

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting

DATE OF CONFERENCES: June 14, 2018

LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building

ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT	Nancy Mayville	Holden	
John Butler	Griffin Parodi	Engineering	Town of Bow
Sheila Charles	John Sargent	Peter Holden	Matt Taylor
Ron Crickard	Leah Savage	William Rossignol	
DJ Doherty			Town of Wilton
Jill Edelmann	NHDHR	MJ	Jim Lavacchia
Jon Evans	Laura Black	Gene McCarthy	Kermit Williams
Sally Gunn	David Trubey	Christine Perron	
Ron Kleiner		Jennifer Zorn	Consulting
Samuel Lanternier	FHWA		Parties
Marc Laurin	Jamie Sikora	106 Associates	Faye Johnson
Rebecca Martin	(va phone)	Scott Newman	Roy Schweiker

PROJECTS/PRESENTATIONS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:

(minutes on subsequent pages)

Portsmouth, 27690, X-A003(589).....	1
Swanzy, 40485, X-A004(415).....	2
Bow-Concord 13742, T-A000(018).....	3
Wilton 15767 (Municipally managed bridge aid program).....	6

Portsmouth, 27690, X-A003(589)

Participants: Christine Perron, MJ; Marc Laurin, John Sargent, NHDOT

Continued consultation directed at making the determination of effect for the proposed rehabilitation of the box culvert that carries US Route 1 Bypass over Hodgson Brook.

The project entails the rehabilitation of Bridge 192/106, which carries US Route 1 Bypass over Hodgson Brook in the City of Portsmouth. Jill Edelmann started the discussion by stating that the bridge was reviewed at the June 13, 2018 Determination of Eligibility meeting. It was confirmed that the bridge contributes to the US Route 1 Bypass historic district under Criteria A and C, and it was determined that the bridge is also individually eligible for the National Register under Criterion C.

John Sargent provided an overview of the proposed rehabilitation. The bridge was constructed in 1940 and rehabilitated in 1966. The 1966 rehab included to the construction of concrete parapet walls to enable the widening of US Route 1 Bypass to accommodate five lanes of traffic. Very little work has been completed on the bridge since 1966 and the concrete is now in need of repair. The concrete for the last five feet at both ends of all cell ceilings will be removed to behind the existing reinforcement and repaired with concrete. New reinforcement will be spliced to the existing reinforcement as required. The culvert invert and wall repair will include concrete removal of the cell floor and two feet up the culvert walls. Concrete removal will extend to sound concrete behind the existing reinforcement. The invert repair will remove the existing concrete to sound concrete below the existing reinforcement. It is anticipated that new

reinforcement will need to be spliced into the existing reinforcement. The existing mass concrete wall will be removed and replaced with concrete moment slabs to anchor new bridge rail. Finally, to address concerns regarding aquatic organism passage, the channel at the bridge outlet will be regraded and stoned to alleviate the existing perched condition, and the concrete lip at the end of one cell will be removed to provide deeper water through the cell. In summary, the project is considered a preservation project and is expected to extend the life of the bridge by about 30 years.

Laura Black asked which cell of the culvert was identified as a cattle pass on the 1939 bridge plan. J. Sargent replied that it was the 5th cell, which currently contains fill and utilities. Little or no work will be necessary in this cell.

L. Black asked if all of the 1966 concrete would be removed, and if the distinction between the 1939 bridge and 1966 work would remain visible. J. Sargent said that the 1966 mass concrete wall would be replaced with a moment slab. The moment slab will overhang the deck more than the existing wall does in order to provide more protection from runoff; however, there will still be a clear distinction between the new work and the original 1939 bridge.

Jamie Sikora asked about the bridge rail. J. Sargent stated that the existing rail is W-beam rail from the 1966 rehabilitation and the new rail will be T4 rail, which will appear more substantial. L. Black commented that this would not be a critical change to the bridge.

L. Black stated that the impacts to the bridge have been minimized and, although there will be changes to the bridge, important design features will still be visible. Therefore, she considers the proposed work to be consistent with the Secretary's standards. She recommended a finding of No Adverse Effect on the US Route 1 Bypass and on the bridge itself. J. Sikora concurred.

Swanzy, 40485, X-A004(415)

Participants: Marc Laurin, Leah Savage, Sally Gunn, DJ Doherty, NHDOT

Review alternatives, including those which do not meet the Purpose or Need of the project, and discuss effects of the proposed action on the Swanzy Civic Historic District.

