

MINUTES
MICHIGAN STATE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING
August 25, 2005
Lansing, Michigan

Meeting noticed in accordance with Open Meetings Act, Public Act 267 of 1976.

Present: Ted Wahby, Chairman
Robert Bender, Commissioner
Vincent J. Brennan, Commissioner
Maureen Miller Brosnan, Commissioner
James R. Rosendall, Commissioner

Also Present: Gloria J. Jeff, Director
Kirk Steudle, Chief Deputy Director
Larry Tibbits, Chief Operations Officer
Myron Frierson, Chief Administrative Officer
Frank E. Kelley, Commission Advisor
Marneta Griffin, Executive Assistant
Jerry Jones, Commission Auditor
Patrick Isom, Attorney General's Office, Transportation Division
John Friend, Bureau Director, Highway Delivery
John Polasek, Bureau Director, Highway Development
Susan Mortel, Bureau Director, Transportation Planning
Tim Hoeffner, Administrator, Intermodal Policy
Carmine Palombo, SEMCOG/Asset Management Council

Excused: Linda Miller Atkinson, Vice Chairwoman

A list of those people who attended the meeting is attached to the official minutes.

Chairman Wahby called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. in the 1st Floor Auditorium, Bureau of Aeronautics Building in Lansing, Michigan.

I. **COMMISSION BUSINESS**

Commission Minutes

Chairman entertained a motion for approval of the minutes of the State Transportation Commission meeting of July 28, 2005.

Moved by Commissioner Bender, with support from Commissioner Brosnan, to approve the minutes of the Commission meeting of July 28, 2005. MOTION CARRIED.

II. **DIRECTOR'S REPORT – DIRECTOR GLORIA J. JEFF**

The final chapter of reauthorization has arrived!

Overview

The new bill, Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA- LU), is 1,752 pages long. House and Senate approved the final version on July 29th. President Bush signed the bill on August 10, 2005. MDOT staff is analyzing the details and language of this new law to make sure we accurately understand what it means for specific projects in Michigan. We worked hard to secure a better funding share for Michigan, and we were successful, thanks to the persistent efforts of our Michigan congressional delegation, especially Senators Carl Levin and Debbie Stabenow, and our entire Michigan Transportation Team. The previous TEA-21 expired October 1, 2003. There were 12 extensions covering 680 days.

Highway spending includes both highway programs and research. Safety includes motor carrier and NHTSA funding. The six year funding figure (\$286.4 billion) represents an increase of 31.5% over the TEA-21 funding level of \$218 billion.

National Highlights

The budget firewalls created in TEA-21 were retained in order to continue to protect transportation spending from being reduced in order to increase spending in other areas of the federal budget.

Donor states were successful in making equity an issue, and the guaranteed rate of return for all states will increase to 92% by the end of the bill in 2009.

The Revenue Aligned Budget Authority (RABA) provisions were retained and improved. The improvements were geared toward eliminating the potential for large adjustments (by changing the calculation method and spreading the required adjustment amount over two fiscal years). If the HTF balance at the beginning of a fiscal year exceeds \$6 billion, even if revenues are less than expected, no negative RABA adjustment will occur. If there is a positive RABA adjustment required in FY 2007, the funds will first be used to increase the minimum guaranteed rate of return for donor states to 92%.

SAFETEA-LU contains over 6,300 earmarks for highway and transit projects nationwide and totaling more than \$24 billion. The number of high priority highway projects increased from 1,850 in TEA-21 to 5,173 in SAFETEA-LU, with the dollar value increasing from \$9.3 billion to \$14.8 billion. SAFETEA-LU also creates two new types of earmarks programs (Projects of National and Regional Significance and Transportation Improvements).

Safety: Many provisions in the bill were focused on safety. Combined funding for highway safety programs and safety grants programs roughly double from TEA-21. SAFETEA-LU contains four new safety apportioned programs: Highway Safety Improvement program; Rail-Highway Crossing; High Risk Rural Roads; and Safe Routes to School. There is a requirement that all states have a strategic highway safety plan in place by the end of FY 2007. Michigan is ahead of the curve, having already developed

one. There are new provisions regarding work zone safety to better protect motorists, pedestrians and construction workers including: a grant program to fund training and establish an information clearinghouse, new requirement for temporary traffic control devices and requirements for high-visibility gear for construction workers.

