

TOWN OF BEDFORD
April 24, 2018
CONSERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES

A meeting of the Bedford Conservation Commission was held on Tuesday, April 24, 2018 at the Bedford Meeting Room, 10 Meetinghouse Road, Bedford, NH. Present were: Dave Gambaccini, Maggie Wachs, Michelle Salvatore, Mac McMahan, Phil Greazzo and Bob MacPherson. Beth Evarts, James Drake and Catherine Rombeau were excused.

Dave Gambaccini was appointed Chairman for the meeting, opened the meeting and had the Commission members introduce themselves.

Approval of Minutes:

March 27, 2018 Regular and Workshop minutes -

MOTION: Mr. Gambaccini made a motion to approve the March 27, 2018, Regular and Workshop minutes. Mr. McMahan seconded. The motion passed with Mr. Greazzo abstaining.

Dredge & Fill Applications:

Town of Bedford – Dredge and Fill permit for an in-kind replacement of two culverts on Sebbins Pond Drive.

Acting Chairman Gambaccini invited the representative for the Town to introduce herself and begin her presentation. Christine Parron introduced herself as a representative of the Town of Bedford's Public Works department. She said she is a certified wetlands scientist with the consulting firm McFarland Johnson. She described the wetlands application they were considering as for the replacement of twin culverts. They are located at the end of Sebbins Pond Drive and the intersection of County Road. These are side by side culverts, or twin pipes. The existing culverts are 15" concrete pipes, the proposal is to replace them in kind with new 15" concrete culverts because the existing culverts are deteriorating and this work is being worked on concurrently with paving operations planned for later this summer.

Continuing, Ms. Parron stated that additional culvert replacements will be carried out under routine roadway notifications that have already been submitted to DES. This particular location didn't qualify under the routine roadway maintenance process because DES does not allow twin

culverts to go under that process. The twin culverts are located between two wetland ditches that are classified as bluster and emergent scrub shrub wetlands, parallel to the roadway. At this time she pointed out on the plan shown on the screen the inlet and outlet of the pipes and showed the Commission photographs of the inlet and outlet of the pipes. She mentioned that about a month ago there was some standing water at the time the photos were taken, but the ditches do dry out during the summer so they do not anticipate any water issues during construction. Ms. Parron then stated that the proposed construction/replacement will result in 172 SF of temporary wetland impact. They will be limited to the immediate area adjacent to the inlet and outlet of the culverts and will be necessary and only temporary. The pipes that are going back in will be the same length and there will be no change to the roadway slopes. So no permanent impacts to either side of the road are proposed.

Ms. Parron then discussed the wetland permit plan. It shows the approximate areas of impact, about the same amount on either side of the culverts. This work will be completed during the dry season and all appropriate BMP's will be in place to avoid any concerns with erosion and sedimentation and again we anticipate the wetlands to be dry during construction. All disturbed areas will be stabilized following construction, there are no known or expected populations of rare species in this location and there are also no wetlands of exceptional value. Due to the minimal impacts that are required for this work, the project does qualify as a minimum impact project under NH DES wetlands rules. DES will expedite their review of the wetlands application should the Conservation Commission choose to sign off on it. Ms. Parron then stated she would be happy to answer any questions.

Acting Chairman Gambaccini stated he had a general question about process, not necessarily about this actual application. When you guys do these replacement, do you put in a new head wall, trap rock, is that whole area redone? Ms. Parron answered yes. He then asked if they were poured concrete head walls or precast? She answered typically they are precast.

Mr. McMahan asked if it was being built for a 50 or 100 year flood plain. Ms. Parron answered that the location is not in a mapped flood plain, so it was not taken into consideration. Currently there is no history of flooding in this location, it is not a stream crossing, and it's just an equalizer pipe draining roadside ditches. Mr. McMahan stated so it is sufficient and Ms. Parron answered yes.

