



PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETING MINUTES

HEB Engineers, Inc. • www.hebengineers.com

New Hampshire: Office (603) 356-6936 • Fax (603) 356-7715 • PO Box 440 • 2605 White Mountain Hwy • North Conway, NH 03860

Maine: Office (207) 803-8265 • PO Box 343 • 103 Main Street • Suite 6 • Bridgton, ME 04009

Date:	June 8, 2016	Time:	7:00PM – 8:45PM	Project #:	2014-052
Project Description:	Center Harbor – New Hampton Waukewan Road Bridge #080/040 over the Lake Waukewan Inlet (Snake River)			NHDOT #:	24579 X-A002(923)
Meeting Location:	Center Harbor Fire Station				
Prepared by:	Ryan P. McMullen, EIT				<i>Page 1 of 4</i>

Attended By:

- Harry Viens, Richard Hanson, Richard Drenkhahn – Center Harbor Select Board Member
- Neil Irvine, Nathaniel Sawyer, Jr., Kenneth Mertz – New Hampton Select Board
- Executive Councilor Joe Kenney
- State Representative Valerie Fraser
- State Senator Jeanie Forrester
- Bob Landry, PE, Kevin Daigle, Jillian Edelmann, Bill Cass – NHDOT
- Chris Fournier, PE, Ryan McMullen, EIT – HEB Engineers, Inc.
- Approximately 70 members of the public in attendance

Purpose of Meeting:

- Introduce Town Officials, residents, and interested parties of Center Harbor and New Hampton to the Options created by NHDOT to address the redlisted Mosquito Bridge and receive feedback.

Items discussed:

- The Center Harbor Select Board opened the meeting.
- Bob Landry (NHDOT) began the presentation portion of the meeting. Bob asked the members of the public who attended the previous meeting on October 27, 2015. Approximately 60% of the public in attendance had attended the previous meeting.
- Bob reviewed the agenda for the presentation including an introduction of the project team.
- Bob reviewed the existing conditions including several aerial photographs and inspection photos. The bridge information was also reviewed.
- Bob reviewed the cultural resources review processes and outlined the results. The bridge was determined to not be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and the New Hampshire Department of Historic Resources (NHDHR) agreed. At this point Bob opened it up for questions from the public with Jillian Edelmann of NHDOT providing feedback on the questions regarding the eligibility of the bridge for the NRHP and Bob providing feedback for the rest.
- The age of the bridge was questioned. Some residents believed it was from the mid 1800's and not 1928 and therefore should be reconsidered for the NRHP.
 - The abutments may be from the mid 1800's, but the deck was not cast until 1928 so that is considered to be the age of the bridge. Furthermore, the abutments have changed overtime and abutments alone are not enough for the bridge to be considered historic. Additionally, the trends of development in the area were not determined to be caused by the bridge.
- A resident asked if the National Department of Historical Resources looked to determine if the bridge was historic or just the NHDHR? It was believed that the requirements for being considered historic may be stricter at the federal level than just the State level. The resident also asked who ultimately paid for the historian who conducted the historical evaluation and completed the Individual Inventory Form.
 - The Individual Inventory Form was submitted to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), as well as NHDHR, and reviewed by both registers. Ultimately, the NHDOT paid for the historian to complete the Individual Inventory Form. Jillian offered to provide copies of the Individual Inventory Form.