Congestion Relief: The legislation attempts to address congestion by requiring the US-DOT to establish a real-time system management information program to standardize the data exchange format and generally make deployment of real-time monitoring tool easier. This is another area where MDOT is a recognized leader. It permits flexibility to use core funds for deployment of real-time monitoring elements, and offers new, but limited, opportunities to toll in order to address congestion (i.e., congestion pricing or value pricing).

Funding Study: SAFETEA-LU commissions a significant study into adequacy of the current structure and level of transportation funding. Specifically, the study will look at what funding changes will be necessary, if any, to meet the current and future needs of the system.

Innovative Finance: To enhance the availability of resources available from non-traditional sources the legislation expands bonding authority for private activity bonds to include highway facilities and freight transfer facilities, lowers the project cost threshold for TIFIA projects to \$50 million, expands eligibility to include freight rail and intermodal freight transfer facilities, as well as creates some limited opportunities to toll.

Financial Oversight: States must submit project management and annual financial plans for all projects with total cost of \$500 million or more. States must prepare and make available annual financial plans for all projects with total cost of \$100 million or more. Also, value engineering will be required for Federal-aid projects over \$25 million, and bridge projects over \$20 million or more.

Core Programs: Aside from a few expansions in the eligible uses of core program funding to most significant changes to the programs were: inclusion of systematic preventative maintenance on bridges as an eligible expense, increase in the federal share of work on Interstate bridges from 80% to 90%, elimination of the STP set-aside for safety (replaced by a new apportioned program), and updated CMAQ funding formula to include new ozone standards.

Equity: The old method of ensuring that all states get to a minimum rate of return on their contributions to the Federal Highway Trust Fund was scraped in favor of a new method. The bottom line is that states will no longer be locked into pre-TEA-21 funding shares when determining minimum guaranteed apportionments (this results in northeastern states doing worse, while growing southern states do better). Also, by fiscal year 2008 all states will be guaranteed to receive 92% return on the federal transportation taxes they contribute.

Planning: Changes to the planning requirements add both new flexibility and new mandates. There are new consultation requirements that apply to long range plans as

well as a requirement that the plan address environmental mitigation activities. Safety and security has been added to the planning requirements for all levels and plans.

The update cycles for TIPs/STIPs will be every four years and now there is additional flexibility for air quality conformity determinations.

Environmental streamlining: While the legislation does add some new requirements, most have been aimed at streamlining the environmental review process and include: a new review process for projects requiring an EIS, opportunities for state DOT to assume some federal responsibilities in review process, a new 180 day statute of limitation for filing lawsuits challenging environmental approvals, reform to section 4(f) making it less likely that the cumbersome process of dealing with historical sites will be necessary. These streamlining provisions will have only minimal impacts on MDOT's environmental processes.

Transit Funding: Changes that lie ahead for transit generally involve realigning spending, to focus more on underserved populations and creating more opportunities for low-income, disabled and elderly populations. This includes a significant increase in funding for rural areas to address unmet needs in low-density areas, a new tier of funding within the urbanized area program to provide more resources to cities with less than 200,000 that have extensive transit systems, and a new formula program to provide resources to states that are projected to grow the fastest over the next 15 years.

In addition to the continuation of the existing program for elderly and disabled populations, the bill created the New Freedom Program, which is a formula-based program intended to fund new services and alternatives beyond those required by the ADA to assist individuals with disabilities. The JARC program will now be a formula-based program (rather than discretionary) intended to assist low-income populations in gaining access to employment opportunities. The share of capital funding going to bus systems (versus fixed guideway) will be higher than it was under TEA-21.

Michigan Highlights

Over the period covering FY 2005 through 2009, Michigan formula highway funding is projected to average about \$239 million more per year than we received under TEA-21. This includes more dollars for congestion mitigation, more funding to invest in border crossings, an expanded focus on safety, and environmental streamlining that allows us to cut through red tape and protect the environment by allowing us to better allocate our highway dollars toward improving road conditions (i.e., the new CMAQ flexibility provision for MI).

