commission approval of a project to rehabilitate the Nemote Creek Culvert on I-90 northwest of Tarkio. The total estimated project cost is approximately \$369,000. The proposed funding source is the Bridge Replacement & Rehabilitation Program. Staff recommends that the Commission approve the addition of this project to the program.

Commissioner Griffith moved to approve the Bridge Rehab on I-90, I-90 Nemote Creek Culvert. Commissioner Lambert seconded the motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimously.

**Agenda Item No. 2: Highway Safety Improvement
SF 139 – Cottonwood & Stucky**

Lynn Zanto presented the Highway Safety Improvement Project SF 139 – Cottonwood & Stucky to the Commission. The overall purpose of the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) is to reduce traffic fatalities and serious injuries by implementing infrastructure-related safety improvements. Funding distribution is prioritized according to benefit/cost ratios at locations where feasible countermeasures to crash trends are identified.

The Cottonwood & Stucky project would install a roundabout at the intersection of Cottonwood Road (S-345) and Stucky Road, southwest of Bozeman. The total estimated cost for all phases is approximately \$3,022,000, and the proposed funding source is HSIP. This project is also eligible for funding under the High Risk Rural Roads Program (HRRR).

Summary: MDT is asking the Commission to approve a project to build a roundabout at the intersection of Cottonwood Road (S-345) and Stucky Road, southwest of Bozeman. The total estimated project cost is approximately \$3,022,000, and the proposed funding source is HSIP. Staff recommends that the Commission approve the addition of this project to the program.

Commissioner Cobb asked about the crash data. Lynn Zanto said she would provide him a copy of the traffic safety report. Dwane Kailey there is really no way to know how much crashes would be reduced with this rehab. Commissioner Howlett said what they do know is that the number of accidents gave rise to this becoming a recommended project.

Commissioner Lambert moved to approve the Highway Safety Improvement, SF 139 – Cottonwood & Stucky. Commissioner Griffith seconded the Motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimous.

**Agenda Item 3: Fox Farm Road Prioritization, Great Falls
Fox Farm Road – Great Falls**

Lynn Zanto presented the Fox Farm Road Prioritization in Great Falls to the Commission. The Surface Transportation Program Urban (STPU) provides funding for improvements on the Urban Highway System in Montana's urban areas. The allocation is based on a per capita distribution and is recalculated after each decennial census. Priorities for the use of STPU funds are established at the local level through local planning processes with final approval by the Transportation Commission.

On behalf of the Great Falls Metropolitan and Planning Organization, MDT is requesting the addition of the following project to the program:

Fox Farm Rd – Great Falls: This project is located in the Great Falls urban area on Fox Farm Road (U-5220) from East Fiesta to Dick Road. The proposed project will reconstruct Fox Farm Road as an enhanced rural arterial, with widened lanes, five foot shoulders and a separated 8–10 foot walking path, as well as reduced vertical curves and an improved travelling surface.

The estimated cost of construction, construction engineering, right-of-way, and utilities is \$7,584,622. The estimated preliminary engineering cost is \$1,103,800 resulting in a project total of \$8,688,422.

Summary: MDT is requesting \$8,688,422 in Surface Transportation Program Urban (STPU) funds for the Fox Farm Road (U-5220) reconstruct in the Great Falls urban area.

MDT staff recommends that the Commission approve the prioritization of this project to the program.

Commissioner Cobb asked about funding for urban projects. Kevin Christensen said our projects give the local governments authority to construct the projects. For example, when we do intersections in the urban system they have to meet our standards. Commissioner Cobb said if it was cost prohibitive to do what they want to do and we go ahead and do something else then we get in trouble down the road. Lynn Zanto said each of the urban areas receives allocation funding and they prioritize how that urban funding is spent. So they have adequate funds to construct this project.

Commissioner Lambert moved to approve the Fox Farm Road Prioritization, Great Falls, Fox Farm Road – Great Falls. Commissioner Skelton seconded the Motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimous.

Agenda Item 4: 2015 Pavement Preservation – Secondary Roads
Cut Bank – North
Stockett – Highwood Junction S
Lincoln Road East

Lynn Zanto presented the 2015 Pavement Preservation – Secondary Roads Cut Bank – North, Stockett- Highwood Junction S, and Lincoln Road East to the Commission. MDT is asking the Commission to approve advancing three pavement preservation projects to the preliminary engineering (PE) phase. These projects will be funded under the Surface Transportation Program – Secondary (STPS). The Secondary Highway System includes any highway not classified as a local route or rural minor collector that the Transportation Commission has chosen to include on the Secondary Highway System. Funding is distributed by formula.

District 3 (Great Falls) nominated these projects for the 2015 Pavement Preservation Program, and they were reviewed to ensure appropriate scope of work. MDT has placed a list of agenda items, including these three projects, on its Web site for the public to view. The following table provides location, scope, and cost information:

Project Name	Scope	Signed Route (Dept. Rte.)	Beg. RP	Length (miles)	PE	CN	CE	Est. Cost (all phases)
Cut Bank North	Chip Seal	Secondary 213 (S-213)	0.435	7.099	\$32,000	\$361,000	\$29,000	\$422,000
Stockett – Highwood Jct S	Chip Seal	Secondary 227 (S-227)	0.000	8.395	\$32,000	\$337,000	\$27,000	\$396,000
Lincoln Road East	Chip Seal	Secondary 453 / Lincoln Rd. (S-453)	0.000	5.121	\$32,000	\$263,000	\$21,000	\$316,000
Totals				20.615	\$96,000	\$961,000	\$77,000	\$1,134,000

This work is estimated to preserve 20.615 miles on the Secondary Highway System. The total estimated cost of PE for these projects is approximately \$96,000.

Summary: MDT is requesting Commission approval to add three pavement preservation projects to the program for delivery in 2015. These projects will improve an estimated 20.615 miles of Federal-aid highway. The combined total estimated cost for the preliminary engineering, construction engineering, and construction phases is approximately \$1,134,000. The projects will be funded through the Secondary Highway Program using STPS funds.

MDT staff recommends that the Commission approve the addition of these projects to the program.

Commissioner Cobb moved to approve the 2015 Pavement Preservation – Secondary Roads, Cut Bank – North, Stockett – Highwood Junction S, Lincoln Road East. Commissioner Lambert seconded the Motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimous.

Agenda Item 5: Rest Area Restoration and Rehab, Columbus Rest Area Hysham Rest Area

Lynn Zanto presented the Rest Area Restoration and Rehab, Columbus Rest Area, and Hysham Rest Area to the Commission. MDT is proposing two projects to address aging facilities at the Columbus and Hysham Rest Areas. Both projects will utilize the design/build method of project delivery in which the design and construction phases are combined into one contract.

The Columbus Rest Area is on Interstate 90 (I-90), about 10 miles east of Columbus in Stillwater County. The Hysham Rest Area is on Interstate 94 (I-94), about 3 miles southwest of Hysham in Treasure County. The projects will rehabilitate facilities on both the eastbound and westbound roadways.

The total estimated cost for each rest area is approximately \$5,849,000. The funding source is the Interstate Maintenance Program (IM). IM funds are allocated to MDT districts based on system performance.

Summary: MDT is asking the Commission to approve two projects to rehabilitate and restore the Columbus and Hysham Rest Areas. The Columbus Rest Area is on I-90 in Stillwater County, and the Hysham Rest Area is on I-94 in Treasure County. Facilities on both the eastbound and westbound roadways are included. The estimated cost of each project is approximately \$5,849,000, and the proposed funding

source is the Interstate Maintenance Program. Staff recommends that the Commission approve the addition of these projects to the program.

Commissioner Skelton moved to approve the Rest Area Restoration and Rehab, Columbus Rest Area, Hysham Rest Area. Commissioner Griffith seconded the Motion. Commissioners Griffith, Howlett Skelton and Lambert voted aye, Commissioner Cobb voted nye.

The motion passed.

Agenda Item 6: Fencing on I-15 & I-90 D2 Interstate Fencing

Lynn Zanto presented Fencing on I-15 & I-90, D2 Interstate Fencing to the Commission. The Butte District (District 2) has nominated a project to replace deteriorated fencing along Interstate 15 (I-15), south of Helena in Jefferson County, and Interstate 90 (I-90), east and west of Livingston in Park County. The project will replace approximately 29 miles of fencing along I-15 beginning at RP 160 and 32 miles of fencing along I-90 beginning at RP 322.

Both areas have documented wildlife movements by a variety of species. Notably, there have been multiple recorded elk collisions between Helena and Boulder over the years. About five years ago, a wildlife barrier fence installation was completed along I-15, just south of the Montana City exit, to guide animals to an abandoned railroad overpass. MDT will consider providing wildlife friendly fencing in appropriate locations, as well as installing barrier fencing, where appropriate, to guide animals to existing underpasses.

The total estimated cost for all phases is approximately \$1,323,000. The proposed funding source is the Interstate Maintenance Program.

Summary: MDT is asking the Commission to approve a project to replace deteriorated fencing along approximately 29 miles of I-15 in Jefferson County and 32 miles of I-90 in Park County. The estimated project cost is approximately \$1,323,000, and the proposed funding source is the Interstate Maintenance Program. Staff recommends that the Commission approve the addition of this project to the program.

Commissioner Howlett said yesterday the Commission viewed several areas where wildlife was a major concern. It is generally agreed that fencing is a good opportunity to mitigate some of those safety concerns related to wildlife and motor vehicle crashes. I'm glad to see this becoming a part of what we do.

Commissioner Griffith moved to approve the Fencing on I-15 & I-90, D2 Interstate Fencing. Commissioner Skelton seconded the Motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimous.

Agenda Item 7: Enhancement Project on MDT Right of Way City Sidewalks – Livingston

Lynn Zanto presented the Enhancement Projects on MDT Right of Way – City Sidewalks in Livingston to the Commission. The Transportation Commission approves Community Transportation Enhancement Program (CTEP) projects that are located on or adjacent to state-designated streets and roads. CTEP projects are funded with the enhancement set-aside of the Surface Transportation Program, which is allocated by population to Montana's local and tribal governments. Communities select projects to fund with their allocations and provide the required

non-federal match. The program is based on an agreement between MDT and Montana local and tribal governments.

The city of Livingston is seeking approval of a project to construct concrete sidewalks and ADA curb ramps in Livingston. The overall project will construct 3,950 lineal feet of sidewalk and 32 ADA ramps. The on-system portion consists of 625 feet of sidewalk and four ADA curb ramps. The on-system locations are listed below:

Dept. Route	Signed Location	Beginning RP	End RP
U-7402	Montana St. between 7 th St. & 8 th St.	0.573	0.643
U-7402	2 nd St. between Montana St. & Gallatin St.	0.993	1.063
U-7410	Geyser St. between Yellowstone St. & 3 rd St.	0.727	0.796
U-7410	Geyser St. between G St. & H St.	1.351	1.421
U-7412	9 th St. between Geysers St. & Crawford St.	0.000	0.88

The total estimated project cost is approximately \$182,000. Including this project, the city of Livingston will have obligated \$920,799 of the \$925,323 made available over the life of the CTEP program.

Summary: MDT is asking the Commission to approve a project to build 3,950 lineal feet of sidewalk and 32 ADA curb ramps in Livingston. The on-system portion of the project consists of 625 feet of sidewalk and 4 ADA curb ramps. The total estimated project cost is approximately \$182,000, and the proposed funding source is Community Transportation Enhancement Program.