- Some residents inquired about what it means to be a Red Listed Bridge and if the bridge was Red Listed, why was it not posted.
 - To be considered Red Listed, one structural component on the bridge must be rated as “poor” and therefore are inspected twice a year. Although the bridge is Red Listed, the load carrying capacity has not yet been compromised, therefore the bridge is not yet posted.
- How and when the average daily traffic count was conducted was questioned. The resident questioning this felt that the number was high and mentioned that the traffic going over the bridge varied based on the season.
 - Bob believes that the number is a seasonal average, but was not certain as to when the count was done. The NHDOT will gather more information on the traffic count and get back to the residents.
- Bob continued with the presentation proceeding to the inspection photos. The inspection photos showed two feet of exposed rebar on the edge of the underside of the concrete deck, as well as voids in the stone abutments.
- Bob reviewed the alternatives for addressing the deficient bridge. The condition of the bridge was too poor to consider repair as a viable option. Bob discussed that there was no good way to repair the bridge because there were no patches that would last 20 years. For rehabilitation, the deck condition is beyond rehabilitation and needs replacement, the stone abutments should be preserved and protected with supplementary abutments provided. Replacement is not being considered.
- Bob showed an animation of how the rehabilitation would be done. This showed the existing superstructure being removed from the stone abutments, new abutments being built behind the stone abutments with a new superstructure resting on the new abutments and spanning over the existing stone abutments.
- Bob discussed Option 1 for the rehabilitation. This includes a single 11-foot lane with 4-foot shoulders, maintaining the existing rail to rail width of 20 feet (the existing bridge is 19 feet 4 inches). However, the State will not own a one lane bridge so if one is built, it will have to be owned by both Towns after construction is complete. Accommodating a modern crash-tested bridge rail system, the total bridge width will increase from 21 feet 2 inches to 23 feet 4 inches. The current width of the stone abutments varies from 22 to 24 feet. A graphic of the proposed cross section of Option 1 was displayed. Bob stated that the existing rail is substandard and needs to be addressed. Option 1 accommodates a modern crash-tested rail system with T2 rail shown on the slides. Bob noted that T101 rail is also sufficient, but is very low.
- Bob discussed Option 2 for the rehabilitation. Option 2 was similar to Option 1, but provides a one-lane width of 17 feet and an elevated, curbed platform for viewing and/or fishing. The total bridge width increases to 23 feet 4 inches (the same as Option 1). A proposed cross section of Option 2 was displayed.
- Bob discussed Option 3 for the rehabilitation. Option 3 provides two lanes with a width of 22 feet. This is narrower than what is typical for two lanes, but Bob is okay with this. This results in a bridge width increase to 25 feet 4 inches and accommodates the modern crash-tested bridge rail system with the T2 rail. A proposed cross section of option 3 was displayed.
- Slides for option 4 were displayed in the presentation. Option 4 includes a two-lane width of 24 feet which meets minimum federal criteria. This results in increasing the total bridge width to 27 feet 4 inches with a 5-foot widening to occur. The existing stones would be reconfigured to match the new width. The proposed expansion would take place on the Snake River side of the bridge causing significant wetland impacts. Graphics showing the proposed cross section of this option and the proposed expansion were displayed.
- Bob highlighted the next steps in the process. These included selecting the preferred alternative, reviewing the project with Natural Resource Agencies to get their input and comments, completing NEPA process for environmental permitting, developing preliminary plans, and having a third public informational meeting to present the progress and preliminary plans. The project is currently scheduled to start construction in 2021.
- At this point Bob opened it up for questions. Approximately 30 residents of Center Harbor or New Hampton spoke up during the meeting to provide a comment or ask a question, with Bob Landry of NHDOT providing feedback.