In addition to the \$239 million increase in highway formula funding, Michigan's FY 2005-2009 transit funding is projected to average \$108 million per year. This represents an increase of \$37 million/year or 52% over the TEA-21 average of \$71 million/year. This bill gets us to a 92% rate of return for highways – much better than the 90.5% return we were getting, but not the 95% we hoped for. In that sense we will still face some challenges as far as being able to do all the preservation projects, capacity improvements, congestion relief and economic development projects we would like to do.

Michigan expects to receive \$239 million more per year under this reauthorization legislation. While technically that may be true, it is very misleading. Common practice at FHWA is to compare this (re)authorization period with the previous authorization period (which is TEA-21). The problem is that in doing so, we are essentially comparing the first year of this reauthorization to the first year of TEA-21, which was 1998, the second year of this reauthorization with the second year of TEA-21, which was 1999, and so on. There is no adjustment made to account for inflation over the six year time difference.

FY 2006 and 2007 are the only years in which Michigan's year over year growth in apportioned program funding is projected to exceed the (conservative) estimate we used in preparing our five-year plan. In fact, our growth in funding is even exceeded by inflation in all but those two years as well. Michigan's increase in funding is only projected to exceed inflation in FY 2007 and 2008. In these two years our increases are primarily due to the increased return on our contributions to Federal Highway Trust Fund that will occur in those years.

Unlike on the highway side, where the new programs and formulas will be applied to FY 2005 funding levels, the changes to transit programs and funding levels are largely delayed until FY 2006, which is when we will see a significant bump in formula funding.

The minimum guaranteed rate of return will increase over the next several fiscal years. Michigan's increase in funding is only projected to exceed inflation in FY 2007 and 2008. These increases are primarily due to the increased return on our contributions to Federal Highway Trust Fund that will occur in those years.

Impacts for Michigan

Earmarks: SAFETEA-LU includes 171 transportation projects in Michigan with a total value of \$643,304,000. Funding for these projects will be available over the five year period covering FY 2005-09 in five equal installments. About \$216.6 million of Michigan's total earmarked funding is for projects over which MDOT has jurisdiction; the remaining \$426.7 million is for local projects. During TEA 21, the state vs. local split in highway projects was 70% (MDOT) / 30% (locals). This time, those percentages are nearly reversed with MDOT's share being 33% and the local's share being 66%.

While MDOT will have no trouble matching any of the funds we receive for highway work (the only issue is whether earmarked projects are in our five-year plan), we are facing significant challenges when it comes to matching transit capital funding. The \$90 million in transit high priority projects listed above largely consists of bus capital improvement projects. Historically, the state has provided the entire 20% match required for federally funded transit capital projects. Reduced CTF revenues, including mandated reductions in sales tax contributions have left the fund depleted to the point where CTF revenue in FY 2006 will not be sufficient to match all available federal transit capital funding. Even if we drop the state match to 13.3% and ask locals to provide the remaining 6.7%, there is a good chance that we will still be unable to match all available federal capital funding.

Some of the categories of highway earmarks, namely the High Priority Projects, are classified as being “below the line”. The line refers to scope, programs below the line are included in scope and funding for those programs are used in calculating the minimum guarantee. Essentially, the \$314 million in funding for below the line project earmarks that Michigan received would have come to the state regardless of whether it is was earmarked or not. In other words, that earmarked money is in place of (more flexible) funding that would have come to the state in the form of formula funding through such programs as IM, NHS, etc.

Changes to Existing Programs: The set-aside for metro planning will increase from 1% to 1.25% (translating into a roughly \$2 million increase in statewide funding, from \$7.7 million to \$9.6 million).

Using the most recent ozone standards as the basis for determining CMAQ apportionments is projected to result in an increase of more than \$20 million for Michigan CMAQ program (from \$34 million to \$58 million). Also, there was a specific provision in the legislation that allows Michigan to use CMAQ funding for ITS operations. We specifically sought this provision so that we can continue to fund the operations of the MITS center with CMAQ funds. This gives us some added flexibility because we will not have to pay for these expenses with state revenue.

Finally, we’re pleased that we will be able to use federal funds to keep our bridges in good shape, rather than only being allowed to these funds to replace and refurbish our bridges.

New Formula Program Highlights

Borders Program: New formula-based program will improve the safe movement of motor vehicles at international border crossings. Funding is based on the following formula: 30% passenger vehicle counts, 25% cargo weight, 25% number of ports of entry, 20% commercial vehicle counts. The standard federal share of project costs are covered (90% for interstates, 80% for most other work).

