
Subject	Consulting Parties Meeting #2 1
Project	BNSF Bismarck Bridge Replacement Project
Prepared by	Lori Price and Aimee Angel
Location	MS Teams Video Conference Call
Date/Time	March 31, 2022, 4:30 p.m. CT

Participants	Organization
Abby Korte	Jacobs
Aimee Angel	Jacobs
Alan Bloomquist	BNSF
Amy McBeth	BNSF
Betsy Merritt	NTHP
Bill Peterson	ND SHPO
Brian Dunn	USCG
Chris Wilson	ACHP
Jim Neubauer	City of Mandan
Kathye Spillman	Mandan Historical Society
Kyle Sumsion	BNSF
Laura Mona	BNSF
Lori Price	Jacobs
Lorna Meidinger	ND SHPO
VelRey Lozano	EPA
Lyle Witham	FORB
Matt Robertson	USCG
Mike Herzog	BNSF

Nick Bradbury	FORB
Rachel Drewlow	Bismarck MPO
Rob McCaskey	USCG
Ron Henke	ND DOT
Shelly Sugarman	USCG
Signe Snortland	FORB
Tim Helbling, Mayor	City of Mandan
Tim Pavilonis	USCG

Rob McCaskey opened the meeting, made roll call, and reviewed the rules for the meeting.

Brian Dunn stated that this is a continuation of the meeting that was held on February 24, 2022. During that meeting, we walked through the latest draft of the MOA, and identified and discussed comments to try to come to some resolution on the mitigation proposed. This meeting is to identify the distribution of funds and get that information into the draft MOA. He asked Dr. Peterson and Chris Wilson if they had any remarks.

Dr. Peterson had no opening comments.

Chris Wilson stated that he hoped this meeting would be as productive as the last meeting. It would be great to come to a consensus on some of the great ideas.

Brian Dunn provided an update on FORB's request to terminate the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA). The PA signatories met on March 9 to discuss FORB's request. At the recommendation of the ACHP, FORB has withdrawn their request to terminate the PA until the issue of ownership has been resolved. The USCG has provided FORB's and BNSF's ownership information to the North Dakota Attorney General's office for their consideration. During the meeting the signatories also agreed to continue working on the draft MOA; however, the MOA will not be signed until the issue of ownership is resolved.

Brian requested but did not receive questions regarding the signatories' meeting.

Brian Dunn restated that during the last meeting, the consulting parties walked through all the comments received on the MOA and during this meeting, we will discuss the distribution of funds within the draft MOA. Currently the distribution is as follows:

\$65,000 for HAER Documentation

\$305,000 for a Grant Program

\$100,000 for Salvage

\$30,000 for Textured Design

Brian stated that the USCG requested comments on the current distribution and received comments from six parties.

Brian Dunn summarized the comments:

- Several parties felt that \$500,000 was inadequate for mitigation and that preservation of the bridge is the best alternative. However, if \$500,000 is the limit, three parties requested that all of the funds go to the grant program.
- The SHPO and Mandan Historical Society felt that salvage was the #2 priority after documentation.
- FORB, SHPO, and the NTHP felt that documentation, salvage, and pigment should be funded through the project budget and not come out of the \$500,000 mitigation money.
- The City of Bismarck responded without additional comment.

Brian Dunn stated that he will use the same list he used for roll call (starting with the six organizations that provided comments) and ask for comments and/or concurrence with the distribution of funds.

Brian requested comments from the Mandan Historical Society.

Kathye Spillman stated the HAER report was a no-brainer and needs to be funded. Documentation should be supplemented with color photographs. Key elements of the bridge should be salvaged and distributed to interested parties. The Railroad Museum and the City of Mandan are both interested in parts of the bridge. The other monies that have been identified as part of the mitigation fund would be distributed among those parties that want to incorporate those salvage pieces and supplement them with informational panels. \$30,000 seems barely adequate for the colorization of the bridge. That suggestion should fall off the list in lieu of things that are more important.

Brian Dunn asked if Kathye Spillman was suggesting that salvage dollars should be used to reassemble the parts of the bridge as displays, or would that fall under grant funding?

Kathye Spillman responded that the Mandan Historical Society is not interested in salvaged pieces. She would not object to it being rolled into the grant program. The Mandan Historical Society is very interested in the grant program and having some videos to record history since that is the mode of communication most likely to succeed with today's generation.

