



# State of New Hampshire

## DEPARTMENT OF SAFETY

James H. Hayes Safety Building, 10 Hazen Drive, Concord, NH 03305

**JOHN J. BARTHELMES**  
**COMMISSIONER OF SAFETY**

---

---

## DECISION & ORDER

---

---

In the Matter of:

-----  
|  
| **Bellamy River,**  
| **Dover, New Hampshire**  
|  
-----

### HISTORY:

Pursuant to RSA 270:12, with special emphasis on RSA 270:12,II and New Hampshire Code of Administrative Rules Saf-C 409 (et seq.), Attorney Christopher Casco, Hearings Examiner, Department of Safety, Bureau of Hearings, conducted a public hearing on Tuesday, August 25, 2015 at the Dover Public Library, Dover, New Hampshire.

The Department of Safety received a petition requesting the establishment of a "No Aviation Zone" on a portion of the Bellamy River, from 39 Spur Road to 193 Spur Road in Dover, New Hampshire. The petition, dated July 10, 2015 was signed by at least twenty-five (25) co-petitioners, supporting the petition. The petition requested "Establishment of a No Aviation Zone on the Lower Bellamy River in Dover, NH." The petition requested a hearing pursuant to RSA 270:12 to address concerns and provided the specific reasons within and the attached petition of names signatory thereto (*infra*):

"We are writing to request a hearing on our petition to create a no-aviation zone on the lower portion of the Bellamy River." The petition cited safety, environmental, and noise concerns as the primary reasons for the ban.

**OPENING REMARKS:**

Everyone present was informed:

1. The public hearing was audio recorded;
2. The recording would be preserved for seventy-five (75) days and an explanation of the procedure by which to receive a copy of the recording;
3. The opportunity to sign the appropriate "sign-up sheet" to present comment on the petition or to register a position without speaking;
4. They could review the legal notice clipping from the newspaper, along with the original petition and any other documents;
5. How and where to submit written comment that must be received within seven (7) days from the hearing date by the Department of Safety;
6. That the notice of hearing and petition were posted on the Department of Safety web site; and
7. The appeal procedure in accordance with RSA 541:3.

---

**EXHIBITS:**

- |                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| <u>Exhibit # 1</u> | Letter from Director Patrick Herlihy, DOT, dated 8/6/15 |
| <u>Exhibit # 2</u> | A Map of Bellamy River and related documents            |

- Exhibit # 3 Maps of Bellamy River
- Exhibit # 4 A Floatplane Size chart
- Exhibit # 5 Article: Safety Last: lies and cover-ups mask roots of small-plane carnage from USA Today
- Exhibit #6 ABC News report print out from Mike Hartman dated 3/17/13
- Exhibit #7 Article from Pilotfriend.com on landing a seaplane
- Exhibit #8 Article from Pilotfriend.com on wake turbulence
- Exhibit #9 Aqua 1500 Float Characteristics
- Exhibit #10 Fiske Mobile Hearing Services Sound Level Survey
- Exhibit #11 Fly Neighborly Guide article on sound generation
- Exhibit #12 Analysis of Noise Level Generated by Helicopters with Various Numbers of Blades in the Main Rotor
- Exhibit #13 Copy of Figure 4, page 8 from Fly Neighborly Guide
- Exhibit #14 Print out from Mercury Outboard Customer Assistance on engine noise
- Exhibit #15 Print out on Robinson Model R44 noise abatement
- Exhibit #16 Information on wetlands from United States EPA
- Exhibit #17 33 USC 403 obstruction of navigable waters
- Exhibit #18 Article from Pilotfriend.com on anchoring, mooring, docking, and beaching a seaplane

- Exhibit #19 Photographs of birds and kayaks; Photograph of shoreline with fence and tree; Photograph of birds on water; Photograph of bird in flight and shoreline with tree and fence
- Exhibit #20 Article from Seacoast Online: Helicopter dries field for big football game
- Exhibit #21 Electronic Code of Federal Regulations section 83.03(rule 3), 83.05 and 83.06
- Exhibit #22 List of bird species on the Bellamy River
- Exhibit #23 Second List of bird species on the Bellamy River
- Exhibit #24 MBTA list of migratory bird program
- Exhibit #25 Document: The Great Bay Important Bird Area
- Exhibit #26 Article from Fosters.com: Helicopter owner claims request stems from "personal" dispute
- Exhibit #27 U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service document: Great Bay National Wildlife Refuge
- Exhibit #28 Document: Comparative Examples of Noise Levels
- Exhibit #29 Document from Seaplanes.org website: Are seaplanes more dangerous than land planes?
- Exhibit #30 Portsmouth International Airport at Pease Part 150 Update Study: 2014 and 2019 Noise Exposure Maps
- Exhibit #31 Document from pilotfriend.com: landing a seaplane
- Exhibit #32 High Tide Reading using GPS on private boat
- Exhibit #33 Loudness Comparison Chart

