

**COUNTY OF MARQUETTE, MICHIGAN
Sawyer International Airport**

**Airport Advisory Committee Meeting
Thursday, September 2, 2010, 4:00 P.M.**

**Airport Services Center,
Second Floor Conference Room
Gwinn, MI 49841**

1. Call to Order

2. Public Comment

3. Approval of the Agenda

4. Approval of Minutes (July Regular Meeting)

5. Items for Discussion

- A. Revised 5-year ACIP (FY's 2011 – 2015)
- B. Draft ACIP for 2016 – 2020
- C. Explorer Solutions / SBA Grant
- D. Aerobatic Box Update
- E. Runway Broom – Paint Striping
- F. WAAS Update
- G. Long Range Planning

6. Informational Items / Project Updates

- A. Terminal Bathroom
- B. Airport Project Updates
- C. Various Lease Updates

7. Public Comment

8. Staff and Committee Member Comment

9. Adjournment

**COUNTY OF MARQUETTE, MICHIGAN
Sawyer International Airport
Airport Advisory Committee**

**Thursday, July 1, 2010, 4:00 P.M.
Meeting Minutes**

**Second Floor Conference Room
Airport Services Center
Gwinn, MI 49841**

- Members Present:** Committee Chairman Bob Struck, and Committee Members Jim Cihak, Scott Schulz, John LaCourt, Andy Sikkema and Fred Benzie.
- Members Absent:** Frank Rosado and Steve Rodgers
- Staff Present:** Keith Kaspari, Airport Manager
- Staff Absent:** Scott Erbisch, Director of Operations
- Guests Present:** Roger Bentlage, Member, Sawyer Chapter of the Experimental Aircraft Association - (EAA).

1. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 4:22 p.m. by Chairman Struck.
2. **Public Comment:** None
3. **Approval of the Agenda:**

Keith Kaspari requested of the committee members to add agenda item 5-F (FY-2010 MAP application), and Committee Member Fred Benzie requested to add agenda item 5-G (FBO Discussions / Agreement).

A Motion was offered by Committee Member Scott Schulz, with a second followed by Committee Member Jim Cihak.

Motion passed.

4. **Approval of Minutes:**

Committee Members reviewed the minutes from the Advisory Committee meeting held in June, 2010.

With no revisions offered, a Motion of Support was offered by Committee Member Fred Benzie, with a second by Committee Member Andy Sikkema.

Motion passed.

5. **Items for Discussion:**

A. 10-Year Airport Capital Improvement Plan (ACIP)

Mr. Kaspari handed out a copy of a memorandum and draft copy of a 10-Year (FY's 2011 – 2020) Airport Capital Improvement Plan (ACIP), beginning with the first five years covering FY's 2011 – 2015.

Staff felt that the airport needed to place a renewed emphasis and an elevated priority on the rehabilitation of our airfield pavements – whereby the first 5-years allows the staff to complete many priority airfield pavement projects (Runway Shoulders and Edge Lighting, runway [asphalt] pavement rehabilitation, the rehabilitation of the pavement for Taxiways Echo and Foxtrot, and begin a phased replacement of concrete joint sealant) while acquiring two major pieces of snow removal equipment.

All projects contained in the ACIP are pending the receipt of AIP discretionary funding, and what the FAA deems as the project priorities for future federal funding, in contrast with what Marquette County, acting as the Airport Sponsor, deems as the project priorities for future federal funding.

B. UPDATE: Aerobatic Practice Area

Mr. Kaspari provided an update to the Committee Members regarding the receipt of an Environmental Assessment (EA), and the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), for the issuance of the waiver for an Aerobatic Practice Area (APA) at Sawyer.

Mr. Kaspari communicated to the Members that a draft Letter of Agreement (LOA) has been submitted to Committee Member Frank Rosado (Air Traffic Manager of Sawyer's Federal Contract – Air Traffic Control Tower), for approval by his company (Midwest ATC) for their review and recommendations.

Once the LOA has been approved, then Staff can complete the steps necessary for the implementation of an APA.

Mr. Kaspari also publicly thanked Mr. Roger Bentlage for all of his time and work to request the APA. The Committee Members also thanked Mr. Bentlage for his work on the APA.

