

**TOWN OF BEDFORD**  
**March 27, 2018**  
**CONSERVATION COMMISSION**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

A meeting of the Bedford Conservation Commission was held on Tuesday, March 27, 2018 at the Bedford Meeting Room, 10 Meetinghouse Road, Bedford, NH. Present were: Beth Evarts (Chairwoman), James Drake (Vice-Chair), Bob MacPherson, Mac McMahan, Dave Gambaccini, Maggie Wachs, Catherine Rombeau, Town Council and Karin Elmer (Planner 1).

Chairwoman Evarts opened the meeting by having the Commission members introduce themselves and she welcomed the newest member Catherine Rombeau.

**Approval of Minutes:**

- January 23, 2018

A motion was made and seconded to approve the January 23, 2018 Conservation Commission meeting minutes. The motion was approved. Catherine Rombeau, James Drake, Bob MacPherson and Mac McMahan abstained.

**Dredge and Fill:**

**Lyophilization Services of N.E., Inc.** - Request to fill approximately 6,461 SF of wetland for the expansion of the current building at 7 Commerce Park Drive, Lot 24-99-4.

Chris Danforth, wetlands scientist from TF Moran introduced himself as the representative for the applicant. Mr. Danforth brought up the impact plan on the screen and stated this was a project that started in 1999, and was for three phases including warehouse and office. He pointed out the first two phases that are completed on the site plan, including the parking and stated that the third phase, or third building would consist of 7,824 SF of office space and 1057 SF of warehouse space.

In 2002, the owner put in the pad for phase II, building two and left it unbuilt. In 2006 building 2 was built, and the applicant had to go to the Wetland Bureau because 2,073 SF of wetlands had formed due to construction activities. Work below the water table caused this to happen. Mr. Danforth then stated he conducted a site inspection for the proposed third phase of the project, and found that there were four separate areas of impact with the largest being a 5,000 SF area on the Southwest portion of the property. Continuing, he said that runoff, primarily spring runoff, had formed the additional areas of wetland that were found and he showed the Commission an aerial photo and pointed out the location of the third building and the extensive runoff flow along the lot into the wetland behind the property.

Mr. Danforth then showed the Commission the original wetland delineation from 2006 and the current, updated version. He pointed out the additional area now delineated as needing to be

filled for phase III, and mentioned that the applicant will be going to the Bedford Zoning Board of Adjustment for relief for filling a portion of a wetland on April 17, 2018 and now has an application with DES for approval for the Dredge and Fill. He mentioned that DES is waiting for comments from the Commission to go forward.

Continuing, Mr. Danforth stated that the applicant has already addressed a number of issues with DES. Those include moving a swale, and using a pipe for stormwater which will be captured and moved through a StormTek treatment device. He also mentioned that with this type of stormwater system, there is no loss of function with the wetland system.

Mr. MacPherson asked if there were any studies done on the ground water in that area. Mr. Danforth stated that the project has disturbed the area, forming the wetland areas and asked for clarification on the question. Mr. MacPherson asked if the project was affecting the ground water. Mr. Danforth answered no. He said we are treating the runoff currently and it is better than the existing. He also said detention basins are being used with the StormTek system and nutrients are still absorbed into the soil.

Mr. McMahan asked about the Southwest corner of the property. Mr. Danforth described the corner and mentioned there is a depression in the area contributing to the wetland area and that the water goes in and sits there and it causes more hydric soils characteristics. Mr. McMahan also asked about the alteration and Mr. Danforth stated it was part of the development, it was not an alteration of the wetland it was an alteration of the drainage patterns. It was asked how the alteration was formed and Ms. Elmer mentioned that some of the alterations were from off-site, the property next door and the road. It was not this developer that caused the problem.

Chairwoman Evarts asked if there were any other comments, questions or concerns.

Mr. McMahan asked if the applicant was going to the Zoning Board. Ms. Elmer replied that is correct. He then asked her what the procedure going forward would be. Ms. Elmer stated the Commission makes recommendations to the ZBA for the variance request and to DES for the Dredge & Fill application. She said your motion will be to either recommend approving the application or not. If there are any suggested conditions of approval, they will be forwarded to the ZBA for consideration. The ZBA will get your comments and the minutes from this meeting in their packets. Also, DES will get a letter with your comments and a copy of the minutes as well.