Seven (7) people signed to speak in favor of the petition (2 were not present when called to speak); Twenty-two (22) persons appeared speaking in opposition to the petition. Two (2) persons wished to not speak but record themselves in favor of the petition and ten (10) persons not speaking wished to record themselves against the petition.

The hearing was closed to public comment at the end of the business day on Wednesday, September 2, 2015. Prior to the conclusion of public comment, Six (6) documents were received in support of the petition. Seven (7) documents were received against the petition.

In summary, the written comment in support of the petition argued the following reasons for granting the petition: low water depth; noise created by seaplanes/aircraft; safety; protection of the environment including wildlife and habitat; narrowness of the channel in the proposed restricted area; very few seaplanes landing in the area; and water quality.

In summary, the written comment against the petition cited to the following reasons for denying the petition: the restriction is unnecessary as there is no history of problems; the NH Fish and Game Department and Audubon Society have no objection to aircraft in the proposed restricted area; more people wish to keep the area unrestricted; water depth is adequate for landing/taking off; wildlife flourishes in the area; the petition is overbroad; noise is not excessive; seaplane pilots are highly trained and certified; evidence of environmental problems is insufficient; and, other activities such as boating cause more noise and environmental impact yet are not restricted.

## **SYNOPSIS OF TESTIMONY:**

### **Parties in favor of the petition**

The petitioner, Elizabeth Bratter, spoke first and introduced the exhibits above-mentioned. She also submitted detailed written testimony in support of the petition. She stated that the water depth is inadequate to land a plane. A plane is unable to land safely at low tide. Also, a Dover city ordinance prevents a helicopter from landing within 1000 feet of a structure. The water is anywhere from 30 to 300 feet from homes, and the same degree of protection from the city ordinance should apply to prevent landing on the water.

Also, low flying aircraft will introduce noise and violate federal wetlands regulations. Moreover, there are many water activities that occur on the river and it will be dangerous for planes to land because people in the water will be difficult to see. There are many animal species that are impacted by planes.

The other speakers in favor of the petition described reasons such as the fact that the river is too narrow for planes to land and that they have to fly too close to houses to land. Also, it was stated that it is safer to land and take off further down the river, away from the proposed restricted area.

### **Parties against the petition**

The first speaker against the petition, Karl Leinsing, presented a detailed statement accompanied by a PowerPoint presentation. He also introduced detailed written testimony to support his position. His position is that a regulation prohibiting seaplanes is unnecessary because after a careful review of the data, there are no safety problems or threats to wildlife presented by flight in the area. This is evidenced by the fact that there have been no accidents or

documented safety issues. Also, pilots care about the environment and do what they can to minimize the impact that flying has on the environment. He feels that property owners invested in their homes based on fewer restrictions, and to introduce a seaplane ban would lower property values. There are 8 licensed pilots who own property in the area.

Furthermore, he challenged the petition process and argued that not all abutters were properly notified. He suggested that a complex with many different residents was only notified once and that such was insufficient. He also claimed that the petitioners presented incorrect information to people to persuade them to sign the petition. He suggested that the petition was filed in order to settle an ongoing personal dispute that he has with the petitioners because they did not want him to land his helicopter in his yard (he lives next door to the petitioners). He tried to get a variance to permit landing the helicopter and it was denied by the city. This is a neighbor dispute based more on vengeance than safety.

Moreover, he cited to the fact that the Hampton air field is 2100 feet long as compared to the proposed restricted area which is 5100 feet. Also, imposing a regulation based on street addresses is improper because it will be difficult for pilots from the air to be able to determine where the zone is located. The city ordinance applicable to the land is irrelevant because the State regulates the water. He contested the claim that the water depth is inadequate and stated that the depth is 5 feet in the channel. Pilots have strict licensing and training requirements and there are very few accidents involving seaplanes.

