

In the Matter Of:

Regional Transportation Commission

ARLINGTON BRIDGES TAC-2 MEETING

August 31, 2020

Job Number: 656644

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RTC PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---o0o---

ARLINGTON BRIDGES TAC-2 MEETING
Bridge and Roadway Elements
Monday, August 31, 2020
Reno, Nevada

24 Reported by: Brandi Ann Vianney Smith
25 Job Number: 656644

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

---o0o---
RENO, NEVADA, MONDAY, AUGUST 31, 2020, 1:00 P.M.
---o0o---

MS. TORTELLI: Let's go ahead and get started.
Welcome, everybody. I am Judy Tortelli, Project Manager for
the RTC. I am here today to talk about the bridge and
roadway elements for the Arlington Avenue bridges project.

I have here in the office with me Brian Stewart.
From the Jacobs team on the line, I have Ken Greene, Project
Manager; Mike Cooper and Matt Negretti, Structural
Engineers.

I wanted to let everybody know that I do have a
court reporter on the line to kind of capture meeting notes.
So, for the most part, she can see everybody's name on the
screen, but let's try and identify ourselves when we're
talking.

So today I am going to run through a brief
presentation, and I'll go over the scoring material.

Mike Cooper from Jacobs will discuss the scores
received, and then we will open it up for kind of a group
discussion.

I would like to ask that as we go through the
presentation, everybody keep your mics on mute, and just
make a note of any questions or comments that you have so

1 that we can address those during the open discussion
2 portion.

3 So I am going to kind of go through
4 introductions/attendance. I have a list here on my screen,
5 so I am just going to call out everybody that I have. If
6 there is somebody on the line that I have not mentioned,
7 just speak up afterwards.

8 Like I said, I'm Judy Tortelli, Project Manager
9 for the RTC. We have Dale from FHWA on the line. Brian
10 Stewart is here in the office. Doug Maloy from RTC is on
11 the line. Dan is on the line. Jaime Schroeder from the
12 City of Reno. I have Kurt Dietrich from the City of Reno.
13 Amy Cummings from RTC. Ken Greene from Jacobs. Mike Cooper
14 from Jacobs. Matt Negrete from Jacobs. Jon Simpson from
15 the City of Reno.

16 Is there anybody on the line that I did not call?

17 MS. KOSKI: Kerrie is here.

18 MS. TORTELLI: Kerrie is here. Hi, Kerrie.

19 MS. KOSKI: Hi there.

20 MR. MORENO: Michael Moreno.

21 MS. TORTELLI: Hi, Michael.

22 Okay. That looks like it. Okay. Sorry. I'm
23 having some technical difficulties getting my presentation
24 to go forward.

25 So the purpose of today's meeting is to give you

1 an overview of what we've done and where we are. We're here
2 today to dive into the details of the bridge and roadway
3 elements of the project.

4 At our first Stakeholder Working Group meeting
5 held back in February, we discussed engineering design and
6 environmental constraints associated with the project.

7 From the information gathered, the team determined
8 applicable evaluation attributes and prepared the initial
9 scoring packets that you all received a few weeks ago.

10 We have 11 TAC members that were previously
11 identified for this project. We received scores from nine
12 of those members, which is a great turnout.

13 I really appreciate everybody getting those scores
14 into me. The team has compiled the scores, and we will
15 present the results today.

16 Several of the TAC members included added
17 attributes, which we are excited to share with the group.
18 Our goal here today is to reduce the range of alternatives
19 that are carried forward into NEPA and design.

20 Based on the scores received, there is a
21 distinction between the alternatives, and they have been
22 ranked accordingly.

23 So here is an agenda of what we're going to cover
24 today. I want to review project scope, process, purpose and
25 need, schedule, and background. This is not new material.

1 These are all items that were presented to the public at our
2 initial public information meeting, again, at our first
3 Stakeholder Working Group meeting, and also at our first TAC
4 meeting.

5 I'll provide an update on how our first TAC
6 meeting went, and spend a little time looking at the
7 qualitative attributes and concept evaluation information
8 that you received. From there, we'll jump right into the
9 scores and results and have some discussion.

10 So this is just a list of the Technical Advisory
11 Committee members that have been identified. We have
12 members from NDOT, FHWA, RTC, and the City of Reno.

13 So the scope of this project -- just to get
14 everybody on the same page -- is to complete a feasibility
15 study to define bridge options, identify constraints, and
16 determine costs.

17 At the end, we will have a bridge and aesthetic
18 package identified to carry forward into environmental
19 clearance and design.

20 Decisions will be documented using a process
21 called "Planning and Environmental Linkages," also know as
22 PEL. Following this process helps inform decision making,
23 engages the public and stakeholders, and streamlines the
24 future NEPA process.

25 Our process is modeled after the Virginia Street

1 process, and includes receiving public, stakeholder, and
2 technical input.

3 Alternatives are evaluated based on the ability to
4 meet the project purpose and need, ability to avoid and
5 minimize impacts to the natural and built environment,
6 construction feasibility and costs, and input from the
7 Stakeholder Working Group, RTC Board, City of Reno Council,
8 and the public.

9 At the public kick-off meeting back in December of
10 2019, we got great feedback. Our first Stakeholder Working
11 Group meeting, held in February of this year, was successful
12 in defining environmental and engineering constraints and
13 criteria associated with the project.

14 We had our first TAC meeting last month, which
15 focused on permitting and regulatory requirements.

16 Moving forward, we will hold two additional
17 Stakeholder Working Group meetings to address bridge
18 concepts and aesthetic themes. We will present information
19 gathered and get input at one more public information
20 meeting, anticipated to be held early next year.

21 Information gathered from the TACs will be
22 presented to the Stakeholder Working Group for concurrence,
23 and then carried forward and presented to the public.

24 So a purpose and needs statement describes the
25 intention of the project and states the problem. It sets

1 the stage for developing and evaluating possible improvement
2 alternatives, but is not mode-specific or biased towards a
3 particular solution.

4 So right now, our project purpose and need is to
5 address structurally deficient bridges, provide safe and
6 ADA-compliant, multimodal improvements, address hydraulic
7 capacity needs, and respond to regional and community plans.

8 So here is a slide of our schedule. We
9 had -- this first little star here -- our public kick-off
10 meeting last year. Here we're working on identifying and
11 analyzing bridge concepts. We're going to have another
12 public meeting early next year. Then we intend to complete
13 this feasibility study. Once this feasibility study is
14 complete, we will kick-off the NEPA process. Our goal is to
15 start construction beginning 2026.

16 So, like I said, back in July, we had our first
17 TAC meeting which focused on permitting and regulatory
18 requirements. The meeting was hosted by the U.S. Army
19 Corps. of Engineers. We had great participation and
20 received some really valuable feedback.

21 FHWA will be the lead agency for project, and the
22 team is clearly defining the steps we have to take to get
23 through the permitting and regulatory process.

24 Some key points brought up at the TAC meeting were
25 dewatering and discharge requirements and the need for

1 access to river for debris removal.

2 The group didn't do a formal scoring of
3 alternatives like we did for this meeting today. The
4 approach there was geared more towards defining the
5 permitting and regulatory requirements associated with each
6 alternative.

7 The group did conclude that the elevated bridge
8 and tied arch concepts would be more challenging from
9 permitting and regulatory perspectives based on viewshed
10 impacts along the river.

11 So now, I would like to take just a little bit of
12 time to review the supporting information that was provided
13 with your scoring sheets. You have all seen this material
14 and been through it, since you've scored the alternatives.

15 I'm just wondering if there's anything out of this
16 stuff that you looked at that confused you or frustrated you
17 when you were doing your scoring that maybe we should
18 discuss as a group?

19 I'm not specifically a TAC member, but I did go
20 through the process of scoring the alternatives several
21 times as we went through different iterations of this just
22 to see if it made sense.

23 One thing that I got a little bit hung up on was
24 the way that we put the scoring together is the highest
25 score was kind of your preferred alternative or the one that

1 you thought would be the best.

2 So, like in terms of construction costs, if there
3 was an alternative that was going to have a really high
4 construction cost, it would actually receive a low score.

5 So I got a little bit hung up on that one when I
6 was doing my individual scoring, but, other than that, the
7 other attributes seemed to make sense.

8 I just wanted to kind of put this out there and
9 see if there was anybody that had any concerns or confusion
10 about the information that we provided during the scoring?

11 (No response.)

12 So it looks like everybody's on mute. I'm
13 guessing there is no questions about these attributes.

14 I do have the concept evaluation information that
15 we provided also. Is there -- you know, of this information
16 that we gave members, is there anything anybody would like
17 to talk about or ask questions on?

18 MR. DOENGES: Hey, Judy, this Dan.

19 MS. TORTELLI: Hi, Dan.

20 MR. DOENGES: For the scoring, one of the things
21 that I guess I got a little bit hung up on myself was a lot
22 of the concepts were similar in the a lot of the categories.
23 So I found myself, when I was doing the scoring, kind of
24 giving them an equal weight.

25 I think in the end, I am not sure -- I know I had

1 some -- I'm trying to remember. I don't have it in front of
2 me.

3 I know I had some that definitely were ranked
4 higher. But a lot of them, like, kind of had the same
5 attributes, so I scored them the same just because you
6 couldn't really pick one over the other when you're,
7 basically, comparing apples to apples.

8 MS. TORTELLI: Right. And I had a similar issue
9 when I did the scoring, Dan. Like, for instance, there's
10 the single pier concept, and within that concept, there were
11 precast concrete girders, cast-in-place concrete rocks, and
12 steel I-girders.

13 I'm not a bridge engineer, so I don't necessarily
14 know all the specifics of those different items, so when I
15 did my scoring, I just scored them all the same.

16 And I think we kind of saw that across the board
17 with the scores. Some people that are more technical or are
18 more bridge-specific scored them differently, but other
19 people just scored them similar.