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the addition of this project to the program.

Commissioner Howlett said this will almost entirely exhaust what Livingston has in their CTEP Fund. Lynn Zanto said that was correct.

Commissioner Griffith moved to approve the Enhancement Project on MDT Right of Way – City Sidewalks – Livingston. Commissioner Lambert seconded the Motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimously.

**Agenda Item 8: Safety Project – Bighorn County
I-90 Scale Site Removal**

Lynn Zanto presented the Safety Project – Bighorn County, I-90 Scale Site Removal to the Commission. Due to safety concerns associated with the scale site’s location in the Interstate median, the Billings District (District 5) has nominated a project to remove the Motor Carrier Services (MCS) scale site on I-90 between Crow Agency and the Battlefield Interchange (I-90/US-212 interchange). MDT identified the safety issue many years ago, and as a result, the Department entered into an agreement with Wyoming to operate a joint port facility on I-90 north of Sheridan, Wyoming.

After the scale site and associated median ramps are removed, MDT will reconstruct the median/roadway to improve geometrics and safety.

The total estimated project cost is approximately \$900,000, and the funding source is the Interstate Maintenance Program (IM).

Summary: MDT is asking the Commission to approve a project to remove the MCS scale site on the I-90 median between Crow Agency and the Battlefield Interchange. The total estimated cost is approximately \$900,000, and the proposed funding source is the Interstate Maintenance Program.

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the addition of this project to the program.

Commissioner Lambert asked about the removal. Lynn Zanto said it would be removed and we would not be able to access that center median anymore and the landscape would be returned to its original state. Dwane Kailey said what is happening now is that it is a wet spot but also has potential for vehicles to cross over the median so it is creating a hazard. Our plan is to remove it; we've already removed the scale site. We are planning to remove all the asphalt and the median and clean that up and re-vegetate and restore it back to its original state. Commissioner Howlett said there have been far too many crashes on interstates with people going around the line. He asked where the scales were being relocated. Dwane Kailey said they are being relocated outside the median within the general area. They will no longer be within the median. Commissioner Skelton asked if the scales were operational. Dwane Kailey said they will be operational when they are relocated. Commissioner Griffith asked if we had an agreement with Wyoming for both states to use one scales. Dwane Kailey said yes we do; rather than building one on the Montana side and one on the Wyoming side, we actually have a couple of locations where we've coordinated with the bordering state or bordering Country (Canada). Commissioner Howlett said we would have two on I-90 coming out of Wyoming; one joint venture and one located in the vicinity of Crow Agency. Dwane said the intent was to capture the traffic coming over from Hwy 212.

Commissioner Skelton moved to approve the Safety Project – Bighorn County, I-90 Scale Site Removal. Commissioner Griffith seconded the Motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimous.

Agenda Item 9: District 5 Reconstruction Projects
Divide - West
Grass Range - West
NW of Red Lodge - NW
Luther – E&W

Lynn Zanto presented District 5 Reconstruction Projects in the Billings District, Divide – West, Grass Range West, NW of Red Lodge – NW, Luther – E&W to the Commission. The Billings District (District 5) has nominated four reconstruction projects – two are in Fergus County and two in Carbon County.

The reconstruction projects located in Fergus County are intended to address roadway safety and geometric issues highlighted in the Lewistown to Grass Range Environmental Assessment document. The funding source for the Fergus County projects is the National Highway System (NH) Program. NH funds are allocated to MDT Districts based on system performance.

The projects located in Carbon County were identified via a pre-environmental corridor planning process that engaged the public, local governments and resource agencies in order to identify issues and needs along the MT-78 corridor. The funding source for the Carbon County projects is the Surface Transportation Program Primary (STPP). STPP funds are allocated to MDT Districts based on system performance.

The following table lists the project names, locations, and costs:

Project Name	County	District Route	Signed Route	Begin. RP	Length (approx. miles)	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
Divide – West	Fergus	N-57	US-87/MT-200	85.7	5.232	\$7,322,000	NH
Grass Range – West	Fergus	N-57	US-87/MT-200	107	5.481	\$7,744,000	NH
NW of Red Lodge – NW	Carbon	P-78	MT-78	5.1	4.788	\$4,731,000	STPP
Luther – E & W	Carbon	P-78	MT-78	9.9	5.457	\$5,421,000	STPP
Totals					20.958	\$25,218,000	

Summary: MDT is requesting Commission approval of four reconstruction projects in District 5. Two of the projects are in Fergus County and two are in Carbon County. The total estimated cost for all projects is approximately \$25,218,000, with funding coming from the NH and STPP programs. Together, these projects will improve approximately 20.958 miles of Federal-Aid highways.

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the addition of these projects to the program.

Commissioner Skelton moved to approve the District 5 Reconstruction Projects, Divide – West, Grass Range – West, NW of Red Lodge – NW, Luther – E&W. Commissioner Lambert seconded the Motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 10: 2010 Urban Area Boundaries, Functional Classification and Highway System Revisions

Lynn Zanto presented the 2010 Urban Area Boundaries, Functional Classification and Highway System Revisions to the Commission. This is an item that happens only once in a decade and is tied to the US Census. In conjunction with the 2010 Census and in accordance with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Urban Boundary Criteria, MDT staff has worked with local officials to conduct urban boundary reviews based on the latest decennial census. The adjusted boundaries must encompass census-defined urban areas and are subject to approval by the Secretary of Transportation [23 USC 101 (a) (36)-(37) and 49 USC 5302(a) (16)-(17)].

Montana law related to the urban boundary includes MCA 60-3-211. This requires that each fiscal year, the Montana Transportation Commission apportion highway funds allocated for the Urban Highway System. The funding for the Urban Highway Program is allocated to urban areas in the state in the ratio of the urban population in each area to the total urban population in the state. The urban boundaries, in addition to defining the extent of the urban population for funding purposes, distinguish between urban and rural functional classification and between urban and secondary highway systems. Urban boundaries do not affect gas tax allocations or maintenance responsibilities.

The revised boundaries were developed in cooperation with local officials and have been discussed with a representative of the FHWA. Some boundary revisions have resulted in system and functional classification changes, detailed in attachments.

With the release of the 2010 Census population figures, and based upon state statute, including Senate Bill 111, passed by the 2013 Legislature, which aligns state law regarding urban boundaries with federal law, Montana's urban areas increased from 15 to 19. Existing urban areas are listed below, along with the additional areas of Sidney, Columbia Falls, Glendive, and Hamilton:

Montana's Urban Areas: Anaconda, Belgrade, Billings, Bozeman, Butte, Columbia Falls, Glendive, Great Falls, Hamilton, Havre, Helena, Kalispell, Laurel, Lewistown, Livingston, Miles City, Missoula, Sidney and Whitefish.

Establishing a new urban area or adjusting boundaries may involve proposing actions related to three key items for Transportation Commission and/or FHWA approval: 1) Urban Boundary, 2) Urban Functional Classification, and 3) Urban Highway System.

1) Urban Boundary

Urban boundaries are established based on decennial census-identified urban clusters of greater than 5,000 people, or urbanized areas with populations greater than 50,000. These boundaries tend to be jagged or irregular in nature.

FHWA allows for states, in cooperation with local officials, to propose a "smoothed" boundary that best reflects urban-like conditions. MDT, in coordination with respective local governments, has reviewed conditions and proposes such boundaries.

2) Urban Functional Classification

The Federal Functional Classification attempts to group roadways into classes according to the character of service they provide, ranging from land access within an area to mobility through an urban area. Due to the proposed urban boundary adjustments, and based on federal guidelines and criteria, 38 routes require functional classification revisions.

3) Urban Highway System

The State Urban Highway Program is a funding mechanism for roadway improvements on a state-designated Urban Highway. To be eligible, routes must be functionally classified as urban collectors or arterials. Often, secondary routes crossing into a new or expanded urban area are revised to urban routes. We have identified the routes for addition to the Urban Highway System, detailed in Attachment A (maps) and Attachment B (tables).

Summary: The attachments indicate staff recommendations for new or adjusted urban area boundaries based on the 2010 Census and related functional classification and system revisions. The tables and maps are organized by numeric district, followed by cities in alphabetical order. Staff recommends the Commission approve the proposed urban area boundaries, functional classification revisions, and system changes as presented in Attachments A and B. These actions are contingent upon FHWA approval.

Commissioner Howlett said when you reach a certain population then you will be classified as urban. Where does the burden lie for allocating funds, i.e., taking away from one area to put into another area? Lynn Zanto said prior to 1991 this was a federally funded program but now it is a state program but we still need to meet the federal criteria. Commissioner Howlett asked if it was state law that requires us to allocate proportionally. Lynn Zanto said it is state law for funding but the federal level sets urban boundaries so it's a combination. The census gives us urban cluster boundaries and we are allowed to adjust those boundaries either to make them smoother or by an identifiable feature. So we adjust them but that causes some of the areas that were previously rural to become urban so we have to change the system to match the functional classification. Prior to the 2010 census, we had 15 urban areas but with the 2010 census there was a bill passed in the Legislature that made Montana law similar to federal law, and that brought in four new urban areas – Sidney, Glendive, Columbia Falls, and Hamilton. So we have to go out again and adjust the boundaries to include these areas. This is a coordinated effort with the local governments.

Commissioner Cobb said the Great Falls urban highway system took out part of the extended route by the old urban center, why don't they do that? Lynn Zanto said

two Commission meetings ago Great Falls brought forward a route to add to the Urban Highway System on 4th Street. The Commission has a policy that if you're adding miles to the system, you need to remove the same amount of miles from another area. Great Falls went back and identified Diamond Spring Road.

Commissioner Lambert moved to approve the 2010 Urban Area Boundaries, Functional Classification and Highway System Revisions. Commissioner Skelton seconded the Motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimous.

Agenda Item 11: Proposed Kalispell Area Functional Classification and Urban Highway System Revisions

Lynn Zanto presented the Proposed Kalispell Area Functional Classification and Urban Highway System Revisions to the Commission. Federal and state laws require the alignment of functional classification and federal and state highway system designations as a condition for the expenditure of federal highway funds. The Transportation Commission approves changes in functional classifications at the state level with final approval by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). System designation changes involving Montana's Primary, Secondary, and Urban Highway Systems are entirely the responsibility of the Transportation Commission.

Summary: On March 5, 2013, the Kalispell Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) voted unanimously to pursue steps for prioritizing Four Mile Drive, from U.S. Highway 93 (N-5) to Stillwater Road (L-15-806), as Kalispell's next urban priority. This improvement is recognized as a priority project in the Kalispell Growth Policy and is recommended in the Kalispell Area Transportation Plan (2006 update). This new roadway would provide a good grid system, specifically east-west connectivity, in the developing areas of Kalispell as well as access from U.S. Highway 93 to the future Kalispell Bypass.

FHWA requirements for functionally classifying non-existent, or "future" roadways, are that it can only be done if the roadway is intended to be built within six years. The MDT Missoula District is targeting construction in 2015. The recommended functional classification for Four Mile Drive between U.S. Highway 93 and Stillwater Road is an urban collector. This segment of roadway will collect and distribute traffic from U.S. 93 and the future Kalispell Bypass to the developing neighborhoods and commercial areas of Kalispell.