Chairwoman Evarts then asked Mr. Danforth if there was a way to avoid more build up in the area as there is still undeveloped land after phase III in the area. Mr. Danforth stated you can't really prevent it. The drainage will be between the two properties. Because the site next door has been built up, it allows for pocketing of the flow. Chairwoman Evarts then asked if this is the last phase of the development. Mr. Danforth said yes. They are running out of room. It is dynamic, the ground water is shallow. There are skidder ruts out back, when you see that it is shallow. It is a marginal upland that can change. Chairwoman Evarts commented that to her, it doesn't connect up to any big wetland area. Mr. Danforth answered it is not very functional. It is a young wetland. There have been a number of projects that were put on hold because of the economy and the wetlands delineations have changed.

The Chairwoman then asked if there were any other comments. Mr. McMahan asked if the applicant will be cutting a lot of trees in the wetland and if they could be shown the extent of the

cutting. Chairwoman Evarts asked the applicant rep to use the satellite image for this discussion. Mr. Danforth put the satellite image up on the screen and pointed out the area that was going to be clear cut for the building and showed where the wetland area would be filled. Additional photos of trees were shown and pointed out on the map for clarification.

Mr. Drake then asked if the applicant is building attenuation or just treatment. Mr. Danforth stated the system is a StormTek system that captures oils, trash etc. and allows nutrients and organics to be put back into the ground. Mr. Drake then asked so this will infiltrate into the ground? Mr. Danforth said yes. Basically it is treating for CFF's, 10 or 25-year storm events. For the lower parking area. Mr. Drake then said will the property owners behind your property be upset with the Commission if their property becomes a larger wetland area if we approve this? Mr. Danforth said we think the amount of runoff we will put on the back property will be negligible. Mr. Drake said how much water is coming off the roof of the building that is not being treated at all? The treatment system is for the parking lot, but the roof is bigger than the parking lot area. Mr. Danforth said they have roof drains that are going into a catch basin and there is an existing catch basin in the back also. Mr. Drake asked if the detention basin in the back was designed for all three buildings. Mr. Danforth replied yes. Ms. Elmer clarified that the catch basin was designed to handle all three phases of the project, and there is still a lot of storm water capacity available.

Chairwoman Evarts stated back in 1988, 1989 and 2006 the approval for wetland Dredge & Fill was 2,000 SF and this project sat for 12 years. Mr. Danforth reiterated that the whole 3 phase project was approved by the Planning Board and the Zoning Board. The Chairwoman then asked if anyone on the Commission would like to document or state any comments or concerns to the Zoning Board on this application before a Motion.

Mr. McMahan asked about tree cutting, and if the applicant was only going to cut the trees needed to accomplish the drainage plan. Mr. Danforth replied yes. Ms. Elmer stated there is no prohibition to cutting in a wetland. It was mentioned that there is just an issue once you remove stumps. Mr. McMahan stated he was concerned that they keep as many trees as possible. Ms. Elmer mentioned the Planning Board will be looking at this and there will be a planting schedule.

Mr. MacPherson asked about feedback from abutters. He asked if the applicant or the Planning Department had heard from any of the abutters. Mr. Danforth stated that they had not. Ms. Elmer state she also had not received any comments. He said part of the Wetland application to the state included notifying abutters but they have not heard from any of them. He also stated the applicant owns 3 or 4 more buildings in this development so it is like a campus with multiple tenants and uses.

**MOTION: To make a recommendation that the Zoning Board of Adjustment consider approving the request to fill 6,461 SF of wetlands for the expansion of the building at 7 Commerce Park Drive, Lot 24-99-4 with consideration to the clearing of the trees as proposed for the tree line in the plan.**

Mr. Drake asked why the motion includes consideration of the trees. Chairwoman Evarts responded that was what she thought was a concern. Mr. Danforth pointed out on an aerial

where the tree cut line would be for the third phase. He said there will be a fill line for the building and parking area and they will clear for that.