20 So I think that was kind of the approach across
21 the board for most members, Dan.

22 MR. DOENGES: Okay. Thanks. I just wanted to put
23 that out there, and didn't want you to think I was just kind
24 of checking the boxes and running through them, because
25 that's not the case at all.

1 MS. TORTELLI: So did anybody else have any
2 questions? No.

3 Okay. Well, here's our concept evaluation scoring
4 sheet that you guys all had. I'm going to turn it over to
5 Mike from Jacobs to go through the scoring.

6 Mike, should I stop sharing and let you take over,
7 or do you want me to just go through the slides?

8 MR. COOPER: I think you can keep going through
9 the slides. I think that'll work fine, Judy.

10 MS. TORTELLI: Okay.

11 MR. COOPER: So just to recap: Here's the scoring
12 card you guys have seen and are familiar with. We had
13 identified nine different concepts for bridge crossings
14 here; kind of lumped them together as Judy noted.

15 The single pier concept with three different
16 bridge superstructure types, the clear span concept with
17 three different structure types, and then an elevated bridge
18 concept that looked at the full corridor across the river
19 incorporating the south bridge as well. The idea of that
20 one was to kind of open things up underneath a little bit
21 more than what they are now today.

22 We had identified eight attributes that you guys
23 got to score. We put together some guidance on the scoring
24 with the score of 1 meaning that that particular concept
25 faired poorly or was poor for a given attribute, up to a

1 high score of 10, where that attribute -- that particular
2 concept was viewed to score very highly or excellent for
3 that attribute.

4 So we had eight that we had identified in
5 the -- with the idea that as you guys went through this you
6 might think of other things that come up as being important
7 to consider that we may not have captured in the attributes
8 we identified, so we had included on the scorecard the two
9 attributes Y and Z, just to put placeholders there.

10 I think, Judy, if you go to the next slide.

11 We ended up with three additional attributes being
12 suggested.

13 The first one, if you click again, I think was
14 from Brian, a permitting and ancillating -- ancillary
15 impacts to the parks, and in parentheses scope creep.

16 In that added attribute, not to spill everybody's
17 cards here, but the clear span concepts were rated nearly
18 excellent. I think the scores were 9 across the board on
19 those. Single pier concepts were rated good, and the
20 elevated concepts as fair.

21 The next attribute that was added -- I think it
22 might have been Jaime -- it was noted as crime prevention
23 through environmental design.

24 And those were rated kind of similarly. The clear
25 span rigid frame, specifically, was given an excellent. The

1 single pier concepts all rated good. The tied arch was
2 fair. The deck arch -- that's the one with the arch shape
3 underneath the deck -- was rated poorly. All the elevated
4 concepts were poor.

5 Then we had a similar attribute, third one on the
6 next slide, homeless camps, graffiti, illicit activity --
7 this one was Theresa, I believe -- and all the clear span
8 comments were rated good -- not nearly good, but they were
9 rated good. Single pier concepts were fair. The elevated
10 concepts were nearly poor. I think, maybe, they were given
11 a 2.

12 So, if you click ahead one line, Judy.

13 We did not include these additional attributes in
14 the scoring that we're going to summarize for you today.

15 The way we scored the -- or assembled the nine
16 scorecards, we looked at the highs and the lows for each
17 attribute on each concept. We ended up taking the average
18 score of all the scores for each of those, and then summed
19 those for a total score.

20 We didn't feel it was appropriate to have just a
21 single person rating these added attributes to include them
22 in the scoring, but, I imagine, you'll see as we get further
23 along in the discussion here and we talk about the
24 results -- flip to the next bullet there, Judy -- if we
25 included the individual scores on those added attributes, it

1 was only a subtle change in the overall rankings.

2 So they didn't really make a difference in how we
3 saw the scoring come in. But that's something at the end of
4 the presentation here and the discussion, we'd like to talk
5 more about these added attributes, how the group feels about
6 them, the importance of incorporating them, and kind of tip
7 the hand to the folks that added them on how they viewed
8 them.

9 We'd kind of like to get, if the group thinks they
10 are important to consider, what those overall scoring might
11 be and it might go into the rankings.

12 Next slide, I think, Judy.

13 So here's the results as we rolled them up. The
14 first column of numbers is the score. As Judy noted, high
15 was good; low was bad.

16 We arrived at the scores you see there by taking
17 the sum of the average of each individual attribute for each
18 concept.

19 So you'll see there the rigid frame ended up with
20 a score of 58. It was quite a bit ahead of the others.

21 Next up were kind of grouped together, the single
22 pier concepts, and then the underdeck arch also had some
23 favorable response too.

24 In general, the elevated bridge concept did not
25 fair well. You can see the total scores there in the 30s

1 versus 40s and 50s for the other ones in general. And it
2 was almost consistent across the board, although, there were
3 a few differences.

4 I think the next slide -- well, before we get to
5 the individual scoring, just wanted to graphically depict --
6 I know I have a hard time looking at a column and numbers
7 and know what that means. So, graphically, it's just a bar
8 indicating the score for each.

9 You can see the rigid frame, clear span concept
10 far outpaced the others pretty much across the board.
11 Conversely, the elevated bridge concepts, all three of them,
12 were towards the bottom.

13 I think on the next slide, brought in -- we took
14 individual scoresheets and did the same total on those, but
15 instead of an average for each attribute, we took the
16 individual score for each attribute.

17 On an individual scorecard basis, the columns
18 would be how reviewer A through I would have ranked the
19 concepts based on how they scored them.

20 So kind of in broad terms, looking at the rigid
21 frame, several 1s in the rankings there, a 2, 3, 4 and a 5,
22 but, generally, pretty consistent on the high end.

23 The single pier concept, there's a little bit of
24 noise in there, but there's some 1s, 2s, 3s, and 4s up
25 there.

1 Then the elevated bridge concept, lots of 7s, 8s,
2 and 9s.

3 So kind of not on every scorecard, but I would say
4 the majority of scorecards, the rankings that we saw
5 individually were pretty consistent with how the group
6 totals came out.

7 I think next slide, Judy. Do one more click here.

8 So there's the scores we came up with without
9 including those three additional attributes. The second
10 group of scores that came up, those are including direct
11 scores out of those individual attributes that were added.

12 You can see the number in the score column is
13 quite a bit bigger. That is because there is three more
14 attributes included, so the numbers got bigger there.

15 The interesting thing is the ranking, rigid frame
16 is still 1, the precast concrete girders on the single span
17 is still 2, 3 and 4 flip-flopped, and the rest stayed same.

18 So we didn't see that those attributes were going
19 to have a significant contribution to how the rankings would
20 come out in the end, but we can talk about that more as we
21 get through the numbers here.

22 So I don't want to dive too far in the details,
23 but I did want to give you guys an indication of the range
24 of results we saw.

25 So these next few slides, we take individual

1 attributes and we look at the low score in the L column and
2 the high score in the H column and the average, and it's
3 that average value that we took and added with the other
4 averages with the attributes to get the total scores.

5 So, in general, you can see that the averages for
6 the elevated bridge concept, when considering construction
7 costs and schedule and cost risks, are kind of behind the
8 others.

9 The rigid frame concept fared really well, and the
10 single pier concept actually fared a little bit better
11 pretty much across the board.

12 Let's go to the next slide. Next one, the
13 existing infrastructure impacts, maintenance, and inspection
14 access, and long-term maintenance costs, kind of similar
15 trends here in these attributes.

16 Quite a range in some of the scores, but if you
17 look, like down at the elevated bridge, and the existing
18 infrastructure impacts, the scores ranked from 1 to -- or
19 numeric values of scores were from 1 to 7, but the average
20 on those were pretty low. Although, we had a couple of high
21 scores -- higher scores there, the trend of the group was
22 ranking that one lower.

23 Kind of similarly, up at the top, if we go over to
24 long-term maintenance costs. The single pier concept, we
25 had 4s to 10 or 3 to 10 on those, with an average that was

1 above the midline. So they didn't do too badly there.

2 The clear span concepts, kind of a mixed bag with
3 the rigid frame doing really well, and the tied arch not
4 looking so good.

5 The elevated bridge in the long-term maintenance
6 costs was little below midrange on that.

7 So the last one -- last of the attributes, I
8 think, environmental impacts, recreation impacts, and
9 bridges aesthetics. Again, a fair amount of range. We went
10 from 1 to 10 in some of these, 2 to 10 in some, and I think
11 the average of those is pretty reflective of what the
12 majority of the group looked at for each one of those.

13 If you guys are interested in seeing these results
14 in an Excel file and want to chew on them a little bit,
15 we're certainly happy to provide that -- I know we're going
16 through these pretty fast here -- to sink your teeth into.

17 So on the next slide, really the goal here is try
18 to identify which concepts to carry forward, wanting to pare
19 it down to ones that really are viable to look at in a
20 little bit more detail and carry through the environmental
21 process.

22 In the first regard, looking at how the three
23 options on the elevated bridge concept, they didn't do very
24 well.

25 So, I think -- Judy, if click the slide again --

1 in our opinion, based on the results we got from you guys,
2 the elevated bridge concepts wouldn't be carried forward to
3 look at any further.

4 On the flip side of that, if you look at the next
5 one, rigid frame obviously did well. At least in
6 percentage-wise, pretty good percentage above the next one
7 in line. So that one's an obvious candidate to carry
8 forward.

9 In looking at how those -- the rigid frame
10 compares to the other clear span alternates, it pretty much
11 far outpaced those.

12 So our suggestion would be not to look any further
13 at the underdeck arch concept or the tied arch concept. So
14 in your eyes, based on the scoring, we would tend to want to
15 eliminate those for further consideration.

16 So that leaves the single pier concept. And the
17 three of those, there's not a significant difference in the
18 scoring on those. So we'd suggest that all three of those
19 be carried forward.