- One resident commented that the photos shown in the presentation of the voids in the stone abutments were misleading and the voids were not actually that large. The resident questioned if concrete could be injected into the voids to repair the abutments.
 - This can be done, but is not viewed as a long term solution.
- A resident asked if the curve would be taken out of the road.
 - No, the alignment of the road will stay the same.
- A resident asked if the bridge was currently considered a one-lane bridge.
 - No it is not. Bob clarified that if the bridge were to become a one-lane bridge, it would have to be owned by both the Towns of Center Harbor and New Hampton. This would include all of Waukegan Road from Winona Road to Route 3 as well.
- Some residents inquired about a do nothing option.
 - This option had been discussed at the previous public information meeting. This would result in the bridge being load posted and closed over time. The timeframe of this is unknown.
- A resident stated that the reality was that people have an attachment to the bridge and federal money has more pressing areas of use. People do not want a new bridge and the Towns do not want a new bridge.
 - The NHDOT has not received a letter from either Town and is still on the ten-year plan. Bob noted that the purpose of the public information meeting was to gather public input.
- A resident questioned if the project was taken off federal funding and if it would have to follow the same standards if so.
 - The project still has federal funding and would have to follow the same standards even if it was no longer federally funded.
- A resident asked why the State could not make an exception to the width of the bridge so a repair can have the same out to out width as the existing bridge. The resident cited the exception made for the blind one-way a few miles from the bridge site and cited old roadway guardrail that is not up to current standards.
 - The exceptions made on other projects will not be made for the bridge rail. The NHDOT is already minimizing the width by considering the road as a low volume road (<400 ADT) despite a traffic count showing slightly higher numbers and using the Low Volume Road Guide Standards. Bob mentioned that roadway guardrail is different from bridge rail because it can deflect up to 6 feet whereas bridge rail cannot deflect as much or someone will end up in the water.
- Some residents asked if the crash-tested rail requirements are based on speed and if the current rail met the requirements.
 - The rail requirements are based on speed and the current rail does not meet the requirements.
- A resident commented that there fender benders that have hit the rail in the past have not resulted in cars in the water. The question was asked if a lower speed posting would decrease the rail requirements and if T101 and T2 were the only rail Options.
 - The width would still be the same with a lower speed posting and there are no crash tested rails that are narrower than T101 and T2.
- A resident asked if the Towns take over ownership of the bridge, are crash tested rails still required or is it the Town's choice.
 - It is not an option to build the bridge below the standards.
- Some residents questioned if there have ever been crashes on the bridge resulting in people in the water.
 - The police have only seen minor crashes and have not seen this happen in the past 18 years.
- A resident stated that crash data shows only eight accidents from 1998 to 2014, all minor.
 - This is why the NHDOT is okay using the Low Volume Road Guide Standards despite having a slightly higher traffic count.
- Some residents inquired about the Town maintaining the bridge with no NHDOT involvement.
 - The NHDOT would require letters from both Towns stating this.
- Some residents believed that repair of the existing abutments is manageable and inquired about repairing them.
 - The NHDOT would like the lifespan of substructure to match that of the superstructure. A new superstructure will last 75 to 100 years. It is uncertain how long repaired stone abutments would last.

- A resident brought up the fact that the current structure has a short span and they do not see the granite stone abutments moving.
 - This has been considered, but there is already evidence of water seeping through the stones.
- A resident asked if the bridge can be load posted to a lower weight. Also, if the federal money is not used in this project, will it be used for something else? If so, can the funds be used to address the beaver problem in the area?
 - The NHDOT cannot arbitrarily load post a structure to a lower weight. The structure's load carrying capacity must warrant a load posting. The funding will be used for other things if not used. The question about addressing the beaver problem was not addressed.
- A resident asked to clarify if Options 3 and 4 would be State owned.
 - Yes.
- Some residents asked about the width of the new bridge Options and if they would be flush with the abutments or if there would be an overhang.
 - All Options require an overhang. The single-lane Options require a 6 to 14 inch overhang, while the two-lane option requires a 10 to 18 inch overhang.
- A resident asked if restoring the abutments would require a deck and guardrail replacement.
 - Yes.
- The importance of the rural character and history of Center Harbor was stressed and it was asked to reconsider the bridge's historical importance.
- Some residents expressed concern for the abutments falling without the vertical pressure of the superstructure on them.
- A resident asked if the deterioration of the concrete on the bottom of the superstructure was due to being bolted on rail.
 - It is believed that the deterioration is a result of salt from salting the roads in the winter and water.
- A resident claimed that there were no bolts left on the guardrail. The resident claimed that a runaway bus had hit the bridge in the past.
 - The NHDOT will look into the possible lack of bolts on the guardrail. There is no record of a bus hitting the bridge in the past 21 years.
- A resident asked why the bridge lanes needed to be widened.
 - Bob said that this was due to the width of the plows. The resident claimed that this was wrong.
- A number of residents expressed their belief that the narrow bridge resulted in slower speeds and therefore made the bridge safer. Concern that a wider bridge would result in faster speeds was expressed. Concern for the homes near the bridge and an increase in danger to the fishermen with a wider bridge was expressed.
- Some residents requested a copy of the Individual Inventory Form.
 - The form will be posted to the NHDOT website.
- A resident expressed concern that repairing the bridge will open up the possibility of repairing the roadway and increasing traffic.
- Neil Irving (New Hampton Selectman) summarized four emails expressing their concern of widening the bridge and requesting to repair the bridge without federal funding. The emails are enclosed for the record.
- A resident asked if construction starting at 2021 is attainable.
 - Yes.
- A resident asked if the road was designated as a scenic route.
 - No.
- The time of the next meeting was discussed. More people can attend in the summer, but waiting one year until the next meeting is too long.

