

From: Stewart, Sarah  
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2019 2:04 PM  
To: Tango-Lowy, Torene  
Subject: FW: Question re: DOT Declaratory Ruling

From: Beaulieu, Philip <Philip.Beaulieu@dot.nh.gov>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2019 11:56 AM  
To: 'John Petrofsky' <jpetrofsky@gmail.com>; Dobbins, Caleb <Caleb.Dobbins@dot.nh.gov>  
Cc: Sheehan, Victoria <Victoria.Sheehan@dot.nh.gov>; Stewart, Sarah <Sarah.Stewart@dncr.nh.gov>; Quinn, Robert <Robert.Quinn@dos.nh.gov>; Monique Petrofsky (Google Docs) <mvpetrofsky@gmail.com>  
Subject: RE: Question re: DOT Declaratory Ruling

Hi John,

No one has officially submitted an application for opening NH-145 to on-highway use by OHRVs yet. The first step in that process is the local municipality must hold a public hearing to gather input. That meeting is currently scheduled for May 22nd in Colebrook. If favorable support exists, then the Town will write a letter that states their desire to open that section of highway. It is only at that point, that the Trails Bureau would submit an application for the on-highway connector trail.

To answer your second question, I have not been contacted by anyone at the Bureau of trails to discuss closing portions of Diamond Pond or Bear Rock Roads. The Town and/or the Bureau of Trails would typically be the parties to initiate a request to rescind a permit that was previously issued.

Thanks

Phil

Philip L. Beaulieu, P.E.  
NH Department of Transportation  
Highway Maintenance – District 1  
District Engineer  
641 Main Street  
Lancaster, NH 03584  
Tel: (603) 788-4641  
Fax: (603) 788-4260

From: John Petrofsky [mailto:jpetrofsky@gmail.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2019 5:20 PM  
To: Beaulieu, Philip; Dobbins, Caleb  
Cc: Sheehan, Victoria; Stewart, Sarah; robert.quinn@dos.nh.gov; Monique Petrofsky (Google Docs)  
Subject: Re: Question re: DOT Declaratory Ruling

Hi Philip,

Sorry to email you again. I wanted to give you my quick thoughts on the proposed route changes on state Rts. 3 and 145, and I wanted to ask a couple of questions about this and related matters.

My main point boils down to this: I support the Rt. 3 crossing because it removes the rationale for many of the roads currently opened at the town and state level, and provides for more direct connections. The Rt. 145 opening however is an unnecessary hazard that goes against the DOT's own policies.

First, who has asked for allowing OHRV traffic on Rt. 145 in Colebrook? Is it the local club and town, or was it the Bureau of Trails too? As you know, it's not an ideal stretch of road for OHRV travel, in fact, having OHRV's on it would seem to be quite dangerous, as it's paved, narrow, and outside of town. Additionally, opening up this road would seem to directly conflict with the DOT's OHRV policy, as it's not in a village district, and isn't necessary for connecting to a village district (particularly if the Rt. 3 crossing is approved). It would just be a link to what is largely a bunch of other town and state roads. As you know, the neighboring landowners closed the nearby trail out of frustration with the club and concern for the well being of their neighbors. It's not the DOT's job to bail out the Metallak ATV club because of their poor approach to working with neighbors and landowners. <https://www.nhstateparks.org/getmedia/9c718a61-dec7-4ac1-9744-92756b99baf9/OHRV-Connector-Policy.pdf>

Second, the Rt. 3 crossing in Colebrook/Columbia, if approved, would make the Rt. 145 travel completely redundant. It would actually make road travel on quite a number of roads redundant, including state portions of Diamond Pond and Bear Rock Roads. If you approve the Rt. 3 crossing, there's no underlying rationale to opening Rt. 145. They both facilitate north/south travel to Colebrook and Pittsburg from points south. The Rt. 3 crossing also facilitates east/west travel to Colebrook from points east. The routes that the Rt. 3 crossing facilitates are actually more direct than anything Rt. 145 allows.

Finally, has anyone from BOT approached DOT about closing state sections of Diamond Pond or Bear Rock roads? How do we start the process for closing state roads to OHRVs if the original purpose for their having been opened is no longer served, and the original conditions are not being met? By original conditions I mean there are kids driving ATVs down the road, and there are state roads currently open that are either redundant, or not serving any purpose as connectors.

Thank you.  
John Petrofsky

On Sat, Apr 13, 2019 at 3:33 PM John Petrofsky <jpetrofsky@googlemail.com> wrote:  
Hi Philip,

Sorry to email you again. I know you've had a lot going on.

Do you have any time to discuss what I mentioned above. Also, let me know if there's someone else at DOT that I should be reaching out to.

Best,  
John

On Sun, Mar 24, 2019 at 4:57 PM John Petrofsky <jpetrofsky@googlemail.com> wrote:  
Dear Mr. Beaulieu,

My mother passed your email on to me. I hope you don't mind my asking a few questions about DOT OHRV trail policy.

I know it's not the goal to open up more roads for riding, but there are a few specific spots where we could alleviate conflict on miles of road by opening up a mile or so.

I also have a question about the Connector Policy from 2017.

<https://www.nhstateparks.org/getmedia/9c718a61-dec7-4ac1-9744-92756b99baf9/OHRV-Connector-Policy.pdf>

Do you have any time to discuss over the phone later this week?

Thank you.  
John Petrofsky