20 Environmentally, they're very similar. They would
21 look very similar. The nuances are really in the
22 superstructure and how you build them, and, somewhat, the
23 look of them.

24 We're thinking that, based on how they got scored
25 fairly close, those we would suggest carrying forward to

1 look at in more detail.

2 So those three and the rigid frame would be the
3 ones we would suggest going ahead with. And the other
4 two -- clear span concepts and the elevated bridge
5 concepts -- appear not to warrant further consideration,
6 based on the scoring from this group.

7 MS. TORTELLI: So that is a lot of information in
8 just a short amount of time. I do recognize that. This is
9 the first time you guys have seen this material.

10 Do you want me to go back to the start of the
11 scoring, maybe, and we can go through it one more time?
12 Would that help? How do I -- would it be better to go back
13 a little bit?

14 MR. STEWART: Just start the dialogue. This is a
15 good slide. I'll start it off, if you want me to.

16 MS. TORTELLI: Okay. Brian is going to start off
17 some dialogue. How does that sound?

18 MR. COOPER: Sounds good.

19 MR. STEWART: All right. So the CSN1, we excluded
20 based on -- and I heard your justifications, but I struggle
21 just looking at this graph that the steel girders for the
22 single pier, they scored under that.

23 And I'm wondering if those should be eliminated
24 also. I mean, if you're going to eliminate the clear span,
25 CSN1, I'm feeling like, maybe, that the steel girder should

1 go also, and you only carry the cast-in-place concrete box,
2 the precast concrete girders under the single pier, and
3 then, obviously, the rigid frame.

4 MS. KOSKI: Kerrie Koski, City of Reno. I agree,
5 Brian.

6 MS. TORTELLI: Oh, you're muted, Kerrie.

7 MS. KOSKI: Sorry. It went back. Did you catch
8 that?

9 MS. TORTELLI: You said you agreed.

10 MS. KOSKI: Yep.

11 MS. TORTELLI: Okay.

12 MR. COOPER: Does anybody else have comments?
13 Anything? Any thoughts on the attributes that were added by
14 folks? Are those worth more discussion?

15 MR. DOENGES: This is Dan. I think the extra
16 attributes, as you pointed out, didn't really seem to affect
17 things too much when you compare the overall scores, and I
18 think they're good inclusions.

19 A couple of them are kind of similar anyway, I
20 think. I mean, I know they are not saying exactly the same
21 thing, but talking about a crime deterrent, graffiti, and
22 that sort of thing.

23 So, yeah, I think they're worthy of consideration,
24 but, again, I don't know how it's really going to impact the
25 overall scores.

1 MS. TORTELLI: Well, I guess with these added
2 attributes -- so let me just revisit what they are. Okay?

3 So we have three. We've got: permitting and
4 ancillary impacts to the park, or scope creep, meaning
5 trying to limit how much of the park we tear up -- right? --
6 then crime prevention through environmental design, and then
7 the last one which was homeless camps and graffiti and
8 illicit activity.

9 And I think these are all really good things to
10 consider, and I know that we only received scores on these
11 from three people, but I am kind of inclined to include them
12 because it's not really, you know, as we've stated, it's not
13 affecting the overall ranking of what we're doing.

14 I think it's good information to carry forward
15 because I think these are important attributes, and that was
16 the intent of providing the group with those X, Y, Z
17 attributes, and say, hey, if were missing something that you
18 think we should include, let's throw it out there.

19 And I think, you know, scope creep is a big deal
20 here -- right? -- because you've got the bridges that go
21 over the river, but there's Wingfield Park there. So that's
22 a big deal. Crime prevention and going under the bridges is
23 a factor.

24 So how does the rest of group feel about including
25 those attributes moving forward? Do people agree with that

1 or disagree strongly one way or another?

2 MR. DOENGES: Again, I like them. That's my
3 opinion. I think it would be good to include them.

4 MR. COOPER: I was just going to say, including
5 them probably makes good sense.

6 I'm wondering, as a group, we've tossed how the
7 individual that added the attribute, how they ranked those
8 as their -- within the group, were folks in agreement with
9 that, or would they look at these differently in how they
10 rank -- or score these attributes for the different
11 concepts?

12 MS. KOSKI: This is Kerrie with the City of Reno.
13 I agree that the additional attributes should be included.
14 I think they are highly appropriate as things have evolved
15 through the years.

16 And I -- it appears to me that the ranking was in
17 alignment with the way I ranked the others. So I think that
18 it's really good information to include.

19 MR. COOPER: Okay.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: This is Jaime from the City of
21 Reno. I have a feeling that Theresa and I were on the same
22 mind set. She just used a different set of words to
23 describe crime prevention through environmental design.

24 Hers is a lot more specific to the issues that I
25 was concerned about with the graffiti, having places for

1 people to be able to hide so that they can sleep or build a
2 camp.

3 That is why I felt it was important to put this
4 information out there, because after the bridge is built,
5 then it becomes a maintenance side of it and the challenges
6 that we already deal with along the river.

7 So I would strongly want to stay we need to take
8 that into consideration as we chose which bridge. But,
9 thankfully, it did seem to mirror up with the engineers.

10 MS. JONES: And this is Theresa Jones. Yes, I was
11 glad to see that somebody else -- actually Jaime did a
12 better job of articulating -- framing what I was trying to
13 say, but my years of bridge inspection with the Nevada
14 Department of Transportation, anytime there is a flat space,
15 a place for people to sit, you find needles and all kinds of
16 inappropriate stuff.

17 I had a question regarding the single pier option.
18 I was kind of going off the picture that was provided, and
19 in that option, the single pier in the river option, it
20 looked like there was also space under there to hide and
21 whatnot.

22 So I think my evaluation was a bit different than
23 Jaime's for the first group of bridges, but that was just
24 based on, yeah, that single pier option.

25 You can see that there is space underneath. I

1 believe it's the south abutment 1 there that might cause
2 some problems in the future.

3 So I think my rankings were a bit different than
4 Jaime's, but that's neither here nor there.

5 MR. STEWART: I agree that those were important to
6 the evaluators to put that information in, and I think that
7 they treated them appropriately so that we can really be
8 transparent and show what the thought process was when we
9 move forward with the design.

10 So I support, definitely, leaving them in, without
11 a doubt.

12 MS. TORTELLI: I mean, even -- I guess, even right
13 now as that north bridge sits existing -- in it's existing
14 condition, you do have the sidewalk that goes underneath and
15 gets down to the river.

16 And I know from our initial Stakeholder Working
17 Group meeting and feedback from the public, being able to
18 access one side of the park to the other side of the park
19 was really important.

20 I think if we could limit how big that area is and
21 not make it a huge, dark space under the bridge, but make it
22 sort of a pedestrian path that's lit or something, I think
23 that's kind of a -- could accommodate both pieces or -- I
24 mean, is this clearly saying you don't want anything under
25 any access under the bridge?

1 I'm trying to say, we're still going to provide
2 access, but it's going to be minimal --

3 MR. STEWART: You're not providing that pier that
4 causes it to be dark or another spot, especially in low
5 flow, that folks can hang out and --

6 MS. TORTELLI: That's true.

7 MR. STEWART: -- tag and whatnot.

8 MR. COOPER: It sounds like there is consensus,
9 then, among to group to incorporate the scores from those as
10 we got them?

11 MS. TORTELLI: I think so.

12 MR. STEWART: Yes.

13 MR. COOPER: Okay. Judy, if you flip to the slide
14 that includes both sets then. Okay.

15 Okay. (Zoom audio drop) support Brian, what you
16 were saying then. The steel girder, it's fifth in the
17 rankings. It kind of drops the underdeck arch a little bit
18 lower still.

19 Then the three that kind of rise to the top are
20 the rigid frame, the precast girders, and the cast-in-place
21 box structure.

22 Does anybody see it differently? Were open for a
23 different ranking?

24 MS. TORTELLI: So, I mean, I guess, if we just go
25 off of the ranking that includes the attributes -- the added

1 attributes, we would be taking 1, 2, and 3 -- right,
2 Mike? -- rigid frame, precast concrete girder and
3 cast-in-place concrete box.

4 We would say that those would be our three
5 alternatives that we carry forward, based on recommendation
6 from this TAC Group.

7 MR. COOPER: In looking at how the rankings came
8 about -- that's just an Excel -- looking at numeric values
9 of the scores to rank those to the nearest (Zoom audio drop)
10 the cast-in-place box and underdeck arch, both show up as
11 64, but one of those was probably a little bit higher than
12 64. It could have been 63.9 or something. That's why they
13 don't have the same ranking, though they seem to have the
14 same apparent score.

15 MS. TORTELLI: Oh, okay.

16 MR. COOPER: So we talked about dropping the steel
17 I-girders from further consideration.

18 Was there anyone interested in trying to carry
19 forward, the underdeck arch since it fared just a little bit
20 better than the steel I-girders? Nope.

21 Everybody's on mute, or nobody wants to carry that
22 one forward.

23 So it sounds like we've got three, then, that the
24 group would recommend taking forward in a little bit more
25 detail to evaluation.

1 MS. TORTELLI: Right. And I guess I just wanted
2 to -- let me go back here. Sorry. I'm all over the place.

3 So I agree, that's the recommendation from this
4 TAC.

5 Moving forward what my plan is to do is take the
6 feedback that we got from our TAC meetings -- so we got
7 feedback from the Permitting and Regulatory TAC Group, and
8 we've received feedback from this group on which
9 alternatives we take forward.

10 My goal is to take that information to the
11 Stakeholder Working Group and gain their consensus with what
12 we're moving forward with.

13 So depending on how that conversation goes or how
14 that input goes from the public -- because the Stake Holder
15 Working Group is more of a public group than a real
16 technical group -- we may end up needing to continue forward
17 with, like, the underdeck arch, just because it's so close.
18 Maybe there's something that somebody wants us to look at a
19 little bit more.