Mr. Greazzo asked when were they originally installed? Ms. Parron stated she did not have the date. He asked if she knew how long they lasted, and she answered she didn't. She mentioned her co-workers may know the date, by guess is these usually last 30-50 years. I don't believe these were replaced in the past, so these are the original pipes. She was then asked if they are being replaced with similar material and she answered yes, with concrete. She was then asked what method was used to determine they were deteriorating. Ms. Parron said I believe just the

age, she didn't believe any extensive survey was taken as far as videoing through the culvert. Mr. Greazzo then stated you stated that it was deteriorating, and Ms. Parron said that is based on the condition outside. The headers are falling apart, the ends of the pipes are crumbling. Ms. Elmer stated that a lot of times these are replaced when rebuilding a road, so as not to leave a 30 year old pipe under new construction and in two years have the pipe disintegrate so it is usually done as a preventative measure.

Acting Chairman Gambaccini asked if there were any other questions. Mr. Greazzo asked what is the cost? Ms. Parron stated she did not know. Ms. Elmer stated you would have to check with DPW, she is just the engineer that designs the crossing. Mr. Gambaccini then said he doesn't know if the Commission has any recommendations or concerns. Ms. Wachs then said we don't make an approval, we make recommendations. Mr. Gambaccini stated we don't have recommendations for or against. Ms. Elmer stated you would recommend approval if that is what the Commission wants to do.

Mr. Gambaccini asked for a recommendation of approval.

MOTION: Mr. McMahan made a motion to approve the Town of Bedford Dredge and Fill application for in-kind replacement of the twin 15" culverts at Sebbins Pond Drive, in accordance with the information from the staff report of April 24, 2018. Ms. Wachs seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

New Business:

Forest stewardship plan RFP– Pulpit Rock Conservation Area.

Ms. Elmer stated that the Commission has sent out a Request for Proposal for a Forest Inventory and Stewardship plan for Pulpit Rock. She said she sent emails to 13 different companies that do this kind of work, and we only got one response. It was clarified that 13 were sent. She then said that the response that did come in was for \$3,940.00 and the RFP has not yet been reviewed to see if this proposal meets all of the criteria that we asked for. Ms. Elmer then stated that she is going to send out follow-up emails to all of the other 12 companies that did not respond, to see why they did not submit a proposal. Was there something wrong with the RFP? Was it too big? Was it too late in the year? To try and figure out why we only got one response. She stated it could be because these companies may already have all of their contracts done for this year. We will find out and I will report back to the Commission. For the next meeting we will review the proposal we got and send any information we may get from the other companies.

Old Business:

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. *(Continued from March 27, 2018.)*

Acting Chairman Gambaccini invited Mr. Hamel to address the Commission at this time. It was confirmed that pictures that were taken of the subject property were included in the Commission packet materials. Mr. Hamel said that since the last meeting, he has had his plot plan adjusted. The question was was a wetland delineation performed and it was by Josh Green, a certified wetlands scientist is December of 2017. The photos that I submitted show where the pool would be and shows edges of the proposed pool and the edge of the wetlands. The purpose of the photos was to demonstrate that even though there are wetlands on the property, I have never had water in there at all. Mr. Hamel mentioned he has a picture showing the back of the shed, that abuts the wetland, it shows everything is dry. The entire area is dry. The area that was delineated as wetland is dry and there is not mud, or puddling of water on the property. I am requesting the variance for the 22 feet from one side and 36 feet from the other be granted so I don't have to dig up and re-route power lines, telephone lines and cable lines. Also, I am concerned that by my deck there is a second well, and if I bring the pool much closer there is a concern that it may cause damage to that well, which would be a hardship because I could potentially lose that well.