Leah Savage went through a power point presentation that described the project purpose and need, the constraints of the project area, and reviewed the alternatives considered by DOT during the development of the selected design. The alternatives which were evaluated were the No-Build, constructing a "T" intersection, re-alignment of the existing "Y" intersection, and constructing a single lane roundabout (proposed action).

The No-Build was not reasonable as it would perpetuate the existing conditions that contribute to the high number of crashes, which are the result of high speeds, conflicts and driver confusion. Signals are not warranted. Laura Black asked why signals would not be appropriate. Leah responded that the intersection is operating at a good level of service, that introducing a signal would cause long queues and delays. Additionally since the intersection volumes are not high enough there is no warrant to install signals and it would not be approved by FHWA. The crashes are due to drivers making bad decisions. David Trubey asked about installing flashing yellow lights. Sally Gunn replied that these are warranted in situations where there is poor sight distance, which is not the case here as the issue is driver confusion and speeds.

The "T" intersection would bisect the existing triangle configuration and would increase the queuing on Sawyers Crossing Road as it merges two intersection legs into one. It would not

address the high speeds of NH 32, which would anticipate similar crash pattern occurring with traffic entering and exiting NH 32. The benefit/cost ratio is under 1, the minimum required for Highway Safety Improvement Program funding, indicating that it would not improve safety enough. It does not address pedestrian crossing.

The re-alignment of the “Y” intersection would realign southern leg of the intersection into a T-intersection. This would bring it closer the northern leg creating complexities, which could still cause driver confusion. Similar to the “t” intersection this alternative would not address the high speeds of NH 32, and similar crash pattern occurring with traffic entering and exiting NH 32 would be anticipated. The benefit/cost ratio is under 1 indicating that it would not improve safety enough. It does not address pedestrian crossing.

Laura asked if could leave one lane as two-way and redesign the other lane as a one-way slip lane. Sally stated that conflict points would occur on Sawyers Crossing with traffic coming from the south, for this reason that the department is removing these configurations in the state. This would not address the speeds on NH 32 and there would be pedestrian concerns with crossing the one-way leg at a yield condition. David inquired about speed tables on NH 32. Sally replied that they are not allowed on State routes.

The single-lane roundabout will provide an area in the center island for landscaping and signage. The scale and feel of the intersection will match the existing intersection as its size was minimized to 120 feet, the smallest on State routes. Speeds will be decreased on NH 32 with no driver confusion. Sidewalks will be provided around the roundabout allowing pedestrians to traverse any quadrant of the roundabout. Safety of the intersection will be increased. The benefit/cost ration is around 2 with a 35 year design life evaluated. The Town is in agreement with the roundabout and is anticipated to maintain the landscaping/plantings in the center island. A welcome sign will be installed in the center island. Minor impacts on Mt. Caesar School property to relocate the existing sidewalk will occur. Impacts on the Monadnock Regional Middle/High School property will be required to install a water quality treatment area. A row of pine trees will be impacted by the treatment swale. The project is scheduled to advertise in January 2019 with construction occurring during the summer.

Laura discussed the relationship of the buildings to each other, the features and trees as components of the Historic District. All alternatives should be included in the alternatives analysis and incorporated into the documentation of the Section 106 process. The impacts to the pine trees must be included in the effects analysis as they do contribute to the character of the District. The proposed action is an Adverse Effect as the triangle configuration of the intersection hasn't changed since at least 1805 and it will be eliminated. Continued consultation on landscaping should occur. Jill Edelmann will draft the Adverse Effects memo and DOT will talk to the Town on mitigation ideas.

Bow-Concord 13742, T-A000(018)

Participants: Rebecca Martin, NHDOT; Jennifer Zorn, Gene McCarthy, MJ; Faye Johnson, Roy Schweiker, Consulting Parties

Continued consultation on the improvements for the Bow-Concord section of Interstate 93 (from the I-89/I-93 interchange to the I-93/I-393 interchange), which serves as a critical link for statewide travel to the White Mountains and the Lakes Region, as well as an important local route within Concord. (<http://www.i93bowconcord.com/index.html>). Discussion included effect tables that were prepared for the historical resources in the project area and changes to the proposed effect of the project on these resources.

This 4.5 mile project entails preliminary design of proposed improvements to the I-93 corridor between the I-89 interchange (Town of Bow) and Exit 15 (City of Concord). The following is a summary of the information shared by Gene McCarthy and Jennifer Zorn from McFarland Johnson, as well as the discussion with the Consulting Parties and the Town of Bow representative.