20 But I think, based on information from this
21 meeting and the previous TAC, I mean, which the Permitting
22 and Regulatory TAC falls right in line with what we
23 discussed today.

24 All of the alternatives are similar from a
25 permitting perspective except for that elevated bridge

1 concept or the tied arch concept are going to be more
2 challenging because they're going to really impact the
3 viewshed.

4 So those particular alternatives are less
5 favorable from a permitting perspective.

6 So it's nice that both the permitting and the
7 bridge and the roadway elements are coming to the same
8 conclusion, I guess, and they're in line with each other.

9 MR. COOPER: Seems like pretty in agreement there
10 between the two groups.

11 MS. TORTELLI: Yeah. And they are totally
12 separate, and they totally look at the project
13 differently -- right? -- this group did official scoring.
14 We gave everybody cards and information and said: Here,
15 score them.

16 It was a different approach with the permitting
17 and regulatory side. So I think this great.

18 Is there any other discussion anyone would like to
19 have or anything anyone would like to add?

20 MR. MALOY: This is Doug from the RTC. I guess to
21 tighten it up a little bit more, maybe we could have a
22 little discussion about, say, steel I-girders.

23 We're looking at numbers. The problem with
24 numbers is there isn't -- there's more behind it than in
25 some cases than others.

1 I'm just -- it would be nice to, maybe,
2 summarize -- have some discussion, and then, maybe,
3 summarize why, say, a steel I-girder just -- it checks a lot
4 of boxes, but, for me, although we're not necessarily in a
5 corrosive atmosphere here, it would be a bigger deal
6 elsewhere.

7 It's just, to me, I think steel is more
8 challenging because it gets tagged, maybe, easier, things
9 like that, and more difficult to deal with and maintain.

10 I don't know if we need to go that far, and just
11 tighten it up a little bit as far as what -- how it, maybe,
12 just dropped off, but was still fairly close to others.

13 MR. STEWART: Doug, this is Brian. I think you're
14 right, but I think it comes out in our scoring. And that's
15 the reason it got a lower score is because of those
16 challenges, I think.

17 I also factored in -- not knowing, and not running
18 any calculations with respect to it -- you know, you don't
19 have that post-tensioning sort of alternative to be able to
20 deal with and get the depth of span ratio to be as small as
21 possible so we can maximize that flow area.

22 I think you might have some options in those other
23 ones with the precast and even the cast-in-place concrete.

24 So that was reflected in my score of -- and
25 probably why you're seeing it in these numbers.

1 MS. TORTELLI: I guess, I'm anticipating -- in
2 terms of discussion, I wouldn't mind having -- it's not --
3 it's a little bit before 2:00, so I think we have a little
4 bit of time.

5 I mean, I think the elevated bridge concept
6 definitely scored the lowest. I guess, if we could have a
7 little bit of discussion, maybe, why people scored it
8 lowest, just to help me with that feedback to the public.

9 I think that would help me moving this forward, if
10 people would be willing to share their thoughts.

11 Maybe, Kerrie, I'll start with you. You're on the
12 top. How does that sound?

13 MS. KOSKI: Okay. Well, I think for one thing,
14 accessibility, and I mean adjacent accessibility is going
15 to -- it would impair -- would be very difficult to
16 accommodate that.

17 The Wingfield Park is very important to the City,
18 and being able to access that, as well as down there through
19 Barbara Bennett, we do have another access route to several
20 of those properties that we have to maintain.

21 I think environmental impacts are much greater and
22 cost. Obviously, I would be concerned about the scope creep
23 with costs with the elevated structure.

24 And then I would defer to Theresa on some of
25 the -- some of elements that she might have picked out,

1 because she's got a lot of experience with different types
2 of structures.

3 I'd like to kind of hear what she has to say.

4 MS. JONES: Yes, Kerrie, I think I mirror what you
5 had said, and, in addition, impacts to the parks, access to
6 the river.

7 A big factor for me as well is just the additional
8 attributes that I added. I just felt that was, for me, a
9 nonstarter on the elevated bridge concept.

10 That is my -- that was my biggest factor is the
11 crime prevention by environmental design. I like Jaime's
12 title much better than mine.

13 I don't have my numbers up in front of me, but,
14 anyway, those were the main issues for me.

15 MS. TORTELLI: That's great feedback, you guys. I
16 really appreciate it.

17 Is there anybody else that would like to add
18 anything?

19 MR. STEWART: I'll add, or just ditto a lot of
20 what you said. When you really look at that elevated bridge
21 concept, it's impacting a lot of use in the park and having
22 to, maybe, mitigate that, where it works fine in the current
23 configuration and the events that happen now.

24 Just to go in there because of that change and,
25 say, move the pavilion or have to deal with the pavilion, I

1 don't think it's worth it in this transportation project of
2 which we're trying to meet the goals and objectives at the
3 front end, or purpose and need.

4 That elevated bridge just really didn't speak to
5 that purpose and need as well as these other concepts, which
6 clearly hit home to me on that.

7 So it felt like, while a little bit of good idea
8 that needed to be vetted, sort of a bigger than what we
9 really needed. Bigger and just over to top.

10 MR. DOENGES: Hey, Judy, this is Dan. I would
11 certainly echo all the comments that have already been made.

12 The only other thing I would add is, you know, I
13 think Wingfield Park really is a gem in the community, and a
14 lot of people visit it and recreate there.

15 I just think the community impacts to change or
16 alter that in any way would probably not go over well. I
17 think people like it the way it is.

18 So to have kind of the minimal impact would be the
19 best course of action.

20 MS. TORTELLI: A lot of people do enjoy that area.
21 To just completely flip access around, it would be
22 harsh -- right? -- I can see that. I agree with that.

23 Okay. Does anybody else want to add anything?

24 MS. KOSKI: So now that we have our rankings, can
25 we move up the construction to 2022?

1 MS. TORTELLI: There's one thing we need and
2 that's money.

3 MS. KOSKI: Oh, Dale is going to help us out with
4 that.

5 MS. TORTELLI: Do you have a lot of money for us,
6 Dale?

7 MR. WEGNER: Wished I could.

8 MS. TORTELLI: It's hard to come by, isn't it?

9 MS. KOSKI: Well, maybe we'll get a real surge to
10 our infrastructure funds here in the next -- 2021; right?

11 MR. STEWART: Well, we want to be prepared, for
12 sure, and doing this important work of looking at these
13 alternatives and looking at those impacts as part of that is
14 getting us set up to do that.

15 The main goal, once we get that environmental
16 document done, is to go out there and swing the bat.

17 MS. KOSKI: Get it shovel ready. No pressure,
18 Jacobs.

19 MR. GREENE: Maybe a little bit.

20 MS. KOSKI: Yeah.

21 MS. TORTELLI: All right. Well, I appreciate
22 everyone's input. Thanks for filling out scorecards and
23 participating in the meeting.

24 I don't -- there were some of pretty big follow-up
25 items that we had from our initial TAC meeting that I need

1 to follow up with the group on -- our first TAC meeting.

2 I don't really see anything here that I need to
3 follow up with the group on, unless somebody is looking for
4 something?

5 I think we've talked through stuff. We will
6 probably finalize the ranking and stuff based on those added
7 attributes, and the recommendations from this TAC will be to
8 move the first top-three-ranked alternatives forward.

9 All right. Well, I am going to call it, unless
10 anybody has anything to add? No.

11 All right. Thank you.

12 MS. KOSKI: Thank you very much. We appreciate
13 your efforts doing this. The City truly does appreciate it.

14 MR. COOPER: Thanks for all your input.

15 MS. TORTELLI: Thanks for everybody's input. Now
16 you've got lots of time to go get something else
17 done -- right? -- since this didn't take all the way until
18 4:00.

19 Thank you, everybody.

20 (Meeting concluded at 1:59 P.M.)

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF NEVADA)
2 COUNTY OF WASHOE) ss.

3

4 I, BRANDI ANN VIANNEY SMITH, court reporter, do
5 hereby certify:

6 That I was present via Zoom audio visual on August
7 31, 2020, at the Arlington Bridges TAC-2 Meeting, and took
8 stenotype notes of the proceedings entitled herein, and
9 thereafter transcribed said proceedings into typewriting as
10 herein appears.

11 That the foregoing transcript is a full, true, and
12 correct transcription of my stenotype notes of said
13 proceedings consisting of 36pages.

14 DATED: At Reno, Nevada, this 7th day of
15 September, 2020.

16

17 /s/ Brandi Ann Vianney Smith

18 BRANDI ANN VIANNEY SMITH

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 HEALTH INFORMATION PRIVACY & SECURITY: CAUTIONARY NOTICE
2 Litigation Services is committed to compliance with applicable federal
3 and state laws and regulations ("Privacy Laws") governing the
4 protection and security of patient health information. Notice is
5 hereby given to all parties that transcripts of depositions and legal
6 proceedings, and transcript exhibits, may contain patient health
7 information that is protected from unauthorized access, use and
8 disclosure by Privacy Laws. Litigation Services requires that access,
9 maintenance, use, and disclosure (including but not limited to
10 electronic database maintenance and access, storage, distribution/
11 dissemination and communication) of transcripts/exhibits containing
12 patient information be performed in compliance with Privacy Laws.
13 No transcript or exhibit containing protected patient health
14 information may be further disclosed except as permitted by Privacy
15 Laws. Litigation Services expects that all parties, parties'
16 attorneys, and their HIPAA Business Associates and Subcontractors will
17 make every reasonable effort to protect and secure patient health
18 information, and to comply with applicable Privacy Law mandates,
19 including but not limited to restrictions on access, storage, use, and
20 disclosure (sharing) of transcripts and transcript exhibits, and
21 applying "minimum necessary" standards where appropriate. It is
22 recommended that your office review its policies regarding sharing of
23 transcripts and exhibits - including access, storage, use, and
24 disclosure - for compliance with Privacy Laws.