As to noise, due to the close proximity of the Pease airport, there is already noise from planes. The Great Bay National Wildlife Refuge has reported very few air strikes with birds and there is no

evidence of strikes on the Bellamy River. Finally, a ban would be difficult to enforce because Marine Patrol has insufficient staff.

The other speakers against the petition included several pilots who indicated that the regulation is unnecessary because there is no problem with seaplanes in the area. They stated that pilots are licensed and trained and know how to land in areas where there is boat traffic and other water users like swimmers. Also, when a plane takes off or lands it does so in a very short time. Boats present more problems than planes.

### **DISCUSSION:**

The hearings examiner after considering all of the evidence, exhibits and testimony presented at the hearing issues findings. In gathering findings of fact, the Revised Statutes Annotated (RSA) and administrative rule(s) (*infra*) are given consideration in addition to the published authority to conduct said public hearing. It is the below governing legal authority that constitutes the basis of the petition and it is outlined for reference. Thereafter, an analysis of the applicable criteria under Saf-C 409.04 will follow and govern whether the petition should be granted.

### **RSA 270-D: 2 General Rules for Vessels Operating on Water.**

"...Vessels shall be operated at headway speed only, while passing under all bridges. VI. (a) To provide full visibility and control and to prevent their wake from being thrown into or causing excessive rocking to other boats, barges, water skiers, aquaplanes or other boats, rafts or floats, all vessels shall maintain headway speed when within 150 feet from: (1) Rafts, floats, swimmers; (2) Permitted swimming areas; (3) Shore; (4) Docks; (5) Mooring fields; (6) Other vessels. . . ."

### **RSA 270:12 Operating Restrictions.**

I. The commissioner of safety shall, after receiving a petition signed by 25 or more residents or property owners of each affected town or towns in which a lake, pond or river is located and after notice and hearing, at which it appears that the public interest requires, adopt rules governing the maximum horsepower of boat engines and outboard

motors or prescribe maximum speed limits for the operation of such boats or outboard motors applicable to or upon all or any portion of the public waters of this state. The commissioner of safety shall, in like manner and after notice and hearing, prohibit the use of motorboats and outboard motors on bodies of public water having an area of 35 acres or less; provided, that said prohibition shall not be construed as affecting the bodies of water covered by RSA 270:75 through 270:132. Hearings under this section shall be held in the vicinity of the body of water under consideration during the months of June, July, August, and September following the date of the petition.

II. Notwithstanding the provisions of RSA 270:12, I, any hearings regarding the closing or restricting of any body of water to seaplanes shall be addressed to and heard by the commissioner of safety or his designee. Prior to issuing a decision, the commissioner shall consult with the director of aeronautics, rail, and transit, department of transportation.

III. Persons petitioning the commissioner requesting a change of use or restriction of the use of any public waters shall notify, by certified mail, all abutters with deeded waterfront property or deeded water access rights of the proposed change or restriction and the department shall post the petition on its official website at least 2 weeks prior to a public hearing scheduled by the department.

IV. In this section, "abutter" means any person who owns property immediately adjacent and contiguous to the area on which the change of use or restriction of use will take place. If the change of use or restriction of use is located in an area which by its configuration would cause the change or restriction to affect noncontiguous properties, owners of those properties are considered as abutters. The term does not include the owner of a parcel of land located more than 1/4 mile from the limits of the proposed change or restriction.

#### **RSA 270:13-a Operation of Seaplanes or Helicopters on Public Waters.**

I. Any seaplane or any helicopter on floats which lands on public waters shall be exempt from all laws and rules concerning the operation of boats for the purpose of landing and taking off from such public waters.

II. Any seaplane or any helicopter on floats shall exercise due caution and respect for the rights and safety of any person or boat using the public waters.

#### **RSA 422:27 Seaplanes in Operation on Public Waters.**

I. All seaplanes shall be considered boats while in operation on the waters of the state and shall be subject to the marine rules of navigation, except that they shall be exempt from all laws and rules concerning the operation of boats for the purpose of landing and taking off from such public waters.

II. The operation of seaplanes shall be subject to any restrictions placed upon the use of public waters by rules adopted by the department of safety or the department of environmental services.

#### **Department of Safety Administrative Rule Saf-C 401.22**

"Vessel" means every description of watercraft used or capable of being used as a means of transportation on water, except a seaplane on the water.

**Department of Safety Administrative Rule Saf-C 409.04**

Saf-C 409.04 Criteria for Review.