Continuing, Mr. Hamel stated in addition, there has been precedence established by the Conservation Commission where I have found that there has been eight different times that a variance has been granted for wetlands setback with one for a new home in which the house was allowed to be 7' away from the wetlands. I am asking for 22' from the wetlands on a lot that is perfectly level and dry. Ms. Elmer then clarified, that it has been mentioned numerously that the property is dry. Wetlands are not determined by how wet they are, they are determined by soil type. She then said the Commission does not approve or deny variance setbacks. All they do is send their minutes and recommendations to the Zoning Board of Adjustment. It is the Zoning Board that grants a variance, the Conservation Commission looks over the application and recommends to the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Mr. Hamel thanked Ms. Elmer for clarifying that.

At this time acting Chairman Gambaccini asked if there were any questions or comments from the Commission members. Ms. Elmer suggested that Chairwoman Evert's e-mail be read into the record. Mr. Gambaccini stated he would read the pertinent sections of the e-mail. Ms. Elmer stated he should start with the sentence "In regard to the swimming pool..." Acting Chairman Gambaccini stated this is from Chairwoman Beth Everts, who is unable to attend tonight:

"Regarding the swimming pool request from Thomas Hamel at 201 Campbell Road, I would like my comments noted that I do not recommend a variance be granted to allow a swimming pool to

be constructed within 22 feet of a wetland edge, where 50 feet is required. While I realize citizens can pave directly up to the wetland edge a source of much debate amongst the Commission allowing a pool within this protective zone, in my opinion, would create a precedent that I am certain we do not want to set for the Commission going forward. My reasons include the concerns of chemicals that would be used in the pool water, what happens if there is a leak, the storing of the pool chemicals and the electrical wiring leading up to the pool. I am making an assumption, since we live in NH, that the applicant would want the pool heated, leading to more construction and disturbance within the 50 feet. Not to mention the construction of the pool itself will create additional disturbance along with storage of construction materials. I am hopeful other Commission members can provide their comments and feedback and my vote on the issue would not be in favor of this variance. Thank you, Beth.”

Mr. McMahan stated I believe that previously our discussion would be that you would check with the actual or any updated delineation of the wetlands, and you have done that. Mr. Hamel stated yes I have. Mr. McMahan said that was in hopes that you might get that expanded if that is the case, and that is not the case. Mr. Hamel said right. Mr. McMahan stated you are not asking for a small variance, it is a considerable one. I think we also discussed that there are other places to put the pool but you did not want to move a phone line that was put in for a nanny before you moved in. It seems that you physically have the room to put a pool in without putting it where it is on this plot plan, even though it may cause you inconvenience. I agree with Beth that the precedent would go up the Zoning Board because we don't do that, and I don't know why the Zoning Board may have granted it in the past, so neither one of us can speak to that, but the issue is it is possible to put your pool in without putting it extremely close, relatively speaking to wetlands.

Mr. Hamel asked what would you propose, requesting a variance but maybe for further away than 22 feet? Mr. McMahan said I think we probably set some time ago the limits to how close you can put a pool to a wetland, and I would like to think it was done with good science and the best interest for the town of Bedford and for our designated wetlands, whether they be wet or not. You could put your pool in, if you wanted to, within the limits. Mr. Hamel said even moving it up to the house, abutting the house, would still be encroaching upon the wetland setback. Mr. McMahan said perhaps, depends on how you design the pool and there are many homes where the pool goes right up to the house. Mr. Hamel stated he has seen the same, my concern is my deck, if it is too close to the pool and it becomes a safety hazard. Having small children around who may want to jump into the pool, which would be the last thing I would want for anything to happen to anybody. Mr. McMahan stated of course, but that is why you build fences. Mr. Hamel then stated in that case there would not be a fence between the deck and the pool, because the fencing would be around the house and pool, an open area. So the fencing would give one level of protection but could not prevent someone from jumping off the deck,

and knowing little children they will find a way to jump, and that is my concern for bringing it closer.