Mr. Drake then stated that he suggests that the Commission give a recommendation to the Zoning Board for consideration that they confirm that a building roof drainage system goes to a detention facility. He said I say that because the Commission is allowing flood storage and creating more run-off and he doesn't want someone coming in later and saying we allowed an impact to someone else's property. We don't want to impact other properties.

**MOTION by Beth Evarts: To make a recommendation that the Zoning Board of Adjustment consider approving the request to fill 6,461 SF of wetlands for the expansion of the building at 7 Commerce Park Drive, Lot 24-99-4 (phase III) with consideration that the roof drainage from the roof building addition is going to an existing detention facility in the back of the property. Second by Mac Macpherson. All in favor.**

**New Business:**

- Introduction of Ethan Belair as the new Hillsborough County Forester:

Chairwoman Evarts welcomed Mr. Belair as the new Hillsborough County Forester. He introduced himself, mentioned he works for the UNH Cooperative Extension and that Ms. Elmer had suggested that he come in to meet the Commission. He stated that has a number of services to offer to the Commission and residents including two main categories. First, to understand what is going on with Forest Management and understand the potential uses. This would include timber management, wildlife and recreational uses to name a few. He stated he would provide unbiased educational information and had educational materials that can be used for outreach. The materials are both in hard copy format and electronic versions such as PowerPoint presentations.

Secondly, Mr. Belair stated he coordinates Group Education Programming. This could include hikes with school age children and/or adults, seminars/outdoor classes and a combination. Also, he has resources and can pull in other professionals for the programs.

Chairwoman Evarts asked if he worked with the UNH Coverts Program. Mr. Belair stated yes, they are separate entities but are part of the same organization and work together. Chairwoman Evarts stated we are working toward more outreach and community involvement. This is timely. With our grant for the Pulpit Rock Conservation area, and work days, maybe you can come out and share your knowledge and educate us and our volunteers.

Mr. McMahan asked if he does any work with the Scouting programs. Mr. Belair said not yet, but would definitely do so and asked if the Commission had his contact information to share. He was then asked if he was the person to contact for homeowners to get a list of tree cutters. He said he did have a list like that. Becky Hebert, the Planning Director was present at the meeting and addressed the Commission. She stated the Planning Department would love to have contact information and educational materials, hand-outs and flyers to give to interested residents. Chairwoman Evarts then mentioned that educational services would be great whereas an invasive species, Woolly Adelgid was discovered at the Pulpit Rock Conservation area by the Bedford

Land Trust. She suggested that Mr. Belair contact the Bedford Land Trust and introduce himself to them also. She also stated there is stuff we can work on together and we are happy to have you. Mr. Belair then reiterated that he can provide a lot of materials to the Town and residents.

Ms. Elmer mentioned that if we get inquiries, we direct people to the UNH Cooperative Extension website. Mr. McMahan mentioned that tree knowledge can be very helpful when building a house and costs can be reduced when cutting and selling trees for construction.

Mr. Drake asked if Mr. Belair provides free inspection services for people to check for invasive species. Mr. Belair stated that he will do visits to individual property owners but not just for that issue. It would be for a large conversation about the whole property and with invasive species being one of the topics. Mr. Drake mentioned that the Commission is doing a Forest Management Plan for Pulpit Rock and the problems with invasive species found there could be spreading and may become a concern for property owners. Mr. Belair then mentioned that he has assisted the Town of Amherst with a timber harvest and gave educational information. He said he can do the same for Bedford. The Chairwoman thanked him for coming in.

- The Chairwoman asked the Commission members if anyone else had signed up for the “Saving Special Spaces” conference. It was determined she would be the only Commission representative attending.
- Chairwoman Evarts then asked Ms. Elmer if she wanted to discuss a second workshop for next quarter. The Commission then briefly discussed the April Conservation Commission meeting due to it being during April school vacation week.