(a) The commissioner shall, after the hearing, adopt rules of the type authorized by RSA 270:12 if it appears that, consistent with RSA 270:1, II, the rule shall provide for the safe and mutual enjoyment of a variety of uses, taking into consideration the factors in (b) below.

(b) In determining whether to adopt such rules the commissioner shall consider the following:

- (1) The size of the body of water or portion thereof for which action is being considered;
- (2) The effect that adopting or not adopting the rule(s) would have upon:
  - a. Public safety;
  - b. The maintenance of residential, recreational and scenic values;
  - c. The variety of uses of the body of water or portion thereof;
  - d. The environment and water quality; and
  - e. Threatened and endangered species;
- (3) The number of people affected, either directly or indirectly, by adopting or not adopting the rule(s); and
- (4) The availability and practicality of enforcement of the rule(s).

---

---

I. The Size of the Body of Water or Portion thereof for which  
Action is being considered:

Based on the evidence presented, the requested area for a restriction on seaplanes/aircraft is from the address of 39 Spur Road through 193 Spur Road in Dover, New Hampshire, an approximate distance of 2 miles. It is apparent that this area is of sufficient distance, and has proper water depth for a seaplane

to land. This is supported by the letter from Patrick Herlihy, Director of Aeronautics, Rail, and Transit, (Exhibit 1), in which he indicated that there is no minimum water depth or length as it relates to seaplane operations.

II. The Effect that Adopting or not Adopting the Rule Would have upon Public Safety:

Those in favor of the petition argued that seaplane and helicopter use in the area presents a public safety hazard. While some of the exhibits addressed safety, and documented some tragic accidents involving aircraft, not a single incident occurred on or even near the area where the regulation is requested. This is important because Pease airport is close by which causes many aircraft to fly in close proximity to this area. There is no evidence of any accident or problem involving a seaplane. Also, several pilots testified that it is the responsibility of the pilot to ensure that the area is safe before landing, and that if conditions are unsafe, they will not land. In fact, the law recognizes this obligation and requires aircraft pilots to exercise due care and to yield to boats and swimmers in the water. RSA 270:13-A-II. This is further supported by Director Herlihy who confirmed that pilots are trained and tested on safe operation of seaplanes. Therefore, the threat to safety by aircraft in the Bellamy River is speculative and there is insufficient evidence to support that there is any threat to safety.

III. The Effect that Adopting or not Adopting the Rule Would have upon the Maintenance of Residential, Recreational and Scenic Values:

There was a suggestion that the lack of a seaplane restriction on the river results in higher property values. Some of the residents in the area are pilots, although it appears that only one, Mr. Leinsing, owns an aircraft and has

a desire to operate in the area at issue. Mr. Leinsing based his statement on a conversation that he had with a real estate agent. There were no studies of the area to support that statement. Another speaker with real estate experience, however, supported this assertion. The area is otherwise not restricted as there is not a no wake zone on the river to regulate motorboat use. This suggests that boat users are not presenting a safety problem, and boat usage is limited and boating is done mostly by property owners in the river. It is an isolated area and many boaters don't attempt to come to the area.

Moreover, despite the lack of a rule, there are very few seaplane landings on this section of river, and the only evidence of recent aircraft operation is a photograph of Mr. Leinsing's helicopter that accompanied a newspaper story about this hearing. Exhibit 26. No other person gave examples of seaplanes creating problems in the area. This suggests that there is no negative impact on residential, recreational or scenic values. It appears that the petitioner was upset by his neighbor, Mr. Leinsing, landing a helicopter at his residence, but this has since been addressed by enforcement of the Dover city ordinance. Therefore, there is insufficient evidence of a problem which requires a regulation to remedy a negative impact on residential, recreational, and scenic values.

IV. The Effect that Adopting or not Adopting the Rule Would have upon the Variety of Uses of the Body of Water or Portion Thereof:

Many people spoke about different uses of this section of river. People use the river around their homes for boating, swimming, and kayaking. Primarily, these activities are done

by people who live in the area as there was no evidence introduced that there is a public beach or boat launch commonly used by the public. No one, however, testified that their use of the water was ever impaired by a seaplane or other aircraft. As a result, there is nothing to suggest that prohibiting seaplane use on the river would enhance the enjoyment of other users. There is no impact on the variety of uses of the water warranting imposing a restriction on seaplanes.