Jennifer Zorn provided a summary of the anticipated impacts in Bow to sites that are eligible for the National Register due to the proximity of the proposed highway access ramp from I-89 to I-93 southbound. The anticipated impacts to eligible properties include: adverse impact to Lamora's Garage resulting from its full acquisition; and adverse impact to the setting of the Upton House and Store. She explained that the new ramp will be located approximately 55 feet from the Upton House structure and approximately 22 feet from the property corner (northeast corner).

Faye Johnson requested that a visualization or photo of the proposed elevated roads in Bow be provided for review. She expressed concern for two additional structures, the Moody House and the Colby House. She would like to see a plan that isn't flat and shows proposed elevations. She also asked how does one build a new highway so close to a historic structure and not damage or impact the structure. Matt Taylor expressed concern about the appearance of the new highway from the ground and its overall impact to the areas known as Bow Junction and Bow Mills.

Gene McCarthy explained the location of the new ramps on the actual design plan and how the proposed elevation is similar to the elevation of I-89 today. Using a photograph of Lamora's Garage (from the Individual Form) he illustrated that the top of the proposed ramp would be similar in elevation to the roof of the existing Lamora's Garage structure.

Matt Taylor and Faye Johnson requested that some form of aesthetic treatment be proposed along the retaining wall of the proposed ramp such as landscape or texture on the surface of the retaining wall.

Regarding the overall impact to Bow, Gene McCarthy re-capped the meeting with the Town of Bow officials that was held in early June, 2018. He explained that the existing Exit 1 ramp is one of the most significant operational deficiencies on the entire project. The proposed ramp eliminates the current safety issues.

Matt Taylor stated that there are alternatives with lower impacts that would be preferable from the town's perspective that would be safe.

Faye Johnson stated that people avoid travel through Exit 1 due to safety concerns however she doesn't want more traffic coming off I-89 and going through the Bow Mills area, which is part of the part of town center. Specifically, she stated that trucks are not desired.

Gene McCarthy stated that the Exit 1 I-89 Area is the junction of two interstates which is challenging from a design and operational perspective where access must be retained as well as safety and efficiency.

Roy Schweiker asked if the ramp could be shifted closer to the I-89 mainline to limited impacts to the Upton House. Gene McCarthy stated that as the project was advanced into final design, the ramp would be moved as far as possible away from the Upton House but there are limits due to the engineering requirements of the new ramp.

Laura Black inquired about final design and the use of landscaping to alleviate the impact of the wall to the view shed of the Upton House, and to help satisfy Section 106 mitigation. Gene McCarthy stated yes.

Faye Johnson stated that the owner of the Upton House (Mr. Blevins) is concerned about snow removal from I-89 and its impact on his property. In addition, she inquired about lights and noise. Gene McCarthy stated that snow wouldn't be plowed onto his property. A snow fence on proposed ramp would prevent this from occurring. Gene explained that the current buildings in this locations are already surrounded by two interstates and the lighting would not likely change from the current condition. In addition, he stated that a noise analysis was being conducted which showed that noise barriers were not feasible or reasonable in this area of the project.

Matt Taylor stated that a beautification project could be completed in this location and the active garden club in Bow could maintain it.

Matt Taylor stated that the Town of Bow was supportive of the project but that they want to make sure it gets done right.

Laura Black concurred that both properties (Lamora's Garage and Upton House) would have adverse effects from the proposed project. She also stated that she would like to create a good mitigation package to help mitigate the impacts.

Regarding noise barriers, Jennifer Zorn explained that one noise barrier would be proposed along the NHTI campus, adjacent to I-93 in the City of Concord. Jon Evans was in contact with NHTI to determine their desire for the wall which was currently estimated at 16 to 25 feet in height and 1,600 feet in length extending from Delta Drive to Fan Road.

According to Jon Evans, even without this project, the NHTI campus already has noise levels that are high and likely an impact. The southern-most residence hall on Fan Road would be the most benefitted receptor from the construction of a noise wall along I-93.

Roy Schweiker asked whether the project added new lanes. Gene McCarthy stated yes and since it is wider there will be more capacity. Jon Evans added that the noise model takes into account lanes which don't influence noise as much as traffic volume.

Laura Black stated that the NHTI, as a historic campus, has many activities and she wanted to understand the uses at different parts of proposed wall. For example, a noise wall to lower sound effects to classrooms seems appropriate but a sound wall would be less necessary at an athletic field. Depending on location, the noise reduction may not matter.

Gene McCarthy stated that the newer classroom building had very good windows. The windows at the older residence halls were not as good.