**Discussion of the Pulpit Rock Trail Grant with Ron Klemarczyk:**

Chairwoman Evarts welcomed Ron Klemarczyk, who introduced himself as a consultant forester from Hopkinton. He said he has been working with Ms. Hebert and Ms. Elmer and that they asked him to come before the Commission. An aerial of the Pulpit Rock Conservation area was put up on the screen and Mr. Klemarczyk began a detailed description of the trails system and his proposed work along the way. He mentioned he has blazed boundaries, and along houses on Indian Rock Road and Pulpit Road to the Amherst line. He discussed his work to date which also included stabilizing and switch back areas to make the trail easier to access. He talked about storm water runoff damaging the trails and the plan to bring in fill to stabilize and make a new ditch. Once the ditch is put in, there would be a good skim coat to be a good hard trail. The next issues include a bridge over a brook. The brook is back cutting and a 16’ bridge is going over there and the bridge will have hand rails. Continuing, Mr. Klemarczyk said because of the back cutting, a portion of the wetland area is drying out. Efforts are done to keep trails dry. Another 16’ bridge will be needed and there is a plan to assist where the rocks are at the old railroad bed area. He pointed out where he would also put a 12’ bridge with no railings.

Mr. Klemarczyk said this overview kind of describes the project. He talked about equipment being used. He said most of the bridges are lucking near the large detention area and can be dropped off. He mentioned the road down to the detention pond is starting to wash out. He said he submitted the proposal for \$34,000. Not to exceed that and with that number being the worst case scenario. There could be overlap that could reduce costs. He expects the total project cost will be lower, considering supervising and working at same time and including volunteer hours.

Continuing, he stated he doesn't know who the volunteers will be, or their skill levels. I have experience with volunteers, it's just a matter of scheduling. He discussed a few Boy Scout projects, projects with the City of Concord and Forestry projects he is currently working on. He said my weekend time is very limited, but weekday time with volunteers can work.

The Chairwoman then thanked Mr. Klemarczyk for the review and update she asked about the new trail section near the current trail split and Mr. Klemarczyk explained how the trail would run to Amherst. Mr. Drake mentioned nixing the idea to go to the detention pond and like the idea to cut into the side to keep wheelchair accessibility. Mr. Klemarczyk mentioned ledge pack being put in the gully where the soil was mushy. He then mentioned that a temporary goad would be constructed by the contractor to get the bridge etc. into the area. Chairwoman Evarts asked about the excavator area. Mr. Klemarczyk said ledge pack would be added and pressure treated posts with railing would be used. The Chairwoman then asked if the diversion ditch was included in his costs. Mr. Klemarczyk said yes. He also clarified the temporary bridges are included and brought in by log trucks and then out when the work is done.

Mr. Drake mentioned at the wash out area, near the pond, does it make sense to build an elevated walkway with hand rails. Mr. Klemarczyk answered that the area is just a little ditch. You don't need a full post walk there, it is not that wet. Mr. Klemarczyk mentioned there is an old piece of farm equipment out there, and that would indicate the area was dry at one time.

Mr. Gambaccini asked about the volunteer labor. He said it was an estimate. What number of hours do you consider for that \$2400.00? A ball park is fine. Mr. Klemarczyk stated he would still be there and there would be two people working on the bridges, me and someone else. Volunteers could possibly eliminate the need for the second person and I can get back to you on that. Mr. Klemarczyk estimated approximately 80 volunteer hours. (\$2400 divided by 30.) Mr. Gambaccini then asked about the ledge pack. Mr. Klemarczyk that he got a good deal on that.

Mr. MacPherson asked about the equipment. He asked if the Commission could find donated heavy equipment and operators, would Mr. Klemarczyk be able to work with them? Mr. Klemarczyk said as an example, at the Boy Scout camp, I had a volunteer that did that. The problem may be scheduling, I have several other clients and I would like to see the work the other person has done. If they are qualified I would have no problem working with them. The Chairwoman mentioned that most of the Commission works during the week, so volunteering will need to be discussed later.

Mr. McMahan asked if there was a material list that they could use to see about getting things donated or at lumber yards. Mr. Klemarczyk said yes, there is a list. Mr. McMahan asked what kind of physical labor volunteers could expect with the project. Mr. Klemarczyk stated volunteers comes in very handy for hauling in the lumber but usually carpentry skills are lacking. My plan is to have lumber delivered to a house, pre-fab the bridges, and have them delivered/installed. In a past project it took 6 adult volunteers, with hammers and wrenches two hours for a bridge construction. He said high school kids love building bridges by not maintaining the trails.

