

Town of Bedford
Conservation Commission Minutes
March 28, 2023

A meeting of the Bedford Conservation Commission was held on Tuesday, March 28, at the BCTV meeting room at 10 Meetinghouse Road, Bedford. Present were Patricia Grogan (Chair), William Carter (Vice Chairman, Town Council Representative), Peter Sullivan (alternate member), Julie Donovan (member), Deborah Evans (member), Kathleen Bemiss (Town Council alternate member), Stephen Clough (Planning Board representative), Grant Killian (alternate member), Stephanie Jones (member), Rebecca Hebert, (Planning Director), Kathleen Ports (Associate Planner).

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chair Grogan called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and initiated Board introductions. Ms. Ports reviewed the agenda and stated the order of the meeting would be adjusted to New Business Item 2, Matthew Reed to be heard before Item 1, Bow Lane Next Gen, LLC.

II. Approval of Minutes: January 24, 2023

III. Dredge and Fill Applications: None

IV. New Business:

1. **Bow Lane Next Gen, LLC** - Review of a request for a variance from Article IV, Section 275-28A to allow the construction of a retaining wall greater than 6 feet in height within the wetland setback (ranging from 0 to 30 feet from edge of wetland) where 50 feet is required.
2. **Matthew Reed** - Review of a request for a variance from Article IV, Section 275-28A to allow the construction of an in-ground pool 41.4 feet from the edge of a wetland where 50 feet is required.
3. National Trails Day - June 4, 2023 1:00 PM to 5:00 PM
4. October Workshop Topics

V. Old Business:

1. Website Content
2. Marston-Dunlap Archaeological Study

VI. Other Business:

1. Update on previously reviewed permits and ZBA applications
2. Legacy Trails / Snowshoe Program Update
3. Trail Stewards Update
4. Pulpit Rock Subcommittee - February 2023 Meeting Update
5. Cub Day - April 15, 2023

VII. Announcements:

1. The next meeting of the Conservation Commission is April 11, 2023.
2. On March 29, 2023 there will be a Trail Stewards Open House between 6:30 and 8PM in the McAllaster Room at the Bedford Public Library. Stop by any time to learn more.
3. There will be a Pulpit Rock Workday on May 6 from 9AM to 1PM with a rain date of May 7 from 1PM to 4PM. Meet at the New Boston Road Parking Lot.

VIII. Non-Public Session:

Per RSA 91-A:3, II(d) for consideration of the acquisition, sale, or lease of real or personal property which, if discussed in public, would likely benefit a party or parties whose interests are adverse to those of the general community.

Chair Grogan read the Mission Statement:

The mission of the Bedford Conservation Commission is to protect, preserve and conserve the Town's natural resources and open space land for the common good. This includes stewardship and management of conservation land, protecting wetlands and vernal pools, and the planning and acquisition of land for conservation purposes. The Commission works with landowners to administer State and Town wetlands regulations and advises other Town boards, such as the Planning Board and the Zoning Board of Adjustment on environmental impacts and alternative considerations regarding development projects. The Conservation Commission promotes conservation activities and communicates with the citizens of Bedford on important environmental issues. Our motto is: *Keeping Bedford Beautiful*.

II. Approval of Minutes – January 24, 2023

Chair Grogan asked if there were any changes to the January 24, minutes. There were none.

MOTION: Ms. Jones motioned to approve the January 24, 2023 meeting minutes. Ms. Evans seconded the motion. ALL IN FAVOR – unanimous. Vice Chair Carter abstained from the vote. Motion carries.

III. Dredge and Fill Applications to Review: None

IV. New Business:

2. **Matthew Reed - Review of a request for a variance from Article IV, Section 275-28A to allow the construction of an in-ground pool 41.4 feet from the edge of a wetland where 50 feet is required.**

Mr. George Chadwick of Bedford Design presents: Good evening. My name is George Chadwick with Bedford Design. I'm here representing the Reeds tonight for a piece of property on Spring Hill Road. It's an existing home with a fairly good-sized lot, although the lot is encumbered quite a bit by wetlands. If you look at the plan that's in front of you and on the screen, the whole left-hand side of the parcel is wet. The lot actually has wetlands on three sides of the buildable area: on the left side, the bottom and on the right side of the lot there. What the Reeds would like to do would be to construct an in-ground saltwater