Eligible uses of funding include the follow types of work done within 100 miles of an international border: improvements to existing transportation and supporting infrastructure, construction of highways and related safety and enforcement facilities, operational improvements (electronic data interchange and use of telecommunications), modifications to regulatory procedures, international coordination of transportation planning, programming and border operation.

There were \$38 million worth of earmarks for the Blue Water Bridge plaza expansion project that is currently in the environmental clearance stage.

Safe Route to School: Funding formula uses only each state’s portion of primary and middle school student enrollment. Apportionments are to be administered by each state’s DOT, and can be used to provide financial assistance to state, local, and regional agencies, including nonprofits.

Eligible activities include (within 2 miles of a school): planning, design and construction of infrastructure-related projects that will substantially improve the ability of students to walk and bike to school (including sidewalk improvements, traffic calming and speed reduction improvements, pedestrian and bicycle crossing improvements, on-street bicycle facilities, off-street bicycle and pedestrian facilities, secure bike parking facilities, traffic diversion improvements).

Between 10 and 30% must be used for behavioral activities (like public awareness campaigns, outreach, traffic education and enforcement).

Each state must use a sufficient amount of the apportionment to fund a full-time position to coordinate their program. We're not yet at the point of making a determination of whether this position will be within MDOT or elsewhere in state government.

MDOT's Five Year Program: It has been our position all along that when federal reauthorization passed we would re-assess our Five Year Program in the context of any new monies and make adjustments to the program based on available funding and system condition goals. As we complete our analysis we will move into the Five Year Program re-assessment phase based on that detailed analysis of this new law. We will make specific announcements in coordination with the development of the Draft Five Year Program over the course of the summer and fall. A draft Program is scheduled to be released in November.

It took congress two years to get this done. The good news is that MDOT made some funding assumptions, developed a program and is ready to proceed, unlike other states that are scrambling for projects. The bad news is the federal priorities will redirect funding to certain national priorities (like air quality and safety).

Chairman Wahby asked if anyone had questions for Director Jeff.

Chairman Wahby asked, regarding the tools available for monitoring, if there would be any money or grants available to help alleviate congestion in certain areas.

Director Jeff answered yes; the CMAQ is one of the funding sources. The other is just utilizing the formula funds that you have available to address the issue of either expanding capacity.

Chairman Wahby further asked if this would be through the ACT 51 monies.

Director Jeff answered not necessarily through the ACT 51 monies, but through the 25% federal funding.

Commissioner Brosnan asked, if we are not able to make the 20% transit funds match, what we plan on having happen with that money.

Director Jeff answered that it is not an immediate crisis. We would anticipate that the Governor, MDOT, and the Commission working with the legislature, we will find a solution; also working with local units of government. The locals can provide a portion of that non-federal match.

Commissioner Brosnan then asked if that is an issue that will impact us in three years.

Director Jeff answered that we have up to three years to address what to do with the federal funds.

Commissioner Brennan asked if we are seeing any increase in dollar amounts through the sales tax portion of the gas prices.

Director Jeff answered that we just got our revenue estimates in and what has happened is that while there has been an increase in the revenue associated with fuel tax sales tax, there has been a substantial decline in the amount of sales tax with respect to auto related products. Therefore, we have basically stayed flat.

No other questions were forthcoming.

III. **OVERSIGHT**

Commission/State Administrative Board Contracts/Agreements (Exhibit A) – Myron Frierson

Mr. Frierson stated that the projects and agreements have been given for review.

Attention was called to Item #1 (Highways – Freeway Courtesy Patrol; Contract 2005-0478) and the funding issue surrounding it. The department is working with the MPO SEMCOG to amend the local TIP (Transportation Improvement Program), which will allow the use of Federal funds for this project. Mr. Frierson requested authority from the Commission to use 100% State funds for this contract (Item #1 of Exhibit A) in the event that the TIP for Southeast Michigan is not amended by September 30th.

Chairman Wahby entertained a motion. Motion was made by Commissioner Brosnan and supported by Commissioner Rosendall to approve Item #1 of Exhibit A. Motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

Pending any further questions, Mr. Frierson asked for approval on the remainder of Exhibit A.