Mr. Drake asked about the railings. Mr. Klemarczyk said posts will be bolted in, rails nailed in. Mr. Drake then asked how are you going to get the supports into the ground. Mr. Klemarczyk said with piers or pinnining if we can't get the piers in. Mr. Klemarczyk then stated if anyone

would like to walk a trail that I have worked on that's already done and see the bridges I could arrange that. It was mentioned the less excavation that can be done the better. It was also mentioned that an archeological assessment was completed and used to determine the placement of the bridges and that they will not be near the dam. In 1990, my company did the Forest Management Plan for the Pulpit Rock area and the dam has moved since then. The Commission then discussed the ditch below the detention pond. Mr. Klemarczyk discussed the difference between a plank walk and a board walk. He said plank walks save a lot of money and mentioned that he roughs up new planks because they are slippery. The Chairwoman then asked if he could revise the budget and include that and add not to exceed.

Ms. Wachs asked if Mr. Klemarczyk could tell the Commission what the contingency amounts cover. He said basically if any archeological issue is found, skeletal remains as an example, and relocation etc is need, or cost of materials sky rockets for some reason those fund would then be used, or they may not be used at all. They mentioned getting plans to the Town Engineer for the bridges. The Chairwoman then clarified that the proposal should add not to exceed \$40,000 and include the changes discussed.

**MOTION: Motion by Mr. Gambaccini to approve Mr. Klemarczyk's budget of a not to exceed &40,000 and to go forward with the Pulpit Rock Trail Grant project. Ms. Rombeau seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.**

**Greenfield Farms boundary marking project.** Mr. Klemarczyk said last year he was asked to do easement monitoring on Town owned parcels. A lot of boundaries are behind homes in developments abutting the open spaces and were not marked, including Greenfield Farms. I was asked how much it would be to put up those tags. I had no idea, it is a very big area and to make boundary lines I had to find corners. I figured it would cost \$160- \$190 for a small area of the neighborhood. The problem is I would be in people's back yards and a lot of notice would be needed to the police and homeowners before the undertaking begins. He then stated the quicker you get those area marked, the better to stop the encroachment that's going on with yards, play sets etc. It's tricky when you start doing boundary markings in back yards.

Ms. Elmer then mentioned you thought you would do it last fall or this spring. Do you have a rough time frame of when you want to start? Mr. Klemarczyk stated I can probably start the week after next and choose a sample area and tell the residents. It was mentioned that after that was done a new estimate will come in to do the boundary markings for the whole subdivision. Chairwoman Evarts thanked Mr. Klemarczyk for coming in and updating the Commission.

- **Thomas Hamel – Request for a review of a proposed variance application** for the installation of an in ground pool 22 feet from the edge of a wetland where 50 feet is required at 201 Campbell Rd., Lot 16-8-7.

Mr. Hamel introduced himself and explained he wanted to install an in-ground swimming pool. He said the only do-able area to put my pool would require a variance because it would be in the wetland setback. It would infringe 15-20 feet on one side and 30 feet on the other. The area is completely dry and never wet in 19 years. Only a little wet after a heavy rain. He mentioned the shed on his property and that it was there when he purchased it.

Continuing, Mr. Hamel described his lot to the Commission and pointed out different features as found on his submitted plan. He said he has two wells, an irrigation system and utility lines/wires for phone, electric and cable in the back yard, and he chose the area behind the house approximately 28' away from the house. Mr. Hamel then pointed out where his leach field and septic were and said the only other place to put the pool, with all of this considered, would be in the front yard. He also stated the proposed area is flat and dry. Mr. McMahan asked Ms. Elmer about the setbacks. Ms. Elmer said a pool is considered a structure and all structures need to be 50' away from a wetland. The idea is water and runoff materials get filtered through the lawn before hitting the wetland.