Brian Dunn responded that his question had been answered and that he agrees that the requested parts get salvaged; then it would probably be a grant program that would put together projects using those salvaged parts. Is that right?

Kathye Spillman responded yes and that the design and colorization of the bridge are of low value and should be dropped and that money rolled into the grant program.

Brian Dunn asked for comments from Preservation North Dakota.

Aimee Angel read the following statement emailed from Emily Sakariassen from Preservation North Dakota who couldn't attend:

I wanted to pass along my apologies that I have a schedule conflict today and won't be able to make the Consulting Parties meeting. I want it known that the Northern Plains Heritage Foundation is still very much interested and willing to work with SHSND to develop stipulations or guidelines for the proposed grant program that is being discussed as a mitigation measure in the MOA. At any time, should SHSND like to schedule a meeting to work toward that goal following the outcome of today's discussion, I can be the NPHF point of contact and will look forward to it. I've cc'd the NPHF executive director (Aaron Barth) here, as well as my own NPHF e-mail address for further communication on this matter.

As I also represent Preservation North Dakota in the CP meetings, I express that I'm sorry I won't be able to attend but I did make that organization's position and priorities known in a brief e-mail to you, Aimee, last week. Please consider that position as part of today's discussion and if it bears stating aloud for the benefit of the other Consulting Parties, please enter it into the record that PND places highest priority on preservation in-situ, and as far as mitigation measures go, documentation is standard and incredibly important to us. The potential for grants that may be made available through the MOA to enable projects that would celebrate the historic significance of the structure is also something PND is supportive of, as we know from our own grant program how limited funding for such work is in this region. PND agrees with the concerns Mandan Historical Society expressed before that the grant program would need to have clear stipulations for who is eligible to apply. But PND has no doubts that that will be taken care of in a professional manner by the two foundations heading up that line item (NPHF and SHSND).

Brian Dunn asked the National Trust for Historic Preservation for their comments.

Betsy Merritt stated that they oppose the demolition of the bridge. However, focusing on mitigation in the event of demolition, \$500,000 is not enough funding for mitigation. She provided two examples of other MOAs for bridge demolition projects that required the costs of documentation, salvage, and design enhancements to be paid over and above the costs of grant funding. The grant funding in both those cases was \$400,000 to \$500,000. Presentations regarding both examples were made in December along with another project that involved a mitigation fund of \$85 million. There is some concern that the two

examples are government funded projects as opposed to a privately funded project. Therefore, she provided the additional example of a privately funded project that involved construction of a new transmission line across the James River in Virginia. It didn't involve the demolition of anything. It was new construction and it was deemed to have an adverse effect. In her experience, the privately funded projects often have greater mitigation packages and so she just wanted to share that example of the \$85 million mitigation package.

The NTHP strongly feels that all the \$500,000 should be used for the grant program if the mitigation is limited to \$500,000. Other costs should be covered over and above that, and the salvage costs should be covered by a party that wants to recover elements for salvage. That doesn't necessarily need to be covered by BNSF. But if there is someone that wants to salvage a part of the bridge, they could cover that cost.

Brian Dunn asked if there was anyone from Historic Bridge Foundation who wanted to speak. Hearing no one, Brian Dunn moved to FORB.

Signe Snortland paraphrased a statement that Mark Zimmerman submitted on behalf of FORB. The statement restated FORB's position that \$500,000 is wholly insufficient considering all the mitigation proposals that have been submitted by government entities and NGOs throughout the consultation meetings. FORB continues to question BNSF's offer of the \$500,000 mitigation fund amount without any documentation or justification for that amount by BNSF. FORB supports the National Trust for Historic Preservation in its position that if the entire mitigation amount is settled at \$500,000, the total amount be designated for granting opportunities. FORB supports the National Trust for Historic Preservation in stating salvage costs should be the responsibility of those entities that wish to use structural pieces of the bridge. Enhancement costs should be the responsibility of the permit applicant (BNSF) and not be part of the mitigation amount. Finally, the final decision on the amount of mitigation funds and allocation of those funds should be paused until the issue of bridge ownership is resolved. The ownership decision will certainly have a major impact on the responsibilities of the determined owner as to any mitigation efforts going forward.

Brian Dunn asked if there were any questions. Hearing none, he called for comments from the City of Bismarck.

Rachel Drewlow responded that there were no additional comments from the City of Bismarck.