Jon Evans stated that this project is their (NHTI) only chance at a noise wall unless future widening occurs. He also stated it would be possible to consider usual enhancements to make wall more visually appealing but the NHTI would have to provide funding.

Gene McCarthy explained that the project would impact a few areas of the NHTI property from various activities, including grading, vegetation removal and periods of construction extending from Delta Drive south to Fan Road.

Roy Schweiker was still concerned about closing off historic routes to the Merrimack River from the downtown area. In his view, these impacts appeared significant.

Laura Black explained that DHR has certain purviews of how they can comment on certain projects. She stated that historic routes in Concord play a role in conversations but that the National Historic Preservation Act limited the discussion by what is eligible for or listed in the National Register. She stated that unless an access route or element is deemed eligible for the National Register it is limited what DHR can influence. She additionally stated that the current situation should not be made worse by this project or other future projects.

Wilton 15767 (Municipally managed bridge aid program)

Participants: Peter Holden, William Rossignol, Holden Engineering; Jim Lavacchia (Wilton Director of Public Works); Kermit Williams (Wilton Select Board); Scott Newman, 106 Associates; Ron Crickard, NHDOT

Continued consultation on the King Brook Road over King Brook bridge improvement project.

Laura Black welcomed attendees to the meeting. She noted that the individual inventory form for the King Brook bridge had been received and NHDHR had agreed with the recommendation to find that the bridge was eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

Scott Newman introduced the applicant's reason for requesting the meeting, which was to discuss the contents of the 5/3/18 RPR Addendum submittal to NHDHR, and to determine whether there was agreement on a preferred alternative, so Holden Engineering could advance a preliminary design. Scott continued to summarize the contents of the RPR addendum noting the following regarding bridge conditions:

- The bridge is on the Municipal Red List and is considered structurally deficient
- The bridge has been extended in both upstream and downstream directions
- Holden Engineering's structural assessment of the bridge that rehabilitation would require complete disassembly and reassembly of the structure, addition of a waterproofing layer, and the construction of a concrete slab over the structure to disperse the load.
- Holden Engineering and 106 Associates' conclusion that an option to disassemble and rebuild the bridge with the required alterations to the historic form would not realize historical or financial value because of the required alterations of the structure and extraordinary costs

Newman added the following regarding the alignment of a replacement bridge:

- Replacement of the bridge off-alignment is problematic due to steeply sloping terrain on either side of the bridge, necessitating a realignment of King Brook Road and extensive earthworks in a densely forested landscape
- The owner of the land on either side of the bridge has an interest in rehabilitating or replacing the stone arch bridge in its present location, and no interest in selling the land required to construct a bypass bridge because of what he considered to be an unnecessarily high cost

Scott Newman added the following regarding design of a possible on-alignment replacement bridge:

- Timber Bridge on new concrete abutments would include a pressure-treated timber bridge with a paved surface that would blend with the natural landscape of the area.
- Precast Concrete Rigid Frame on new concrete footings would take the overall form of the existing concrete arch and could be poured with form liners or faced with stone.

Newman added the following regarding disposition of the existing arch:

- the existing structure could be disassembled and reassembled in another location for public viewing and education purposes.
- The existing granite could be reused in a replacement bridge and incorporated into the façade or portals.

Newman concluded his remarks noting that the applicant was seeking concurrence that a replacement structure on-alignment is an acceptable preferred alternative, and requested feedback on design alternatives.

Laura Black thanked Scott Newman for the Inventory Form for the bridge and confirmed the structure was eligible for the National Register under criteria A and C. Laura added that the reviewer was impressed by the devotion and resilience of the property owner, nearby residents, and town in caring for the bridge over the years. The reviewer also noted that while the interventions to repair the bridge were not required to meet the secretary's standards, that they did, resulting in continued eligibility for the NR.

Laura Black asked in reference to the RPR Addendum letter whether the applicant had talked to any stone masons about the bridge. She noted that other projects involving stone bridges were employing techniques to preserve stonework, including the application of waterproofing membranes. Laura presented a flyer from the "Stone Trust" organization as an example of available expertise.

Laura Black asked whether the engineers had looked at disassembly and reassembly of the bridge in situ, and noted the advantages of this alternative. Scott Newman responded that the Kings Brook Bridge, owing to its location and the length of bypass was used for heavy truck traffic, including fire apparatus, ambulances, and school busses and that the basic bridge structure could not be rehabilitated to safely carry the required loads without substantial alteration.

