

# BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT CONFERENCE REPORT

**SUBJECT:** Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting  
**DATE OF CONFERENCES:** September 10, 2015  
**LOCATION OF CONFERENCE:** John O. Morton Building

**ATTENDED BY:**

<b>NHDOT</b> Sheila Charles Ron Crickard Jill Edelmann Jon Evans Ron Grandmaison Bob Juliano Bob Landry Marc Laurin	Stephen Liakos Joshua Prescott C.R. Willeke  <b>NHDHR</b> Laura Black Edna Feighner  <b>FHWA</b> Jamie Sikora	<b>VTRANS</b> (via teleconference) Judith Ehrlich Dan Landry  <b>HTA</b> Aaron Lachance Matthew Low Kimberly Peace	<b>MJ</b> Christine Perron  <b>STANTEC</b> George Bogue Michael Leach
---	--	--	--

**PROJECTS/PRESENTATIONS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:**  
*(minutes on subsequent pages)*

*Peterborough 14772A, X-A000(535) and Peterborough 14933, X-A002(107) ..... 1*  
*Lyme, NH-Thetford 14460, X-A000(394)..... 4*  
*Dover 27885, X-A003(655)..... 6*  
*Statewide 28513, X-A003(762)..... 7*  
*East Kingston, 26942, X-A003(411)..... 8*

*(When viewing these minutes online, click on a project to zoom to the minutes for that project)*

**Peterborough 14772A, X-A000(535) and Peterborough 14933, X-A002(107)**

Participants: Aaron Lachance, Matt Low, Kimberly Peace, Hoyle, Tanner & Associates; Ron Crickard, Steve Liakos, C.R. Willeke, Marc Laurin, NHDOT

Continued consultation, update and review of preliminary plans for the Peterborough US 202 Intersection and US 202 Retaining Wall Project (Project No. 14772A) and the Main Street Bridge (Project No. 14933).

The project was presented to the Committee to update them on the current status of the project. This meeting covers two separate projects: the Main Street bridge replacement project (14933) and the Route 202 intersection improvements and retaining wall stabilization project (14772A).

M. Low provided an introduction to the project. He explained that this was the fourth or fifth time this project has been presented to the Committee, with the most recent being December, 2014. The project is currently in the design phase, and preliminary plans were submitted in August, 2015. Most recently, the project was presented at a Natural Resources meeting in February, 2015, and a Public Informational Meeting was held in June, 2015. There are features of the project still

being developed, and the design team would like further input from the Committee on those features.

K. Peace provided further project details. She explained that the project is located in an eligible historic district with historic structures, and will have an adverse effect on the district due to the replacement of the historic bridge. The design concept for the project has changed during project development, and the roundabout originally proposed has evolved to the current design which includes minor improvements to the existing intersection. The project also includes impacts to the Transcript Dam, and an existing granite masonry construction underground canal. The current plan was well received by the public at the Public Informational Meeting. The Town's Heritage Commission now supports the project. The separate pedestrian bridge, a design detail actually suggested by the Library, was also well received.

There was discussion about the proposed pedestrian bridge. M. Low explained that the Town is currently working on the design of a separate pedestrian bridge, to be located in the nearby Grove Street parking lot, over the Nubanusit River. There will be continuity in design between the bridge proposed for this project and that structure. L. Black asked about the appearance or surface treatment of the pedestrian bridge abutment. M. Low answered that the intent was to use a plain concrete finish on the abutment, to distinguish it as a separate structure from the roadway bridge, such that it is clear the new abutment was constructed in a different period. L. Black suggested that the abutment concrete could be stained so that it doesn't stand out drastically as new concrete.

M. Low explained the T4 steel rail system proposed behind the sidewalks within the project limits, specifically along the west side of Route 202 from the southern project limits to the Main Street bridge. A very similar rail system was used on a recent Town of Peterborough project (Elm Street), and was vetted with residents through public input. The rail system for this project will likely be a four-bar system, versus the tree-bar system used on Elm Street, for pedestrian accommodation.

M. Low discussed the Town's plans for reusing the granite slabs salvaged from the existing canal. The slabs will be salvaged to the Town when the canal is slip lined, and a separate future project is being developed that will create a "Canal Walk" through Town along the path of the canal. The granite slabs will be set flush into the ground above the canal. M. Low explained that there is an odor of gasoline in the canal that could be a result gasoline in the soil from of a prior fuel spill; appropriate bid items will be included in the contract for proper handling and disposal of contaminated soil, should it be encountered.