From: Robert Landry
Sent: Thursday, June 09, 2016 12:36 PM
To: Chris Fournier (HEB)
Cc: Kevin Daigle
Subject: FW: Mosquito Bridge meeting - request

Please include in final minutes of the meeting

From: Erik_Sean@comcast.net [mailto:Erik_Sean@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2016 7:09 PM
To: selectmen@new-hampton.nh.us
Cc: Valerie.Fraser@leg.state.nh.us; Joseph.Kenney@nh.gov; mosquitobridge@gmail.com; chselectmen@metrocast.net
Subject: Mosquito Bridge meeting - request

New Hampton Selectmen-

Thank you for all you do for New Hampton. I have a property at 84 Seminole Avenue, our little slice of heaven! I am unfortunately to able to make the meeting on June 8 regarding "Mosquito Bridge" as we know it, part of what makes our slice of heaven just that!

I would genuinely appreciate if you could represent my sentiments at the meeting: I am opposed to any expansion of width to the bridge. Please also maintain the current length & configuration of the structure, including preserving the granite abutments. Based on prior meetings, I suspect we are better off without federal funds and the requirements/constraints they bring with them, so ideally DOT can leverage State monies for 'simple' repairs of the bridge.

Thank you for representing this. Have a fun meeting.

Sean Sweeney
84 Seminole Avenue
New Hampton, NH

From: Anne [<mailto:bh317@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2016 8:13 PM
To: selectmen@new-hampton.nh.us
Cc: 'Fraser, Valerie'; joseph.kenney@nh.gov; 'SRMB Bridge Preservation Committee'
Subject: Mosquito Bridge DOT

We regret that we are unable to attend the Snake River / Mosquito Bridge DOT Presentation Meeting on June 8th, but request that our statement be read for the record.

We have been in the Lake Waukewan area for over 40 years currently having lived on Seminole Ave near Mosquito Bridge for 24 years so we are intimate with the traffic, safety, environment, history and the scenic beauty of Mosquito Bridge. As such we can attest that the current bridge has no issues in any of these areas, but more importantly the bridge represents a sense of place that is unique and enhances the beauty of this fragile eco-system and area and we wish to have our voice heard for the record:

- We oppose ANY increase in width or change in configuration of the bridge or roadway leading to or from the bridge
- We expect to keep the granite abutments as the foundation for the bridge that have already stood the test of time as well as their historic value

- We want the existing bridge to be repaired preserving the current bridge width, configuration and with the existing guardrail system, not a guardrail system that does not suit the area
- Remove the bridge project from the federal funding track so that the bridge repair can be handled as we are requesting with local decisions made to preserve the quaint rural character of the area

We ask that you listen to the people who live and care for this special area and request "repair the of the existing bridge" as it is.