Mr. Drake stated we recognize that structures of a certain type, like small sheds with small footprints are allowed in that 50' setback. Ms. Elmer clarified that the shed on the subject property would not qualify because it is too big. She also said you can make recommendations about the shed also to the ZBA. It was mentioned that the pool was planned to be 26' x 40' in size. The Chairwoman asked if Mr. Hamel could move the pool closer to the deck. Mr. Hamel said he is concerned he will damage his nearby will for his irrigation system and it also has power lines in the ground area. He said the previous owner had tv/cable, electrical and phone wire going out back to accommodate a nanny. A discussion about the well and issues with installing a pool near it was started. Mr. Hamel then said the wire will be staying there for the pool filter. The Commission then discussed possible location changes for the pool. At this time, Ms. Elmer pointed out and explained to the Commission the various lines depicted on the plan and what they meant.

It was discussed and clarified that the hardship for needing the pool in the setback was that he was going to have to pull out an electrical wire. Mr. Rombeau mentioned that was not shown on the drawing. The Commission and applicant then discussed the two wells on the property.

Mr. MacPherson said to the applicant, you stated you have been there for 19 years and you indicated you never saw any water in the wetland? It has always been dry? Mr. Hamel said there is not running water, but there is mush out back after the winter or after heavy rain events. A brief discussion about wetland area not only having water, but different species was started. Mr. Drake asked when was the last time a jurisdictional wetland delineation was done on this property. Mr. Hamel said he didn't know. Mr. Drake then mentioned the Commission had had an earlier applicant and they discussed how in a 12-15 year time period a wetland changed dramatically and impacted their project.

Mr. Drake asked Mr. Hamel if he could flip his plan in the back yard, and add grass in the wetland setback and move the pool closer to the house. Mr. Hamel said I chose not to do that because it would increase the costs to do the landscaping in the back instead of putting the pool out there.

Mr. McMahan stated removing a phone line where the nanny used to be may be a good trade off if you want your pool. The most important thing is to see if the wetland lines have changed. What is delineated could be against you or for your argument. Mr. Hamel stated he could bring back the engineer that worked with him when he replaced his leach field a year ago. It would be an additional cost, possibly a few thousand dollars just to re plot the wetlands. Mr. Drake asked Mr. Hamel if he could get a picture of the wetland area in question, and Mr. Hamel said no problem.

Ms. Wachs mentioned that there are a lot of dates on this plan, it is unclear when different lines were put in. Ms. Elmer clarified that a surveyor stamped the plan after marking/measuring the lot. There are no wetland scientist stamps on the plan, so I assume the wetlands have been drawn in from past records from 1994.

Chairwoman Evarts said she would like a wetlands survey to be done on the lot, just like the Commission requested another applicant to do a few months ago. She said I want to have that information and have you come back before this commission before we send a recommendation to the Zoning Board. Mr. McMahan stated that would be best for all. Ms. Rombeau said because this is for something entirely in the setback, not just a few feet in, a delineation would be best. It was mentioned that if he could come back with those results and photos that would help the Commission.

It was then discussed and clarified that the Commission wants the applicant to get the wetland delineation completed on his lot, front and back yards, and come back to the Commission before they send their recommendations to the Zoning Board. Mr. Hamel said will do. The application was tabled to April 24, 2018.

- **Earl Sandford – Review of a variance for a residential solar panel installation** 15 feet from the edge of a wetland where 50' is required at 597 New Boston Rd., Lot 6-29-14.

Mr. Sandford introduced himself and said today he is wearing his homeowners' hat. Basically I have been working on a solar project for a year. I needed a variance to put the solar array in. Mr. Sandford then described the layout of his property. He pointed out on the plan that they have an upper driveway that is used for the home and a lower driveway that is used for the business. He said I am attempting to become a little greener for both my home and business by putting in solar. I received an approval for putting the array on the roof, but it would require cutting a lot of trees and would harm the buffer between my property and the Pulpit Rock Area across the Street.

Continuing, Mr. Sandford said I came up with this new plan instead of going on the roof and doing an extensive cutting. If I move the proposed array to my parking area, it is a much more friendly area for saving trees. I also needed a variance, and we adjusted property boundaries with the neighbors. Basically after missing a few meetings, I went to the ZBA first. They were reluctant to do anything without Conservation Commission comment, but allowed me to go to their Board first as long as I went to your Commission after for comments and recommendations. I said I would come with an open mind to see if there was some way to make this plan better. He then showed a drawing of the "carport" design that has the solar arrays on top. Mr. Sandford then said the ZBA worked with me and I appreciated that. Prices for materials were going up, and the design will end up being a six port design. He mentioned the footing were re-purposed. He said the pond is stocked with fish and we play hockey on it.