pool. That pool is shown on your plan and is located 41.4 feet away from the wetland with a 4-foot-tall fence around the exterior of that being located 36.5 feet. My understanding is because the fence is 4 feet or less, it's not considered a structure. So in this instance, the pool itself is the structure being 41.4 feet away from the wetland. We at Bedford Design located the wetlands flags placed by Gove Environmental. So we did have the wetlands flagged. We located the flags as well as all the improvements on this plan. So what you have in front of you is an accurate plan of what's actually out there. That's pretty much it in a nutshell. There is an existing shed that you see on the plan there, down in the V portion of the buildable area that appears to be installed at one point maybe in the wetlands or adjacent to the wetland and the wetland grew. I really don't know. The shed was there before the Reeds got there, but they are willing to take that shed and move it further upland from where it is located now and get it out of what's probably the wetland line. As I said, it's a saltwater pool. The filter will be located out of the wetland buffer. I'm not sure if you've got a saltwater pool. I don't. I've always had a Softswim type of pool or a Baqacil type of pool. But I'm being told that a saltwater filter does not need to be backwashed similar to a chlorine-based product pool, so there wouldn't be any constant backwashing of material that would flow down to the wetlands. What you do is you actually take the filter out. It's a cartridge filter type thing and you rinse out the filter. That rinsing can be done in the non-wetland area, and I would expect that to occur. With that, there's no additional trees to be cut. There is lawn now, so it'd be disturbing some of their backyard to install the pool. That's about it. They will be going in front of the Zoning Board next month and I'm here to listen to any comments the Board may have.

Chair Grogan asked if the Board had any questions. Vice Chair Carter said thank you, Madam Chair. When it comes to overflow, obviously back splash, over splash, is there an opportunity to maybe put some kind of a water garden or some kind of way of catching that? I know it's grass but getting towards the wetland to try to filter that a little bit more. I know it's saltwater. Is there a way that possibly we could put in something that is ornamental that can catch and filter some of that before it really flows further down? I have no issue with it being 41 feet. It's well within the area. But I would like to see some way of catching some of that, even though it's salt water, and treating it before it works its way down into the wetland. It doesn't really have to be something major, but it's more of a bump or something that when the water comes down... Mr. Chadwick replied I'm sure we can do something like that around the outside, backside of the fence. We could create like a little berm or something like that. I've been in front of the Board before and I've done several of these pool variances or buffer setback impact variances before and some of them I have recommended putting in a water garden, rain garden or something to that effect. In this one, I didn't. And I think the reason I didn't was that there was such a large amount of greenery or grass between the impact area and the edge of wet that it's going to filtrate into the ground. The grass is, the soil is going to absorb the minor amount of splash. But if the Board does feel that it's appropriate to put some sort of minor, little berm around the outside of the fence as part of a planting bed or something like that... Vice Chair Carter said the key is, too, you're taking away some of that green by putting the pool in. All the excess that would be coming in that grass, catching all that and filtrating through, it will give you another layer of protection. And it's not much. It's when you're out there doing all your excavation, you're really just kind of doing a little bit more. Mr. Chadwick said we'll have excess material anyways when we build the pool. Vice Chair Carter said that's pretty much what it is. Mr. Chadwick replied sure. No problem. I'm sure we could do that.

Ms. Bemiss asked where is the leach field on this property? Mr. Reed answered it's in the front yard to the right of the walkway. So if you're looking here, the front yard, that front walkway—to the right of that. Ms. Bemiss said OK. And then I'm familiar with this property from the previous owners. So, where you're anticipating putting the pool is currently ground that may have been filled in at one point in time as well.

I'm not sure that all of the disturbed area is going to have as good of drainage that you might anticipate. So with that said, along with Mr. Carter's question, is how much area is the patio? Is it an impervious area?

Mr. Chadwick replied yes, the area within the wetland buffer, there's a four-foot patio around the exterior of it. And that's simply just to get around the pool. We tried to limit that amount. Where you get up closer to the house, it does widen out outside of the wetland buffer or setback. Vice Chair Carter asked so technically the outside part of the pool is 36.5 feet? Mr. Chadwick replied correct. Actually, it'll even be less than that. There's a 4-foot patio. So, you take the 41.4 less a 4-foot patio is 37.5 and then a foot to build the fence. Vice Chair Carter replied OK.