Brian Dunn asked BNSF for comments.

Mike Herzog stated that BNSF had made a sincere offer of the amount of \$500,000 for mitigation for the loss of the bridge. The impact is only for the loss of the bridge. No other historic structures are impacted by the removal of this bridge and based on BNSF's experience, \$500,000 is commensurate with the loss of the bridge for the proposed salvage, grants, bridge modification, and HAER documentation.

Brian Dunn asked for any questions. Hearing none, he called on comments from North Dakota DOT.

Ron Henke responded that they had no comments.

Brian Dunn asked for comments from North Dakota Parks and Recreation, however no one was present.

Brian Dunn asked for comments from the City of Mandan

Jim Neubauer stated that he did not agree with the idea that salvage costs should be covered by the applicant because that makes it difficult to do any mitigation projects. \$500,000 may be a little on the shy side. The city is looking at doing some monument signage for the "Welcome to Mandan" entrance signage (on the east end and on the west end of the strip) using stones from the piers. If the salvage money gets combined with the grant money, it would affect the project. He reiterated that he does not agree that the salvage should be paid for by the interested parties who may be looking to salvage parts of the bridge.

Brian Dunn stated that what he was talking about earlier is whether the grant program could cover projects to use salvage parts.

Brian Dunn called for any questions. Hearing none, he called for comments from the following entities, none of which attended the meeting:

- Burleigh County
- Northern Plains Heritage Foundation.
- Bismarck Parks and Recreation.
- Bismarck Historical Society.
- Bismarck Mandan Metropolitan Planning Association.
- Captain's Landing Township
- Abraham Lincoln Foundation.
- Lewis and Clark Riverboat.
- Morton County.
- Morton County Historical Society.
- North Dakota State Railroad Museum.
- Rails to Trails Conservancy.
- North Dakota State University Department of Landscape Architecture

Mandan Parks and Recreation Brian then requested comments from the ND SHPO.

Dr. Bill Peterson replied that the SHPO's position is that \$500,000 is not commensurate with the significance of the effect. They agree with the recent discussion that the documentation, salvage, and design enhancement costs should not come out of the \$500,000 amount.

Brian Dunn asked if there were any questions. Hearing none, he asked to hear from the ACHP.

Chris Wilson replied that he is concerned that there is not a group that has funding available to deal with salvage. We are looking at just depositing salvage items. It would be a travesty if in 20 years some of those items are sitting in a boneyard and they were never used to mitigate the loss of the bridge. We need to write the MOA so that we can defer the costs of using the salvage items to a later date by any group that's interested in using them. I think that the North Dakota SHPO is the subject matter experts in this region on whether the mitigation is commensurate with the loss of the bridge. It looks like we are getting close to consensus about the dollar amount, although some people think it should be more. It is common that documentation costs be absorbed by whatever entity is responsible, whether it be a federal partner or a permittee.

Chris Wilson asked Brian Dunn if there was a way to have parties interested in salvage figure out how they are going to use the salvage at a later date?

Brian Dunn replied that funding for the projects is one of the things that opening the grant program to the use of those salvage items for projects that would commemorate the historic aspect of the bridge could help with. He then asked if the SHPO would like to have an approval process in place to ensure that a salvage project is in keeping with the historic preservation aspects of the MOA.

Dr. Peterson replied that they would want to develop some sort of guidance on that so that the use was consistent with preservation.

Brian Dunn responded that he has been thinking about the idea of using something similar to the grant process for the salvage projects. Even if it is not asking for funds, if it is asking for approval of projects to use parts of the bridge.

Dr. Peterson responded that they would consider that.

Brian Dunn stated that some language could be added to the MOA to meld those things together to have an approval process for projects using salvage parts that would be in keeping with historic preservation.

Chris Wilson asked if it wouldn't make sense for the committee that's going to be established to oversee the grants be the same committee to oversee the salvage and how it's used and where it goes? He assumes that the projects would all be used for interpretive reasons and be visible to the public and in a public space in North Dakota.

Brian Dunn responded that he was also thinking that the grant committee handle both the salvage and the funding of grants. We will try to adjust the language for the grant process to include approval of projects for salvage.

Mike Herzog responded that he thought that previously Chris Wilson was trying to defer the identification of salvage until a later date when grant applications are being considered. However, it needs to be determined what items are being salvaged on the front end so the best pricing can be secured.