According to state statute [MCA 60-2-126], routes must be functionally classified as urban arterials or collectors to be eligible for the Urban Highway System. The routes of the Urban Highway System shall be selected by the Transportation Commission in cooperation with the appropriate local officials. Following System Action Policy, when mileage is added to the Urban system, a reasonably equal amount of mileage may be required to be removed from the Urban system.

*Mileage proposed to be **added** to the Urban Highway System:*

The proposed addition would originate where Four Mile Drive intersects U.S. Highway 93 (N-5) and continue west approximately one mile to Stillwater Road (L-15-806).

*Mileage proposed to be **deleted** from the Urban Highway System:*

On April 23rd the Kalispell TAC recommended dropping portions of the 3rd and 4th Avenue East couplet from the Urban system:

- 3rd Avenue East (U-6724) from Center Street (U-6714) to 11th Street East (U-6718)
- 4th Avenue East/14th Street East (U-6725) from Center Street (U-6714) to 3rd Avenue East (U-6724)

The total mileage proposed to be removed is approximately two miles.

In preparation of pursuing improvements to Four Mile Drive as Kalispell's next urban priority the Kalispell TAC is requesting Transportation Commission approval of:

- the future functional classification of Four Mile Drive connecting US-93 to Stillwater Road as an urban collector,
- the addition of Four Mile Drive, as described above to the Urban Highway System, and
- the removal of portions of 3rd and 4th Avenue East as described above.

Staff recommends Transportation Commission approval of the requested changes:

1. Future functional classification of Four Mile Drive, from U.S. Highway 93 (N-5) to the future Kalispell Bypass approximately at Stillwater Road (L-15-806) as an urban collector.
2. Add Four Mile Drive, from U.S. Highway 93 to the future Kalispell Bypass approximately at Stillwater Rd to the Urban Highway System.
3. Remove 3rd Avenue East (U-6724) from Center Street (U-6714) to 11th Street East (U-6718) and 4th Avenue East/14th Street East (U-6725) from Center Street (U-6714) to 3rd Avenue East (U6724) from the Urban Highway System.

Commissioner Howlett said we have some concerns with this. We toured this area yesterday. There are some issues related to the Kalispell Bypass that this Commission would like to further look into. I think it is premature to offer a guarantee that this will be built in the next six years; I don't think we can do that. Lynn Zanto said that this road is an Urban System route and the funding is set so we are requesting your approval. Commissioner Howlett said he understood that but also understood that there is a hook that says we are going to build this other connector in six years and we cannot make that commitment. Lynn Zanto said the road can function independently of the Bypass. Commissioner Howlett said if we didn't have the six-year hook it might be more palatable but for the time being I think this issue should be tabled. The Commission was in concurrence with taking no action and requested additional information prior to taking action.

Dwane Kailey asked if there was information needed from the Department so they could put it on the Agenda for the next Commission meeting. How would you like us to address this in the future? Commissioner Griffith said the Commission wants to really begin to understand a lot more about the Kalispell Bypass. Commissioner Howlett said it isn't just the Bypass but priorities of the District. This is sort of a commitment to that project but we saw bridges that need some help up there. My thought is to look at the priorities in the Red Book and after that we can ask for something to be prepared. Right now it is so fresh we haven't had time to think about what needs to happen. Maybe by the September meeting we'll have a better direction for what the Commission wants to do. That gives us time by Red Book to make a decision. Dwane Kailey said his concern was the upcoming Red Book and that we have you prepared to make that decision.

Commissioner Howlett said one of the things I want to publically address today is perhaps making some changes in the way we do business in terms of the Commission taking the lead role in defining the priorities of their districts. That is a change from the way it's been. The way it's been has not been functional. We have been appointed to represent the issues of the people of our Districts and we need to be more engaged as a Commission in looking at what those priorities are. That's really our goal; we're here to tell you what the priorities of the Districts are and then you can accommodate the determined priorities. It's a dynamic change but it is a more engaged change. So for the time being this issue is tabled.

No action.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Commissioner Howlett reminded those making comment to keep their comments brief. We cannot take action on your comments today but we will take them into consideration and address them as best we can.

Wes Delano, Missoula

I live on 6th Street in Missoula. I am going to present briefly a community proposal. I have given you a handout to review. People who have lived on 5th and 6th Street in the adjacent neighborhoods as well users of 5th and 6th Street have had some issues for a number of years with the current configuration. Those issues range from property damage, speeding, and insufficient widths for travel trailers being passed by another motor vehicle. Additionally there is insufficient, and in some cases non-existing bicycle facilities along 6th Street. The configuration issues lead to property damage. People who live along 5th Street report their vehicles being struck by moving vehicles. There are incidents with bicycle contact that are problematic. Speeding is a rampant concern for people who live along 5th and 6th Street, the posted speed limit is 25 mph and obviously a two-lane configuration does not support the notion of travel at 25 mph. So in order to address some of these concerns the neighborhood got together and formed a Subcommittee.

That Subcommittee flushed out a number of ideas ranging from turning 5th and 6th Street back to two-way streets like they used to be decades ago. Proposals ranged from that idea to bulb-outs for calming speeds. Some people brought to the table the notion of roundabouts which has gained some popularity. We had a number of discussions and came to the conclusion and galvanized around the proposal that you see in front of you today – removing the one motorized travel lane on both 5th and 6th Street to provide dedicated space for alternative modes hopefully to curb the speeding issue and to mitigate the property damage issue.

At the community level we do understand that 5th and 6th Streets are urban routes and therefore fall under the purview of your administrative control. That's why we're here today – we want to keep the Commission abreast of this proposal as it develops in the community. We brought the proposal to the City's Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Board as well as the City Council Committee. So it is moving forward. It has a degree of support that is sufficient, in our opinion as well as public administrators in this city, to make it a priority in moving forward.

Basically I'm here today to let you know that the proposal exists and that people are excited about it and that it seems to be moving forward. If the Commission has any questions I'd be happy to answer them. Additionally if the Commission has any concerns I'd be happy to address some of those. In addition to that, we would like the Commission's partnership in sort of gaining an understanding of how we can move this proposal through the state level and find ourselves in a position of

implementation. My name and contact information are on the back of the handout I gave you.

Commissioner Howlett asked if there was a traffic count on either of the streets. Wes Delano said it is less than 4,000 on both.

Bob Luceno, Missoula

Good morning. I'm representing the members of the Cornerstone Homeowners Association in the mid to upper Rattlesnake Valley in Missoula. The officers could not be here because of vacations and neither could two of the City Council Representatives. I'm here to present you with some petitions. We have a historic route which is one of two principal corridors. It is a very narrow valley at the beginning of I-90 and the east Broadway interchange. It's about one quarter mile wide and tapers out at $\frac{3}{4}$ quarter mile wide. It's an old road in Missoula and it was here before Missoula was developed going back to Native American trails.

As you travel north here (referring to graphic) to Rattlesnake Drive, the first mile is a 25 mph speed limit. The next .6 mile increases to 30 mph. Interestingly, when it goes past Rattlesnake School with about 400 children and recently developed bulb-outs, it's still 30 mph. As we move north to the 2.4 mile marker, it increases to 35 mph. Then just a one tenth of a mile past that, it increases to 45 mph. Why – because it's probably always been that way.

Prior to about 1991 when the Cornerstone PUD was put in there, with approximately 75 homes and many other homes built since then in that stretch of about six tenths of a mile from that right-angle turn along the winery and before you get into the trees there is a posted speed limit of 45 mph. We have no shoulders; we have a path about 9 to 12 inches wide on each side of a two-lane asphalt road with borrow pits on both sides. We have hundreds of recreational cycles every day and every weekend especially in the warmer months going back and forth to the Rattlesnake Wilderness for rides, road rodding, and in addition we have neighbors who are riding and trying to navigate 9 inches of path which is ridiculous.

We have many deer crossing there. We have deer killed every year in this stretch and north into the trees where Jaden Johns lives – he's picking up multiple dead deer along his property. Interestingly when it moves into the trees north of this section past the winery, the limit goes down to 35 mph and remains 35 mph for another seven tenths of a mile in a really wooded and restricted area where there are more dead deer. North of that area it goes back to 25 mph.

So my point is that we had a fatality about a year ago with a gentleman on a motorcycle going south on the 45 mph strip who didn't negotiate the right angle turn correctly. We have a roll-over at that turn about every 18 months. It's just a disaster and a place where accidents are waiting to happen. I think the 45 mph speed limit has far out-lived its usefulness; it's a developed area now. There are so many homes built in that mid to upper rattlesnake area.

Commissioner Griffith asked if this was part of the City of Missoula. Bob Luceno said it is part of the city where it's posted 45 mph but there is a jurisdictional issue. The County Commissioners will talk more about that. The state apparently has some jurisdiction over this piece of road. Dwane Kailey said Agenda Item 14 addresses this issue.

Bob Luceno said to summarize, as our Homeowners Association delved into it, virtually every single person signed the petition and it didn't take any persuading. They all understand it's a problem. Only one person out of 170 didn't sign it. In this five-mile corridor, the speed limit changes six times. It remains 30 mph at Rattlesnake School. There are even sections in the wooded area where it is 35 mph

on one side and 25 mph on the other. It just needs some attention. Thank you that you're willing to take a look at this and thank you for your time. I'll leave these petitions with you and we hope you can work with the City Council Reps and the Public Works Committee. Thank you.

Jean Belangi Nye, Lolo

I'm Chair of the Missoula Lolo Alliance for Pathways. I've served on the Citizens Advisory Committee for Hwy 93 South from Florence for the Missoula Corridor Study and Missoula Long Range Transportation Plan and also the Bike Ped Path in Missoula. I'm here to address you on three separate items. Since Mr. Luceno spoke about one of them, this is a nice dove-tail.

In Lolo we have a serious problem also with speed limits. Coming into Lolo from the North, the speed limit is 45 mph until you hit Glacier Drive where it drops to 35 mph but during school hours it drops to 25 mph. Then as you get to Hwy 12 it goes back up to 35 mph and from Hwy 12 to the Community Center it is 35 mph. Coming in its 35 mph at the Community Center on one side of the street and going out its 45 mph. That would be okay except the Community Center is also the baseball fields and 1/3 of our students in Lolo live south of Hwy 12. So either they walk to school on the pathway or their parents drive them to school. At Morgan Creek which is just about one quarter mile from the Community Center we have a 50 mph speed limit. That wouldn't be so bad but just beyond Morgan Creek we've got a pull-off on the right next to the lake but there are two more streets coming off – Carris Lane and Delako. By the time you hit Carris Lane and Delako, the speed limit although it is posted 35 mph, is anywhere from 65 mph to 75 mph. I go to Carris Lane on a regular basis and I have to pull off to the shoulder of the road to avoid being it; even signaling or slowing down doesn't help.

In other states it seems that small communities have similar set speed limits of around 35 mph. Why in Montana do we have all these speed limits in these little communities? Lolo should be 35 mph from the north end to the entrance sign at the south end. It's really simple. We have approximately 4,000 people in our community, we have 650 kids who walk, ride, or bike, and play across that highway. It is definitely a dangerous highway. We've had three students hit, one was hit so severely that her medical damages were \$1 million the first year and she been under total care for the last 24 years. Simply I'd like to see consistent speed limits in every community in this State and in Lolo especially.