Chairwoman Evarts asked Ms. Elmer if this was considered a structure and she said yes. Ms. Elmer said that is why he had to get the variance. The Chairwoman then asked Mr. Sandford if he had anything more to say before she opened the hearing to comments and questions. She then said she loved the presentation, and said the Commission appreciates the consideration for other options. She apologized for all of the weather-caused meeting delays,

Mr. McMahan asked if it would be an impervious surface under the top. Mr. Sandford said it was a hard pack gravel and mentioned there were cracks between the above solar panels, where dripping will occur and snow will be going into his driveway.

Mr. Drake asked why you were talking about a buffer strip. What is it for? Mr. Sandford clarified that was only temporary while he built the footings to help with erosion control. Mr. Drake then asked if the pond has an outlet and the answer was yes, across the town line, through culverts into New Boston. Mr. Sandford then pointed out a beaver dam area and said he doesn't see this proposal as having any negative issues with wildlife.

Mr. McMahan asked if there was grass between his parking area and the pond and the answer was yes. Mr. Sandford mentioned the scrub brush would not be taken out and Mr. McMahan stated the more vegetation the better.

At this time, the Chairwoman asked for any other comments or questions. There were none. She thanked Mr. Sandford for coming in. Ms. Rombeau stated she appreciated the effort to bring in more solar energy. Mr. McMahan stated he appreciates what Mr. Sandford is doing. Mr. Sandford was asked if his neighbors were alright with the project and he said yes. Mr. Drake said it is not creating a peak runoff into the pond, because it points into the driveway. Mr. Sandford thanked them for their time.

### **OLD BUSINESS:**

#### **Chairwoman update:**

- The Performance Zone wetlands setback issue is put on hold right now because of the MS-4 permit process and is tabled until next year.
- Chris Wells was reached out to regarding the Tarr Trust, where there seems to be a lot of activity going on there. We are asking for updates whereas we assisted in acquiring that property.
- The bat house project will be worked on by an Eagle Scout or a Trust and we will update.
- Boundary marker signs were ordered and all stocked up.

#### **Forest Stewardship Plan:**

Ms. Elmer said the RFP's went out. We asked for a three month turnaround to get the project completed, and we heard from a number of foresters that that was not enough time. Their spring and summer was already booked for this year, and it usually takes about a year to complete such projects. She then stated we re-issued the RFP with a due date of December of this year and the RFP's are due back in two weeks. We will keep you up to date and give you numbers at the April meeting.

**Foreco:** The Chairman stated that the Greenfield Farms boundary marking project was already discussed.

#### **Mission Statement:**

Mr. MacPherson was thanked for putting together a draft for the Commission to consider. The Chairwoman suggested taking out the words “for the benefit of its citizens”. Mr. MacPherson pointed out that for consistency, the words Commission and Committee should not be interchanged. Ms. Elmer stated she would fix that. Ms. Elmer then asked if the Commission would like to vote and adopt the mission statement tonight or wait until the next meeting.

Ms. Elmer then gave new members of the Commission a brief description of the three types of land the Commission deals with.

1. Town owned and town maintained. The Commission is in charge and do everything.
2. Privately owned land but with a Town of Bedford Conservation Easement on them. We monitor them and it is up to the property owner to maintain per their easement.
3. We own the land, but a different entity has the conservation easement, like the Bedford Land Trust. We own, they monitor and tell us if any problems are found and we have to fix them.

It was mentioned that there is a lot of overlap between observing and monitoring. If there are wetlands issues we notify DES.

Mr. Drake suggested changing the word “management” to “stewardship”. Ms. Elmer said she will re-do the mission statement with the changes for the next meeting.

#### **News Articles:**

Ms. Wachs said she did not have any updates for this meeting, and will report back at another meeting.

**MOTION: Chairwoman Evarts asked for a motion to adjourn and it was so moved. It was seconded and the passed unanimously.**

The meeting adjourned at 9:25 pm

Respectfully submitted,  
Christine Szostak