Bill Rossignol P.E. added that the bridge was constructed in 1840 and to remain in use would need both concrete footings and concrete slab ovetop to carry the live load. Bill added that with these improvements in place the bridge arch would no longer be functional and the span would lose its

historic integrity. Bill added that the bridge would need new concrete wingwalls and that any included stonework would constitute a façade.

Kermit Williams asked if the bridge could be moved, noting it would no longer be a highway bridge.

Bill Rossignol asked where the bridge could be moved, noting it could not be reused for traffic. Bill added that the owner of the adjoining land did not want the town to spend more than was necessary on the project.

Laura Black recommended that the consultant team look at the Depot Street Bridge in Antrim for an example of an arch that was overtopped with a concrete slab, but the stone arch was left in place.

Nancy Mayville noted that the State Aid Bridge Program would cover 80% of the costs of relocating the existing stone arch bridge if that was a stipulation of DHR. Nancy further noted that a concrete slab could be poured over the arch and the arch left in place per Bill Rossignol's earlier comment.

Laura Black recommended the applicant look at other projects as examples to help inform alternatives for the King Brook Bridge project, including a Trails Bureau stone box culvert being rehabilitated and including a waterproof membrane. Laura added that some combination of treatments may be appropriate for this project.

Nancy Mayville stated that more analysis of alternatives is needed.

Laura Black requested the project team look into additional alternatives, and that if it is demonstrated that none are feasible, then the existing bridge could be removed and documented. Scott Newman asked whether it was worth the effort to lose the function of the arch but preserve it as an aesthetic resource in this setting as it cannot readily be appreciated by the public.

Peter Holden noted that the use of round stones in this bridge made the structure less amenable to rehabilitation, and agreed that there was no visibility of the structure from the public right-of-way.

Kermit Williams stated that the area around the bridge is prone to flooding, and the new structure should be able to handle a 100-year flood event.

Nancy Mayville noted that more hydraulic analysis is needed to determine needs at the site.

Scott noted that the most interesting part of the bridge are the portals with the arrangement of cut stone, and that relocating a portal, possible to include a demo of how falsework was used in the construction could be an educational resource.

Peter Holden noted the arch is in poor structural condition with deformations, deep voids in the stonework, and bulging, and would need a supplementary structure to support the arch.

Bill Rossignol noted that the needed concrete reinforcement, wing walls, and guardrail supports would result in a concrete structure faced partially with stone.

Nancy Mayville reiterated the need for further engineering and hydraulic analysis was needed, documenting what it would take to preserve the arch in place with pros and cons for each alternative.

Laura Black reiterated her suggestion to talk with stone masons and look at other stone arch bridge rehabilitation projects, ensuring to avoid an over-engineered solution to the bridge deficiencies. Nancy Mayville asked what percentage of vehicles are trucks and whether the objective of the project was to achieve and HS 20 rating.

Kermit Williams stated that it is unlikely the Town would vote on its own to relocate the bridge, but it were part of the project the Town would be willing to participate in relocating a portion of it for use on a pike/ped facility.

Laura Black indicated this is not a preferred option as relocating the bridge would remove it from its historic context, but should be considered a backup option if the bridge cannot be rehabilitated on site.

Scott Newman asked at what point would the project be committing resources to preserve an altered bridge that the public cannot appreciate, noting that the structural intervention recommended by the engineers would cause an adverse effect.

Laura Black requested that the project team conduct further research to determine whether there were less invasive and less expensive treatments that would meet the project purpose and minimize impacts to the historic bridge.

Scott Newman noted the existing engineering evaluation documents that the existing arch cannot be rehabilitated to carry modern traffic loads.

Nancy Mayville noted the need to fully document the effectiveness and feasibility of a variety of alternatives.

Kermit Williams noted that the analysis in hand demonstrated that the historic integrity of the arch bridge cannot be preserved.

A discussion followed about to what extent visibility of the span could be improved. Scott Newman noted the steep slopes on either side of the bridge and that clearing land outside the right-of-way would not be an available option.

Nancy Mayville reiterated the need to conduct a full engineering analysis of the project to evaluate alternatives that would avoid-minimize-mitigate (in that order) the effects to the bridge, looking at impacts to historic and cultural resources. She added that more detailed documentation is required. Scott Newman asked whether overtopping the bridge with a concrete slab to carry the live load would be considered by DHR to be an adverse effect.

Meeting concluded with agreement to conduct additional engineering studies to evaluate alternatives that would include obtaining input from an expert stone mason.