Mr. Sullivan said I just had one observation. Probably saltwater pools, from what I understand, for years and years they do great. But if there ever were an issue where the pool needed to be drained having, I would guess probably on the order of 10s of thousands of gallons of salt water, that's kind of a headache of figuring out what to do with that. And the last thing that you would want is either put it into your septic system or just dump it out back into the wetlands because it's kind of what ancient armies used to do to kill everything and make ground non usable for generations to come is dump salt on it. So, the last thing that we would want is all of that water to just go into the wetlands with a few sump pumps if the pool needed to be repaired. And my understanding from a lot of pool water delivery companies is that they don't suck out and transport and dispose of salt water either. That's a conundrum and something to think about now is, Murphy's law: when something happens, what are you going to do with all of that water so that it's not going into the wetlands or killing your grass, destroying your septic system, whatever the case is. Mr. Chadwick replied sure. I think that's something we need to be cognizant of. I guess you have to weigh is chlorine worse than salt would be. Mr. Sullivan said chlorine dissipates, so chlorine in a pool after several months it's just water. Whereas salt, that's not going to dissipate. Once it's salt water, it remains salt water.

Mr. Clough said I think the charge before the Commission is the setback. We're going into details here about what is and what is not environmentally good stewardship. My opinion is that we should focus on the setback. And as far as salt goes, I know saltwater pools are...it's not salt water. It is saltwater, but it's very low concentration compared to say, seawater. And if the pool is to be drained, I don't see a problem with it going out into the street because they salt the streets every winter, every storm. I think that's one argument as far as the salt goes. So, my opinion is that we just focus on the setback and that maybe we do not provide undue burden on the applicant.

There were no further questions from the Board. Chair Grogan invited the public to speak. There were no questions or comments from the public.

MOTION was made by Vice Chair Carter that the Conservation Commission recommend approval of the request for a variance from Article IV, Section 275-28A to allow the construction of an in-ground pool 41.4 feet from the edge of a wetland where 50 feet is required, with a suggestion to put in a rain garden to catch any overflow from the pool. Mr. Clough seconded the motion. ALL IN FAVOR – Unanimous. Motion carried.

Mr. Chadwick said thank you very much. Appreciate your time. Chair Grogan said thank you. Have a good evening.

Mr. Sullivan asked do you mind if I just ask a question of clarification on my status? Am I an alternate or voting member? Because I know there are some recent emails about that, so I just want to know where

I am today. Ms. Hebert replied I don't believe the Town Council made any new appointments yet for Boards or Commissions, so hang tight. I think there may be some changes moving into May. Mr. Sullivan replied OK. Perfect. I just want to know what I'm doing. Thank you. Ms. Hebert said yes, Thank you. Vice Chair Carter said we're doing our Organizational on April 12th. So, there'll be more clarity. The two-week delay in the elections has put a delay on what we have to do as a Town Council to get that completed.

Chair Grogan moved to the next item on the agenda:

- 1. Bow Lane Next Gen, LLC - Review of a request for a variance from Article IV, Section 275-28A to allow the construction of a retaining wall greater than 6 feet in height within the wetland setback (ranging from 0 to 30 feet from edge of wetland) where 50 feet is required.**

Mr. Nick Loring of Benchmark, LLC presents: Good evening, everyone. My name is Nick Loring. I'm with Benchmark. We're the engineers on the project. The project is owned by Bow Lane Next Gen, LLC. Sitting to my left here is Al Sfeir. He's the owner of the property. The property is identified as Tax Map 20, Lot 22-14. It's located at Number 206 on Route 101. We're before you tonight because we're in the process of filing an application with the Zoning Board to allow construction of retaining walls over 6 feet in height within the wetlands setback. The Zoning Ordinance qualifies any wall over 6 feet in height as a structure, so therefore to construct those in the 50-foot buffer, we need a variance from the Zoning Board.

The existing site, it's a 2.66-acre site commercially zoned on Route 101, and it's just east of the Wallace Road intersection with 101. It's currently developed with a restaurant, some associated parking and other improvements. Most of you probably know it previously as Shorty's restaurant. The property has an existing onsite septic system here located behind the building in the back. There's the parking for the site provided by several aisles. When you pull in this main entrance, there's parking to the left and right, and also there's some parking up towards the back. All of this parking requires vehicles to back up and turn around. There are no empty spaces, there's no real site circulation, so to speak, with what's currently there and there are no drainage measures for treatment or mitigation of stormwater runoff from the site. We did have our wetland scientist, Nancy Rendell, from Blue Moon Environmental, look at the wetlands on site. She identified 2 wetlands. They're identified on the plans as Wetland 1 and Wetland 2. Wetland 1 is known as Riddle Brook. It comes onto the site. There are three 60-inch RCP culverts under Route 101 that flows from north to south and it comes down the edge of our property in this direction here. The Wetland 2 is on the south and west side of the property. So, it starts up in this corner, flows north and then it flows along there's some existing, I guess you call them ditches along the front of the property line, parallel to Route 101. That ditch line is bisected by the entrance driveway. There's a culvert under that to let that water flow through and continue, and that wetland 2 does eventually drain into wetland one or Riddle Brook. Portions of the existing site are developed currently in the 50-foot setback of these wetlands to the north, south and east side of the property. It's not so north, south and west. There's not so much here at the back.