Respectfully,

William Hodges and Anne Tarryk

102 Seminole Ave
New Hampton, NH 03256

Mobile: 860-729-3348

E-mail: bh317@sbcglobal.net

From: Shirley Splaine [<mailto:garden775@myfairpoint.net>]

Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2016 1:59 PM

To: selectmen@new-hampton.nh.us

Subject: mosquito bridge

I do plan to attend the meeting this evening. I definitely oppose ANY increases in width or changes to Mosquito Bridge. We value our rural roads and do not wish to encourage speeding which I think the proposed changes would do. The bridge has stood well and people do slow down. The scenery is lovely there and I think it's a good thing to slow down and enjoy it. Shirley G. Splaine 775 Winona Rd., Ctr. Harbor NH 03226. (garden775@myfairpoint.net)

From: Joe Finch [<mailto:josephmfinch@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2016 2:55 PM

To: selectmen@new-hampton.nh.us

Cc: Valerie.Fraser@leg.state.nh.us; Joseph.Kenney@nh.gov; mosquitobridge@gmail.com

Subject: Snake River / Mosquito Bridge DOT Presentation Meeting June 8th - Opposition to DOT plans

Selectmen,

Although I am unable to attend this evening's meeting in person due to a sudden scheduling conflict, I wanted to ensure that you received my opinions regarding the proposed repairs to be conducted on the Snake River / Mosquito Bridge.

As a landowner in very close proximity to the southern bridge approach (133 Waukegan Road, New Hampton), I have a vested interest in preserving the existing bridge configuration and design as it stands today. I have no desire to see the historic structure upgraded, enhanced, modernized, or otherwise altered OTHER than to repair the damage caused by DOT's years of neglect to the structure. My opposition extends to any upgrades to the existing guard / crash rails that are in place today, which are in much better condition than other guardrails in the area and are appropriate to the level of traffic that crosses the bridge.

Ideally, I would like to see this project removed from the federal funding list, since this would mandate that federal standards be enforced in any repair / replacement of the structure, running contrary to the objectives above.

I stand with the Snake River/Mosquito Bridge Preservation Committee with regards to their desire to see this project redirected towards repair and preservation, as opposed to upgrade or replacement.

Thank you,

--

Joe Finch

Mobile: 978-337-6844

josephmfinch@gmail.com

IM: josephmfinch (Skype)

<http://www.linkedin.com/in/josephfinch>

L. Robert Landry, Jr.
NHDOT Bridge Design
RLandry@dot.state.nh.us
603.271.3921

From: BOARD OF SELECTMEN [mailto:selectmen@new-hampton.nh.us]
Sent: Thursday, June 09, 2016 11:55 AM
To: Robert Landry
Subject: FW: Mosquito Bridge meeting - request

fyi

From: Erik_Sean@comcast.net [mailto:Erik_Sean@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2016 7:09 PM
To: selectmen@new-hampton.nh.us
Cc: Valerie.Fraser@leg.state.nh.us; Joseph.Kenney@nh.gov; mosquitobridge@gmail.com; chselectmen@metrocast.net
Subject: Mosquito Bridge meeting - request

New Hampton Selectmen-

Thank you for all you do for New Hampton. I have a property at 84 Seminole Avenue, our little slice of heaven! I am unfortunately to able to make the meeting on June 8 regarding "Mosquito Bridge" as we know it, part of what makes our slice of heaven just that!

I would genuinely appreciate if you could represent my sentiments at the meeting: I am opposed to any expansion of width to the bridge. Please also maintain the current length & configuration of the structure, including preserving the granite abutments. Based on prior meetings, I suspect we are better off without federal funds and the requirements/constraints they bring with them, so ideally DOT can leverage State monies for 'simple' repairs of the bridge.

Thank you for representing this. Have a fun meeting.