C. Wide Area Augmentation System (WAAS): Mr. Kaspari was unable to contact officials with the FAA to provide an update to the Committee Members regarding the Wide Area Augmentation System, or WAAS, for the Runway 1 approach end.

Mr. Kaspari will attempt to provide an update for the August meeting.

D. Runway Broom:

As part of the July agenda packet, Mr. Erbisch included a memo to update the Committee Members on the status of scheduling and payment for delivery, set-up and demonstration of a rotary broom to enhance the braking action of aircraft on SAW's airfield movement and non-movement areas during the winter season. Discussion ensued.

Staff and Committee Members discussed the equipment that was displayed to Committee Member John LaCourt and Staff (Keith Kaspari) during their February trip to the Cherry Capital Airport in Traverse City.

Discussion continued with the following talking points:

- The Committee discussed the overall price of the two pieces of equipment purchased by the staff at the Cherry Capital Airport, with Committee Member Jim Cihak inquiring about the cost of the equipment purchased by Traverse City, which, Mr. Kaspari commented that each vehicle costs between \$500,000 & \$600,000;
- Committee Member LaCourt provided comment that staff at Cherry Capital Airport liked the equipment so much, that they plan on purchasing two additional – similarly outfitted;
- Committee Member Jim Cihak commented that using a broom to begin the removal of water from the pavement areas would be of significant assistance to prohibit the water from freezing;
- Keith Kaspari provided comment that due to the age of the existing plows and material (sand) spreader, that he recommended the acquisition of a combination plow and material spreader such as what officials at Cherry Capital Airport purchased approximately 3 or 4 years ago;
- Committee Member Scott Schulz provided comment that Staff should complete a Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA), for the potential cost of the snowbroom, chemicals, equipment to apply the chemicals (if necessary) maintenance of the equipment, and other potential costs that the airport would be required to absorb for the on-going operation of the snowbroom – including what impact the use of this equipment would have on the visibility or reflectivity of the airfield markings, as noted by Mr. Kaspari, below.
- Mr. Kaspari provided comment that from a conversation that he had with the Assistant Director of the Cherry Capital Airport (Kevin Klein), that he commented that he would recommend that we repaint the airfield markings every year due to the wear and tear of the markings by plow blades and rotary brooms.

Mr. Kaspari continued, in that we have an on-going program to repaint the airfield every three years (we are currently one-year overdue), and to repaint the airfield every year, would require us to dedicate nearly 10% of our annual AIP Entitlement funds, as it costs approximately \$90,000 to repaint all the pavement markings on the runways, taxiways and aircraft ramp areas.

Committee Members John LaCourt and Jim Cihak requested of staff to submit a letter to the various SRE broom manufacturers (Wausau and M-B Co.) prior to the August meeting, and to request that they place Sawyer as a location to demonstrate their equipment at Sawyer for the upcoming 2010 – 2011 winter season.

Mr. Kaspari also recommended that Staff send out a letter of invitation to SRE manufacturers that if they need a location for the testing of SRE equipment, that staff would provide a location for their winter testing at no cost.

E. Strategic Long Range Planning:

Due to the absence of Scott Erbisich of the Airport Staff, and Committee Members Steve Rodgers and Frank Rosado, the long range planning discussion has been tabled for the August meeting.

Mr. Kaspari recommended to Chairman Struck that we could hold a special meeting, yet to be scheduled, during the week of July 26th.

Chairman Struck recommended of staff to submit an email regarding the availability of Committee Members during the week of the 26th.

F. FY-2010 Military Airports Program (MAP) Application

Mr. Kaspari provided an update to the Committee Members regarding the status of the MAP Application that Airport Staff submitted to the FAA many months ago.

Via an email received on July 1 (2010) from the American Association of Airport Executives (AAAE), Airport Staff discovered that Sawyer was not included in the list of airports for FY-2010.

Of the 15 airports that can be approved to participate in the MAP program, there were nine airports in the MAP program, with two additions, thereby leaving four open slots.

Mr. Kaspari shared email communication received on Thursday afternoon (July 1, 2010) from Ms. Amy Berglund, U.P. Regional Representative to U.S. Senator Carl Levin, regarding the position of the FAA from the FAA's Office of Legislative Affairs, to quote:

Keith,

According to the FAA legislative office, the improvement and upgrading projects Sawyer submitted are eligible for other funding opportunities outside of MAP. Have these projects been submitted elsewhere for funding?