There was discussion about the existing dam abutment that will be impacted as a result of the Route 202 retaining wall realignment. K. Peace explained that impacts to the dam abutment were unavoidable if the alignment of Route 202, and the intersection with Main Street, were to be improved as part of this project. The new dam abutment will be reconstructed "in kind" with the existing dam abutment.

C.R. Willeke commented that accelerating the NEPA schedule wherever possible is important. M. Low responded that right-of-way and utilities, which can often hold a project up, are currently being coordinated in attempt to avoid delays.

There are some project details left to finalize, such as rail appearance and overall pedestrian bridge appearance, and the Design Team is soliciting feedback from the Committee. There was discussion of what type of mitigation would be proposed as part of the project. M. Low explained that reuse of the stone from the existing bridge on the replacement structure is a very costly design

feature and could be considered mitigation. E. Feighner added that the canal walk is an excellent example of mitigation. M. Low explained that reuse of stones from the existing ashlar wall, and the stones from the boulder wall north of the Transcript Dam, may be difficult due to constructability issues of the new retaining wall at the southeast bridge corner.

S. Liakos asked about what areas the Contractor will be able to use for staging during construction. M. Low explained the Library's plans to temporarily relocate during construction, and that they had offered the Town the use of their parking lot during construction. This would need to be coordinated between the project contractor and the library as it would not be an eligible right-of-way expense for the project. He also said that the existing parking area north of the bank building, adjacent to the southwest corner of the bridge, is a possible location but may need to be coordinated outside of the contract between the Contractor and property owner. Meetings with the Town and abutting property owners are beginning as early as next week to discuss right-of-way issues.

L. Black asked if Route 202 was going to be shifted temporarily to the east, and if so were there landscape features in the right-of-way that would be impacted? Items such as stone walls, mature trees, etc. M. Low explained that there is a steep uphill bark-mulched embankment on the east side of Route 202 in this area, with some smaller shrubs and plantings that may be impacted. . The details of the temporary and final sidewalk have not been finalized yet, and the use of short retaining walls may be necessary to minimize impacts and retain the slope.

L. Black asked how dusty the construction will be, and how will the dust from construction impact the library's book collection? M. Low answered that construction would create normal construction dust, but wasn't exactly sure of the details of the library relocation. He said that he understood that the library would be relocating their complete operation – including all of their items – to the temporary location during construction, but wasn't positive. M. Low explained in further detail the library overhaul project, and that the newer portion of the structure that was added to the historic portion was being removed. L. Black clarified that when structures are determined to be individually eligible for the Historic Register, the classification applies to the entire structure, not just the "historic portion".

L. Black commented that the project is on the right path. M. Low asked what the next step was for the project. L. Black responded that Hoyle, Tanner may start developing a draft Effect Memorandum, which would be followed by a Memorandum of Agreement. Hoyle, Tanner will draft the memo, but NHDOT will transmit the letter to alert ACHP of the project. J. Sikora offered to send a draft of the letter that will be sent to ACHP, for reference. M. Low said individual meetings with specific consulting parties to discuss the project details and mitigation would begin soon.

**Lyme, NH-Thetford 14460, X-A000(394)**

Participants: Michael Leach, George Bogue, Stantec; Ron Crickard, Bob Landry, Robert Juliano, NHDOT; Judith Ehrlich, Dan Landry, VTrans

This meeting is a continued consultation meeting from August 14, 2014 and April 30, 2015. Tim Cook of the Lyme Heritage Commission was not able to attend this meeting as noted by Jill Edelmann of NHDOT. In addition, Judith Ehrlich and Dan Landry of VTrans joined the meeting via conference call.

M. Leach noted that this presentation is similar to the previous ones, but with updated information included since the last presentation. M. Leach began with the power point presentation that started with the bridge history information and noted it is currently posted for 15 ton load. An aerial view of the location and close up photographs of the existing dwellings along with the approximate Area of Potential Effect (APE) of the project were then shown. Following those photographs was a summary for the tasks completed to date, which included the on-site initial meeting with NHDHR, NHDOT-BOE, and VTrans in August 2013; in-depth structural inspection September-October 2013; underwater pier inspection August 2013; pier concrete sampling and testing in October 2013; Load Rating analysis January to May 2014 and Public Information Meeting in Lyme on July 23, 2014; Cultural Resources meetings August 14, 2014 and April 30, 2015; Bridge Inventory completed and determined eligible; Visual Phase 1A of SE Quadrant parcel; Individual inventory of the NE Quadrant parcel completed and determined eligible; and Individual inventory form for the two parcels in Vermont.