Sean Sweeney
84 Seminole Avenue
New Hampton, NH

June 8, 2016

To the Honorable Selectmen of New Hampton and Center Harbor,

Re: Mosquito Bridge

We would like to take this opportunity to thank our selectmen for all they do on behalf of our towns. We also wish to thank our selectmen, our state representative Valerie Fraser and executive councilor Joe Kenney for listening to, and supporting the more than 320 New Hampton and Center Harbor residents who want to preserve Mosquito Bridge. Additionally, we wish to thank NHDOT for holding these public meetings to gather input from our communities. We are encouraged that DOT's goal is to develop a repair plan for the bridge which meets our town's wishes.

Mosquito Bridge is not just a quaint little rural bridge located on the town line of two small towns in NH. It is a beloved landmark. NHDOT may state that according to their findings, Mosquito Bridge is not eligible for the National Register of Historic places, but our beloved landmark is historic to those who treasure it from near and afar. The bridge is part of New Hampton and Center Harbor history and its granite abutments have been in place since the mid 1800's; it speaks to us of our heritage. We cannot allow our rural, historic landmarks and areas to disappear piece by piece; lost forever to our children, grandchildren and their children. Eventually the cumulative effect is the total obliteration of these rural landscapes and the loss of what makes rural NH so endearing to us.

Those of us who live in the area of Mosquito Bridge understand that the existing narrow width and configuration of the bridge and roadway approaches act as a natural speed calming device and deterrent for our area roadways to be used as a bypass by transient traffic including large truck traffic.

Any increase in the bridge width or change in configuration will allow higher speeds through the bridge area and attract and increase traffic using our rural, residential roadways thereby placing the safety of residents, pedestrians, fishermen on the bridge and motorists at risk.

We have watched decades go by where the maintenance and repair of Mosquito Bridge has been neglected by NHDOT and sadly we have watched the bridge fall into disrepair. We thank NHDOT for finally placing our beloved bridge on their Ten Year Plan so the bridge will finally receive the maintenance and repair it needs.

We also have faith and expect that NHDOT will listen to the directives of the townspeople and use the utmost care and skill when repairing our beloved landmark known as Mosquito bridge understanding its significance to so many within New Hampton and Center Harbor.

We are opposed to any repair plan that increases the existing width of the roadway and deck structure or changes to the current placement and configuration of the bridge or roadway approaches. Further, we expect that any added support structures will be hidden and invisible to the eye and will preserve the granite abutments and the look of our beloved bridge. We have complete confidence that NHDOT will find a way to install a guardrail system very similar to what exists now on the bridge that will not increase the size of the bridge and deck surface. Finally we are opposed to the use of federal monies which carry federal guidelines and wish NHDOT to use the state funds we were assured would be found for this project.

Most sincerely,

Wesley and Janan Hays
28 Seminole Ave. New Hampton, NH
Waukewan Rd., Center Harbor, NH

From : lisa.olsheskie@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2016 11:20 PM
To: chselectmen@metrocast.net
Cc: Valerie.Fraser@leg.state.nh.us; Joseph.Kenney@nh.gov; mosquitobridge@gmail.com
Subject: Mosquito Bridge meeting with DOT on 6/8/2016

Dear Center Harbor Selectmen,

Waukewan Road is a narrow, winding country road that is an access route to residences in and around Lake Waukewan. These residences, in some cases, are right up next to the road with very little set back from the roadway. There are also numerous private lanes off Waukewan Road that are not paved. Many of these private ways, such as the one on which we live (Brookside Lane), have very limited sight clearance around bends and have sharp, steep entries that require a car leaving or entering to slow way down to make the turn. Waukewan Road currently is mostly used by those who have a destination somewhere along the road.

We all want the bridge to be safe. We respectfully ask that whatever repairs are done keep the bridge in it's current size, shape and configuration. In doing so, the bridge will retain its historic significance, remain in keeping with the local landscape, and continue to "communicate" to drivers that this is a narrow, rural road on which one must be extra careful and mindful of other possible hazards up ahead in this residential area.

If the bridge were to be widened and/or expanded in any way, it will encourage drivers to be less cautious, since there would now be swift, smooth sailing through this passage. It would appear to drivers to be little different than any other roadway with a modern overpass. But this would be a very unsafe illusion.