Thanks, Amy.

Airport Staff (Keith Kaspari), responded to Ms. Berglund's email, with the following:

Amy:

Thank you.

Some projects were (snow removal equipment), and others on the list were submitted because they met the criteria for MAP funding.

Consistent with previous applications submitted, I still submitted many projects for continued hangar improvements (repairing hangar floors, fire suppression systems, roofs) and others (fuel farm security project, building demolition), etc.

I also requested snow removal equipment, as snow removal equipment was allowed in previous MAP programs, and due to what the FAA deemed as higher priority projects for our annual entitlements, (airfield lighting, runway reconstruction) snow removal equipment does not get the priority that other equipment does - ex: airport fire trucks.

You would think that the FAA would grant special consideration for airports in winter climates, and the northern-tier states, especially those airports that annually receive the amount of snow that we get here in the U.P.

Additionally, our runway pavement reconstruction project, which is usually a very high priority for funding, Sawyer received zero discretionary funds, and instead of a one or two year max project, resulted in what will end up being a 4-year reconstruction project - therefore not allowing us to conduct a phased replacement of large snow removal equipment - especially when snowblowers can price out in excess of \$800,000.

Also, when we bid out a project for the interior rehab. of the 400-series hangars last summer, this bid letting also included the two buildings mentioned below, but, approximately a million dollars of our potential funding to make the exterior improvements on the two buildings below, was re-directed to I believe the Mesa, Arizona airport for a passenger terminal improvement project.

Other projects, that are considered MAP eligible, included projects or systems for utility improvements - thereby, my request included improvements to Sawyer's water and waste water treatment plant, and water line improvements for an increased flow rate of water for a large number of buildings for fire suppression systems, fire hydrants, terminal, tower and airport fire station.

I truly believed that all projects as submitted, were excellent candidates for MAP funding as I believe the projects met all eligibility criteria.

Thanks for all you have done Amy, Tom and Sheri.

Keith

Staff recommended to the Committee Members that at the very least, that the County Board sends correspondence to Senators Levin and Stabenow, and Representative Stupak, for all of their assistance with the significant amount of funds that Marquette County has received for the many capital improvements completed with MAP funding.

G. UPDATE: FBO Lease Agreement and Discussion -

Committee Member Fred Benzie requested of staff for an update regarding the FBO discussions and agreement, and when an update would be provided to the Marquette County Board of Commissioners.

Mr. Kaspari provided comment, that as per an email received from Scott Erbisich, to present to the Committee at the July meeting, that an update would be provided to the County Board at the July 13th meeting.

Committee Member Benzie offered a Motion of Support for staff to provide an update to the County Board of Commissioners within the next 30-days, or prior to the August meeting.

A second was provided by Committee Member Jim Cihak.

A Roll-Call vote was necessary, reflecting the following voice votes:

Ayes: Committee Members LaCourt, Benzie, Schulz and Struck;
Nays: Committee Members Sikkema and Cihak.

6. Informational Items:

A. UPDATE: Terminal Restroom

Mr. Kaspari led discussion, via an update from Scott Erbisich regarding the future construction of a restroom for the airport passenger terminal.

Mr. Kaspari commented that staff anticipates receiving the plans for the restroom during the month of July, with review by Committee Member LaCourt, and the County's Building Codes department.

Mr. Kaspari provided comment to the Committee Members that he anticipated the project to be completed prior to the Thanksgiving Holiday season.

B. FAA Runway Reduction

Mr. Kaspari led discussion with regard to the potential reduction in the useable length of the runway.

As part of the discussion, Mr. Kaspari informed the group that due to a recently completed survey, that the current length of the runway has been reduced from 12,370' to 12,366' due to current location of the threshold lights at the Runway 1 approach end.

As a result, this will require a complete updating of the Final Report of Sawyer's Airport Master Plan, and forthcoming Airport Layout Plan (set of plan drawings).

C. UPDATE: Memo, Telkite Land Purchase and Marketing Agreement

As part of the July agenda packet, Airport Staff (Scott Erbisch) provided a copy of correspondence to the Marquette County Board of Commissioners, regarding an update of the County's agreement with Telkite.