J. Ehrlich noted that the Smith & Webster house (NW quadrant) was eligible, but the Bailey house (SW Quadrant) was not.

The presentation continued with photographs from the bridge inspections including deteriorated steel bridge rail and curb, stringers, abutments, and the pier deterioration above and below water. The anticipated rehabilitation effort was introduced that included: replacement of the concrete deck and curbs; replacement of the bridge rail with approved crash tested rail; replacement of end floor beams and stringers as necessary; paint all structural steel; repair abutments; replace pier.

G. Bogue then spoke of the proposed pier alternates that were considered. Rebuild the pier in kind was not recommended; this was difficult due to depth of water (15'+/-); required a deep tremie seal and removal of existing piles; and very expensive cofferdam required.

Construction of a new two column drilled shaft pier was recommend that avoids the need for a tremie seal and cofferdam, and most of the construction could be done from barges. Elevation views of two drilled shaft pier alternatives were presented. One alternative has two drilled shafts close together with a short pier cap that would involve removal of a portion of the existing pier during construction. The other drilled shaft alternative has a longer pier cap with the drilled shafts outside the limits of the existing pier. Following the elevation views, the piers were shown graphically simulated on a bridge photograph showing the potential view upon completion. B. Landry noted the wider pier option may be a concern with people getting out onto the pier cap.

G. Bogue continued the presentation with a graphic section view showing the superstructure rehabilitation. The graphic indicated the bridge deck replacement along with beams, bracing, stringers, curbing and bridge rail being replaced indicated in yellow. Three deck replacement alternatives were presented that increased in cost as follows: 8" cast-in-place concrete deck with

2.5” pavement being the least expensive; 8.5” cast-in-place bare deck with epoxy coated reinforcing steel; and 8” cast-in-place bare deck with stainless steel reinforcing being the most expensive, but preferred since it is the lowest weight therefore increases the live load capacity of the truss, is anticipated to have the longest service life and avoids strengthening the upper truss members.

A plan view graphic of the flooring system rehabilitation was next presented using yellow to highlight the replacement stringers and bracing locations. The existing truss and interior floor beams would remain, but the end floor beams and all the stringers and bracing would be replaced with new steel. This was followed with the graphic simulation of the proposed new rail and curb superimposed over the existing curb and rail. G. Bogue note that the existing rail is not crash worthy and new rail is needed. With the new rail as shown, there is actually more open area between the railings that currently exists. The new crash tested railing would be mounted on top of the new concrete curb.

The presentation continued noting that the rehabilitation to the superstructure truss members would only be cleaning and painting that would be done in the second year of construction. A summary of the rehabilitation was presented noting that the project will rehabilitate the bridge to carry legal loads; and will involve only minor approach work. This would include replacement of the guardrail at both ends; the work would take two seasons to complete. The first season would be to replace the pier and complete the structural repairs; the second season would be clean and paint the bridge; the bridge would be closed during construction; the estimated construction cost is 4.5 million dollars.

Next the detour routes were shown in a graphic. M. Leach noted that due the current weight limits, trucks are already detoured to north to Orford-Fairlee.

The presentation continued with the Next Steps: ( we included the preferred alternatives in the presentation); review constructability and access to site; hold Public Informational Meeting in Thetford, VT (tentatively in October 2015); complete the NEPA process and continue section 106 consultation process with both states; develop preliminary plans; develop contract plans and documents. The next steps for Cultural Resources was Determination of Effect for bridge rehabilitation work and any mitigation, if any; need to investigate potential access locations near project area to serve as access to the river and pier during construction; need to investigate if additional resources exist in potential river access location.

M. Leach noted that there was an existing boat ramp about 3 miles north of the bridge in Vermont. This was a potential location but this needs more investigation but it was not in close proximity to the project. B. Landry noted that a potential location would be south of the bridge on the Vermont side beyond the existing buildings, but would need additional investigation.

L. Black noted that the presentation had a lot of information but the impacts to the character defining features of the bridge as prepared by Preservation Company was unclear. Pages 8 and 9 of the inventory form noted the character defining features. The rail and curb were the two features noted, but there was not enough information presented to indicate why these features could not be retained. It was explained that the steel curb leaks and that the leaking curb with water that includes road salt is what has caused the deterioration of the stringers. It was noted that the steel curb would be replaced with concrete curb and be part of the deck. The concrete curb would be dimensionally similar to the existing curb.