Commercial trucks that could now use the road, would be on it not as a destination, but as a bypass to get to Route 3 or Route 25, etc. They, and the other motorists now encouraged to come this way as a bypass, would not be slowly looking for an address of a friend or family member they're coming to visit, or slowing down to turn onto their own dirt road, but will be goal-oriented to get through this area as quickly as possible to get to wherever else is their destination. This would significantly and negatively impact the area and make Waukewan Road very much more dangerous for residents, walkers and visitors.

Respectfully submitted,
Lisa & Mark Olsheskie

From: Thomas Cowie [mailto:snowguy665@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2016 10:43 AM
To: SRMB Bridge Preservation Committee
Cc: chselectmen@metrocast.net; valerie.frase@leg.state.nh.us; joseph.kenney@nh.gov
Subject: RE: MOSQUITO BRIDGE - IMPORTANT - PLEASE READ IMMEDIATELY

We fully support the positions taken to not increase in width or change the configuration of the bridge or approaches. Please preserve the granite abutments.

From: Arabella S Dane [arabellasd@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2016 6:44 AM
To: chselectmen@metrocast.net
Cc: Valerie.Fraser@leg.state.nh.us; Joseph.Kenney@nh.gov; mosquitobridge@gmail.com
Subject: Mosquito Bridge DOT Presentation Meeting June 8 2016 7:00pm

My husband Edward. N Dane and I, Arabella S. Dane, are opposed to ANY increase in width or any change in configuration of the bridge or roadway approaches to Mosquito Bridge.

We expect DOT to preserve the granite abutments.

We are opposed to the proposed upgrading of the guard rail system as the new guard rails would require widening the road and current guard rails are adequate for the speed of the vehicles using the bridge.

We support the plan to have the bridge project removed from the federal funding track which carries federal guidelines and ask that DOT defer to state money for the bridge repair.

We live at Hillcrest Farm, 252 Dane Rd. in Center Harbor.
Sincerely Arabella S. Dane & Edward N. Dane

From: Shirley Splaine [garden775@myfairpoint.net]
Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2016 2:09 PM
To: mosquitobridge@gmail.com
Subject: bridge

I do plan to attend the meeting this evening. I definitely oppose ANY increases in width and changes to Mosquito Bridge. We value our rural roads and do not wish to encourage speeding which I think the proposed changes would do. The bridge has stood well and people do slow down. The scenery is lovely there and I think it's a good thing to slow down and enjoy it. Shirley G. Splaine, 775 Winona Road, Ctr. Harbor NH 03226 (garden775@myfairpoint.net)



**BUREAU OF
BRIDGE DESIGN**

PROJECT Center Harbor - New Hampton
 PROJECT NO. 24579 BR. NO. 080/040
 CALCULATIONS FOR Public Information Meeting
 MADE BY _____ DATE 6/8/16
 CHECKED BY _____ DATE _____