Committee Member Scott Schulz provided comment regarding his views that for an annual investment of \$100,000 to Telkite officials for airport marketing services, and over the past five year period, that he has seen little if any end result.

D. Airport Runway (Taxiway) Lighting Project – Phase II

Mr. Kaspari led discussion and provided an update regarding the status of the Phase II taxiway lighting rehabilitation project.

- Currently, and as of July 1, completes Week No: 3;
- The General Contractor (Airport Lighting, LLC) is on schedule or even ahead of schedule, and is still set for completion on or about August 16th.

7. Public Comment

None

8. Staff and Committee Member Comment

Committee Member Andy Sikkema provided an update on the status of MDOT projects in Marquette County.

Airport Manager Keith Kaspari provided the Committee Members a brief update on the following:

- Third daily trip to Detroit Metro on Delta Airlines begins on July 15th in contrast with the previous schedule of July 1st. No reason for the change in schedule was received by officials at Delta Airlines;
- Staff will be forwarding correspondence to the Marquette County Board of Commissioners in preparation of the Phase IV runway slab reconstruction project set to begin on or about Monday, August 9; and,
- Congress is extending for the 14th time, aviation taxes for a 30-day period which is now set to expire on or about August 3rd.

9. Adjournment

A Motion to Adjourn the meeting was offered by Committee Member Jim Cihak, with a Second offered by Committee Member Scott Schulz.

Motion Passed.

Time of adjournment: 5:57.



50




Airport Services Center: 125 G Avenue • Gwinn, MI 49841 • www.sawyerairport.com

Airport Administrative Office
(906) 346-3308

Water/Wastewater Department
(906) 346-3137

Maintenance Department
(906) 346-4336

Memorandum

To: Airport Advisory Committee
From: Scott Erbisch 
CC:
Date: August 13, 2010
Re: Aerobatic Practice Area

The Aerobatic Practice Area request has taken another step forward. This week Roger Bentlage received and forwarded the attached finalized Environmental Assessment – Finding of No Significant Impact.

The next step is for the FAA Flight Standards Office is to issue the waiver. Unless there is additional requirements that are requested from the FAA, the waiver will be the last step in the process from the FAA. Once the waiver is in place, then the airport and the control tower can determine whether a LOA will be needed. A draft LOA has been prepared and is ready to be utilized if warranted.

Environmental Assessment

Finding of No Significant Impact

Issuance of a Waiver for an Aerobatic Practice Area at
Sawyer International Airport, Gwinn, MI

August 2010



This Environmental Assessment becomes a Federal document when evaluated, signed and dated by the Responsible FAA Official

Harvey Risse
Responsible FAA official

8/12/10
Date

1. Proposed Federal Action and FAA Responsibility

This document is an Environmental Assessment (EA) of a proposed federal action to issue a waiver (under applicable sections of FAR Part 91.303) for an Aerobatic Practice Area (APA) overlying Sawyer International Airport, Gwinn, MI. It was prepared to analyze, document, and disclose potential environmental impacts of the APA. Flight Standards Handbook, FAA Order 8900.1 CHG 85 Vol. 3, Chapter 5 Section 1, specifies the need for an Environmental Assessment in association with an APA waiver. The EA complies with FAA Order 1050.1E, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* and related regulations of the federal Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). CEQ guidance states: "Since the EA is a concise document, it should not contain long descriptions or detailed data which the agency may have gathered. Rather, it should contain a brief discussion of the need for the proposal, alternatives to the proposal, the environmental impacts of the proposed action and alternatives, and a list of agencies and persons consulted." (Section 1508.9(b))

2. Background

2.1. Aerobatic Practice Areas

Aerobatic Practice Areas (APA) are volumes of airspace with sides of at least one kilometer and a height of at least .75 km, in which a pilot may practice aerobatic maneuvers flown in air shows and competitions. In order to establish an APA the operator must apply to the local Flight Standard District Office (FSDO) for one or more waivers to aviation regulations. These waivers may include approvals of aircraft operations over any congested area of a city, town, or settlement; over an open air assembly of persons; within the lateral boundaries of the surface areas of Class B, Class C, Class D, or Class E airspace designated for an airport; within 4 nautical miles of the center line of any Federal airway; below an altitude of 1,500 feet above the surface; or when flight visibility is less than 3 statute miles. This particular waiver involves the operation of aircraft within the Class D airspace of Sawyer International Airport (SAW.) In addition to evaluating the safety of the APA, an Environmental Assessment (EA) is required by the FAA. An EA is an environmental investigation to see if the proposal would have a significant environmental effect.