It was also noted that the existing rail is not crash worthy and a crash tested rail is needed. The proposed rail is crashed tested and would be attached to the top of the concrete curb. The current

rail is attached to the truss. B. Landry asked if the type of effect could be determined from the information presented. L. Black noted that there should be more information that identifies each of the character defining features and how the alternates have been considered during the process to get to the preferred alternates presented. One of the Section 106 criteria of adverse effect is whether or not a project is consistent with the Secretary's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (<http://www.nps.gov/tps/standards.htm>; [http://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/four-treatments/standguide/rehab/rehab\\_index.htm](http://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/four-treatments/standguide/rehab/rehab_index.htm)). Project compliance materials therefore need to clearly show how the project design meets the Secretary's Standards before a finding of effect can be finalized. J. Ehrlich noted that the impacts to the character defining features need to be described. It was understood that additional information was needed relative to the character defining features and the alternatives.

D. Landry asked about the timing for the Public Information Meeting in Thetford. B. Landry noted that they were looking for something in later October this year. B. Landry would follow-up with VTrans.

### **Dover 27885, X-A003(655)**

Participants: Ron Crickard, Rebecca Martin, Joshua Prescott, NHDOT

Initial consultation on the Dover railway highway crossings project, including Central Avenue, Chestnut Street, and Third Street in Dover.

The project area includes the Pan Am Railways Main Line. The NH Division of Historical Resources concurred in 1993 that the linear transportation corridor for the railway that passes through Dover is eligible for the National Register. The highway-railway crossing reconstructions are within this eligible transportation corridor. In addition, the project area is within an area identified by various entities in the community as important historically.

Laura Black asked a question about a rumored traffic circle in the project area. A discussion of the potential problems and benefits associated with traffic circles ensued. Joshua Prescott mentioned that if the City of Dover brings such a proposal to the Department in the future, it will be evaluated at that time. The current project does not include a traffic circle.

Jamie Sikora asked if there are currently gates at the intersections and Joshua Prescott explained that there are gates.

Joshua Prescott provided an overview of the project. The three crossings are proposed to be replaced with new rail and roadway surfaces. Approximately 600 feet of track will be replaced, underground railroad signal cable and conduit connecting the two signal cabinets will be installed and the railroad signals and/or gates will be replaced. At each crossing the existing track and pavement will be removed, approximately 13 feet wide, and excavated to 27 inches below the top of rail. The rail track will then be rebuilt to roughly the existing grade. All existing signal cabinets, signals, roadway and pedestrian gates, signs, rail, plates, spikes, ties, stone ballast and pavement will be replaced with new materials in nearly the same location as the existing equipment. The foundations for the signals will require excavation of a depth of 4 feet. Joshua Prescott explained that the railroad/roadway and train control signals are interconnected and that they were updated in 1998 and 1999. The new Dover train station is west of the project area and is not expected to be impacted. Rebecca Martin commented that the current station was built in 2001 for the Downeaster service.

Edna Feighner commented that her concerns would only be with impacts to the original station site. Sheila Charles commented that she believes the work proposed is close enough to the rail and will not impact the original site on Third Street.

Laura Black commented that the transportation corridor is an eligible resource, but because the impacts will be modern equipment replacing modern equipment, it is not a concern. Laura Black asked if any of the buildings nearby over 50 years old will be impacted. Joshua Prescott explained that there may be a need to temporarily detour roadway traffic around some buildings while work is ongoing, but these impacts will be temporary. There are no expected impacts behind the curb and the signal house is expected to be the same size as the existing. Therefore, there will be no historic properties affected. Jamie Sikora concurred.

Jill Edelmann stated that the next step will be to prepare the No Historic Properties Affected memorandum. There will be no need to return to the Cultural Resource Agency Meeting when the length of the project is determined.

### **Statewide 28513, X-A003(762)**

Participants: Jon Evans, Ron Grandmaison, NHDOT

Initial consultation regarding the installation of rumble strips in various places statewide.

Jill Edelmann began by giving a brief overview of the project. This Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) project would involve the installation of centerline and/or edge line rumble strips/stripes along various roadways throughout the state. The proposed work is intended to improve the safety of the travel way by preventing lane departure crashes on the subject roadways. All rumble strips/stripes would be installed in accordance with the Department's *Rumble Strip Installation Guidelines*. All work would be confined to the limits of the existing pavement.