Brian Dunn replied that is correct and that the salvage piece that BNSF would be involved in would be the salvage of parts that have been identified by the salvage working group. Salvaged truss spans, granite blocks, etc. would be delivered to the locations that have been identified. The long-term piece is approving those projects or approving the use of salvaged parts for projects through the grant process.

Mike Herzog stated that helps clear things up and that would keep some amount of funds still dedicated toward the salvage piece to actually perform salvage and then there would be language in there for the grant program to consider projects related to those pieces. Is that correct?

Brian Dunn replied that is what he is suggesting right now. We would keep the salvage line in there right now for funding available to salvage parts as part of the demolition process. Money would be available in the grant program for use of those salvage parts and other projects that that are proposed.

Mike Herzog replied that that made sense.

Brian Dunn called on Jim Neubauer for comments.

Jim Neubauer replied that they just received concepts and really rough prices today on what they would be looking at doing and he is concerned about the process and doesn't want to see the funds used for the grants to be spread so thin that the projects are not feasible or are so spread out across the country or state. He would rather see the monies focused on the Bismarck-Mandan area.

Brian Dunn responded that the intent is having SHPO and Northern Plains Heritage Foundation involved. He then called on Signe Snortland for comment.

Signe Snortland stated that she heard quite a few organizations state that all of the \$500,000 should be used for grant funding but now is hearing that part of that money should go for salvage. How are you making this decision? You've gotten feedback from quite a few entities that it should all be kept for the grant program. So how are you making the decision now that part should be split off now and go to salvage.

Brian Dunn responded that this is what is currently being discussed because there are entities still interested in salvage parts. And how would that work into the grant program?

Signe Snortland asked if salvage would be eligible. That the actual taking pieces of the bridge would not be eligible but for displaying the pieces – that could be eligible for the grant. Or are you saying that they would be able to apply for grant funds to buy pieces of the bridge?

Brian Dunn replied that the way that it was originally broken down in the MOA or that it evolved into the MOA was that there were several entities that were interested in using salvage parts from the bridge. We broke out money in the distribution of funds to fund the salvage of those parts. However, that was only for removing the parts and placing them in different places for later use. So you might have a number of granite blocks go to the city of Mandan, a number of granite blocks that go to city of Bismarck, the Railroad Museum requested some truss pieces and some blocks and some track. So that is what the salvage funding would be for; for BNSF, as part of their contract, to have the construction contractor or demolition contractor remove and place those parts where they go. That salvage money was not intended for the actual construction of the projects that those parts would be used for. And when we have discussed it, they would be eligible for grant funding for those projects, or there might be outside funding that might be available, such as public works money or other money that might come in to help those projects be completed.

Signe Snortland responded that she understands but you've heard from the North Dakota SHPO, the National Trust, Preservation North Dakota, and FORB who all think that none of the money should go to salvage – that all of it should go to the grant funding. Are you ignoring that feedback?

Brian Dunn replied that he is saying that there are other interested parties that would like to have those salvage parts. So we are looking at what all the consulting parties have to say and then we will go through that information and determine what the final allocation of funds will be.

Lyle Witham commented that this illustrates what is wrong with going ahead with \$500,000 without having any idea of how much it is going to be to do salvage, without knowing what the salvage cost is, because just saving a few pieces could cost \$500,000. The \$500,000 figure has no factual basis on anything presented by the railroad. And then that insufficient amount is split up which all the people, including Dr. Peterson, agrees is not enough to try to cover all of the costs of mitigation. We just want to continue to emphasize that \$500,000 isn't enough and without any factual basis for the \$500,000 based on actual salvage costs, it's a meaningless number.

Brian Dunn called on Chris Wilson.

Chris Wilson stated that from a Section 106 standpoint, mitigation cannot leave North Dakota. We prefer Bismarck or the Mandan area or another appropriate place throughout the state. The mitigation must be used in relationship to historic properties. So, Jim (Neubauer), don't worry, this will be targeted, and the MOA will lay out the framework for how the grant funds will be distributed. Also, my concern from the ACHP is that the MOA is trying to limit the amount of money it would take for salvage to put the largest amount possible toward grants. Brian, you may want to clarify, you were going to cap the amount to be used for salvage to reserve as much as possible for the grants. Am I correct?

Brian Dunn responded that is correct. And the figure we have in the draft MOA is \$100,000 for salvage. He then called on Nick Bradbury for comments.