V. The Effect that Adopting or not Adopting the Rule Would have upon the Environment and Water Quality:

There was testimony indicating that seaplanes have a negative impact on the environment, and that the close proximity of the Great Bay National Wildlife Refuge to the proposed restricted area supports banning seaplanes. A written statement also referred to horses in the area that would be negatively impacted by aircraft. Director Herlihy, however, contradicted those claims. He indicated that conservation land does not extend into the Bellamy River. Furthermore, he is of the opinion that aviation and wildlife coexist peacefully in New Hampshire. As an expert in this area, his letter is entitled to significant weight. It suggests that a ban is unnecessary.

As to seaplanes causing poor water quality, there is insufficient evidence as to how they have a negative impact on water quality. It can be inferred that the landing and taxiing of a plane on the Bellamy River may have some impact on the river bottom. Such would be minimal because the takeoff and landing process is quick and does not occur often in the area. Also, a seaplane tank does not discharge any fuel into the water. Consequently, the minimal impact that this

activity may have on water quality does not support enacting a rule banning seaplanes.

VI. The Effect that Adopting or not Adopting the Rule Would have upon Threatened and Endangered Species:

The petitioner introduced several exhibits concerning birds and other wildlife in the area and argued that seaplanes will negatively impact the animals. Again, these claims are contradicted by Director Herlihy who indicated that the conservation area does not extend to the Bellamy River, and that many species of animals coexist peacefully with aviation. Moreover, there was evidence that both the New Hampshire Fish and Game Department and the Audubon Society do not feel that there is any negative impact on wildlife in the area. Consequently, there is insufficient evidence that adopting a seaplane/aircraft ban would protect threatened or endangered species.

VII. The Number of People Affected, either Directly or Indirectly, by Adopting or not Adopting the Rule:

This 2 mile area of the Bellamy River has many residences as is evidenced by the long list of abutter notifications that the law required. In addition, many people testified at the hearing and submitted written comment. What is not in the hearing record, however, is any instance of a seaplane or aircraft presenting a problem to any of the residences or users of the river. The only specific incident cited is from the co-petitioner, Mr. Bratter, who indicated that a helicopter landing next door was dangerous. He did not, however, state that the helicopter caused any injury or property damage, and that activity has since stopped because it violates a Dover city ordinance. Therefore, enacting a seaplane ban will not

address that specific activity, the only aircraft activity in the area referenced.

Moreover, many people testified that seaplanes do not often land in the river, and that it is not an ideal site for seaplanes to land. Consequently, although there are many residents on the river, there is insufficient evidence that not approving a seaplane ban will have a negative impact.

#### VIII. The Availability and Practicality of Enforcement of the Rule:

Finally, the petition requests a no aviation zone, something that is well beyond the Commissioner's statutory authority to grant because the Federal Aviation Administration regulates airspace. "No state law, ordinance, or petition can prevent the use of airspace." Exhibit 1. This would make enforcement of such a rule difficult, if not impossible. As Director Herlihy pointed out, this is a broad and all-encompassing term which would need to be explained and specific aeronautic activities listed before a clear regulation could be enacted.

Consequently, any rule to implement this petition would be difficult to enforce, which supports denial.

As the designee of the commissioner to recommend Findings of Fact, a careful and complete review of the petition submitted has been finalized. Appropriate weight has been given to the area under discussion in accordance with the criteria above-mentioned for evaluating this petition found within the scope of authority as listed within this discussion including documents and testimony received during a comment period. The information submitted was thoroughly considered within the petition, along with the public commentary received. It is noteworthy that prior decisions granting petitions restricting seaplanes on certain bodies of water often cited to the fact that those bodies of water already had motorboat restrictions such as

no wake areas, or were public water supplies, compelling evidence to support restrictions. The Bellamy River, in contrast, has no other restrictions, and it is not a public water supply, which further supports denying this petition.

Based upon the Findings of Fact published below, I recommend that the following Conclusion of Law and Disposition denying the petition be approved.