Centerline and/or shoulder rumble strips/stripes would be installed along the following sections of roadway:

- NH Route 3A – Plymouth
- NH Route 103 – Newbury, Bradford, Sutton, Warner
- NH Route 12 – Westmoreland, Surry, Keene
- NH Route 9 – Chesterfield, Westmoreland, Keene, Roxbury, Sullivan, Nelson, Stoddard, Antrim, Hillsborough, Concord, Pembroke
- NH Route 28 – Allenstown, Pembroke, Epsom, Chichester, Pittsfield, Barnstead, Alton, Wolfeboro, Ossipee
- NH Route 102 – Hudson, Londonderry, Chester, Raymond
- US Route 4 – Salisbury, Boscawen, Concord, Canterbury, Chichester, Epsom, Northwood, Nottingham, Barrington, Lee, Durham, Madbury, Dover

J. Edelmann indicated that although rumble strip installation is included in the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement's Appendix B Certification as a "modernization and general highway maintenance undertaking", the various sections of the project area are likely to pass through the boundaries of multiple known or potential historic districts. As such, use of the Programmatic

Agreement is not allowed. She also noted that in the past, before the programmatic agreement, rumble strips were usually reviewed by the Department's Cultural Resource Program Manager. These rumble strip projects were generally considered of little concern as they were felt to be a measure that could be removed if issues arose at a later date. However, given the explicit exclusion of the use of the Programmatic Agreement in the installation of rumble strips through potential historic districts, the Department submitted an RPR form to DHR. DHR subsequently requested further information, review and discussion of the project due to the understandably limited nature of information provided with the RPR.

Jon Evans indicated that it is important to note that the installation of rumble strips have been proven to be an extremely effective tool in substantially reducing both roadway departure and head on collisions, which are some of the most serious and fatal types of accidents. He also noted that given that rumble strips are generally only "hit" when there is a problem, their installation is not anticipated to result in any constant or pervasive changes to the noise environment adjacent to the roadway.

Laura Black indicated that one of DHR's biggest concerns was to ensure that the Department was communicating properly with the communities through which the rumble strips are intended for installation, to identify any areas of concern. Ron Grandmaison indicated that given the number of municipalities through which this and other rumble strip projects pass, the Department's standard public informational sessions are unrealistic. As such, for this and other rumble strip projects, the Department has sent letters to each of the municipalities through which the rumble strips are intended for installation. He indicated that in general, concerns related to rumble strip installations are not usually brought up until after installation and generally subside over time as the public gets used to the presence of these roadway features. The Department considers and addresses concerns regarding rumble strip installations on an individual, case-by-case basis.

L. Black indicated that based upon the project description and the Departments public coordination efforts the project was unlikely to result in historic property impacts as long as the Department worked to address any concerns that may arise subsequent to installation. J. Edlmann indicated that she would prepare a No Historic Properties Affected Memo for signature by DHR and FHWA. J. Edlmann and L. Black agreed that given the extent of the Department's annual rumble strip installation efforts, the language in the existing Programmatic Agreement as it pertains to rumble strip installation should be revisited.

### **East Kingston, 26942, X-A003(411)**

Participants: Ron Crickard, Bob Landry, NHDOT; Christine Perron, MJ

Initial consultation regarding the revised plans to complete a deck replacement on bridge 061/064. Bob Juliano provided an overview of the project. The purpose of the project is to address Bridge 061/064, which carries NH Route 107A over the Boston & Maine (Pan Am) Railroad. The bridge is a steel stringer bridge constructed in 1937 as a grade separation. The bridge consists of three 40-foot simple spans, with a curb to curb width of 28'. The bridge deck and rail were replaced in 1969. Minor patching and painting are the only repairs that have been completed since that time. The bridge deck is in serious condition and currently has timber blocking in place to prevent spalls from falling. The structural steel is in fair condition with some rusting. The substructure is in satisfactory condition, with spalls and cracking evident on the abutments and pier foundations. The bridge has been on the State's Red List since 2010.

The project proposes to rehabilitate the bridge to remove it from the Red List. Work would entail replacing the concrete bridge deck and curbs (maintain out-to-out deck width); replacing the aluminum bridge rail & approach rail with standard steel tube rail and snow screening above the railroad; patching deteriorated areas of the abutments and piers as needed; and painting all structural steel. This work would be completed in one construction season with the bridge closed during construction. A temporary detour bridge is not proposed. The estimated construction cost is \$750,000. A Public Officials meeting was held on December 8, 2014, and a Public Informational meeting will likely be scheduled for February 2016. The project is currently scheduled to advertise in January 2019.