Commissioner Rosendall, regarding Item #14 (Agreement #2002-0012/Z21; Bay Area Transportation Authority-BATA), asked what the “wind turbine generator and parts” are for.

Mr. Frierson asked for Sharon Edger of the MDOT Passenger Transportation Division to respond.

Ms. Edger stated that it involves the alternative fuel issues that BATA is working with in relation to their buses.

Director Jeff added that BATA is looking to build a wind turbine (windmill) utilizing its power to provide themselves, as well as other governmental entities within the Bay Area, with electricity.

Commissioner Rosendall asked if anyone else were putting money into this endeavor.

Director Jeff answered that the Traverse City Transit Agency as well as the Traverse City School system are also involved.

Ms. Edger further stated that these funds are matching their federal earmarked funds, and that BATA has been very aggressive about getting these funds for alternative issues.

No questions were forthcoming.

Chairman Wahby entertained a motion. Motion was made by Commissioner Brennan and supported by Commissioner Bender to approve Exhibit A. Motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

Supplemental Commission/State Administrative Board Contracts/Agreements (Exhibit A) – Myron Frierson

Mr. Frierson stated that the documentation has been given for review, and, pending any questions he asked for approval of Supplemental Exhibit A.

No questions were forthcoming.

Chairman Wahby entertained a motion. Motion was made by Commissioner Bender and supported by Commissioner Brosnan to approve Exhibit A. Motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

Bid Letting Pre-Approvals (Exhibit A-1) – Myron Frierson

Mr. Frierson gave a brief re-cap of the September 9th bid letting activities. The department had estimated \$899 million in state projects this year. Through August we are up to \$772 million. They project another \$116 million in state projects in the September letting, making it \$888 million in terms of state projects being projected based upon their activity this year. The overall program has exceeded \$1 billion. The department is looking at approximately \$1.1 billion for the year in terms of construction.

Pending any questions, Mr. Frierson asked for approval of the bid items for the September letting in Exhibit A-1.

No questions were forthcoming.

Chairman Wahby entertained a motion. Motion was made by Commissioner Brennan and supported by Commissioner Brosnan to approve the September bid letting. Motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

Supplemental Bid Letting Pre-Approvals (Exhibit A-1) – Myron Frierson

Mr. Frierson noted that documentation has been given for review, and, pending any questions asked for approval of the 5 supplemental bid items for the September letting in Supplemental Exhibit A-1.

No questions were forthcoming.

Chairman Wahby entertained a motion. Motion was made by Commissioner Brosnan and supported by Commissioner Rosendall to approve the Supplemental September bid letting. Motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

Letting Exceptions Agenda (Exhibit A-2) – John Polasek

Mr. Polasek noted four projects (2 state; 2 local) for which he is asking approval pending any questions by the Commission. No questions were forthcoming.

Chairman Wahby entertained a motion. Motion was made by Commissioner Bender and supported by Commissioner Brosnan to approve Exhibit A-2. Motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

Contract Adjustments (Exhibit B) – John Friend

Mr. Friend stated that the department finalized \$20 million worth of construction projects in July within 1% of the original “as-bid” cost. Before the Commission today are six MDOT projects and seven local agency projects. Pending any questions, Mr. Friend asked for approval of Exhibit B.

Commissioner Brosnan asked if any patterns are seen to explain the large size of some of the overruns. In particular, it appears that these overruns are probably related to engineering oversights, therefore she asked if the department tracks who the engineers are on each of the projects.

Mr. Friend answered that the department has the ability to track project costs by the assigned project engineer. He stated that one needs to have a little bit of caution due to the fact of managing a construction project in southeastern Michigan is a lot different than managing a project in northern Michigan. It would not be prudent to compare a project engineer in southeastern Michigan to a project engineer in northern Michigan since they don't operate in the same type of work environment. Those reports are certainly available and can be provided at your request.

Commissioner Brosnan stated that as long as the reports are already being generated, she would like to see them.

Director Jeff interjected that we could establish a time, sit down with her and go through the reports.

Chairman Wahby stated that the reports should be gone through with all the Commissioners. Whenever one asks for specific information, it should be made available to all.

Director Jeff agreed, and asked Chairman Wahby to allow this to be done outside of a public workshop due to it being a personnel matter.

Chairman Wahby stated that Mr. Kelley will work with the Directors' staff to set this up.