25 © All Rights Reserved. Litigation Services (rev. 6/1/2019)

-	2022 33:25	50s 15:1	able 24:1 25:17 30:19 31:18	ADA-COMPLIANT 7:6
---o0o--- 1:6 2:1,3	2026 7:15	58 14:20		
1	2:00 31:3	6	above 18:1 19:6	add 29:19 32:17,19 33:12,23 35:10
1 11:24 16:16 17:18,19 18:10 25:1 27:1	2s 15:24	63.9 27:12	abutment 25:1	added 4:16 12:16,21 13:21,25 14:5,7 16:11 17:3 21:13 22:1 23:7 26:25 32:8 35:6
10 12:1 17:25 18:10	3	64 27:11,12	access 8:1 17:14 25:18, 25 26:2 31:18,19 32:5 33:21	
11 4:10	3 15:21 16:17 17:25 27:1	656644 1:25		
1:00 2:2	30s 14:25	7	accessibility 31:14	addition 32:5
1:59 35:20	31 1:11 2:2	7 17:19	accommodate 25:23 31:16	additional 6:16 12:11 13:13 16:9 23:13 32:7
1s 15:21,24	3s 15:24	7s 16:1	accordingly 4:22	address 3:1 6:17 7:5,6
2	4	8	across 10:16, 20 11:18 12:18 15:2,10 17:11	adjacent 31:14
2 13:11 15:21 16:17 18:10 27:1	4 15:21 16:17	8s 16:1	action 33:19	Advisory 5:10
2019 6:10	40s 15:1	9	activity 13:6 22:8	aesthetic 5:17 6:18
2020 1:11 2:2	4:00 35:18	9 12:18	actually 9:4 17:10 24:11	aesthetics
2021 34:10	4s 15:24 17:25	9s 16:2		
	5	A		
	5 15:21	ability 6:3,4		

18:9	alignment 23:17	27:5 28:9,24 29:4 34:13 35:8	9:9,16 11:1 21:12 26:22 32:17 33:23 35:10	approach 8:4 10:20 29:16
affect 21:16	all 4:9 5:1 8:13 10:14, 15,25 11:4 13:1,3,7,18 15:11 19:18 20:19 22:9 24:15 28:2,24 33:11 34:21 35:9,11,14,17	although 15:2 17:20 30:4	anyone 27:18 29:18,19	appropriate 13:20 23:14
affecting 22:13		among 26:9	anything 8:15 9:16 21:13 25:24 29:19 32:18 33:23 35:2,10	appropriately 25:7
after 5:25 24:4		amount 18:9 20:8		arch 8:8 13:1, 2 14:22 18:3 19:13 26:17 27:10,19 28:17 29:1
afterwards 3:7	almost 15:2	Amy 3:13	anytime 24:14	area 25:20 30:21 33:20
again 5:2 12:13 18:9,25 21:24 23:2	along 8:10 13:23 24:6	analyzing 7:11	anyway 21:19 32:14	Arlington 1:9 2:8
agency 7:21	already 24:6 33:11	ancillary 12:14 22:4	apparent 27:14	Army 7:18
agenda 4:23	also 5:3,21 9:15 14:22 20:24 21:1 24:20 30:17	ancillating 12:14	appear 20:5	around 33:21
ago 4:9	alter 33:16	Ann 1:24	appears 23:16	arrived 14:16
agree 21:4 22:25 23:13 25:5 28:3 33:22	alternates 19:10	another 7:11 23:1 26:4 31:19	apples 10:7	articulating 24:12
agreed 21:9	alternative 8:6,25 9:3 30:19	anticipated 6:20	applicable 4:8	assembled 13:15
agreement 23:8 29:9	alternatives 4:18,21 6:3 7:2 8:3,14,20	anticipating 31:1	appreciate 4:13 32:16 34:21 35:12, 13	associated 4:6 6:13 8:5
ahead 2:5 13:12 14:20 20:3		anybody 3:16		atmosphere

30:5	B	before 15:4 31:3	14 30:5 33:8, 9	21:5 26:15 30:13
attribute 11:25 12:1,3, 16,21 13:5,17 14:17 15:15, 16 23:7	back 4:5 6:9 7:16 20:10,12 21:7 28:2	beginning 7:15	biggest 32:10	bridge 1:10 2:7 4:2 5:15, 17 6:17 7:11 8:7 10:13 11:13,16,17, 19 14:24 15:11 16:1 17:6,17 18:5, 23 19:2 20:4 24:4,8,13 25:13,21,25 28:25 29:7 31:5 32:9,20 33:4
attributes 4:8,17 5:7 9:7,13 10:5 11:22 12:7,9, 11 13:13,21, 25 14:5 16:9, 11,14,18 17:1,4,15 18:7 21:13,16 22:2,15,17,25 23:10,13 26:25 27:1 32:8 35:7	background 4:25	behind 17:7 29:24	bit 8:11,23 9:5,21 11:20 14:20 15:23 16:13 17:10 18:14,20 20:13 24:22 25:3 26:17 27:11,19,24 28:19 29:21 30:11 31:3,4, 7 33:7 34:19	
audio 26:15 27:9	bad 14:15	being 12:6,11 25:17 31:18	board 6:7 10:16,21 12:18 15:2,10 17:11	bridge-specific 10:18
August 1:11 2:2	badly 18:1	believe 13:7 25:1	both 25:23 26:14 27:10 29:6	bridges 1:9 2:8 7:5 18:9 22:20,22 24:23
Avenue 2:8	bag 18:2	below 18:6	bottom 15:12	brief 2:18
average 13:17 14:17 15:15 17:2,3, 19,25 18:11	bar 15:7	Bennett 31:19	box 21:1 26:21 27:3,10	broad 15:20
averages 17:4,5	Barbara 31:19	best 9:1 33:19	boxes 10:24 30:4	brought 7:24 15:13
avoid 6:4	based 4:20 6:3 8:9 15:19 19:1,14,24 20:6,20 24:24 27:5 28:20 35:6	better 17:10 20:12 24:12 27:20 32:12	Brandi 1:24	build 19:22 24:1
	basically 10:7	between 4:21 29:10	Brian 2:9 3:9 12:14 20:16	built 6:5 24:4
	basis 15:17	biased 7:2		
	bat 34:16	big 22:19,22 25:20 32:7 34:24		
	becomes 24:5	bigger 16:13,		

bullet 13:24	6:23 19:2,19	change 14:1 32:24 33:15	17:1,2	4:14
<hr/> C <hr/>	carry 5:18 18:18,20 19:7 21:1 22:14 27:5,18,21	checking 10:24	columns 15:17	complete 5:14 7:12,14
calculations 30:18	carrying 19:25	checks 30:3	come 12:6 14:3 16:20 34:8	completely 33:21
call 3:5,16 35:9	case 10:25	chew 18:14	comes 30:14	concept 5:7 9:14 10:10 11:3,15,16, 18,24 12:2 13:17 14:18, 24 15:9,23 16:1 17:6,9, 10,24 18:23 19:13,16 29:1 31:5 32:9,21
called 5:21	cases 29:25	chose 24:8	coming 29:7	
came 16:6,8, 10 27:7	cast-in-place 10:11 21:1 26:20 27:3,10 30:23	City 3:12,15 5:12 6:7 21:4 23:12,20 31:17 35:13	comments 2:25 13:8 21:12 33:11	
camp 24:2		clear 11:16 12:17,24 13:7 15:9 18:2 19:10 20:4,24	COMMISSION 1:4	concepts 6:18 7:11 8:8 9:22 11:13 12:17,19,20 13:1,4,9,10 14:22 15:11, 19 18:2,18 19:2 20:4,5 23:11 33:5
campus 13:6 22:7	catch 21:7	clearance 5:19	Committee 5:11	
candidate 19:7	categories 9:22	clearly 7:22 25:24 33:6	community 7:7 33:13,15	
capacity 7:7	cause 25:1	click 12:13 13:12 16:7 18:25	compare 21:17	concerned 23:25 31:22
capture 2:14	causes 26:4	close 19:25 28:17 30:12	compares 19:10	concerns 9:9
captured 12:7	certainly 18:15 33:11	column 14:14 15:6 16:12	comparing 10:7	conclude 8:7
card 11:12	challenges 24:5 30:16		compiled	concluded 35:20
cards 12:17 29:14	challenging 8:8 29:2 30:8			
carried 4:19				

conclusion 29:8	15:2,22 16:5	31:22	D	7:22 8:4
concrete 10:11 16:16 21:1,2 27:2,3 30:23	constraints 4:6 5:15 6:12	costs 5:16 6:6 9:2 17:7, 14,24 18:6 31:23	Dale 3:9 34:3, 6	definitely 10:3 25:10 31:6
concurrence 6:22	construction 6:6 7:15 9:2,4 17:6 33:25	Council 6:7	Dan 3:11 9:18,19 10:9, 21 21:15 33:10	Department 1:5 24:14
condition 25:14	continue 28:16	couple 17:20 21:19	dark 25:21 26:4	depending 28:13
configuration 32:23	contribution 16:19	course 33:19	deal 22:19,22 24:6 30:5,9, 20 32:25	depict 15:5
confused 8:16	conversation 28:13	court 2:14	debris 8:1	depth 30:20
confusion 9:9	Conversely 15:11	cover 4:23	December 6:9	describe 23:23
consensus 26:8 28:11	Cooper 2:11, 20 3:13 11:8, 11 20:18 21:12 23:4,19 26:8,13 27:7, 16 29:9 35:14	creep 12:15 22:4,19 31:22	decision 5:22	describes 6:24
consider 12:7 14:10 22:10	Corps 7:19	crime 12:22 21:21 22:6,22 23:23 32:11	Decisions 5:20	design 4:5,19 5:19 12:23 22:6 23:23 25:9 32:11
consideration 19:15 20:5 21:23 24:8 27:17	corridor 11:18	criteria 6:13	deck 13:2,3	detail 18:20 20:1 27:25
considering 17:6	corrosive 30:5	crossings 11:13	defer 31:24	details 4:2 16:22
consistent	cost 9:4 17:7	CSN1 20:19, 25	deficient 7:5	determine 5:16
		Cummings 3:13	define 5:15	determined
		current 32:22	defining 6:12	