Number Two – you are all aware of problems with the median issue that arose in the Bitterroot on Hwy 93. I have to say that working with the guys in this Division for the last 20 years from Jim Weber all the way up to Ed and the entire crew has been a positive experience. One of the things that came out of that is when we're doing maintenance projects; it affects a community and its character. Is it possible to have a public meeting before the project is let so that the community knows what's going on and can have input into that project? Usually we don't have that with maintenance projects. If we could have some community input, then we wouldn't have so much controversy.

Number three – This is more for information because there isn't much you can do. There is an eight-mile stretch that doesn't have a pathway. The pathway from Lolo to Hamilton is basically 34 miles long. If we connected the Missoula-Lolo section, that would be a 54-mile pathway. Unfortunately the eight-mile section behind the school at Lolo is quite expensive to build and it's an extremely dangerous section of the highway. Eight thousand touring bicycles come through that section ever year and it's listed as one of the most dangerous highways in the United States. For people living in Lolo or Missoula who are biking or walking back and forth between the two communities, it's taking your life in your hands. It's a curvy road, its four lanes with 24,000 cars per day at 65 mph. We need a pathway. We've applied for a

Rural Tiger Grant. There's not much you can do about it unless you want to pick up the phone and call John Tester or Max Baucus for support. We just want you to be aware that this is a project that's been on-going for the last 15 years. Missoula-Lolo Trail Alliance has met yearly for the last 10 years and we've written multiple Grants. We got rejected on the last Flat Grant because it was \$8 million. We didn't make the \$3,300,000 selection on the Flat Grant from Missoula to Blue Mountain Road. So the Tiger Grant right now is our last option. We will be starting a capital campaign regardless of whether we get the Tiger Grant or not. I just want to say if there's any way that you could support this pathway, we would genuinely appreciate it.

Dwane Kailey said MDT is currently seeking applications for transportation alternatives programs for fiscal year 2013-14 funding. So we would recommend that you get that application done because that bike path would be eligible under that funding. Jean Belangi Nye asked if it was for \$6.5 million. We can do the first section is for \$395,000. The next section from Blue Mountain to Lolo is \$6.5 million.

Commissioner Howlett offered a commentary – we missed the boat on this. There is not a bike path there. As we plan future projects those are things that need to be part of the project. It was planned for going down to Hamilton and it's nice and it's used; there are people on it every time I drive it. I want everybody to understand there is only so much money that we can put towards bridges, bike paths, buses, interstate maintenance, etc. You've heard the projects that have come forward. It's not that we don't care and we're not concerned, it's what we can do with the limited resources we have to provide the safest possible opportunity for people to travel. I appreciate you coming forward today and expressing these concerns. We will give it consideration but we have a very difficult task to allocate the limited resources we have. Quite honestly we've spent the last three days just looking at projects in this District which consists of 13 counties in western Montana; two very local communities in Kalispell in Missoula. Just their requests alone exceed what we need to do in Troy, Arlee or wherever else. I want people to be aware that we don't have an infinite pot of money. We have a very difficult task. A project can take seven to eight years from the time it's nominated to the time we find the resources to get it done. I'm hopeful that we would begin to turn some attention to our own domestic infrastructure and put some resources toward that. It isn't just highways, its sewer lines, power lines, electric grid, and all kinds of things that need a whole bunch of attention that we've kind of let go. We share your anguish.

Jean Belangi Nye said I have one other comment. This brings things into perspective – the thing that got me involved in pathways was about 24 years ago when one of my students was hit in front of the Community Center. It was her fault; she was on a bicycle with no pathway. I was a new Principal. Her medical costs for the first year were one million dollars. The educational costs were \$3,000 for the second year at our school. There was a child who was in a car accident last year with similar injuries. Anyone who survives a bike accident at 35 mph alone would probably sustain these kinds of injuries. His bill was \$6.5 million for one year. That would build most of our pathway. As we start looking at the trade-offs, you're absolutely right. The problem with the section we're on and the reason it doesn't have a pathway is because the two Senators from Ravalli County and Missoula County came up with an idea in the 1960's that we were going to have an Interstate that ran through the Bitterroot Valley. Fortunately Mike Mansfield said we weren't going to go that way and instead build a four-lane highway but there were no amenities on that four-lane highway. I understand the trade-off and the infinite pot problem. There is an amendment before the US Senate, Amendment 1752, to eliminate all alternative transportation funding and put it towards building bridges, etc. We're in a very tight spot and I absolutely agree. Thank you and we'll keep you posted on our progress.

Monica Wessal, Missoula

My husband and I live in Missoula. My public comments today will reference the Maclay Bridge Project here in Missoula. As I understand it, a few years ago this Commission approved pending funding for a project to build a new bridge across the Bitterroot River to replace the current single-lane bridge that is located in south Missoula known as Maclay Bridge. This was a controversial issue and it continues to be. The Missoula County Commissioners accepts funding from MDT to conduct a pre-NEPA study to assess all possible alternatives. The recommendation by the Planning Team was to construct a new bridge at the end of South Avenue. From day one there has been overwhelming opposition by the Target Range Community to build a new bridge to replace the current Maclay Bridge. Some members of the Planning Team have indicated that we're just a group of people who don't like the recommendation and that couldn't be further from the truth. We're a neighborhood community who does not believe that serious consideration has been given to rehabilitate and preserve the current bridge as we've supported and believe our comments, for the most part, have fallen on deaf ears through this planning process.

Our neighborhood went as far as hiring our own Bridge Engineer to evaluate the possibility of rehabilitating Maclay Bridge, our neighborhood bridge. We raised over \$4,000 at a fund raiser to pay for his services. In 2010 the Target Range Community, with assistance from County Planning staff, completed a neighborhood plan which was signed by our County Commissioners and was adopted into the Missoula Growth Policy. In that neighborhood plan, 88% of respondents indicated that preserving the rural character of Target Range was very important, 11% somewhat important and only 1% not very important. And the neighborhood plan did not identify a need for a new bridge. That's 99% of our community who believed maintaining the rural character of our neighborhood is important.

In reviewing this, I tried to do a lot of research on the history of this Commission, and in reviewing minutes of your meetings last year on July 26, 2012, and September 27, 2012, there was much discussion and explanation on the passage of the new Federal Transportation Bill. On July 26, 2012, Kevin McLaury with the Federal Highway Administration told you that "States and the Commission now have the ability to direct where funds are going whereas in the past you didn't have that flexibility. The Transportation Construction Plan is needs driven – identify the needs, the worst first." At your September 27th meeting, Mr. McLaury told you that "you would be getting \$340 million of spendable authority and our process determines where it goes. We have to use every bit of that by September 20th or it goes back into a pot and gets redirected to states that use it." At that same meeting, Lynn Zanto told you that the Bridge Program will be a stand-alone program and "we have to make sure we spend a certain amount on off-system bridges, but again the funding source truly is from either the National Highway Performance or Safety Transportation Program." The minutes also reflect the bridge program is moving forward referencing the minimum funding thresholds in MAP 21 and Montana vastly exceeds those thresholds. Maclay Bridge is considered an off-system bridge and there appears to be an abundance of money to spend to build a new bridge. My concern is that the need to spend the money or lose it if you don't use it, far outweighs any local opposition to consider other options to rehab and preserve historic Maclay Bridge.

With that said I respectfully ask that if you can, please consider spending funding at this time for the Maclay Bridge project and allow the historic preservation option the chance to move forward to determine if it truly is a viable choice mitigating the safety issues that have been raised about the current bridge. Although there have been recent strides in preserving historic bridges, too many still succumb to needless replacement. According to the National Trust for Historic Preservation our nation's bridges are being destroyed at the alarming rate of one every two or three days. Lack

of maintenance and a knee-jerk preference for replacement often counter the directive of Congress that historic bridges be preserved whenever possible.

Most of the residents in Target Range in Missoula love this bridge and if there's a way to save it, maintaining its rural, cultural, and historic significance, I would hope you give that consideration. Just as important is not spending tax dollars on a project when \$1 million dollars can be spent to rehab this bridge versus in excess of over \$8 million to build a new one.

In closing, prior to our move to Montana, my husband and I came here from Louisiana, I served as a Louisiana State Representative in the Louisiana Legislature from 2003-2008. During that time I participated in numerous meetings that allowed for public comment. I have always had a deep belief and conviction that the places of the people are important and they need to be heard. It was always important to me in whatever meeting I was in to listen to those words and as a Representative to keep an open mind. Sitting on this side of the table at this point in my life, I believe those words even more now. I sincerely appreciate the opportunity to talk to you. If there's flexibility in funding, maybe there is some bridge money that can build a pathway between Lolo and Missoula. It's getting creative with funding.

Helen Orendain, Missoula

I live at 2555 Blue Mountain Road in Missoula, figuratively in the shadow of the Maclay Bridge. That is the topic I wish to discuss this morning. Actually I was not familiar with your Commission. At first I wondered if this was a rubber-stamp group, however, after many inquiries I learned your Commission is industrious and dependable and known for probing research. Thank you for your diligence.

Maclay Bridge is one-lane, historic, and eligible to be on the National Historic Registry for Historic Places. The bridge spans the Bitterroot River west of Missoula. It maintains a high health index – safe, functional, and suits the temp and rural mood of the area creating a traffic calming aspect. Maclay is the gateway to a beautiful recreation area including prime trout fishing spots for rainbow, brown, cutthroat, and whitefish. Further on to Blue Mountain Road there are hiking trails and the renowned Blue Mountain Recreation Area. It is a treasure enjoyed by all of the community. This is not a neighborhood issue.

Recently the Missoula County Commissioners have moved against the consensus of the Missoula City and County residents by voting to replace the bridge with a two-lane structure which will permanently change the character of the area. Narrow, winding, rural roads will need to be widened to accommodate increased traffic as collector roads. Trees will be removed to accommodate the widening. Wildlife will be jeopardized and property condemned. The high cost of the infrastructure changes are not factored into the bridge costs. Property tax payers will bear that burden.

In my mind I compare the potential loss of our recreational oasis to that of Butte losing the Columbia Gardens. As a child when I would visit my mother's home town, we would make a bee-line for the Columbia Gardens. That's been lost for 40 years! When you consider that tenacity and the vigor of the Butte community, once it's gone, it's gone! If they couldn't do it, it's gone. The pre-NEPA Feasibility Study failed to get public input having Planning Meetings held at MDT headquarters. The public would attend but they were to be seen and not heard. Hence there was no dialogue in a timely fashion.

The renderings of the Rehab Maclay Bridge prepared by a bridge expert engineer, complete with an attached pedestrian bike walkway, was ignored by this Study. No exploration of alternative options was studied. A rehab bridge would cost just under \$1 million; a fraction of the cost of the new two lane.

Since retiring from my law practice, I have been involved in the tourist industry renting vacation homes, meeting people from all over the country including Canada. Visitors consistently praise the beauty of Missoula and the advantage of a close-in recreation area. It is sad to think Missoula's natural created treasure is in jeopardy. We ask that funds for a new two-lane bridge be held in abeyance until we can explore other viable options. Recently we've learned about the Treasure State Endowment Program which may, just may, be able to match county funds to rehab the bridge. It is important that we respect the sentiment of the people. We ask you to listen.

Alex Taft, City Council, Missoula

I'm a City Councilman for the University District, the Rosa Parks neighborhood, and the river front area that you heard about earlier. For the record, I think those people need relief from problems of speeding traffic.