Nick Bradbury stated that he is concerned because demolition of a bridge across a navigable waterway of the United States would typically require its own separate permit to proceed and we have not vetted any project to destroy the bridge in the same fashion as would be required as its own separate dedicated permitting process. Because of that, he does not think consulting parties have good insight into what demolition of the historic bridge would entail regarding costs. While we have seen some loose estimates of construction costs for the new bridge, we have not seen estimates or a plan for how the demolition of the historic bridge would occur if it were to be destroyed. He feels it's really hurting the consulting parties in being able to figure out how to sort out the mitigation regarding salvage versus the grant program.

Brian Dunn responded that there is no requirement for a permit to remove a bridge. Typically, the removal of the bridge is part of the permit to replace a bridge. If BNSF wanted to remove the bridge today, there is no permit required for that removal.

Nick Bradbury responded that it would require approval from the State Historic Society to approve the destruction of historic property that is on state land.

Brian Dunn reiterated that it would not require a USCG permit. And Section 106 and NEPA would not necessarily apply because there is no federal permit required for the removal.

Nick Bradbury submitted that they still do not have a reasonable foundation on which to base these mitigation discussions without understanding the process and cost of removing the bridge.

Brian Dunn proposed putting \$125,000 toward salvage which would pay for the parts based on the estimate requested by the Railroad Museum. The remaining funding would go toward documentation and grants. Any Thoughts?

Betsy Merritt replied that there are a number of parties objecting to including the cost of documentation being taken from the mitigation fund. Could you respond specifically to comments that objected to taking documentation costs out of the mitigation fund. We feel strongly that they should be a part of the project budget.

Brian Dunn replied that we have not gotten there yet but that was a good segue. We are trying to look at how we distribute the funds. We have \$65,000 for HAER documentation, \$305,000 for grants, \$100,000 for salvage and \$30,000 for texture and design (which we have not yet discussed). The textured design is another item that some have suggested should be dropped and the money rolled into the grants program. The point that I want to make with the salvage is that one of the estimates for salvage projects includes salvage and moving bridge parts to the State Railroad Museum to set up a display there. The estimate for

that was \$125,000, so I am just looking at shifting funds. Is that something we want to consider? Do we want to leave salvage at \$100,000? He opened the discussion of funding HAER and the textured design to the group.

Kathye Spillman stated that she thinks the intended purpose of the design enhancement has shifted away from what it was originally intended. Nobody is advocating for it. She suggested that the \$30,000 allocated for textured design be added to the grant funding.

Signe Snortland replied that FORB supports the Bridge Advisory Committee's advice to BNSF and thinks that the funding for it should come out of the project budget, not the mitigation budget.

Mike Herzog stated that BNSF has no objection to eliminating the bridge pigmentation and putting the \$30,000 towards the grant program.

Betsy Merritt responded that the bridge pigmentation is "lipstick on a pig."

Brian Dunn asked Mike Herzog if the \$65,000 for HAER documentation could be rolled into the project budget.

Mike Herzog replied that BNSF has considered it and that is a total price for documentation related to mitigation for the loss of the bridge. So our position is we would like to keep HAER documentation as part of the \$500,000.

Brian Dunn asked if there were any additional thoughts from anyone.

Nick Bradbury noted that removing the pigmentation from the cement on the approaches of the new bridge is the final nail in the coffin for the Bridge Advisory Committee's work.

Signe Snortland asked how USCG would make a decision when there was no consensus and some strong opinions.

Brian Dunn replied that are going to look at the comments and make a couple of proposals as to how the funding be distributed.

Betsy Merritt suggested having the MOA say that the bridge owner would pay for the documentation because the ownership issue remains unresolved.

Brian Dunn reminded everyone that the MOA is being developed based on BNSF owning the bridge and if that changes, there are a number of other discussions that are going to need to take place. So it would be premature to change the wording at this point.

Lyle Witham stated that he thinks it is difficult and unfair to not know what one may be getting for \$100,000 for salvage, to make a rational choice about how funds are going to be distributed. \$100,000 may only buy you one or two granite blocks. This is another example of how BNSF has never been open with their calculations or shared them in any meaningful way.

Brian Dunn reminded the group that there was a salvage committee who came up with the recommended parts to salvage and as part of that discussion, it was decided that up to \$100,000 would be available to pay for salvage of the parts and that those entities would be responsible for funding the projects that went along with the salvage pieces.