Respectfully Submitted,



---

Christopher Casco, Esq.  
Hearings Examiner

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

1. That pursuant to RSA 270:12, twenty-five (25) or more people petitioned the Commissioner of the Department of Safety to conduct a public hearing to regulate seaplane usage on the Bellamy River between 39 Spur Road and 193 Spur Road in Dover, New Hampshire and establish a prohibition against aircraft. The Petitioner notified abutters by certified mail.
2. Official notice for the hearing was published in the Union Leader, Manchester, New Hampshire on July 16, 2015.
3. The petition and notice of hearing were posted on the Department of Safety web site beginning on July 14, 2015 and remained until after the public comment period.
4. A public hearing was conducted on Tuesday, August 25, 2015 at 1:00 p.m. on the legal issue and pursuant to RSA 541, RSA 270:12 (with special emphasis on RSA 270:12,II) and Administrative Rule Saf-C 409 at the Dover Public Library, Dover, New Hampshire.
5. The petition seeks a no aviation zone on the Bellamy River from 39 Spur Road to 193 Spur Road, Dover, NH.
6. The approximate size of the proposed area encompasses approximately 2 miles of the river.
7. Presently, there is neither a maximum nor minimum horsepower limit on motorboats nor speed restriction on the Bellamy River which is evidence that there are no safety problems in the area where the restriction is requested.

8. The effect which adopting or not adopting the rule(s) would have upon the public safety is considered. There is insufficient evidence that imposing the ban is necessary for public safety.
9. There is insufficient evidence that the maintenance of residential, recreational, and scenic values would be enhanced by a ban because very few seaplane pilots use the area, and there are no documented accidents or reports of dangerous seaplane operation in the proposed zone.
10. There is insufficient evidence that the variety of uses in the proposed area support a seaplane ban.
11. There is insufficient evidence that a seaplane ban is necessary to protect the environment and water quality.
12. There is insufficient evidence that a seaplane ban is necessary to protect threatened and endangered species.
13. A large number of people would be directly affected by imposition of a ban, but there is insufficient evidence that there would be an adverse effect on the majority of those people if the ban is not imposed.
14. The Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics was consulted and provided detailed comments concerning the petition. Director Herlihy found several problems with the petition including that it was overbroad, seeks to regulate aviation that is within the authority of the Federal Aviation Administration, the conservation area does not extend to the Bellamy River, and that wildlife and aviation synergistically exist in New Hampshire. Moreover, there is no minimum water depth or

length required for a seaplane to take off and land, and therefore, such is insufficient justification for a seaplane ban.

15. The Department of Safety, Division of Safety Services, New Hampshire Marine Patrol enforces the statute and rules governing the Bellamy River and navigational laws are enforced through that agency. Due to the overbroad nature of the petition, and the lack of reported problems due to seaplanes, enforcement of an aviation ban would be problematic.
16. There is insufficient legal authority under RSA 270:12-II to create a "no aviation zone" between 39 Spur Road and 193 Spur Road on the Bellamy River in Dover, New Hampshire.

**CONCLUSION OF LAW:**

The evidence demonstrates that the petition is not fulfilling the purpose of law, and is not of sufficient proof to show cause that a no aviation zone on the lower Bellamy River in Dover, NH from 39 Spur Road to 193 Spur Road be established pursuant to RSA 270:12-II and Administrative Rule Saf-C 409.04.

**DISPOSITION:**

The petition is respectfully **DENIED.**

Date of Order: 10/6/15

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John J. Barthelmes  
Commissioner of Safety

**APPEAL PROCEDURE**

**RSA 541:3 Motion for Rehearing.**

Within 30 days after any order or decision has been made by the commission, any party to the action or proceeding before the commission, or any person directly affected thereby, may apply for a rehearing in respect to any matter determined in the action or proceeding, or covered or included in the order, specifying in the motion all grounds for rehearing, and the commission may grant such rehearing if in its opinion good reason for the rehearing is stated in the motion.

**RSA 541:6 Appeal.**

Within thirty days after the application for a rehearing is denied, or, if the application is granted, then within thirty days after the decision on such rehearing, the applicant may appeal by petition to the supreme court.

---

---

I certify that a copy of the order has been forwarded to the below named via first-class mail or electronic mailing (as applicable).

Date of mailing: 10/7/15



---

Christopher Casco, Esq.  
Hearings Examiner

A copy of this order was sent by email to the following who supplied an email address:

Petitioner Designee: Elizabeth Bratter

Karl Leinsing  
Maurene Keough  
Alice Meattley  
Steve Williams  
Philip Shelton  
Andi Bartlett  
Jim Crawford  
Eric Parker  
Michael Hoffman  
Jay Chastenay  
Kimberly Hardy  
Ray Bardwell  
Bambi Miller  
Gerald Hanscom  
Jim Knowles  
Mark Woodruff  
Danielle Price  
City of Dover  
Colonel Robert Quinn, NH State Police

File