I come before you today to talk about Item 14 & 15 on the Agenda – Reducing the speed limits on Rattlesnake Drive. To give you some context, Missoula has a focus-inward growth policy which has been established for many years. We have a transportation policy that backs up the growth policy. That means that we have decided to preserve our open space where we can and we've had several bond issues to do that. We are trying to retain our agricultural resources around the city. Alternatively we are encouraging development within town so that we don't sprawl out and endanger those areas. We do that through housing development and general economic development. Fortunately the Legislature saw to it that we would receive \$29 million to help with that. We have the college right in the middle of town. We are building 1,000 new apartments for students. If you go on Russell and California Streets – Russell Street is a transportation project that compliments the housing development that is taking place there and you can see new construction happening today.

Another element of this focus inward approach supported by the transportation policy is to not only make the city accessible by car and commercial vehicles, but also transit alternatives. When you do that kind of thing, you need to have a roadway system that can accommodate all those modes of traffic. The so-called alternative modes of biking, walking, and transit can take cars off the street giving us more actual capacity on the street.

To do that well and safely we need slow speeds. The old adage that "speed kills" is correct. There have also been recent studies over the last several years that show different speeds kill at different rates and injure at different rates. So if we can lower speed limits, which we've had some success where we have control of the roadways and others where we've asked you. If we can do that we are going to be supporting our growth inward policy and our transportation policy. So I urge you to approve those two Urban system segments to lower the speed limit from 45 mph to 35 mph so we can continue with this policy as well as provide safe access and mobility.

Bob Jaffe, City Councilman, Missoula

I'm also a City Councilman representing the same district. I just want to dove-tail his comments quickly. First with the 5th and 6th Street project – it is something that I find extremely interesting and an opportunity for us to greatly enhance our flexible infrastructure in Missoula, bicycle and pedestrian structures which is a high priority for us.

Ed Childers, City Councilman, Missoula

I appreciate you coming to Missoula for your meeting and thank you for serving. A number of things have come up. The trail between Lolo and Missoula is an absolutely wonderful idea and if there is something that can be done to help that, I

think it would be great. Maclay Bridge is an issue I'm going to stay as far away from as I possibly can. I'm skeptical of the 5th and 6th Street redesign. I think it's a great idea and certainly worth looking at. It's interesting because I hear that narrower roads and lower speeds are a good thing and now we have a narrow road that should lower speeds and it doesn't. So it's certainly an interesting dilemma to consider. As far as the speed limits, we have some legacy speed limits. We've done a lot of building and there's a lot more density there now and those certainly need to be reduced to 35 mph. I think that's reasonable. In the future we'll probably continue to come back to you for lower speed limits. One more thing – there seems to be some sort of jurisdictional question over who gets to set those speed limits on roads. That's been settled and it's you guys. Thank you.

Representative Nancy Wilson, Missoula

I'm a Representative for HD 97 which does include residents close to Maclay Bridge. I am here to say that they are adamantly opposed to a two-lane bridge increasing traffic throughout the whole area and changing that whole beautiful area. I believe the folks here are doing a great job of telling you about that.

The thing I'm here to talk to you about is that I hope that public comment is considered and responded to and not just checked off. It's really important that we take public comment, listen to it, and incorporate it in our decisions. I know that you want to do that. I appreciate you being here to hear everyone's comments so that you can take them to heart and see what you can do to incorporate them into your funding proposals and your projects. I want to thank you for being here and I hope that you'll take the opportunity while you're here to see some of the great projects that Missoula has gotten done by being the squeaky wheel and wanting to do things different. We've done some things that I think the rest of the state is excited about. We've done them with you folks sometimes kicking and screaming and sometimes taking you're funding away, but in the end helping us and in the end seeing a project that we all really love. So I really encourage you to go look at the Arthur, 5th & 6th Street, and the Madison Street intersection - the gateway to the University. It was a project we fought over for many years that ultimately everyone is very pleased with and that is working beautifully for all modes of transportation. The reason it is working beautifully is because of the highly incorporated transit modes – in fact traffic numbers are dropping in that area instead of increasing as was projected by the Department because we've added frequent transit service.

We've also made some brilliant changes to connections to the trail increasing biking and walking in that area. I believe the last number I heard was 56% and it may be higher than that – it's huge. We can do some really interesting things but we need flexibility. I appreciate the Commission and the Department really listening to the public because they are the ones who know. They are literally on the streets and know what will work in their community. It's really important to not bring cookie-cutter responses to our communities. It's important to listen to the community and look at the infrastructure around that community and what that community desires as you're doing these road projects. Roads change your community; they are a huge part of changing the community. The community needs to be involved and we appreciate you coming here to see what we have to offer and how engaged our community is in our transportation efforts. Thank you.

Melinda Barnes, Helena

I'm the Executive Director of Bike / Walk Montana. I've met with Director Tooley, Lynn Zanto and Dwane Kailey and I really appreciate each of them taking the time to meet with me and their responsiveness. I have a really great feeling that we're going to be able to work well together and I'm really happy about that.

The reason I'm here today is that I also recognize that you have the decision-making and the approval authority. So I just want to ask you to please consider all users in our transportation mix in making decisions that affect our roadways. Please consider bicyclists and pedestrians as well as motorists whether it's in communities or whether it's out there on the highways. Imagine yourself as a bicyclist or tourist going down a highway that has a two-foot or less shoulder. I've seen bicyclists with bags on the back of their bikes at least two feet wide going down a two-foot shoulder with 70 mph motorists passing them; it's not a very safe feeling. Then consider a rumble strip being put down the two-foot shoulder and now all of sudden that cyclist is pushed out in the traffic. So I just ask you to take those kinds of things into consideration when you are looking at projects and reviewing them.

I also want to say that I appreciate the importance that you've put on safety. I've attended a couple of your meetings before and in talking with the MDT personnel about how important safety is and how they guide your decisions, I really appreciate that.

Bob Schweitzer, Missoula

Thank you for allowing me to come before you. My wife and I own five green acres in Missoula about four miles west of Maclay Bridge. I would like to say first off that we're here to spend less; we're not trying to get more money out of you for anything. I would like to begin by saying that Maclay Bridge has been nominated for replacement by Missoula County. The intent of that nomination was never for rehabilitation; it was nominated specifically for the purpose of replacing it. There are a number of folks who will deny that. Maclay Bridge is a historic bridge and it's eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. This project is being promoted as a locally supported project, but it is not. First off, over three years ago we submitted a petition before the County Commissioners of over 1,100 signatures asking them to deprioritize the replacement of Maclay Bridge. That went directly in the circular file.

The Target Range folks got together and wrote their own plan and people from both sides of the river that are not in the Target Range neighborhood participated in the writing of that plan. It spoke very well for maintaining Maclay Bridge and keeping it in good condition because it is important. It asked that no replacement be considered. That was blown over in a recent study as was the social manufacture of the new two-lane bridge. The two-lane project has now progressed to a NEPA study following the 13-month pre-NEPA study that was advertised to be unbiased regarding present conditions. The Maclay Bridge study was anything but unbiased. It never did consider rehabilitation. There were four public hearings on the issue each attended by over 100 participants and their comments were dutifully appended to the study but really given no consideration yet 75% to 85% of those participants strongly opposed a new bridge and favored rehabilitation.

These people felt strongly enough about it that they hired a registered engineer well experienced in rehabilitation and also experienced specifically with Maclay Bridge. He prepared a plan that added guards to the trusses to remove fracture critical status which is offensive to Missoula County. Most of the users don't care that's its fracture critical or not but the county does. The plan also added the separated bicycle pedestrian walkway for safe crossing. We also suggest that they use the entire right of way along River Pines Road and not to widen the road but to add a separated pedestrian bicycle path. This plan was developed with a cost under \$1 million dollars. The plan was summarily dismissed and replaced with the recommendation that they implement a two-lane bridge at a cost of \$7.4 million for the bridge and approaches.

Why don't they want to keep this old bridge? Because of the traffic calming effect of the old bridge – people have to slow down, they have to beware of the traffic approaching, and they have to stop for stop signs approaching it. It's a natural

slowing element in the area that if replaced the first thing to happen would be roundabouts installed to slow the traffic. We don't need the roundabouts and we don't need slowing traffic under the present circumstances. We've asked why a new bridge is necessary, we've been told for safety sake. That is always the fallback yet when they site numbers of accidents, they don't talk about the cost of these accidents. When asked about the reason for the accidents, the majority recite excessive speed. In spite of the fact that there have been no fatalities there because narrow roads slow people down enough that the accidents don't cause fatalities. They tell us there are nearly 3,000 vehicles per day crossing the bridge right now. I have no reason to doubt that. People stop and wait and what I've observed is that the long wait for opposing traffic on that bridge can be 30 seconds and most cross in less than 20 seconds. On Reserve Street you have to wait 3 minutes for a cycle change.

It should be clear that we cannot bring all bridges and roads up to current standards and we should not want to. That route has been used for the Missoula marathon which brings over one million participants per year into Missoula. One of the photo backdrops was Maclay Bridge this year. It is prized by the community. You've heard about the recreational aspects and we ask that you please consider that in any requests for funding.

Peggy Morrison, Missoula

I live at 4415 South Avenue West in Target Range. I will not reiterate all of the things that have been said before me. First of all I have a copy of the Rehab Plan presented by our engineer. It contains the real cost of what it would take to rehab the bridge – it comes out to approximately \$1 million dollars.

I was one of those individuals who sat in on the Planning Meetings every three weeks. It was often hard to be a mouse in the corner who couldn't squeak but we did because we wanted to be in on the conversations. The screening process that was used in pre-NEPA made it impossible for any rehab proposition or proposal to rise to the top. It was apparent in looking at the criteria that there was only one direction this thing could go – a new bridge.

Every time safety comes up the question in my mind is can they prove to me that a two-lane is safer than the bridge we have right now. I know there was information given out stating that we had a killer bridge, that people died at Maclay Bridge. In doing research, in the last ten years unfortunately one individual did die in the area. It was a teenager, fully clothed walking alone, non-swimmer who was walking along the side of the river and the riverbed gave way and he ended up in the water and he drowned. He was not on the bridge; he was simply in the area.

The character of the neighborhood is extremely important to me. It's a quiet rural area. The traffic right now isn't that bad and I live right on South Avenue. If you follow the traffic from north that is transferred onto South, it's going to become a thoroughfare. What comes to mind is what happened to South Avenue when Russell Street was built. If you have driven on South Avenue between Brooks and Reserve, you will notice that most of the houses have become commercial businesses. I foresee that if we get a two-lane bridge at the end of South of Avenue, that Reserve to that bridge will convert to commercial. It's a reasonable thing to have happen – lots of traffic, put your business there.

In any of the discussions on the pre-NEPA that have asked about the infrastructure, Four-Corners toward Bryan Creek, River Pines Road and Big Flat Road will not handle increased traffic brought by a two-lane bridge. That will have to be updated. What about the structure on the road from Hummel to Clemens? Any time these questions are brought up, we're told "sorry we're not discussing that; it's outside the purview of the scope of this particular study" and yet it's very much in it. I'm going to have to pay for those upgrades and so will ever other resident of Missoula County.

Where do we go from here? I don't know but I know there are a lot of very educated folks that live in Big Flat, Bryan Creek, Blue Mountain and Target Range east of the river who are putting their heads together and all of their expertise saying this isn't going to work. I appreciate your time this morning; thank you very much.