Continuing, Mr. Hamel said possibly I could do to hopefully satisfy the Commission is I have a draft where I propose bringing the pool 10 feet closer to the house and moving it 10 feet as you are facing the pool from the back of the house to the right. Ms. Elmer asked if that gets him into the 25 foot side setback. Mr. Hamel said there was no way I could get the 50 foot setback clearance. Ms. Elmer said right, but you said you were going to move it forward 10 feet and to the side 10 feet...would you meet the side setback from the property line which is 25 feet. Mr. Hamel said yes I do. Mr. Hamel then passed out a draft, and stated that even with this draft portions of the pool will still be in the 50 feet but will still be 35 feet and 36 feet from the wetlands. So I would be needing a 14 or 15 foot variance for a setback. Basically the pool is pulled up 10 feet closer to the house and shifted 10 feet over towards the left, and it will still meet the setback for the property line of the 25 feet and all of the other requirements with the exception of the wetland setback.

Mr. McMahan stated it still looks like you could bring that pool south. Mr. Hamel said, no not without digging up the irrigation lines and power lines to the well and the possibility of causing damage to the well. Mr. McMahan said the well is to the right of the deck. Mr. Hamel said yes, I have two wells on my property. A member mentioned that just by looking at that diagram you have a fair amount of room to move it without encroaching on that well. Mr. Hamel said the plan would be with this proposal is to put on further grass surrounding the back and sides of the pool to give better drainage. Bringing it up much closer will cause a problem. Because as I said earlier, there are power lines underground to the cable tv and phone and also to the irrigation systems on the corner of the house. He pointed out various sections of his lot where power lines were located underground. Mr. McMahan asked if he had all of those lines listed and plotted so the Commission could see them. Mr. Hamel said I don't have them, they were already on the property before I bought it. I wouldn't even know where to find them unless I start digging up my yard. Mr. McMahan said I understand why this would be a problem for you, but I think you still have a problem with wetlands separation.

Mr. Hamel said if I could provide the list of the eight exceptions that the Commission has granted waivers from being within 35 – 7 feet from wetlands. Ms. Elmer asked if all of those were for pools. Because there is a difference between a structure and a pool. Mr. Hamel said one of them was for a pool. Ms. Elmer asked if that decision was from the Conservation Commission or from the Zoning Board. Mr. Hamel said he pulled it off the Conservation Commission notes/minutes. Ms. Elmer said you also have to look at the Zoning Board, because the Zoning Board and the Conservation Commission are two different Boards and even though they may recommend or not recommend, the Zoning Board does not always match what the

Conservation Commission does. It's complicated. Mr. Hamel stated I understand that, but the recommendations were from the Conservation Commission to approve the variance.

Ms. Wachs stated she cannot speak to the precedent, but she did have a question about what you said earlier. Between the proposed pool area, and I'm talking about the plan where we are looking at 22 feet, the original plan, between the pool and the house there are irrigation lines and power lines etc. So where the pool is located on this plan, would there be no disturbance at all over these things? Or would you have to do some re-routing? Mr. Hamel said I don't know. Ms. Wachs asked how far back does your irrigation go? Mr. Hamel said it goes back to probably 25 feet up to the pool. Ms. Wachs said so given construction and what needs to happen those things will probably need to be disturbed regardless of where the pool goes? Mr. Hamel said very possibly, I don't know. She said if we are talking about not disturbing these things at all or disturbing them in some way regardless of where the pool goes I think that does impact the recommendation a little. Mr. Hamel said more importantly is the well. It is an approximate 400 foot well, and I am more concerned but not definitely sure that bringing in heavy equipment to dig and cause enough vibration to collapse that well. Ms. Wachs asked if this was the secondary well you use for irrigation. Mr. Hamel replied yes. She said I could see that happening, but if this map is to scale it looks like you have a good 60 feet to work with here. Between where the pool is proposed and where the well is now. Mr. Hamel clarified that my drinking water well is about 60 feet away, the other is about less than 10 feet from the decking footings. Mr. Wachs said right, I was thinking the pool doesn't come anywhere near that. Mr. McMahan said it looks like you have room for an excavator to go through the east side of the property. He then asked Karin if the utilities would have some sort of record like Dig Safe? Ms. Elmer stated no. They know where it comes from the street to your home. But when a contractor does work in your back yard they don't keep track of any of that stuff. Mr. Hamel said he did get Dig Safe for a new septic system in the front of his property two years ago, and had them plot it.