CALCULATION SHEET for BRIDGES & STRUCTURES

Sign In Sheet

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>E-mail</u>
Fred & Deanna Campbell	98 Waukenwan Rd	mysoup@metrocast.net
Richard & Cheryl Lanzer	40 42 Brookside Lane CH	Ricklan2a@hotmail.com
LISA & MARK OLSHESKIE	28 BROOKSIDE LANE, CH	MARK.OLSHESKIE@COMCAST.NET
DEB & DAVE MARSH	8+12 SEMINOLE AVE	DMARSH329@GMAIL.COM
PETER & CATHY TALLMAN	6 SEMINOLE AVE (ABUTTER)	PTALLMAN@METROCAST.NET
Carol & Ciro de la Vega	52 PIPER HILL RD.	
Jean A. Brem	59 Piper Hill Rd.	
Gene and Winnifred Boynton	450 Piper Hill Rd	
Linda and John Hopper	43 Wood Ridge Rd	hoppers43j1@gmail.com
George and Mary Earl	446 WAUKEWAN Rd	MAYOFARM@METROCAST.NET
George & Elizabeth Moser	124 WOOD RIDGE CH	gfmoser@aol.com
Dwain Bronson	5 Wood Ridge Rd.	gwbro914@gmail.com
Rebecca Neal	15 Wood Ridge Rd. CH	rebecca.r.neal@dartmouth.edu
Judy Hood	788 Straits Rd	julieputwork@comcast.net
Victor Hood	" " "	signator@yahoo.com
DAVE + NANCY CURRAN	21 Indian Trail, New H.	djcrnc@aol.com
David & Patricia King	24 Seminole Ave, New Hampton	clpkmg24@gmail.com
JOSEPH ALONZO	21 Wood Ridge Rd	jsalonzo1@gmail.com
Fran Secord	307 Dane Rd. CH Hbr	Frsecord@AOL.com
Mason Marceau	40 Waukenwan Road	
Brianna Miller	40 waukenwan Road	
Thomas & Susan Cronin	40 Waukenwan Rd.	
Joey Shaw	325 Winona Rd New Hampton	JoeyS@metrocast.net
Lee Callahan	498 Waukenwan Rd, Ctr Hbr.	lycall2han@gmail.com
Deb Corr	20 Seminole Ave, New Hampton	debcorr@metrocast.net
Anne Seyers	135 Waukenwan Rd, NH	Annewauke1@aol.com
Sharon O'Donnell	546 Waukenwan Rd, Ctr Harbor, NH	
Maureen A Crisia	116 Hawkins Pond Road, Ctr HBR	moe66@metrocast.net
Karen Ponton	227 High Faith Rd Ctr Hbr	Ksponton@yahoo.com



**BUREAU OF
BRIDGE DESIGN**

PROJECT Center Harbor - New Hampton
 PROJECT NO. 24579 BR. NO. 0801040
 CALCULATIONS FOR Public Informational Meeting
 MADE BY _____ DATE 6/8/16
 CHECKED BY _____ DATE _____

CALCULATION SHEET for BRIDGES & STRUCTURES

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>E-mail</u>
Alan Hanscom	NH DOT	
Bill Cuss	NH DOT	
Bob & Leanne D'Amico	22 Proctor RD Center Harbor	
Joe Keavey	Executive Council Joseph Keavey @ NH.Gov	
Valerie Fraser	State Rep Belknap	valeriefrasernh@gmail.com
Tom Gowie	RESIDENT	deacowie@roadrunner.com
CATHERINE HALSEY	WILKINSON RD. RESIDENT	bottlenosedolphindrive.com
Joseph Iadonisi	RESIDENT	JoeSueIAD1@myfairpoint.net
THOMAS CRILLY	NH RESIDENT	crillytom3@gmail.com
TAMSAN THARIN	Waukewan Rd Resident	tamsan@tamsan.net
JEANIE Forrester	Senator, District 2	jlf@worldpath.net
KEITH FORRESTER P.E.	FESI	FESI@worldpath.net
Harold & Ute Stalford	Resident	Stalford@ou.edu
DAVID + Ginny Schimke	Resident	
Wesley + Janan Hays	Resident	
David Reilly	Resident	
BUZ & IRENE SPALLDING	RESIDENT	buzspalding@METRICALST.NET
Shirley G Splaine	resident (garden775 @myfairpoint.net)	
Wilmas Berlant	Resident	
Palmer & Dorrie Smith	Resident Center Harbor	
Mike Izard	LRPE	mizard@lakesrpe.org
Claire Dors	Resident	claireortom@gmail.com
TOM DORS	Resident	" " " "
Joseph Alonzo	resident	jalonzo1@gmail.com
Patty & Dave Fura	resident - N.H.	
Ruth Nancy Curran	resident NH	DSCRNC@aol.com
David J. Curran	resident NH	"