2.2. Proposed APA at Sawyer International Airport, Gwinn, MI

Mr. Roger Bentlage, Marquette, MI, has requested authorization for the APA, located at SAW. SAW is a county owned airport located approximately 7 miles north of Gwinn, MI. The airport has approximately 44 based aircraft and approximately 22,500 aircraft operations (landings and take-offs.)

The proposed APA is a rectangular volume of airspace 12,370 feet long, 3,300 feet wide, and between 1,500 feet above ground level (AGL) and 4,500 feet AGL. The APA would be located parallel and just to the west of Runway 1-19 at SAW.

The APA could operate Monday through Friday between 1000 and sunset and between 1200 hours and sunset on Saturdays and Sundays. It could operate once per day, average

duration 30 minutes, and as many as 20 occasions per month between April 1 and October 31. This equates to 4 average-day aerobic maneuvers (20, ½ -hour operational periods per month times 6 aerobic maneuvers per ½ hour operational period, divided by 30 days.) This figure is needed for noise and air quality analyses.

3. Alternatives

CEQ regulations require that Environmental Assessments evaluate the proposed action and alternatives to the proposed action, which includes a no-action alternative for comparative purposes. The alternatives examined in this EA include the proposed action and no-action (whereby FAA would not approve the waiver of the aerobic practice area.) The no-action alternative would not be in the interest of aviation safety, since the purpose of an APA is to permit pilots to practice prior to aerobic competition or air shows. Other alternatives involved with different locations were considered environmentally inferior because they would distribute the aircraft activity over greater amounts of incompatible land use. APAs generally produce less noise to incompatible land uses if they are located over airports.

4. Environmental Impact Categories

4.1. Air Quality

The Proposed Action: SAW is located in Marquette County, MI. According to the Environmental Protection Agency's *Green Book*, Marquette County is located in an area which is in attainment for all six national criteria pollutants. Given this, under the General Conformity guidelines of EPA, no further air quality analysis is necessary.

In support of this, FAA Order 1050.1E identifies the analysis requirements for air quality, which are contained in FAA's *Air Quality Procedures for Civilian Airports and Air Force Bases*. This document provides guidance concerning the scope of air quality review required under NEPA and states:

"...Many projects at airports and air bases are too small to require detailed air quality analysis and only a few projects are both broad enough in scope and located in nonattainment or maintenance areas such that the full complement of analyses described in this handbook would be required. Screening techniques that streamline the process for many air quality assessment actions are available and discussed."

Figure 1 in *Air Quality Procedures for Civilian Airports and Air Force Bases* states that if the general aviation (GA) activity at a GA airport is less than 180,000 annual operations then no National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) assessment is required. Total operations at SAW are estimated at 22,500 operations. Given that this APA would result in approximately 1,440 additional operations, the total is still well below the threshold of 180,000 operations.

The No-Action Alternative: There would be no emission related activity from the no-action alternative. However, this alternative would not achieve the objective of providing for a location to practice aerobatic maneuvers.

4.2. Noise Impacts

The Proposed Action: In May 2006, the U.S. Department of Transportation's Volpe Center Acoustic Facility, following a request from FAA, reported on a noise measurement study of aerobatic aircraft. The study looked at noise levels from multiple types of aircraft most commonly used in APAs. In this study the noise was measured during both International Aerobatic Club (IAC) Sportsman 2005 known routines as well as the IAC Intermediate 2005 Freestyle routine. The study used the Integrated Noise Model (INM) for calculating the noise levels, measured in DNL (day-night average sound level) decibels at various distances from the center of the APA. The study concluded that:

"The estimated DNL of a single, daytime aerobatic routine was less than 42 dB (A) for all three aircraft at all measurement positions. Even when multiple daytime routines were considered (up to 50 identical routines), the estimated DNL values due to any of the aerobatic routines never exceeded 60 dB(A) DNL directly below the practice box, 56 dB(A) DNL 1/4 mile away from the center of the practice box, or 46 dB(A) DNL one mile away. Although these estimated DNLs did not take into account approaches to and departures from the practice box, it may be inferred that even with their inclusion, none of the aerobatic routines flown in this study would have exceeded 65 dB DNL at distances 1/4 mile or more from the center of the practice box.