Commissioner Rosendall stated that he had some of the same concerns.

No other questions were forthcoming.

Chairman Wahby entertained a motion. Motion was made by Commissioner Brosnan and supported by Commissioner Brennan to approve Exhibit B. Motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

IV. **PRESENTATIONS**

Fiscal Year 2006 Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Goals – Patricia Collins

Pursuant to requirements of the U.S. Department of Transportation's regulations at 49 CFR Part 26, MDOT has completed its annual review to develop the overall goal for Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) participation.

Over the past year, the department has accomplished a great deal to move our DBE Program forward. Some of the major accomplishments/activities include:

*Two key long-term DBE firms who were responsible for a significant portion of the construction program successfully graduated from the DBE program.

*Successful networking sessions for DBE firms and prime contractors. Over 100 business owners attended the three networking sessions held this past year.

*Successful 25th Annual DBE Conference at which over 300 participants attended. These participants included DBE's, prime contractors, MDOT managers and staff, representatives from associations, state and local government partners, and others interested in our DBE program.

*Training and educational workshops for over 200 certified DBE's. These training sessions and workshops covered a diverse range of topics which included electronic bidding training, entrepreneurship information, plan reading training, and information covering bid preparation for MDOT contracts.

*Sponsored one informational session in each of MDOT's seven regions. Approximately 400 DBE's, prime contractors and MDOT region representatives received information about the federal DBE regulations, MDOT requirements of DBE's and prime contractors, and details about the 2005 projects for each region.

*Worked with Metro Region staff and Michigan's Federal Highway Administration representatives to identify 15 projects of less than two million dollars. The projects were unbundled from three larger projects and will allow small business owners, such as DBE's, an opportunity to bid as a prime contractor.

Based on prior achievements and projected availability of DBEs, Ms. Collins recommended and asked that the State Transportation Commission adopt a DBE Goal of 11% for FY 2006. It is expected that the recommended goal will be met through race-conscious (8.5%) and race-neutral (2.5%) means.

Ms. Collins asked for questions.

Commissioner Brosnan asked what the incentive is for graduating DBE companies if they are not participating in creating more dollars.

Ms. Collins answered that once they graduate, the company is established, no longer needs the DBE Program, and are good contractors for the department. The other incentive is that the federal government has two requirements for remaining in the program: 1) when a company exceeds a certain net worth, they no longer qualify; 2) if the company grows to a certain size, they no longer qualify.

Director Jeff interjected that this is not a program for life. The graduating company has acquired the skills, the business where-with-all—whether it's the bonding capacity, or the expertise to compete in a much larger market.

Commissioner Bender asked for the criteria or definition of a "disadvantaged business".

Ms. Collins answered that certain groups are presumed to be disadvantaged when they are owned and controlled by minorities, women, and other socially and economically disadvantaged persons. In addition, anyone that is not a woman or a minority, but can prove that they have been disadvantaged in some way, is also eligible to participate.

Director Jeff also answered that there is a category related to being economically disadvantaged that is not ruled by race, gender, etc.

Commissioner Bender asked if it was basically small business oriented.

Director Jeff answered yes.

No other questions were forthcoming.

Chairman Wahby entertained a motion. Motion was made by Commissioner Bender and supported by Commissioner Brosnan to approve the FY 2006 DBE Goals. Motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

Asset Management Council Fiscal Year 2007 Budget – Carmine Palombo

Mr. Palombo briefly reviewed the draft budget provided to the Commissioners in their meeting packets. The total amount of the FY 2007 budget is \$1,625,050.00.

Mr. Palombo asked for questions; none were forthcoming.

Chairman Wahby entertained a motion. Motion was made by Commissioner Brennan and supported by Commissioner Brosnan to approve the FY 2007 Budget. Motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Palombo informed the Commission that during the September meeting TAMC would be requesting approval for several Council appointments and re-appointments.

V. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Chairman Wahby asked if anyone wanted to address the Commission; none were forthcoming.

Chairman Wahby asked if any member of the Commission had comments; no other comments were forthcoming.

VI. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 10:17 a.m.

The next full meeting of the Michigan State Transportation Commission will be held on September 29, 2005, in the Bureau of Aeronautics Auditorium in Lansing, Michigan, commencing at the hour of 9:00 a.m.

Frank E. Kelley
Commission Advisor