Fred Steward, Missoula

I live in the Target Range area. I've been involved in the community issues for more than 20 years and I've spent a lot of time going door-to-door talking to individuals over the years so I have a fairly good idea of those things that are of interest to the community. I'm not a politician and I'm not running for office. In the most recent process on Maclay Bridge study, the focus was on engineering and the community and economic impacts are not well represented. Those characteristics are very hard to measure. I'm not minimizing the difficulty of doing that but those are the things that matter to the people who live there. What we call "quality of life" again is something that is very hard to measure but that's what's reflected in those numbers that were mentioned about the fact that 99% of the people surveyed said that the rural character of the community was either very important or important to them. So those were the things that were not well considered in the study that was presented and led to the Commissioners wanting to move forward with the funding and the NEPA study. I was at the TPCC Meeting last week and the vote was 4-3 in terms of whether to support moving forward with this particular study going to the NEPA stage.

I want to just point out that there is a lot of controversy and it's not something that has a lot of community support. I understand the Commissioners wanting to be able to utilize money when it's available to proceed with a project they feel is necessary. The community by a large margin feels that the existing bridge could be brought up to deal with many of the safety standards that are concerning people for much less money than the two lane.

I sincerely thank you for being here and giving us a forum and an opportunity to talk to you. I would also offer that if you have an hour after the meeting to give you a site visit. Let's go take a look at the bridge so that it's not an abstraction; you'll have a sense of how it fits into the community and the flow traffic on that structure, the short-comings and things that could be addressed with the very realistic rehab project option that we tried to get evaluated in the Maclay Bridge Study that, for some reason we don't understand, was not included. I will be here until the end of your meeting and I would be glad to take an hour and give you some sense of what is involved from a community perspective. Thank you very much for your time; I really appreciate it.

Commissioner Howlett said he wanted to assure the participants of a couple of things. We listen. I ask in the opening invocation that we have open ears and that we're sincere about what we do. Really it's a county decision. It's an off-system bridge. I don't know what we can do – possibly not approve the project. I'm not suggesting anything at this point. It is something we all take a real interest in knowing how you feel and what your impacts are. We spent the last two days touring this District, not just urban but out in the brush. We looked at small communities and speed limits and bridges that were failing that we don't seem to have money to replace. We checked out an entire national highway. We talked this morning about re-ordering priorities and we intend to do that. What we really want to know is that what we're doing addresses the real issue of safety, that it preserves the integrity of our communities, that it accommodates the desires of the people who travel our roads. With any study we can find fault but what we really want to know is if we left out some critical elements and how do we mitigate those. No study is perfect, no study addresses every issue but they haven't moved any dirt yet so we'll take a look at

this. I don't know what the next process is – we'll have to sit down with staff and determine that.

I thank you all for coming. It's great that the community of Missoula, as diverse as you are, seems to agree on this. I tell my colleagues that nobody in the community of Missoula agrees on anything. I live in Arlee and I'm in Missoula a lot and graduated from the University and it's always been that way. Missoula is a real diverse community but that is what makes it unique. Again thank you; I appreciate you coming. This Commission is committed to doing good public service and part of that is listening to you and your concerns.

Commissioner Howlett said that was good public comment session. We heard some concerns from the crowd. I don't know that any decision will change. We need to work with the Department but I would like to know how the comments made were not incorporated into some final decision. It's a local decision but I think it's absolutely important that we listen to what they have to say. I understand there is another side to the story. There must be minutes of the meetings that were held and I'd like to get a copy of those minutes and distribute them to each Commissioner so we could know what the comments were and we'll go from there.

Agenda Item 12: Speed Limit Recommendation US310 Bridger

Dwane Kailey presented the Speed Study Recommendation for US310 – Bridger to the Commission. Bridger County reached out to us and asked us to look at the speed limit. We are looking at extending the speed limit. We looked at the crash history and the accident history and the traveling speeds in the area. We are recommending the following adjustment:

A 45 mph speed limit beginning at station 1344+50, project F 258(15) (50' south of Cemetery Rd.) and continuing north to station 1358+00, an approximate distance of 1,350 feet.

A 35 mph speed limit beginning at station 1358+00, project F 258(15) (south side of Jim Bridger Rd.) and continuing north to station 4+00, an approximate distance of 850 feet.

A 25 mph speed limit beginning at station 4+00, project F 170(16) (500' south of Carbon Ave.) and continuing north to station 2+00, an approximate distance of 2,200 feet.

A 35 mph speed limit beginning at station 2+00, project F 4-1(5) (300' south of Yellowstone Ave.) and continuing north to station 10+00, an approximate distance of 800 feet.

A 45 mph speed limit beginning at station 10+00, project F 4-1(5) (500' north of Yellowstone Ave.) and continuing north to station 18+00, an approximate distance of 800 feet.

The Department recommends approval from the Commission.

Commissioner Skelton moved to approve the Speed Limit Recommendation for US 310 – Bridger. Commissioner Lambert seconded the Motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimous.

Agenda Item 13: Speed Limit Recommendation US 93 – Victor

Dwane Kailey presented the Speed Limit Recommendation, US 93 – Victor to the Commission. I believe most of you know about the reconstruction in this area. With the completion of the US 93 – Victor Urban project, Ravalli County officials submitted a request to expand the 45 mph speed zone in Victor to encompass the intersection with Victor Crossing to the south and the Sweathouse Creek Bridge on the north end of town.

Based on an engineering investigation of the operational characteristics we proposed modifying the existing 45 mph speed zone outward some and introducing new 55 mph speed zones on either end of the community. In reviewing our findings and proposed recommendations local officials submitted comments indicating their preference to expand the 45 mph speed zone as originally requested. The District office also supported local official desires.

In discussing this issue beyond present driver behavior and taking into account other views and concepts such as the urban design interface and its value to this and other communities along US 93, we recommend a two-fold approach. The first being Commission approval of the engineering recommendation that coincides with community desires. Secondly, an interim speed limit recommendation on the north end of study area. With approval this will permit us to further investigate the matter at a later date as well as provide a select case study for a previously nominated research project “Speed Limits Set Lower than Engineering Recommendations”. Our findings would then be submitted to local officials for further review prior arriving at a final recommendation for action.

Technical Recommendation

A 55 mph speed limit beginning at (metric) station 162+80, project NH 7-1(115) (0.4-mile south of Victor Crossing) and continuing north to station 168+00, an approximate distance of 520 meters or 1,700 feet.

A 45 mph speed limit beginning at (metric) station 168+00, project NH 7-1(115) (100 meters south of Victor Crossing) and continuing north to station 177+00, an approximate distance of 900 meters or 3,000 feet.

A 55 mph speed limit beginning at (metric) station 177+00, project NH 7-1(115) (140 meters south of Mountain View Dr.) and continuing north to station 181+40, an approximate distance of 440 meters or 1,400 feet.

Interim Recommendation

A 45 mph speed limit beginning at (metric) station 177+00, project NH 7-1(115) (140 meters south of Mountain View Dr.) and continuing north to station 181+40, an approximate distance of 440 meters or 1,400 feet.

A 55 mph speed limit beginning at (metric) station 181+40, project NH 7-1(115) and continuing north to station 184+40, an approximate distance of 300 meters or 1,000 feet.

The County would like to incorporate Meridian Road within the 45 mph. When we looked at it, the traveling speeds weren't the 85th percentile; however, when we designed this project we also placed curbs and gutter which included that section of roadway. We have a project that we are moving forward on and about a year from now we'll look at it and bring it back to the Commission for the final decision. The Department recommends Commission approval.

Commissioner Howlett said if we've had the discussion before about the accordion speed limits, doesn't it make sense to have one reduced speed through that area. I understand the 85th percentile but because vehicles are traveling faster than the speed limit, that to me doesn't justify raising the speed limit. Dwane Kailey said we are actually going further north than what the county has requested. We are going about 500 feet further north for the 45 mph speed limit. We would like to look at the curb and gutter and whether it is more conducive in getting the traveling public to slow down to the 45 mph speed limit.

Commissioner Griffith asked about the south bound traffic being slowed to 35 mph. The signs would provide notice to the public and thus increase safety in the area. He asked Dwane to address that? Dwane Kailey said in the interim we are actually recommending going further north, so again we're beyond what the county is asking. The reason is because of the design of the roadway. Commissioner Griffith said we're in the middle of a dilemma with the speed limit we enacted two meetings ago. Now the county is saying we went too far. I don't like being put in that position. What is your rationale for the interim being extended? Dwane Kailey said the rationale is that we would like to deal with the amenities that were built with this project; in particular the curb and gutter. From experience we prefer not to have curb and gutter in anything greater than a 45 mph speed zone, so we would like the opportunity to go out and study the effect it is having on the traffic, hence the need for the interim request.

Commissioner Griffith said we are reducing the speed limit as an interim, correct? Dwane Kailey said yes. Commissioner Griffith said then we are going to come back and re-look at it after the curb and gutter is replaced, correct? Dwane Kailey said the curb and gutter is actually in place now. We would like to look at the posted speed of 45 mph to see if it is conducive to slowing the public down. There was a study done by WDI that actually recognizes that curbs are conducive to reducing speed. So we want to see if the characteristics out there are conducive to corresponding to the 45 mph speed limit through the curb and gutter area. Commissioner Howlett asked if the county was going to come back saying they didn't want it that far out. Dwane Kailey said we have presented this to the county and gotten feedback from them.

Commissioner Lambert asked about the north end and the 45 mph speed limit. Dwane Kailey said we are recommending that be 45 mph and include the curb and gutter. Commissioner Howlett said it seems to me we ought to look at the boundaries that are there and not speculate about it and to extend it looking for an answer. We have requests, we've done the study and the study indicates 45 mph within the requested area and I'm okay with that. I'm just not okay with going out further. Dwane said the study did not coincide with what the county was requesting on the north end. We were about 500 feet short of what they requested on the 45 mph speed limit. That's why we would like to look at an interim speed limit to look at the amenities out there. Commissioner Howlett asked why not just extend the 45 mph another 500 feet. Dwane said the Commission has that authority to adopt a speed limit as requested today or you can adopt it in accordance with what the county has requested with the interim speed limit, or some other fashion along that route.

Commissioner Lambert Skelton moved to approve the Ravalli County request for US 93 – Victor. Commissioner Lambert seconded the Motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimous.

Agenda Item 14: Interim Speed Limit Recommendation Rattle Snake Road – Missoula

Dwane Kailey presented the Interim Speed Limit Recommendation, Rattle Snake Road – Missoula to the Commission. This was discussed in the public comment session earlier. The history is that the City Council has requested a reduced speed on Rattle Snake Road. There is a section in there that is currently posted 25 mph. We are requesting that it be posted 35 mph. To be timely and get this before the Commission as soon as we could, what we are bringing to you today is an interim speed limit request. The city is currently working on a speed study but it was not done in time for this Commission meeting. So we're asking for an interim of 35 mph until we can bring the speed study before you which should be ready for the September meeting.