A conservative recommendation would be to locate heavily utilized aerobatics practice boxes 1/2 mile [from the center of the box] or more from noise sensitive receivers."

The SAW proposal is approximately an average of 4 aerobatic routines per day, significantly less than the 50 routines used in the study. This would produce significantly less than 60 DNL under the SAW APA and significantly less than 56 DNL 1/4 mile from the lateral limits of the SAW APA. FAA's level of significance is a 1.5 DNL change in the 65 DNL noise contour.

The No-Action Alternative: There would be no noise generated as a result of the no-action alternative. However, this alternative would not achieve the objective of providing for a location to practice aerobatic maneuvers.

4.3. Other Environmental Impact Categories

The Action and No-Action Alternatives: The Action and No-Action Alternatives:

The proposed APA is unlikely to have any significant adverse effect on any of the following other categories of environmental impact:

Coastal Resources
Compatible Land Use
Construction Impacts
Department of Transportation Act

Farmlands
Fish, Wildlife, and Plants
Floodplains
Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention, and Solid Waste
Historical, Architectural, Archeological, and Cultural Resources
Light Emissions and Visual Impacts
Natural Resources and Energy Supply
Secondary (Induced) Impacts
Socioeconomic Impacts, Environmental Justice, and Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risks
Water Quality
Wetlands
Wild and Scenic Rivers

5. Public Involvement

The APA was the subject of a February 4, 2010, Airport Advisory Committee meeting. The Committee is comprised of representatives of aviation and non-aviation interests. The Committee voted to support the waiver request, noting that aerobatic maneuver operations “will enhance public awareness [and] lead to a stronger relationship between the airport and the community.” (Sawyer International Airport letter to FAA Flight Standards District Office, dated May 7, 2010.)

6. Conclusion

Based on the above analysis, there are no significant impacts from any of the environmental impact categories for either the proposed action or the no-action alternatives.

7. Applicability

A signed Finding of No Significant Impact is applicable for a period of three years from date of signature below. **If issued within three years of the signature date below, subsequent waivers with no significant change in location or operation of the APA need only reference this EA and Finding.** A **significant change in location** of the APA means that there is a proposed change in boundary that locates the APA closer to residential, church or school land uses, public park land, historic properties, National Wildlife Refuges, or properties located within a Coastal Zone referenced in an approved Coastal Zone Management Plan. (Coastal Zones are normally within a few miles of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans and Great Lakes.) A **significant change in operation** of the APA means that the number of average daily aerobatic maneuvers within the APA is proposed at a level at least double that assessed in this EA, or that operations would occur between 10:00 pm and 7:00 am.

8. Preparation of EA

This Environmental Assessment was prepared by John Silva, SAIC, Senior Aviation Environmental Specialist.

9. Finding of No Significant Impact

After careful and thorough consideration of the facts contained herein, the undersigned finds that the proposed federal action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives as set forth in section 101 of the NEPA and other applicable environmental requirements and will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment or otherwise include any condition requiring consultation pursuant to section 102(2)(C) of NEPA.

APPROVED: Nancy Risso DATE: 8/12/10

Nancy Risso
Manager, NextGen Branch, AEA-220
Flight Standards Division
FAA Eastern Region



CA



Airport Services Center: 125 G Avenue • Gwinn, MI 49841 • www.sawyerairport.com

Airport Administrative Office
(906) 346-3308

Water/Wastewater Department
(906) 346-3137

Maintenance Department
(906) 346-4336

Memorandum

To: Airport Advisory Committee Members
From: Scott Erbisch *SE*
CC:
Date: August 12, 2010
Re: Airport Terminal Bathroom Update

The plans and specifications for the terminal bathroom have been received and reviewed by Marquette County Buildings Codes personnel, John LaCourt, and airport staff. All comments were submitted to the engineer for review and incorporation into the final drawing(s).

The project is still on schedule and is will be out for bids by Thursday, August 19, 2010. Bids will be due by September 10, 2010.