Mr. MacPherson said for a point of clarification, both of these wells are needed to service your home? One is for drinking water, and the other was originally going to be the main well, but had a lot of minerals in the water so the one closest to the home I use for irrigation. Because the water is probably better for my grass than the water coming out of my tap, because it has the minerals already in it. I lost my drinking well 6 months after I bought the house and that was 600+ feet. So I am overly cautious that I don't take all of my water from the same spot, the same water vein. That is the purpose for the two wells. Mr. McPherson asked for the dimensions of the pool. Mr. Hamel said the pool is 26 feet by 40 feet. It is in the shape shown on the plot plan.

Mr. McMahan stated he would like to say he agrees with the rationale of the letter from the Chairwoman Beth Evarts that was read to the Commission earlier. Ms. Wachs asked if we want to vote on a recommendation? Does anyone have any other questions or at this point would we vote? Mr. McMahan asked if there is any other discussion? Acting Chairman Gambaccini

asked the applicant if he had any further questions for the Commission and understanding, as clarified by Ms. Elmer, that our role is not to approve or not approve. Our role is to just make a recommendation that the Zoning Board looks at, and the Zoning Board is the one that makes an approval. We just make recommendations on what the Town has asked us to do to protect the Town as Stewards of the land and wetlands are something we are keeping an eye on. I know I cannot speak to any of the previous variances, I don't think anyone here could. Every situation is unique, everything that you have brought is good information. We simply have to look at this and understand what we are trying to achieve, what is the precedent we are trying to set for these setbacks. I see a lot of other options that may not be favorable for you as the homeowner knowing that I want to provide a nice area, a nice pool a certain size and shape, and there are a lot of options that could get us closer. This is not to scale. Mr. Hamel clarified the plan is to scale. Mr. Gambaccini said I meant out with a measuring tape out on the lot to see how everything is laid out. A installed pools and irrigation in the past, I don't know why any of those lines would be anywhere but within a few feet of the house. I look at it as moving irrigation, electrical and some conduit while an inconvenience is not difficult. If it gives us the opportunity to bring us within the setbacks it is an easier conversation for the Commission. These are specialized pools. A lot of folks have a 16' x 32' pool and it suits the needs for cooling off. So changing the size or shape, I hear us struggling with the idea that there is potentially other ways to get the pool in so at least the Conservation Commission role for making recommendations could be more clear.

Mr. Hamel said I want to go back and say there was one instance where the Conservation Committee approved a variance for a setback for a pool and the distance was 30 feet from the wetland. When I read that, that is why I went back to the people who did my plot plan to move it over to see if I could get further than the 30 feet and I have done that. Precedence has already been set. Ms. Elmer clarified that the ZBA doesn't set precedent. Mr. Hamel said the Conservation Committee gave approval to it, I read that in the minutes. Mr. MacPherson that is difficult for us to address without knowing all of the specifics. Mr. Hamel said I can give it to you. Mr. Gambaccini said I guess what we are saying is it is sort of irrelevant. I drive down 101 doing 45 and I may get a warning, and you are behind me doing 44 and you may get a ticket. There's a lot of variables that we are unaware of. Mr. Hamel said I am trying to satisfy the requirements for what you are looking for, what's best for environment and also something that is workable without having kids on a deck jumping off a hot tub into it. Knowing my six grandchildren it would probably happen. So it is more of a safety issue.