Kevin Slovarp, Missoula City Engineer

The City Council passed a resolution setting temporary speed limits on both this agenda item and the subsequent agenda item. We didn't realize that we didn't have jurisdiction to set speed limits on those roads. So the request before you is for a temporary limit reduction until I can finish the speed study and get that to MDT for review and bring it before the Commission. Essentially for Rattle Snake Drive, as you heard from the public, the 45 mph speed zone is located between two 35 mph zones essentially with the same road geometry. So we are recommending a temporary reduction at this time based on driver expectations and consistency of the speed limit. This recommendation can be supported. Commissioner Howlett asked if his recommendation was for 35 mph through the duration of the drive. Kevin Slovarp said yes, that is the recommendation.

Commissioner Cobb asked how long we could have an interim speed pending the completion of the study. Tim Reardon said it was until the Engineering Study is completed. There is no time constraint of the statute but the historic preference of the Commission has been within one year. The local government can finish the study and present it to you with the concurrence of MDT's engineering staff. That can be presented at any time. Commissioner Cobb asked if an interim speed limit was a way around doing a study. Tim Reardon said we ask the engineer to go out and drive the route along with the local government and they just make an educated guess based on their observation of the roadside culture and determine if the speed is too high. That includes everything from pedestrians, bike users, to site distances, changes in construction and so forth. So if the traffic engineer reaches the conclusion that it is too fast then we will lower the speed temporarily until we can get a completed study.

Commissioner Griffith moved to approve the Interim Speed Limit Reduction request for Rattle Snake Road. Commissioner Lambert seconded the Motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimous.

Agenda Item 15: Interim Speed Limit Recommendation Mullan Road

Dwane Kailey presented the Interim Speed Limit Recommendation, Mullan Road to the Commission. This is a request for a temporary reduced speed limit for Mullan Road. The segment of Mullan Road that the City of Missoula would like to request a temporary speed limit be set is between Reserve Street and W. Broadway Street. This roadway segment is approximately 0.87 miles in length and is located just north of the Clark Fork River toward the eastern City Limits. The current speed limit for this segment of Mullan Road is 45 mph and the request is to temporarily reduce the speed limit to 35 mph. The following were observations from the site study:

- There is an existing continual two-way center turn lane.
- It is a fully developed corridor with mostly businesses but some multifamily residential units adjacent to the roadway.
- A striped bike lane is adjacent to the vehicular lane in both directions.
- Sidewalks are present on both sides of the roadway but are adjacent to the curb.
- The existing speed limits on Reserve Street and W. Broadway Street at Mullan Road are 45 mph and 35 mph respectively.
- This is a busy roadway segment during the day with motor vehicle traffic, bicyclists and pedestrians constantly using the corridor.

Driver expectations for a three-lane facility in the City of Missoula is a factor relating to the temporary speed limit request as other three-lane roadways in Missoula are less than 45 mph.

Kevin Slovarp, Missoula City Engineer

Essentially this is a busy roadway segment during the day with vehicle traffic, bicyclists, and pedestrians of all age groups. We recently had a pedestrian fatality on this roadway. The Council, as many testified earlier, is requesting a temporary speed limit reduction. Again I will be working on these speed studies on both routes in the near future and collecting some of the data and then I will write it up and get it to the District to review and then forward it on to the Commission.

I want to take a quick opportunity to thank the District staff. They are very good to work with – Ed Toavs and Shane Stack. I also want to thank Jack Nye and Glenn Cameron who were really good to work with. We appreciate their hard work.

Commissioner Cobb said once the study is done will it change any of this? Dwane Kailey said in this case no. Tim Reardon said we like to utilize these interim speeds simply because it takes quite a while to get the study we need. If there is a perceived danger and risk out there, the utilization of an interim has been beneficial to allow safety for the users out there.

Commissioner Lambert moved to approve the Interim Speed Limit Reduction request for Mullan Road. Commissioner Griffith seconded the Motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimous.

Agenda Item 16: Letting Lists

Dwane Kailey presented the Letting Lists to the Commission for July through September. We are asking for your approval. We've got three projects to present and some others that are ready to go. ... (inaudible) ...

Commissioner Griffith moved to approve the Letting Lists. Commissioner Lambert seconded the Motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimous.

***Agenda Item 17: Certificates of Completion
April & May, 2013***

Dwane Kailey presented the Certificates of Completion for April & May, 2013 to the Commission. Staff recommends approving the Certificates of Completion for April

& May 2013. It was about six months ago that we started setting DBE project specific goals. The DBE goal in the first column (referring to handout) will be zero for a little while. The second column shows how much DBE participation the Contractor disclosed when he bid the job. Then the last column shows how much we paid out to a DBE. Commissioner Howlett asked if the DBE process was working. Dwane Kailey said yes. Director Tooley said he had seen a report that went to Federal Highways, our DBE goal for the year is 5.83%, and right now the Department is sitting at 8.45%. So it's the first time ever that we might actually meet the DBE goal.

Commissioner Griffith moved to approve the Certificates of Completion for April & May, 2013. Commissioner Lambert seconded the Motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimously.

**Agenda Item 18: Project Change Orders
April & May, 2013**

Dwane Kailey presented the Project Change Orders for April & May, 2013 to the Commission. Staff recommends approval.

<i>Month</i>	<i>Total</i>
April 2013	1,219,671.49
May 2013	596,683.29
	\$1,816,354.78

Commissioner Howlett noted that we've seen how some of these change orders can affect the project when we discover these outcrop of rock and how unstable they are. It's not uncommon to look at these more complex projects and having to change what was bid. I was commenting to Commissioner Griffith that when you see all these change orders in District One not to get too alarmed because we've got some real complex projects in that District.

Commissioner Griffith moved to approve the Project Change Orders for April & May, 2013. Commissioner Lambert seconded the Motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 19: Liquidated Damages

Dwane Kailey presented the Liquidated Damages to the Commission. We have one project for your review. Sletten Construction had an overage of 12 days on the Kiowa Jct – Hudson Bay Divide Project for a total amount of \$34,668. They are not disputing those charges. You do not have to take any action on this item unless you wish to adjust those charges.

Stand.

**Agenda Item 20: Amended Access Control Resolution
NH 8-4(27)58; US 287 Passing Lanes 3377**

Dwane Kailey presented the Amended Access Control Resolution, NH 8-4(27)58; US 287 Passing Lanes 3377 to the Commission. We are recommending this to maintain consistency throughout the corridor.

The route for Montana Department of Transportation Project NH 8-4(27)58 begins on the centerline of U.S. Highway 287 (P-8) at a point approximately 12.71 km (7.90 miles) southeast of East Helena, Montana (Reference Point 57.5), which said point is located in the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 8, Township 9 North, Range 1 West, PMM, Broadwater County, Montana and extends southeasterly along said centerline a distance of 77.41 km (48.10 miles) to a point of ending on said centerline on the section line common to the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 4 and the NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 3, Township 2 North, Range 1 East, PMM, Broadwater County, Montana, approximately 3.70 km (2.30 miles) North of the junction of U.S. Highway 287 and Interstate 90 (Reference Point 105.6), as the route for said Project NH 8-4(27)58 has been located, surveyed, planned and designed by the Montana Department of Transportation.

Locations of the limited access controlled areas are at the following reference points:

Location 1 (Baum Road):	RP 57.5 to RP 59.5
Location 2 (North of Silos):	RP 67.6 to RP 70.3
Location 3 (South of Toston):	RP 89.1 to RP 95.9
Location 4 (North of Three Forks):	RP 102.1 to RP 105.6
Location 5 (Filson Quarter Circle Rd):	RP 60.6 to RP 62.0

Commissioner Griffith moved to approve the Amended Access Control Resolution, NH 8-4(27)58; US 287 Passing Lanes 3377. Commissioner Lambert seconded the Motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimous.

Agenda Item 21: Design Build I-90 Rockfall Mitigation West of Drexel

Dwane Kailey said we had a little bit of an event on this Agenda Item 21. MDT has been working on this design build for a slide up on I-90. We had planned to have that completed and present this for award, however, during the RFP process we had a number of contractors come in who identified the fact that we needed to acquire additional right of way. So we stepped back and tried to acquire some additional right of way. Unfortunately that has not been fruitful. So we've started to move forward to design build but unfortunately the time frame was delayed and we are not able to bring it to you today. I'm asking if we can bring it to you at the next conference call. We will send you the information ahead of time. So we're asking for a little leniency so we can move this project along. Commissioner Howlett said the Commission needed a consensus to address this at the next conference call. The Commissioners all agreed.

Also we've got an area along 191 that is very challenging. It has very unstable soils. We've actually done a fair amount of work over there trying to stabilize it but the only way to stabilize it is to build a bridge from one end to the other and the estimated cost of well over \$100 million. However, we have a stream that, due to a recent storm event, has jumped its bank and has now eroded the fill. That fill was very unstable to begin with. We are asking to an exigency project to move along the project itself but we need your approval for delegation of authority. We are planning to go to bid, advertise, and award next week. We are not building a bridge; all we're doing is putting in some rip-rap along the creek and re-establishing the fill. Commissioner Howlett clarified that the Department was requesting authority to award this. Dwane Kailey said the Department is asking for the Commission to delegate the authority to do this. Commissioner Howlett asked if they could give you the authority up until the conference call. With a \$2 million project somehow the Commission ought to be involved. We should go ahead and give you permission to bid the job and then you can come back and ask for permission to award it just like

we normally do. Commissioner Howlett asked if that time frame was okay. Dwane Kailey said I can't give you that assurance but if that is what the Commission agrees to then we can abide by that.

Tim Reardon said the proposal that has been put together proposes to let the contractor do the first section which is A-typical of what we normally do. So the purchasing section is the first level award and we are looking for your concurrence at this stage. You can delegate the authority to the purchasing section but I don't know that you want to go that far. My suggestion would be continue as Dwane has proposed and if timing becomes an issue perhaps we can call each of the Commissioners and let you know how the prices came in and what we're talking about and let you decide at that time if you want to do it over the phone or if there is a question, give you time to discuss it. It sounds to me that the soils issue is such that some sort of expedience is in order to get this put together. Commissioner Howlett asked that MDT get the Commission the information and we will address it on the next conference call.

Directors Discussion

West Fork Road

Director Tooley said this is the road at Carbon County that Commissioner Prinkki has brought before you more than once. It is progressing. Right now we are up to about 75% of the design plan; Right of Way is working on that. Three parcels still need to be acquired and they expect that will take one year. So construction of that project will not take place until 2015 at least. We still don't know about the match situation. There may be some remaining Forest Access funds that can be used to match on behalf of Carbon County but that hasn't been determined yet. We are starting to see an answer on the match from the Congressional side of the issue and I don't think they are going to get the fix they were hoping for; I don't see that occurring. So their best hope for the match is from excess funds from other projects that just never got completed. So progress is occurring and in 2015 hopefully this project will be completely put to bed.

Great Falls Urban Routes

They requested that we draw on some of the mileage under their authority to make up for mileage they added to the system. So that is done.

100-Year Celebration Events

One hundred year celebrations continue. August 17th is the next one at Aeronautics and everybody is welcome to come. Commissioner Griffith is feeding everybody who shows up between noon and 3:00 on Saturday. We will keep you advised of the 100-year events occurring in your Districts. There is active planning for one in Billings and that will be a big celebration.