Ron Crickard commented asked Laura Black for clarification on the comments received on the RPR form. L. Black replied that the scope of work described in the updated RPR submission was not very clear and seemed to indicate that the project would replace the entire superstructure. Such work would likely have been an adverse effect on the Boston and Maine Western Division Historic District, as she wrote on the RPR form. After hearing the presentation, L. Black noted that it was now apparent that the project is replacing only the deck, not the entire superstructure, and, further, that the deck, rail, and curb are all modern components of the bridge. Therefore, she recommended a finding of No Adverse Effect on the historic district. Jamie Sikora concurred.

L. Black commented that it would be important to note in the effect memo that the individual eligibility of the bridge has not been determined. The DOE committee did find that the bridge was not eligible under Criterion C; however, the committee was unable to determine if the bridge is eligible under Criterion A. Since the bridge is not eligible under Criterion C for engineering, and the proposed project will result in no adverse effect to the bridge itself, there is no need for further analysis of the bridge's eligibility for this project.

Submitted by: Sheila Charles and Jill Edlmann, Cultural Resources

s:\environment\meetings\shpo - cr agency coordination\minutes\2015 minutes\9 september 10 2015.docx

# New Hampshire Department of Transportation Cultural Resources Agency Coordination Meeting

Date September 10, 2015

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

Initial	Name	Agency	Email Address
LB	Laura Black	NH Division of Historical Resources	<u>laura.black@ddcr.nh.gov</u>
	Richard Boisvert	NH Division of Historical Resources	Richard.Boisvert@ddcr.nh.gov
SC	Sheila Charles	NHDOT - Bureau of Environment	scharles@dot.state.nh.us
	Victoria Chase	NHDOT - Highway Design	vchase@dot.state.nh.us
RC	Ronald Crickard	NHDOT - Bureau of Environment	rchrickard@dot.state.nh.us
	Michael Dugas	NHDOT - Highway Design	mdugas@dot.state.nh.us
JE	Jill Edelmann	NHDOT - Bureau of Environment	jedelmann@dot.state.nh.us
EF	Edna Feighner	NH Division of Historical Resources	Edna.feighner@ddcr.nh.gov
	Ron Grandmason	NHDOT - Highway Design	rgrandmason@dot.state.nh.us
BL	Bob Landry	NHDOT - Bridge Design	rlandry@dot.state.nh.us
	Marc Laurin	NHDOT - Bureau of Environment	mlaurin@dot.state.nh.us
SL	Leigh Levine	Federal Highway Administration	Leigh.Levine@dot.gov
	Stephen Liakos	NHDOT - Community Planning	scliakos@dot.state.nh.us
	Don Lyford	NHDOT - Highway Design	dlyford@dot.state.nh.us
	Beth Muzzey	NH Division of Historical Resources	elizabeth.muzzey@ddcr.nh.gov
	Kevin Nyhan	NHDOT - Bureau of Environment	knyhan@dot.state.nh.us
JS	Jamie Sikora	Federal Highway Administration	<u>jamie.sikora@fhwa.dot.gov</u>
	Pete Starnas	NHDOT - Highway Design	pstarnas@dot.state.nh.us
	Cindy Vigue	Federal Highway Administration	Cindy.Vigue@dot.gov
CR	CR Willeke	NHDOT - Planning	<u>cwilleke@dot.state.nh.us</u>

Please fill in all of the requested information.

September 10, 2015

Name	Agency	Phone #	Email Address
✓ Matthew Low	Hoyle Tanner	603 669-5555	Mlow@hoyletanner.com
✓ Kimberly Peace	" "	" "	KPEACE@hoyletanner.com
✓ Anna Lachance	" "	" "	A.LACHANCE@ " " "
✓ <del>Steve Higgins</del>	<del>NHDOT - Agency</del>	<del>271-8420</del>	<del>shiggins@</del>
✓ George Sogure	STATE	802-864-0223	GEORGE.SOGURE@STATE.CO.NZ
✓ MICHAEL LEXTER	STATE	603-669-8672	MICHAEL.LEXTER@STATE.COM.
✓ BOB TULLIANO	NHDOT	603-271-2731	RTULLIANO@DOT.STATE.NH.US
✓ Judith Ehrlich	VRAMS via teleconference		
✓ Dan Landry			
✓ Joshua Prescott	NHDOT	271-3631	
✓ Jon Evans	NHDOT	271-4048	Jevans@dot.state.nh.us
✓ Ron Grandmaison	NHDOT	271-2171	Rgrandmaison@dot.state.nh.us
✓ Christine Perran	MS	825-2978	cperran@msinc.com