Mr. McMahan asked Mr. Hamel if he would be willing to come back again, and put that pool within the fifty foot limits and present that? Mr. Hamel said I don't think it is going to be doable. I can look into it, have my civil engineers take a look at it to see what they could do. He then said the deck on the back of my house extends further back then the back of the house, that's approximately 10 feet and that limits how far I can do. I can't bring it closer to the house

because they have to bring in a back hoe, they need access to it. Mr. Gambaccini said he is looking at a Google Map of your neighborhood and some of these pools look a lot closer than 38 feet, they look like part of the house. Mr. Hamel said my next door neighbor's is like that because it was the only place they could put it. Mr. McMahan mentioned I remember talking about this last time. Mr. Hamel said I have had that with some of my other homes but I did not have the restrictions that I have with this lot, to have it installed and not be a safety hazard. I don't think there is anywhere on that plot plan showed that I can put the pool without encroaching on the wetlands.

Mr. McMahan stated he was sorry Mr. Hamel will not come back to meet again with the Commission. Mr. Hamel stated I am not saying that. Mr. McMahan then asked if anyone else on the Commission had any comments. Mr. Gambaccini asked if they should ask for the option for more information before they make the recommendation to the zoning board? Does that seem like the reasonable next step to try and help Mr. Hamel? Ms. Wachs said she didn't know that there was any leeway with the rule, it seem like a hard and fast rule.

MOTION: Mr. McMahan moved that the Commission gives a negative recommendation to the Zoning Board for an in-ground pool to be 22 feet from the edge of wetlands where 50 feet is required at 201 Campbell Road, Lot 16-8-7, as outlined in the staff report of April 24, 2018 and per these deliberations. Ms. Wachs seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Hamel asked that the motion be clarified because he passed out a draft option in which the pool would not be 22 feet from the wetland. Ms. Elmer asked the Commission to clarify if they were not recommending plan A, plan B or both. It was clarified the Commission was giving a negative recommendation to the Zoning Board for BOTH plan options.

AMENDED MOTION: Mr. McMahan amended his motion to include that both plans submitted for consideration from the applicant are not being recommended. Ms. Wachs seconded the amended motion. The amended motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Elmer stated that the applicant Mr. Hamel can still go to the Zoning Board even though the Conservation Commission is not recommending either of the two proposals he presented. She said she would go over the process with Mr. Hamel. He said that sounds good. Mr. McMahan stated he strongly suggests Mr. Hamel go to the Zoning Board. Ms. Elmer clarified the Zoning Board has a different set of regulations that they have to follow and it can get confusing. Mr. McMahan thanked Mr. Hamel for coming in, Mr. Hamel thanked the Commission for their time.

FORECO project at Greenfield Farms.

Acting Chairman Gambaccini asked Ms. Elmer if she had an update on the FORECO project. She stated yes, we do. She said for those of you who were not here for the last meeting, last year the Conservation Commission hired FORECO which is a Forestry Company, and one of their foresters Ron Klemarczyk to go out to Greenfield Farms to mark all of the boundaries of all of the Open Space along the property lines with the homeowners. When that subdivision was done, we didn't have requirements or signs to mark these, but today we do. Any new subdivisions that go in today, the back boundary line has to be marked with Open Space signs. We asked Ron to give us an estimate and he said because it was such a big place, he wanted to do just one street to see how long it would take to do one, and then he could figure out how much it would be to complete the subdivision. He did finish Winding Road, this week and he sent over an e-mail with how much time it took and how many missing bounds he found, and how many signs he put up. There is a total of 344 homes at Greenfield Farms, so now he is going to submit a proposal for what it would cost to do the entire Greenfield Farms with all of their open spaces and a time frame with which he thinks he can get it accomplished. We will have that for you for the May meeting and the Commission can decide if they want to split it between years, or pay for it all at once.

Mr. McMahan asked Ms. Elmer to explain why it is important to delineate those lines. Ms. Elmer stated the Conservation Commission is responsible for that land. We have to do easement monitoring on it every year as part of the stewards of that property. What we found over the last couple of years of doing easement monitoring, was a lot of homeowners have "yard creep" because no one lives behind them many try to make their yards a little bigger, not even knowing where the boundary markers are. It's not done intentionally or maliciously, people throw grass clippings back there, extra stuff goes back there. We first want to delineate and show where the boundaries are, and then we will probably do an educational package for all of the homeowners letting them know what the Open Space is and why it is important to keep their stuff off of it. We are not yelling at people. It's a process we are going through.