Submitted by: Sheila Charles and Jill Edelman, Cultural Resources

New Hampshire Department of Transportation Cultural Resources Agency Coordination Meeting

Date June 14, 2018

Please initial next to your name. Guests: Please use reverse side to sign in.

Initial	Name	Agency	Email Address
<i>LB</i>	Laura Black	NH Division of Historical Resources	<u>Laura.Black@dncr.nh.gov</u>
	Richard Boisvert	NH Division of Historical Resources	<u>Richard.Boisvert@dncr.nh.gov</u>
<i>SK</i>	Sheila Charles	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	<u>Sheila.Charles@dot.nh.gov</u>
	Victoria Chase	NHDOT – Highway Design	<u>Victoria.Chase@dot.nh.gov</u>
<i>RC</i>	Ronald Crickard	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	<u>Ronald.Crickard@dot.nh.gov</u>
	Meili Dube	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	<u>Melilotus.Dube@dot.nh.gov</u>
	Michael Dugas	NHDOT – Highway Design	<u>Michael.Dugas@dot.nh.gov</u>
<i>KE</i>	Jill Edelmann	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	<u>Jillian.Edelmann@dot.nh.gov</u>
	Ron Grandmaison	NHDOT – Highway Design	<u>Ronald.Grandmaison@dot.nh.gov</u>
	Bob Landry	NHDOT – Bridge Design	<u>Robert.Landry@dot.nh.gov</u>
<i>ML</i>	Marc Laurin	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	<u>Marc.Laurin@dot.nh.gov</u>
	Leigh Levine	Federal Highway Administration	<u>Leigh.Levine@dot.gov</u>
	Don Lyford	NHDOT – Highway Design	<u>Donald.Lyford@dot.nh.gov</u>
	Rebecca Martin	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	<u>Rebecca.Martin@dot.nh.gov</u>
	Beth Muzzey	NH Division of Historical Resources	<u>Elizabeth.Muzzey@dncr.nh.gov</u>
	Kevin Nyhan	NHDOT – Bureau of Environment	<u>Kevin.Nyhan@dot.nh.gov</u>
<i>JS</i>	Jamie Sikora	Federal Highway Administration	<u>Jamie.Sikora@fhwa.dot.gov</u>
<i>PS</i>	Pete Stannas	NHDOT – Highway Design	<u>Peter.Stannas@dot.nh.gov</u>
<i>DT</i>	David Trubey	NH Division of Historical Resources	<u>David.Trubey@dncr.nh.gov</u>
	Cindy Vigue	Federal Highway Administration	<u>Cindy.Vigue@dot.gov</u>
	CR Willeke	NHDOT – Planning	<u>Charles.Willeke@dot.nh.gov</u>

Please fill in all of the requested information.

June 14, 2018

Name	Agency	Phone #	Email Address
GRIFFIN Parodi	DOT BOE	603-762-3205	
Samuel Lanterner	DOT-BOE	603 4795140	SAMUEL.LANTERNER@DOT.NH.GOV
Joh. Saiget	Dot Grids	271-7406	
Christine Porran	MS	225-2978	
Leah Savage	DOT-HVFF	271-8247	
BRUY Gurn	DOT-THUY	271-1899	
Gene / M Corby	McFarland Johnson	225-2978	gmcorty@njlive.com
John Butler	NH DOT	271-7420	johnbutler@dot.nh.gov
Maft Taylor	Town of Bow	223-3571	mtaylor@bow.nh.gov
Faye Johnson	110 Knox Rd	228-8149	fjohnson@myfairpoint.net
Jonathan Zorn	MS	225-2978	jzorn46@gmail.com
Roy Schwicker		224-0598	royswtr@hotmail.com
Rebecca Martin	DOT-BOE	60781	rebecca.martin@dot.nh.gov
JON Evans	DOT-BOE	4048	jonathan.evans@dot.nh.gov
Bon Kleiner	DOT-Plan/CA		bon.kleiner@dot.nh.gov
Jim Lavacchia	Town of Wilton	603-801-0571	Jlavacchia@wiltonnh.org
PETER HOLDEN	HOLDEN ENTERPRISES	603-472-2078	PESHOLDEN@ENTERPRISES.COM
Kermit William	Town of Wilton	603-769-9703	Kermit.williams@gmail.com
WILLIAM C ROSSIGNOL	HOLDEN ENTERPRISES	603 472-2078	WES@HOLDENENTERPRISES.COM
Scott Newman	106 ASSOC.	603-777-1572	scotnewman@106ASSOCIATES.COM