There is 100-year floodplain as well on the property. If we look at this plan here, this orange line is the 100-year flood buffer, the limits of it. So, there's this portion when you pull in on the left that significant portion of that existing parking lot is underwater in the 100-year flood event. That 100-year flood does extend up the Wetland 2 towards the rear of the property on the west side. So, for what we're proposing with the site, the property owner wishes to redevelop the site. There are a couple steps to this. The first step is raising the existing building that's there. The second step is leveling the site to create a more flat, buildable area. The third is to construct the drainage measures and underground flood storage for the mitigation of the improvements that are being proposed, and the filling of some of the flood area in this

existing parking lot when we raise that grade. The fourth is to construct the retaining walls around the site. Some of these walls are over 6 feet in height, which will require the variance from the Zoning Board. It's one of the main reasons why we're here tonight. The last part is to construct the new commercial building. The building that we're proposing is approximately 11,750 square feet in size, does have a mezzanine, outdoor seating area and a drive through.

The current proposal has no wetland impacts. But there are impacts to the wetland setback. So, when you got here tonight, there's a couple of handouts that I just wanted to clarify. The change on those was on the existing conditions plan. So, with Wetland 1 that runs towards the east and Riddle Brook, that 50-foot setback to each wetland kind of overlaps and there's this little corner here. So, there was just an error initially. So, there's some of that area in the wetland tube buffer was shown. So, the area of the Wetland 2 buffer is slightly larger on the original plans. In post development, nothing did change as far as the impact. We just wanted to make sure we're comparing apples to apples and put that it's about a 40 by 40, so 1600 square foot area of that existing parking lot back onto the buffer impacts for Wetland 1.

You can see on this plan the Wetland 1 has an existing buffer impact of 3,500 square feet. That's the paved parking area. And then there's a gravel access drive up to the rear of the property. And there's two areas here. They totaled the 19,400, so that did go down slightly. So those existing buffer impacts are this yellow area here, and then that upper parking area is in the 50 towards the rear of the property. And proposed conditions plan. that impact to Wetland 1, it decreases from 3,500 square feet down to 2,700. So we have a net decrease of 800 square feet. And then in the Wetland 2, it goes from the 19,400 square feet of buffer impact up to 24,000. So there's a 4,600 square foot increase in that wetland buffer. The areas that mainly impact are up in these on either side of that rear to the rear of that existing parking and over to the left. You can see in this plan here those, the areas that aren't developed.

The methods we're using to avoid and reduce to mitigate our wetland buffer impacts. Stated before, this is an existing commercial lot along Route 101. It's currently developed as a restaurant use. The site layout has no drainage measures at all. It wouldn't meet a lot of today's requirements for site plan regulations. A few of those we discussed was the traffic flow, the driveway. When you drive in there, it's very steep. It's about 12 percent off the shoulder of Route 101. Department of Transportation typically wants to see 5% landing, so vehicles have a safe flat spot to pull out onto the highway. Some of the difficulty is with a lot of the triangular shape. When you look at that lot towards the east side, it does widen and then it does narrow down on the west side. It has a more unique shape to it that leaves a lot of that developed area on that eastern side of the site. These limit the redevelopment options that we have. We looked at it. We wanted to put the best option forward for raising, and then we thought that that would be raising the site in order to install wetland mitigation, our mitigation measures. There's a couple of mitigation measures that we're proposing. You can see on this plan here. The first one is to on Wetland 1. We're going to remove approximately 1,900 square feet of impervious area pavement and gravel that's right adjacent to Riddle Brook on this larger end here, that's about 24 feet further back. That pavement will be pulled out of the buffer. That's the removal of some area in Wetland buffer 1. Wetland buffer, 2 on this west side, there's 1,500 square feet in this corner that'll be pavement that will be removed. That area is about 30 feet in width. In all of these areas, they'll be restored with native repairing and buffer plantings from DES's planting list. To mitigate the 100-year flood storage impact, we're proposing underground storage for that in an equal volume to what will be filled in that area. These are underground chambers. They're going to have pipes that daylight through that proposed retaining wall to allow water to freely flow in and out of that storage area. There would be no impact on the flood storage volume that the site currently has. The second part is the drainage that we're proposing. Currently there's no improvements for drainage. In order to install these drainage measures, these walls will allow us to fill the grade in the