Mike Herzog added that in addition to working with the salvage committee, BNSF did reach out to trusted contractors who routinely rebuild bridges for BSNF and had conversations about the proposed scopes of salvage in an effort to obtain some preliminary costs. Information has been supplied to provide an understanding of what this cost is. He then referred to Ron Henke (with ND DOT) for validation. He then stated that whenever you are talking about trying to secure pricing for a scope of work, the absolute best opportunity you have for getting the best price tag is during the competitive bid process. Very seldom do you get the best pricing when you try to negotiate. It is at the front end when the scope is defined that you get the best pricing. To try to make a statement of, well, will \$100,000 buy a couple of blocks? That's a totally uninformed statement that has not taken into consideration any of the work performed during these meetings.

Lyle Witham asked if \$100,000 would get all the blocks that the City of Mandan needs to do the project as they described.

Mike Herzog replied that Lyle should revisit the volumes of information that has already been supplied and look at it for himself.

Brian Dunn reminded everyone that \$100,000 for salvage has been previously discussed and it was agreed that if any parties wanted any salvage beyond that, that they would be responsible for the funding.

Signe Snortland responded to the comment previously made by Betsy Merritt that the state of North Dakota would pay for HAER documentation if determined to be the owner. If determined to be owned by the state, the bridge cannot be demolished without approval from the State Historical Board (under 55027 of the North Dakota Century Code). Signe does not think that it would work to have the state pay for HAER because of this statute.

Chris Wilson suggested extending the meeting.

Brian Dunn replied that the discussion was nearing an end and he would move the textured pigmentation design money into the grant program making the distribution of funds \$65,000 for HAER documentation, \$335,000 for the grant program and \$100,000 for salvage.

Jim Neubauer addressed Lyle Witham and stated that based on rough estimates obtained this afternoon, the cost of salvage was approximately \$1,250 per block. The project would need about 50 blocks on the east end of Memorial Highway and 50 on the west end of the highway, which would be about 100 blocks and eat up that \$100,000 of funding. He invited Lyle Witham to discuss the proposed design.

Lyle Witham said Jim Neubauer could give him a call.

Brian Dunn stated that the salvage committee notes have been provided to everyone.

Jim Neubauer stated that as of this afternoon, they have a much better idea of what they will need. They originally thought they would only need 20 blocks and now they are looking at 100.

Brian Dunn asked for thoughts on the distribution of funds that he proposed.

Nick Bradbury stated that according to his math, the city of Mandan's proposal would use the entirety of the \$100,000 allotted for salvage. If that were the case, would there be any point in having any grant money left over for other groups to apply?

Jim Neubauer stated that he thought there may be some other funding available for the reconstruction of Memorial Highway. It will take up the majority of that, but again, it is a matter of who has a project that we think would be most significant to mitigate the bridge and I think we have a good concept going.

Brian Dunn added that is the importance of having a process in the MOA to make sure that those projects meet the historic preservation standard.

Mike Herzog stated that he thought the reuse of the granite blocks was a fabulous way to mitigate for the bridge and he applauds the City of Mandan.

Brian Dunn stated that there were no more hands raised for comments and that the USCG would look at integrating the salvage process into the grant program in the MOA. He reiterated the new distribution of funds at \$65,000 for HAER, \$335,000 for the grants program, and \$100,000 for salvage. The MOA will be updated, and a final draft will be sent to the consulting parties. He reminded everyone that the MOA will not go out for signature until there is a resolution on the issue of ownership. He then updated everyone on the EIS process. The USCG is continuing to review the draft EIS comments and preparing the final EIS. The

USCG does not plan to move forward with the final EIS or permit decision until the issue of ownership is resolved. Any final questions or comments from SHPO?

Bill Peterson added, for the record, that they do not feel that \$335,000 is enough for the grant program.

Brian Dunn responded that we are working with the funds that are available and that we can have further conversations with the signatories of the MOA as we move forward to finalizing it.

Betsy Merritt agreed with the SHPO.

Signe Snortland agreed with the SHPO and Betsy Merritt.

Brian Dunn asked if there were any final comments from Chris Wilson.

Chris Wilson had no comments.

Brian Dunn stated the USCG will revise the MOA and distribute to the consulting parties. He then concluded the meeting.

Meeting ended at 6:30 pm