Mission Statement review:

Ms. Elmer said the Commission was tasked with making and changes or suggestions and The Chairwoman Ms. Evarts and Vice-Chairman Mr. Drake were interested in being part of that discussion and they were hoping you would be willing to table to next month's meeting. The Commission agreed to table the Mission Statement discussion to next month's meeting.

Social Media Commission news articles:

Ms. Wachs stated she does not have an update at this time and needs to talk with Chairwoman Evarts.

Enclosures:

Master Plan Announcement: Ms. Elmer stated an RFP went out for the Master Plan and there have been submissions and a subcommittee is reviewing the companies. A company has not been picked yet. Once a company is picked, then there will be meetings with them to discuss public engagement and the Commission will be kept up to date as the project continues. Chairwoman Evarts will be the Conservation Commission representative on the Master Plan Committee, but as they do chapters, when the Conservation chapter is being worked on the Conservation Commission members are encouraged to come and participate for those specific chapters. There will be different types of outreach and meetings. All of the public is welcome to attend all of those meetings. Mr. Gambaccini stated as volunteers of the Town, it would be good for the Commission members to share this information with other community members so their voices can be heard. Ms. Elmer stated it is a two year project. It will be completed chapter by chapter.

Brochure: Vacancies for alternates for the Commission:

Acting Chairman Gambaccini spoke about a hand-out distributed by Ms. Elmer. It is regarding vacancies on the Conservation Commission, and it was mentioned the flyer has been distributed around to the Town buildings and on the website. Ms. Elmer stated there is a volunteer opportunity page on the website that you can go through and fill out. The Town Council makes the appointments to the Commissions. Hopefully we will get some new members.

Pulpit Rock Conservation Area Annual Spring Workday: May 12, 2018, 9am.

Ms. Elmer stated this is separate from the grant. This is the annual clean up day at Pulpit Rock, being Saturday, May 12 at 9am. Interested folks can meet at the New Boston Road parking lot. Ms. Elmer stated everyone is invited, and a coordinator assigns tasks including blazing, picking up trash etc. Mr. Gambaccini mentioned someone could help out for an hour or eight hours. Ms. Elmer stated remember your bug spray, sun screen and water.

Other Business:

Routine Roadway Maintenance: Ms. Elmer had a few updates. She mentioned that there are different types of permits to do road construction and repairs. There is “routine roadway maintenance” and this is something the Commission does not review. If a single culvert is replaced in kind, or they are cleaning out ditches, that kind of thing, that is not a standard Dredge & Fill permit. You don’t review those. But I want to tell you that we have the routine roadway maintenance notices that went to DES for portions of Gage Road, Pheasant Road, Barrington Drive, Sebbins Pond Drive, Heather Drive, Teaberry Lane, Bayberry Court and Sandy Pond

Parkway. We are announcing this in case people see someone digging on the side of the road, this is the reason on the streets.

Bedford Land Trust: It holds the easements on a few of our properties, and they monitor those properties. They have been working on part of the Joppa Hill property, and our trails are interconnected with the Amherst Conservation land. They have had a lot of trouble with ATV's up there. So they will be posting no ATV usage on those trails, so if you see people putting up signs in that area it is the Bedford Land Trust. Also, the Van Loan property has a pedestrian bridge that is in disrepair, so they are working with DPW and the Town Engineers to see if that bridge has to be totally replaced or repaired, and what the extent is.

Acting Chairman Gambaccini asked if the Commission needed to go into non-public and Ms. Elmer stated no.

MOTION: Acting Chairman Gambaccini asked for a motion to adjourn. It was moved by Mr. MacPherson. Ms. Wachs seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

*Respectfully submitted,
Christine Szostak*