front and install underground chamber systems. There's one on each corner, front corner of the site, so there's one over here. And then there's another underground system here. What these Chamber systems will allow is us to provide the most amount of treatment possible for the stormwater runoff for the site. We'll be able to treat all of the proposed impervious areas. There's just a little bit of section of the entrance driveway that we're not able to capture. Other than that, the entire site all impervious areas will flow to one of the two underground drainage systems. Those two front corners are a little unique because they're the lowest spots on the site after it's in the proposed site. So, we're able to drain all of the runoff there. On the west side, there's some double great catch basin. And on the east side along Riddle Brook, there's a catch basin network. We have a low spot up behind the building and there's four catch basins to get that water down into that underground infiltration system. And we do meet or exceed all the Town's drainage requirements with this proposal. There will be no filing with AOT because we're at the 80,000 square feet of impact. But we did look at this using AOT's guidelines for stormwater. So, and more specifically, they're the water quality that they look at. When AOT looks at water quality, they focus on first flush, which is that first inch of rain. They have some formulas and some tables that we use to, that one inch of rain is based on how much impervious is flowing to each treatment measure that we have. And it gives us what we call the water quality volume and that that volume is actually stored in our underground chambers, and we elevate the outlet device so that water doesn't leave, and it'll infiltrate into the ground. We're trying to go and provide as much treatment to that runoff from the site as possible and we're taking no credit for that existing pavement. From the treatment standpoint of it, it's all based on whatever is proposed for new impervious area that it meets all of AOT requirements for water quality. That was our main objective. From approving the property, we really just wanted to focus on the drainage measures and provide that mitigation because we feel that that's really the best option. When you construct those walls in the front, it allows you to raise that grade and provide some underground treatment and it keeps that treatment. Without raising that grade, that treatment would be below the elevation of the wetlands. Parking there isn't elevated much, so you wouldn't be able to meet some of the separation, the water table, and you'd be in that wet elevation of the wetlands. That's everything I have. I'm happy to answer any questions that the Board may have.

Vice Chair Carter asked first of all, how high are those walls along 101? What are the proposed heights? Because obviously you're tending to raise this property up quite a bit. Mr. Loring replied yes, the wall profile shows the section. This proposed conditions plan—any of these dashed red lines are the walls that are greater than six feet in height. That entrance driveway, those walls are below the six. They do get taller on either side, but towards the end, these are all underneath 6—less than six feet. Same thing with the back here. It's anything in red is over 6.

Vice Chair Carter said basically, you're bringing the drive up to be a 5 percent versus where it is at 12 percent. Mr. Loring replied yes. Vice Chair Carter said that's a good thing. The other concern I see is, yes, you're putting underground storage drainage. What is there to catch in case you have a situation where you have a major leak...a car leaks. You have a problem. Yeah, I know underground is going to allow it to do something, but you're not really treating in case you have a situation where it's not just water going into that underground storage. Because your holes are at a certain height and all of a sudden now you have all that floating into Riddle Brook. Mr. Loring replied there are two parts. The water that flows, the underground storage for the mitigation of the flood is what has the culvert pipes. They're tied together with pipes, and that's what the water comes in and out of freely. The underground chamber systems are underground. They are a plastic open bottom arch that's encased in stone so that the water enters that—it has to be a certain height above seasonal high-water table because we are utilizing them for infiltration. So, there's a few ways that they achieve treatment. So there's kind of two parts. One is the pretreatment. They use what's called an isolator row. Where the main inflow of water enters into the first row of