4:7	3:23	9:18,20 10:22	29:8	14:3 15:22
deterrent 21:21	direct 16:10	21:15 23:2 33:10	early 6:20 7:12	16:20 28:16 33:3
developing 7:1	disagree 23:1	done 4:1 34:16 35:17	easier 30:8	ended 12:11 13:17 14:19
dewatering 7:25	discharge 7:25	doubt 25:11	echo 33:11	engages 5:23
dialogue 20:14,17	discuss 2:20 8:18	Doug 3:10 29:20 30:13	efforts 35:13	engineer 10:13
Dietrich 3:12	discussed 4:5 28:23	down 17:17 18:19 25:15 31:18	eight 11:22 12:4	engineering 4:5 6:12
difference 14:2 19:17	discussion 2:22 3:1 5:9 13:23 14:4 21:14 29:18, 22 30:2 31:2, 7	drop 26:15 27:9	elements 1:10 2:8 4:3 29:7 31:25	engineers 2:12 7:19 24:9
differences 15:3	distinction 4:21	dropped 30:12	elevated 8:7 11:17 12:20 13:3,9 14:24 15:11 16:1 17:6,17 18:5, 23 19:2 20:4 28:25 31:5,23 32:9,20 33:4	enjoy 33:20
different 8:21 10:14 11:13, 15,17 23:10, 22 24:22 25:3 26:23 29:16 32:1	ditto 32:19	dropping 27:16	eliminate 19:15 20:24	environment 6:5
differently 10:18 23:9 26:22 29:13	dive 4:2 16:22	drops 26:17	eliminated 20:23	environmenta l 4:6 5:18,21 6:12 12:23 18:8,20 22:6 23:23 31:21 32:11 34:15
difficult 30:9 31:15	document 34:16	during 3:1 9:10	elsewhere 30:6	Environmenta lly 19:20
difficulties	documented 5:20	each 8:5 13:16,17,18 14:17 15:8, 15,16 18:12	end 5:17 9:25	equal 9:24
	DOENGES	<hr/> E <hr/>		especially

26:4	exactly 21:20	13:2,9 14:25 18:9	22:24	flip 13:24 19:4 26:13 33:21
evaluated 6:3	Excel 18:14 27:8	faired 11:25	feeling 20:25 23:21	
evaluating 7:1	excellent 12:2,18,25	fairly 19:25 30:12	feels 14:5	flip-flopped 16:17
evaluation 4:8 5:7 9:14 11:3 24:22 27:25	except 28:25	falls 28:22	felt 24:3 32:8 33:7	flow 26:5 30:21
evaluators 25:6	excited 4:17	familiar 11:12	few 4:9 15:3 16:25	focused 6:15 7:17
even 25:12 30:23	excluded 20:19	far 15:10 16:22 19:11 30:10,11	FHWA 3:9 5:12 7:21	folks 14:7 21:14 23:8 26:5
events 32:23	existing 17:13,17 25:13	fared 17:9,10 27:19	fifth 26:16	follow 35:1,3
every 16:3	experience 32:1	fast 18:16	file 18:14	follow-up 34:24
everybody 2:6,13,24 3:5 4:13 5:14 29:14 35:19	extra 21:15	favorable 14:23 29:5	filling 34:22	Following 5:22
	eyes 19:14	feasibility 5:14 6:6 7:13	finalize 35:6	formal 8:2
	F		find 24:15	forward 3:24 4:19 5:18 6:16,23 18:18 19:2,8,19,25 22:14,25 25:9 27:5,19,22,24 28:5,9,12,16 31:9 35:8
everybody's 2:15 9:12 12:16 27:21 35:15	factor 22:23 32:7,10	February 4:5 6:11	fine 11:9 32:22	
everyone's 34:22	factored 30:17	feedback 6:10 7:20 25:17 28:6,7, 8 31:8 32:15	first 4:4 5:2,3, 5 6:10,14 7:9, 16 12:13 14:14 18:22 20:9 24:23 35:1,8	
evolved 23:14	fair 12:20	feel 13:20	flat 24:14	found 9:23

<p>frame 12:25 14:19 15:9,21 16:15 17:9 18:3 19:5,9 20:2 21:3 26:20 27:2</p> <p>framing 24:12</p> <p>front 10:1 32:13 33:3</p> <p>frustrated 8:16</p> <p>full 11:18</p> <p>funds 34:10</p> <p>further 13:22 19:3,12,15 20:5 27:17</p> <p>future 5:24 25:2</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">G</p> <hr/> <p>gain 28:11</p> <p>gathered 4:7 6:19,21</p> <p>gave 9:16 29:14</p>	<p>geared 8:4</p> <p>gem 33:13</p> <p>general 14:24 15:1 17:5</p> <p>generally 15:22</p> <p>getting 3:23 4:13 34:14</p> <p>girder 20:25 26:16 27:2</p> <p>girders 10:11 16:16 20:21 21:2 26:20</p> <p>give 3:25 16:23</p> <p>given 11:25 12:25 13:10</p> <p>giving 9:24</p> <p>glad 24:11</p> <p>goal 4:18 7:14 18:17 28:10 34:15</p> <p>goals 33:2</p> <p>goes 25:14</p>	<p>28:13,14</p> <p>good 12:19 13:1,8,9 14:15 18:4 19:6 20:15,18 21:18 22:9,14 23:3,5,18 33:7</p> <p>graffiti 13:6 21:21 22:7 23:25</p> <p>graph 20:21</p> <p>graphically 15:5,7</p> <p>great 4:12 6:10 7:19 29:17 32:15</p> <p>greater 31:21</p> <p>Greene 2:10 3:13 34:19</p> <p>group 2:21 4:4,17 5:3 6:7,11,17,22 8:2,7,18 14:5, 9 16:5,10 17:21 18:12 20:6 22:16,24 23:6,8 24:23 25:17 26:9 27:6,24 28:7,</p>	<p>8,11,15,16 29:13 35:1,3</p> <p>grouped 14:21</p> <p>groups 29:10</p> <p>guess 9:21 22:1 25:12 26:24 28:1 29:8,20 31:1, 6</p> <p>guessing 9:13</p> <p>guidance 11:23</p> <p>guys 11:4,12, 22 12:5 16:23 18:13 19:1 20:9 32:15</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">H</p> <hr/> <p>hand 14:7</p> <p>hang 26:5</p> <p>happen 32:23</p> <p>happy 18:15</p> <p>hard 15:6</p>	<p>34:8</p> <p>harsh 33:22</p> <p>having 3:23 23:25 31:2 32:21</p> <p>hear 32:3</p> <p>heard 20:20</p> <p>held 4:5 6:11, 20</p> <p>help 20:12 31:8,9 34:3</p> <p>helps 5:22</p> <p>here 2:7,9 3:4,10,17,18 4:1,18,23 7:8, 9,10 11:14 12:17 13:23 14:4 16:7,21 17:15 18:16, 17 22:20 25:4 28:2 29:14 30:5 34:10 35:2</p> <p>here's 11:3, 11 14:13</p> <p>hey 9:18 22:17 33:10</p>
---	---	---	--	--

hide 24:1,20	I	8:10 12:15 17:13,18 18:8 22:4 31:21 32:5 33:15 34:13	includes 6:1 26:14,25	23:18 24:4 25:6 28:10,20 29:14
high 9:3 12:1 14:14 15:22 17:2,20	I-GIRDER 30:3	impair 31:15	including 16:9,10 22:24 23:4	infrastructure 17:13,18 34:10
higher 10:4 17:21 27:11	I-GIRDERS 10:12 27:17, 20 29:22	importance 14:6	inclusions 21:18	initial 4:8 5:2 25:16 34:25
highest 8:24	idea 11:19 12:5 33:7	important 12:6 14:10 22:15 24:3 25:5,19 31:17 34:12	incorporate 26:9	input 6:2,6,19 28:14 34:22 35:14,15
highly 12:2 23:14	identified 4:11 5:11,18 11:13,22 12:4,8	improvement 7:1	incorporating 11:19 14:6	inspection 17:13 24:13
highs 13:16	identify 2:16 5:15 18:18	improvement s 7:6	indicating 15:8	instance 10:9
hit 33:6	identifying 7:10	inappropriate 24:16	indication 16:23	instead 15:15
hold 6:16	illicit 13:6 22:8	inclined 22:11	individual 9:6 13:25 14:17 15:5,14,16,17 16:11,25 23:7	intend 7:12
Holder 28:14	imagine 13:22	include 13:13,21 22:11,18 23:3,18	individually 16:5	intent 22:16
home 33:6	impact 21:24 29:2 33:18	included 4:16 12:8 13:25 16:14 23:13	inform 5:22	intention 6:25
homeless 13:6 22:7	impacting 32:21		information 4:7 5:2,7 6:18,19,21 8:12 9:10,14, 15 20:7 22:14	interested 18:13 27:18
hosted 7:18	impacts 6:5			interesting 16:15
huge 25:21				into 4:2,14,19 5:8,18 14:11
hung 8:23 9:5,21				
hydraulic 7:6				