Requests for Naming Highways

I've been receiving more and more requests to name bridges or other infrastructures after fallen Veterans from a number of different groups. I've talked to Mr. Reardon about the authority to do that and it's his advice that the Department and Commission have a discussion about that. There is a precedent and there has been a route for members of law enforcement to have sections of roads named after fallen officers and they've chosen to go through the Legislature. However, the Legislature only comes to town every two years and unfortunately there are many more fallen Veterans that need to be considered. In that process, there's never any opposition to such an approach. You will get a nay vote in Committee once in a while from a

particularly conservative member or two but it's good because it's an avenue for public input. Families of fallen service members or law enforcement want to have the opportunity to come before a public group and say "this was my relative and the really deserves something named after them to be remembered." I think it's necessary to have that public input conduit. So you can either send them to the Legislature which meets every two years but that's cumbersome because you have to get somebody to carry the bill and go through two hearings and get the signature of the Governor before anything gets done. Or you can find another public group that might want to take that on specifically as it related to highway infrastructure. Right now the interest is on bridges. There are some advantages to that; you meet regularly, it doesn't require drafting of a bill or going through a sponsorship. There are also some disadvantages; it's more work for an already pretty busy group. It's going to require some kind of vetting procedure – who qualifies for this honor, which group is qualified to bring forward such a request. These can be very emotional hearings; totally draining hearings.

It's coming up more and more. There are a number of different groups that are not linked to each other but it's becoming more of an issue. I don't disagree with honoring fallen Veterans at all. I don't specifically have the authority to do that nor does the Commission but I think we have the ability and although there are federal rules to follow and within those guidelines we can probably satisfy the codes. Is this something the Commission is interested in taking on as a way to recognize fallen Veterans?

On the other hand the Department is going to have to set up a vetting process and recommend such things like we do for projects now. When you hear or see them you will know they've been through the process like the Veteran's Memorial here in Missoula. General Quinn has offered his assistance in doing that.

Commissioner Howlett said I also would like to see these. We have a couple now that we named and approved. I would like to see the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Veteran's Representative put together a coalition to talk about criteria so that it's not one group but it's a collaboration of all the services. I think that would be the first step in doing this. We want to be supportive but the groups representing these individuals both alive and fallen should tell us what criteria there should be to have someone memorialized on a project. That would be a fair starting place.

Commissioner Griffith said we've done it in the past for fallen officers. My thought is to make it more visible, for example, we ought to have a Veteran's area maybe at a Rest Area. There's probably a story behind each veteran who lost his life and you miss it with just a sign. We named a portion of Red Lodge for a man who was part of the road construction so there was a tie. I don't see the tie between a bridge and the Veteran. A memorial that actually talks about the Veteran and gives the story that people can read is better. Every District has one or two rest areas that they can key on as the area to display this. I think the idea of memorializing Veterans is great but I don't know if the bridge is the adequate vehicle to do that. Director Tooley said that is what the groups are focusing on right now.

Commissioner Griffith said they hadn't been given any options – they look at what's been done and stick with that. Director Tooley said that is exactly what is going on. Bridge for the Fallen is one of the groups which started in Massachusetts by naming a bridge after a Marine Corporal who was killed in action because he fished under the bridge. I think it's as simple as that and so now it's all bridges all the time. I like your idea to actually tell the story instead of just naming a bridge.

Director Howlett said if we get with these Veterans groups and tell them MDT is interested in memorializing the services of our service people but we're interested in doing it in a more public way and a place that has more visibility. Ask them what the

criteria ought to be there. Director Tooley said he thought General Quinn would be willing to help us engage the other groups. Commissioner Lambert said, as a former Legislator, we designated many pieces of road after people who contributed to Montana somehow. I think this is a great idea and I also think it is a good idea for the Commission to do it rather than taking it to the Legislature because they only meet every two years and also because the Legislature usually has 2,500 bills to consider, so those become much more unimportant than they should be. It is a complicated proposition to get any bill through the Legislature – even a chunk of road. I think it's a good idea to put it back into the Department's hands. I also think it's a good idea to make it more public. Just in the interest of expediency because the Legislature only meets every two years.

Tim Reardon said we think MDT can do it but it will grow very quickly and we need to let the Legislature know that this is what we are doing. Maybe a piece of roadway should be named for a time period, i.e., 20-30 years because if we name everything for people who served 90 years ago we'll run out of roads. That's one reason to speak to the Veterans groups to get input. Again I would tell the Legislature that we are going to start doing this. At some point the Department needs to set limits on what we are doing because sooner or later other people will be added and it will get bigger and bigger. Commissioner Howlett said maybe it should be limited to fallen Veterans. If people don't like the limits, they can go to the Legislature and ask for something different.

Tim Reardon said maybe we can start to develop some policy information for the Commission to consider as to any group or individual requesting the naming of a segment of road or bridge. Then there would be a policy in place to do what needs to be done and maybe some criteria also. Commissioner Howlett said obviously we want to pay respect to Veterans. Tim Reardon said we have 18 statutes in place right now for naming highways. Several of them are for officers who have been killed in the line of duty and I expect those will continue to get Legislative recognition. We had several sections of road named for Veteran Medal Winners. They are perfectly appropriate but it would be an endless stream until you develop some policy which may include a time frame of 25 years or whatever. Maybe we can help draft some basic specs for you to look at. Commissioner Howlett said that would be good and asked them to do that.

Commissioner Howlett said he would be cautious about bridges because, if it got to be a memorial, people might stop and leave flowers and other memorabilia and that's not safe. Somehow we have to take into account the safety aspect of what we're doing. Tim Reardon said that will go to the information you put on the sign. If you put the history of why it is being named as such, somebody is going to stop to read it. Commissioner Howlett said that's appropriate at a rest area versus a bridge. Tim Reardon said that is your call. Putting just a name on a bridge wouldn't be a hazard or safety issue because people will just drive by that. I think it's appropriate to put some information on the sign.

Director Tooley said they have a request from the Park County Commissioners and the City of Livingston to name the new Yellowstone Bridge "The Veteran's Memorial Bridge" which is pretty non-specific and isn't an individual. They would like to do that in September. Commissioner Howlett said that is appropriate. Is it a formal request? Director Tooley said yes.

Commissioner Griffith moved to authorize the naming of the Yellowstone Bridge "The Veteran's Memorial Bridge." Commissioner Skelton seconded the Motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimous.

Commissioner Griffith said having the local government involved in making their request to the Commission may take care of having some public input before it gets to the Commission because if there is a problem they would catch it.

New Direction

Director Tooley said he had a great tour this week, saw some great things, and got to know the Commission better. It was just right. As we travelled I listened to your conversations and it was striking to me how much your discussions about priorities reflects the discussions we've had internally at the Department in the last few months about how to deal with the mega projects and bridges that are on the fracture critical list and need to be replaced way ahead of the Red Book. I think there are some opportunities here. Not only do you have a new administration from the Governor on down but you also have new additions to the Commission. While all this is occurring, the Department is also looking at reviewing Tran Plan 21 and coming up with a strategic direction. Just to add to the fun, federal changes funding and in Congressional leadership have occurred. So you can look at it one of two ways – we've got a train wreck coming or we have an opportunity to review the way we all do business. I think everything points to an opportunity after listening to the Commission this week and listening to my own staff in Helena to review our priorities and find a new way to address the critical needs and look at the critical needs versus projects. We know the \$50 million mega projects are a thing of the past and we have to find a new way of doing business. We have to do something different and how do we do that? My encouragement is that we do it cooperatively. I think we can complement each other's efforts pretty well because we really have the same desire in the end which is a safe efficient transportation system but we need to do it in a way that doesn't necessarily threaten current projects or things that already have money spent on them. I'd like to work with you to start turning this ship slowly. We may not have it all wrapped up by Red Book in October but maybe we can have part of it done by October. But by next year let's find a new way of doing business that compliments TranPlan 21 and both of our current priorities within an uncertain federal funding picture. So I think we have a great opportunity. I was excited to be with you this week and I look forward to these discussions. If we see it from each other's perspective we will find a way to get it done sooner rather than later. So I want to thank you and say that you have a Department that is willing to work with you.

Closing Comments

Commissioner Lambert thanked the staff and the people who executed the tour in Missoula; it was very well done. I saw much more than I thought I would get to see. It was a fantastic tour and very well done.

Commissioner Skelton said it was great tour and a very educational process. Thank you so much. It was eye opening. I always thought my District had the biggest problems but then Commissioner Howlett pointed out some of the diversity and effects in his District. This District has every echo system and diversity in nature. Thank you, Lori, for all your hard work.

Commissioner Cobb said it was his first trip and it was very educational. Thank you.

Commissioner Griffith thanked the Chairman for his hospitality and Ron for having a nice event at his place. It was a very good trip that started a discussion. The discussion isn't intended to be an "end-all" but one to get the wheels moving. There are two projects outside of my District that I've taken an interest in – Two Medicine and Nine Pipes. We have been working and struggling with Nine Pipes for years. We promised to get US 93 done. We promised in a bond issue which ran out of money. He thanked Ed for taking the Commission around. When we went up to

Culbertson we found problems and it was a growth moment of realizing that maybe we haven't been paying close enough attention. We just need to be a little bit more involved in the process.

Commissioner Howlett thanked everyone for coming to District One. It is really diverse and it has a lot of issues; a lot of governments, a lot of environment, lots of rules, lots of agencies. This trip provided an opportunity to kind of galvanize our thoughts as a Commission. I've been here a long time and I feel that I went through a period of time where I was just expected to staff something; the Kalispell Bypass was one of those things. I don't know how it got in front of all the other priorities that were there but it's there and we will deal with it and we will complete it. But there are also other projects that are started that we need to get done. The priority has got to be safety – people are losing their lives in the crashes that are occurring. I encourage this Commission to become more engaged with your District and the District Administrators. I really think it's our job to set the priorities, to shift against a turn. The Districts are working more closely with the Commissioners who represent the public on the priorities in the District. That's our job; that's what we do. We represent the public in that section of the state that the Governor has appointed us to. The projects don't belong to us; they belong to all the people in the state. I want whatever we do to be transparent. The group here this morning took the time to come here and they are passionate about what they said. Engineering has a focus and that's appreciated but I told one of the attendees that they were charting a long-term course here by deciding what you want your community to be in perpetuity. They see how their community can begin to be dismantled with something new being added. There is no doubt that when you bring in more capacity, you're going to bring in more issues. I don't hold that against them at all; in fact to me it's commendable. The role of the Commission really hasn't changed. The period of time we went through, the former Commissioners and the staff, I now understand how you were treated. Without mentioning names, that's water over the dam and it's now time to move forward. Your opinion and expertise and involvement and your ability to come to meetings and your ability to make decisions locally are all renewed. I know for a time they were stuffed under the carpet.

I welcome this as a new day and District One is a good place to start. I look forward to a real active Commission. John has lots of questions; he's new to the process and I certainly welcome that. I learn something new at every meeting and I rely on the staff to give me the kind of information I need to be able to represent what I'm supposed to represent. To each of you – enjoy the rest of the summer. I appreciate your support and I'm willing to support you with projects. This is a team; it isn't my show or your show, it's a team and together we'll get there.

Commissioner Howlett said it was a pleasure to be in the company of Federal Highways. We will need your support for some of the projects. We have some things that appear to be out of our reach and we'll need to have your support to do that.

Next Commission Meeting

The next Conference Call was scheduled for August 20, 2013.

Adjourned

Meeting Adjourned

Commissioner Howlett, Chairman
Montana Transportation Commission

Mike Tooley, Director
Montana Department of Transportation

Lori K. Ryan, Secretary
Montana Transportation Commission