18:16 24:8	32:4	20,23 11:14, 20 12:24 14:6,9,21 15:20 16:3 17:7,14,23 18:2 21:19 22:11 24:18 25:23 26:17, 19 32:3 33:18	let 2:13 11:6 22:2 28:2	31:3,7 33:7 34:19
introductions/ attendance 3:4	Judy 2:6 3:8 9:18 11:9,14 12:10 13:12, 24 14:12,14 16:7 18:25 26:13 33:10		like 2:23 3:8, 22 7:16 8:3, 11 9:2,12,16 10:4,9 14:4,9 17:17 20:25 23:2 24:20 26:8 27:23 28:17 29:9, 18,19 30:9 32:3,11,17 33:7,17	long-term 17:14,24 18:5
issue 10:8				looked 8:16 11:18 13:16 18:12 24:20
issues 23:24 32:14	July 7:16	kinds 24:15		
items 5:1 10:14 34:25	jump 5:8	knowing 30:17		looking 5:6 15:6,20 18:4, 22 19:9 20:21 27:7,8 29:23 34:12,13 35:3
iterations 8:21	justifications 20:20	Koski 3:17,19 21:4,7,10 23:12 31:13 33:24 34:3,9, 17,20 35:12	limit 22:5 25:20	
<hr/> J <hr/>	<hr/> K <hr/>		line 2:10,14 3:6,9,11,16 13:12 19:7 28:22 29:8	looks 3:22 9:12
Jacobs 2:10, 20 3:13,14 11:5 34:18	keep 2:24 11:8	Kurt 3:12		lot 9:21,22 10:4 20:7 23:24 30:3 32:1,19,21 33:14,20 34:5
Jaime 3:11 12:22 23:20 24:11	Ken 2:10 3:13	<hr/> L <hr/>	Linkages 5:21	
Jaime's 24:23 25:4 32:11	Kerrie 3:17, 18 21:4,6 23:12 31:11 32:4	last 6:14 7:10 18:7 22:7	list 3:4 5:10	lots 16:1 35:16
job 1:25 24:12	key 7:24	lead 7:21	lit 25:22	low 9:4 14:15 17:1,20 26:4
Jon 3:14	kick-off 6:9 7:9,14	least 19:5	little 5:6 7:9 8:11,23 9:5, 21 11:20 15:23 17:10 18:6,14,20 20:13 26:17 27:11,19,24 28:19 29:21, 22 30:11	lower 17:22 26:18 30:15
Jones 24:10	kind 2:14,21 3:3 8:25 9:8, 23 10:4,16,	leaves 19:16		lowest 31:6,8
		leaving 25:10		lows 13:16
		less 29:4		

lumped 11:14	Matt 2:11 3:14	6:17 28:6	33:18	Moreno 3:20
<hr/> M <hr/>	maximize 30:21	member 8:19	minimize 6:5	most 2:15 10:21
made 8:22 33:11	may 12:7 28:16	members 4:10,12,16 5:11,12 9:16 10:21	mirror 24:9 32:4	move 25:9 32:25 33:25 35:8
main 32:14 34:15	maybe 8:17 13:10 20:11, 25 28:18 29:21 30:1,2, 8,11 31:7,11 32:22 34:9,19	mentioned 3:6	missing 22:17	moving 6:16 22:25 28:5,12 31:9
maintain 30:9 31:20	mean 20:24 21:20 25:12, 24 26:24 28:21 31:5,14	Michael 3:20, 21	mitigate 32:22	much 15:10 17:11 19:10 21:17 22:5 31:21 32:12 35:12
maintenance 17:13,14,24 18:5 24:5	meaning 11:24 22:4	mics 2:24	mode-specific 7:2	multimodal 7:6
majority 16:4 18:12	means 15:7	midline 18:1	modeled 5:25	mute 2:24 9:12 27:21
make 2:25 9:7 14:2 25:21	meet 6:4 33:2	midrange 18:6	Monday 1:11 2:2	muted 21:6
makes 23:5	meeting 1:9 2:14 3:25 4:4 5:2,3,4,6 6:9, 11,14,20 7:10,12,17, 18,24 8:3 25:17 28:21 34:23,25 35:1,20	might 12:6,22 14:10,11 25:1 30:22 31:25	money 34:2,5	<hr/> N <hr/>
making 5:22	Mike 2:11,20 3:13 11:5,6 27:2	mind 23:22 31:2	month 6:14	name 2:15
Maloy 3:10 29:20	mine 32:12	minimal 26:2	more 6:19 8:4,8 10:17, 18 11:21 14:5 16:7,13,20 18:20 20:1,11 21:14 23:24 27:24 28:15, 19 29:1,21,24 30:7,9	natural 6:5
Manager 2:6, 11 3:8	meetings			NDOT 5:12
material 2:19 4:25 8:13 20:9				nearest 27:9

nearly 12:17 13:8,10	next 6:20 7:12 12:10,21 13:6,24 14:12,21 15:4,13 16:7, 25 17:12 18:17 19:4,6 34:10	14:14 15:6 16:14,21 29:23,24 30:25 32:13	18:7,12 19:5, 6 20:11 22:7 23:1 25:18 27:11,22 31:13 34:1	15:10 19:11
necessarily 10:13 30:4		numeric 17:19 27:8	one's 19:7	over 2:19 10:6 11:4,6 17:23 22:21 28:2 33:9,16
need 4:25 6:4 7:4,25 24:7 30:10 33:3,5 34:1,25 35:2	nice 29:6 30:1	<hr/> O <hr/>	ones 15:1 18:19 20:3 30:23	overall 14:1, 10 21:17,25 22:13
needed 33:8, 9	nine 4:11 11:13 13:15	objectives 33:2	only 14:1 21:1 22:10 33:12	overview 4:1
needing 28:16	nobody 27:21	obvious 19:7		<hr/> P <hr/>
needles 24:15	noise 15:24	obviously 19:5 21:3 31:22	open 2:21 3:1 11:20 26:22	P.M. 2:2 35:20
needs 6:24 7:7	nonstarter 32:9	off 20:15,16 24:18 26:25 30:12	opinion 19:1 23:3	package 5:18
Negrete 3:14	note 2:25	office 2:9 3:10	option 24:17, 19,24	packets 4:9
Negretti 2:11	noted 11:14 12:22 14:14	official 29:13	options 5:15 18:23 30:22	pare 18:18
neither 25:4	notes 2:14	once 7:13 34:15	others 14:20 15:10 17:8 23:17 29:25 30:12	parentheses 12:15
NEPA 4:19 5:24 7:14	nuances 19:21	one 6:19 8:23,25 9:5, 20 10:6 11:20 12:13 13:2,5, 7,12 16:7 17:12,22	ourselves 2:16	park 22:4,5, 21 25:18 31:17 32:21 33:13
Nevada 1:12 2:2 24:13 36:1	number 1:25 16:12		outpaced	parks 12:15 32:5
new 4:25	numbers			part 2:15

34:13	22:3 28:7,21, 25 29:5,6,16	Planning 1:5 5:21	6:18	25:2
participating 34:23	person 13:21	plans 7:7	presentation 2:19,24 3:23 14:4	process 4:24 5:20,22,24,25 6:1 7:14,23 8:20 18:21 25:8
participation 7:19	perspective 28:25 29:5	pointed 21:16	presented 5:1 6:22,23	
particular 7:3 11:24 12:1 29:4	perspectives 8:9	points 7:24	pressure 34:17	project 2:6,8, 10 3:8 4:3,6, 11,24 5:13 6:4,13,25 7:4, 21 29:12 33:1
path 25:22	pick 10:6	poorly 11:25 13:3	pretty 15:10, 22 16:5 17:11,20 18:11,16 19:6,10 29:9 34:24	properties 31:20
pavilion 32:25	picked 31:25	portion 3:2	prevention 12:22 22:6,22 23:23 32:11	provide 5:5 7:5 18:15 26:1
pedestrian 25:22	pieces 25:23	possible 7:1 30:21	previous 28:21	provided 8:12 9:10,15 24:18
PEL 5:22	pier 10:10 11:15 12:19 13:1,9 14:22 15:23 17:10, 24 19:16 20:22 21:2 24:17,19,24 26:3	post-tensioning 30:19	previously 4:10	providing 22:16 26:3
people 10:17, 19 22:11,25 24:1,15 31:7, 10 33:14,17, 20	place 24:15 28:2	precast 10:11 16:16 21:2 26:20 27:2 30:23	probably 23:5 27:11 30:25 33:16 35:6	public 5:1,2, 23 6:1,8,9,19, 23 7:9,12 25:17 28:14, 15 31:8
percentage 19:6	placeholders 12:9	preferred 8:25	problem 6:25 29:23	purpose 3:25 4:24 6:4,24 7:4 33:3,5
percentage-wise 19:6	places 23:25	prepared 4:8 34:11	problems	put 8:24 9:8
permitting 6:15 7:17,23 8:5,9 12:14	plan 28:5	present 4:15		

10:22 11:23 12:9 24:3 25:6	rankings 14:1,11 15:21 16:4,19 25:3 26:17 27:7 33:24	4:9,11,20 5:8 7:20 22:10 28:8	regional 1:4 7:7	results 4:15 5:9 13:24 14:13 16:24 18:13 19:1
Q		receiving 6:1	regulatory 6:15 7:17,23 8:5,9 28:7,22 29:17	review 4:24 8:12
qualitative 5:7	rated 12:17, 19,24 13:1,3, 8,9	recognize 20:8	remember 10:1	reviewer 15:18
question 24:17	rating 13:21	recommend 27:24	removal 8:1	revisit 22:2
questions 2:25 9:13,17 11:2	ratio 30:20	recommendat ion 27:5 28:3	Reno 1:12 2:2 3:12,15 5:12 6:7 21:4 23:12,21	rigid 12:25 14:19 15:9,20 16:15 17:9 18:3 19:5,9 20:2 21:3 26:20 27:2
quite 14:20 16:13 17:16	ready 34:17	recommendat ions 35:7	Reported 1:24	rise 26:19
R	really 4:13 7:20 9:3 10:6 14:2 17:9 18:3,17,19 19:21 21:16, 24 22:9,12 23:18 25:7,19 29:2 32:16,20 33:4,9,13 35:2	recreate 33:14	reporter 2:14	risks 17:7
range 4:18 16:23 17:16 18:9	reason 30:15	recreation 18:8	requirements 6:15 7:18,25 8:5	river 8:1,10 11:18 22:21 24:6,19 25:15 32:6
rank 23:10 27:9	recap 11:11	reduce 4:18	respect 30:18	roadway 1:10 2:8 4:2 29:7
ranked 4:22 10:3 15:18 17:18 23:7,17	receive 9:4	reflected 30:24	respond 7:7	rocks 10:11
ranking 16:15 17:22 22:13 23:16 26:23, 25 27:13 35:6	received 2:21	reflective 18:11	response 9:11 14:23	rolled 14:13
		regard 18:22	rest 16:17 22:24	route 31:19
		regarding 24:17		

<p>RTC 1:5 2:7 3:9,10,13 5:12 6:7 29:20</p> <p>run 2:18</p> <p>running 10:24 30:17</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">S</p> <hr/> <p>safe 7:5</p> <p>said 3:8 7:16 21:9 29:14 32:5,20</p> <p>same 5:14 10:4,5,15 15:14 16:17 21:20 23:21 27:13,14 29:7</p> <p>saw 10:16 14:3 16:4,24</p> <p>say 16:3 22:17 23:4 24:13 26:1 27:4 29:22 30:3 32:3,25</p> <p>saying 21:20 25:24 26:16</p> <p>schedule</p>	<p>4:25 7:8 17:7</p> <p>Schroeder 3:11 23:20</p> <p>scope 4:24 5:13 12:15 22:4,19 31:22</p> <p>score 8:25 9:4 11:23,24 12:1,2 13:18, 19 14:14,20 15:8,16 16:12 17:1,2 23:10 27:14 29:15 30:15,24</p> <p>scorecard 12:8 15:17 16:3</p> <p>scorecards 13:16 16:4 34:22</p> <p>scored 8:14 10:5,15,18,19 13:15 15:19 19:24 20:22 31:6,7</p> <p>scores 2:20 4:11,13,14,20 5:9 10:17 12:18 13:18, 25 14:16,25 16:8,10,11 17:4,16,18,</p>	<p>19,21 21:17, 25 22:10 26:9 27:9</p> <p>scoresheets 15:14</p> <p>scoring 2:19 4:9 8:2,13,17, 20,24 9:6,10, 20,23 10:9,15 11:3,5,11,23 13:14,22 14:3,10 15:5 19:14,18 20:6,11 29:13 30:14</p> <p>screen 2:16 3:4</p> <p>second 16:9</p> <p>seem 21:16 24:9 27:13</p> <p>seemed 9:7</p> <p>Seems 29:9</p> <p>seen 8:13 11:12 20:9</p> <p>sense 8:22 9:7 23:5</p> <p>separate</p>	<p>29:12</p> <p>set 23:22 34:14</p> <p>sets 6:25 26:14</p> <p>several 4:16 8:20 15:21 31:19</p> <p>shape 13:2</p> <p>share 4:17 31:10</p> <p>sharing 11:6</p> <p>sheet 11:4</p> <p>sheets 8:13</p> <p>short 20:8</p> <p>should 8:17 11:6 20:23,25 22:18 23:13</p> <p>shovel 34:17</p> <p>show 25:8 27:10</p> <p>side 19:4 24:5 25:18 29:17</p>	<p>sidewalk 25:14</p> <p>significant 16:19 19:17</p> <p>similar 9:22 10:8,19 13:5 17:14 19:20, 21 21:19 28:24</p> <p>similarly 12:24 17:23</p> <p>Simpson 3:14</p> <p>since 8:14 27:19 35:17</p> <p>single 10:10 11:15 12:19 13:1,9,21 14:21 15:23 16:16 17:10, 24 19:16 20:22 21:2 24:17,19,24</p> <p>sink 18:16</p> <p>sit 24:15</p> <p>sits 25:13</p> <p>sleep 24:1</p> <p>slide 7:8</p>
---	--	--	---	---

12:10 13:6 14:12 15:4,13 16:7 17:12 18:17,25 20:15 26:13	26:8 27:23 south 11:19 25:1 space 24:14, 20,25 25:21 span 11:16 12:17,25 13:7 15:9 16:16 18:2 19:10 20:4,24 30:20 speak 3:7 33:4 specific 23:24 specifically 8:19 12:25 specifics 10:14 spend 5:6 spill 12:16 spot 26:4 stage 7:1 Stake 28:14 stakeholder	4:4 5:3 6:1,7, 10,17,22 25:16 28:11 stakeholders 5:23 star 7:9 start 7:15 20:10,14,15, 16 31:11 started 2:5 STATE 36:1 stated 22:12 statement 6:24 states 6:25 stay 24:7 stayed 16:17 steel 10:12 20:21,25 26:16 27:16, 20 29:22 30:3,7 steps 7:22 Stewart 2:9	3:10 20:14,19 25:5 26:3,7, 12 30:13 32:19 34:11 still 16:16,17 26:1,18 30:12 stop 11:6 streamlines 5:23 Street 5:25 strongly 23:1 24:7 Structural 2:11 structurally 7:5 structure 11:17 26:21 31:23 structures 32:2 struggle 20:20 study 5:15 7:13	stuff 8:16 24:16 35:5,6 subtle 14:1 successful 6:11 suggest 19:18,25 20:3 suggested 12:12 suggestion 19:12 sum 14:17 summarize 13:14 30:2,3 summed 13:18 superstructur e 11:16 19:22 support 25:10 26:15 supporting 8:12 surge 34:9 swing 34:16
--	---	--	---	---

T	4:7,14 7:22	16:15 21:21, 22 31:13 33:12 34:1	23:15,23 31:18 35:5	26:19 31:12 33:9
TAC 4:10,16 5:3,5 6:14 7:17,24 8:19 27:6 28:4,6,7, 21,22 34:25 35:1,7	tear 22:5	things 9:20 11:20 12:6 21:17 22:9 23:14 30:8	throw 22:18	top-three-ranked 35:8
TAC-2 1:9	technical 3:23 5:10 6:2 10:17 28:16	thinking 19:24	tied 8:8 13:1 18:3 19:13 29:1	Tortelli 2:5,6 3:8,18,21 9:19 10:8 11:1,10 20:7, 16 21:6,9,11 22:1 25:12 26:6,11,24 27:15 28:1 29:11 31:1 32:15 33:20 34:1,5,8,21 35:15
TACS 6:21	teeth 18:16	thinks 14:9	tighten 29:21 30:11	
tag 26:7	tend 19:14	third 13:5	time 5:6 8:12 15:6 20:8,9, 11 31:4 35:16	
tagged 30:8	than 9:6 11:21 24:22 25:3 27:11,20 28:15 29:24, 25 32:12 33:8	thought 9:1 25:8	times 8:21	tossed 23:6
take 7:22 8:11 11:6 16:25 24:7 28:5,9, 10 35:17	thankfully 24:9	thoughts 21:13 31:10	tip 14:6	total 13:19 14:25 15:14 17:4
taking 13:17 14:16 27:1,24	that'll 11:9	three 11:15, 17 12:11 15:11 16:9,13 18:22 19:17, 18 20:2 22:3, 11 26:19 27:4,23	today 2:7,18 4:2,15,18,24 8:3 11:21 13:14 28:23	totally 29:11, 12
talk 2:7 9:17 13:23 14:4 16:20	their 23:8 28:11 31:10	through 2:18, 23 3:3 7:23 8:14,20,21 10:24 11:5,7, 8 12:5,23 15:18 16:21 18:16,20 20:11 22:6	today's 3:25	totals 16:6
talked 27:16 35:5	themes 6:18		together 8:24 11:14,23 14:21	towards 7:2 8:4 15:12
talking 2:17 21:21	Theresa 13:7 23:21 24:10 31:24		took 15:13,15 17:3	transparent 25:8
team 2:10	thing 8:23		top 17:23	transportation 1:4 24:14

33:1	24:20 25:21, 24,25	vetted 33:8	warrant 20:5	Wished 34:7
treated 25:7	underdeck 14:22 19:13	viable 18:19	way 8:24 13:15 23:1,17	within 10:10 23:8
trend 17:21	26:17 27:10, 19 28:17	Vianney 1:24	33:16,17 35:17	without 16:8 25:10
trends 17:15	underneath 11:20 13:3	viewed 12:2 14:7	weeks 4:9	wondering 8:15 20:23 23:6
true 26:6	24:25 25:14	viewshed 8:9 29:3	WEGNER 34:7	words 23:22
truly 35:13	unless 35:3,9	Virginia 5:25	weight 9:24	work 11:9 34:12
try 2:16 18:17	until 35:17	visit 33:14	Welcome 2:6	working 4:4 5:3 6:7,10,17, 22 7:10 25:16 28:11,15
trying 10:1 22:5 24:12 26:1 27:18 33:2	update 5:5	<hr/> W <hr/>	went 5:6 8:21 12:5 18:9 21:7	works 32:22
turn 11:4	use 32:21	want 4:24 10:23 11:7 16:22,23 18:14 19:14 20:10,15 24:7 25:24 33:23 34:11	whatnot 24:21 26:7	worth 21:14 33:1
turnout 4:12	used 23:22	wanted 2:13 9:8 10:22 15:5 28:1	while 33:7	worthy 21:23
two 6:16 12:8 20:4 29:10	using 5:20	<hr/> V <hr/>	will 2:20,21 4:14 5:17,20 6:16,18,21 7:14,21 35:5, 7	<hr/> Y <hr/>
types 11:16, 17 32:1	valuable 7:20	wanting 18:18	willing 31:10	year 6:11,20 7:10,12
<hr/> U <hr/>	value 17:3	wants 27:21 28:18	Wingfield 22:21 31:17 33:13	years 23:15 24:13
U.S. 7:18	values 17:19 27:8			
under 20:22 21:2 22:22	versus 15:1			

Z

zoom 26:15
27:9