chamber, that chamber is isolated off. It has a double layer of filter fabric on the bottom, and this elevation is, that's the lowest elevation and all the other outlets where it ties into the other chambers are higher, so it stores that. It provides pretreatment, it captures a lot of the sediment and trash. There's an access manhole. That's the pretreatment of it. And then the rest of the, once it captures that sediment, the bottom of that pond, so to speak, the underground chambers are where the treatment is provided. So the outlet of those systems are raised off the bottom. So water that goes in there or any contaminants on that first flush first inch of rainfall don't leave the system. Vice Chair Carter asked will that help you with winter? Because obviously I would think that this parking lot is going to be salted and snow is going to be stored on this property. Mr. Loring replied a few things with, when it comes to the salt. The biggest thing, and we've done this with a few AOT projects, is the best thing to do is to minimize your salt use. There's calibration of your equipment, training of the operators. They've been using brine pretreatment on parking lots to try and reduce the amount of deicing material overall that's used on these projects. One unique thing about putting these retaining walls around it is anywhere these front portions that are all in fill are going to have curbing and guardrail. So, all the snow that's contained on site when it melts will go to the treatment measures, and then anything that, if there's too much snow on the site, it would be removed off site. Vice Chair Carter said I would just want to make sure that that was put into all the information that the Zoning Board and anyone else further would make sure that that—I know we're only recommending possibility. The last thing, again, without seeing a concept other than what we have here, I applaud you for your attempt to do some mitigation. I don't really see benefit to that mitigation, per se, especially the one that is closer to Riddle Brook. I don't think it's big enough. It's just my personal opinion that it doesn't, I believe, what's the law? I mean, you're proposing so many square feet which is coming down to almost a pinch down towards the middle part of that? What's the max that is that mitigation of that triangle part? Mr. Loring replied the widest end adjacent to 101 is about 24 feet. Vice Chair Carter said like I said.

Mr. Clough said I feel that they only have so much space to work with and he's keeping it at a right angle. Vice Chair Carter said I understand that. Like I said, I started my comment with I applaud you for what you're doing here. I just don't think it's enough to make any factor. Yes, it needs to be put in there. I take it that the wall also is going to be taller than six feet there also.

Ms. Hebert said anything red is taller than six feet on the plan, and that's what the variance request is for the structure to be within the 50-foot set back. I was curious where the outfall was for the underground storage system closest to Riddle Brook. Will that outfall towards the brook? Because the outfalls can be pretty large. Mr. Loring said no. The outfall flows towards that Swale on 101. So it flows to the north here, that outlet pipe. There's a little bit of outlet protection there, so it'll flow in this end of wetland too. It wouldn't flow out the area that we're proposing to restore to the north. Vice Chair Carter said to continue, I hate to, but I just looked at this and if the wall was moved back further, that would definitely affect your parking situation? Mr. Loring said yes. Vice Chair Carter said I know someone mentioned to me that right now what's required is 77 and you're supplying 102. If that wall was not there and had to be pushed back more towards the building, that would eliminate the extra 25 spots that you're proposing in your 102? Mr. Loring answered yes, the additional parking isn't really the issue here because the majority of the parking is along the back and the sides on that side. It's to fit the area outside of building setbacks. It's the way that property, the triangular shape—it's forcing that building to be more towards that east side. And then from the edge of the building, we just have the 24-foot travel lane here. So there is no parking along that side. The extra number of parking spaces isn't the reason. Vice Chair Carter said OK. So the wall could possibly be moved back away from 101.

Mr. Sfeir said thank you for hearing us on this tonight. One of the reasons why we need this driveway on this side is for circulation. Later on this is going to be required by the Fire Department and Emergency Services. Otherwise, it will create a bottleneck in the back driveway. So this will create a safe, circular wrap around driveway for the building. That's why it's so critical to us. And if we want to move the building, shrink it more, we'll go back to the argument of just doing this. Honestly, I was recommended by my engineer not to take that out. They told me this is going to be very expensive. Vice Chair Carter said you're doing a lot of fill. If you're bringing the grade up... Mr. Sfeir said the fill is to really what's around the site. It's to make the site safe. To make it ADA accessible and safe. Otherwise, leaving the site the way it is and trying to use it the way it is, which it's been vacant for a while for the reason because it offers a lot of challenges: with the stairs, with the parking lot, with slip and fall, ADA access. We're spending all that money to make this site really beautiful and be part of the community in Bedford, and this site will be an added value once it's done. I hope you see it that way, and you'll help us achieve this goal. And when we say it's above 6 feet for the walls, we're not going above certain grade. The top side, it's all the same—it's the lower part of the site requires seven or eight feet. And still it's going to be below the grade of 101. So it's not going to be intruding. It's not going to be an ugly wall. It's going to be there to protect the watershed to the brook and it's going to provide a very safe environment. Vice Chair Carter said don't get me wrong, I'm not trying to tell anyone not to build on a piece of property that they're going to do. I just want to make sure that from this Commission's standpoint, that we are comfortable with passing our recommendation up to the Zoning Board and the Planning Board or wherever it's heading after it's here. I just want to make sure that I bring out what I think is being the issues to make sure that the rest of the Board understands what I see here. Mr. Sfeir replied, and I appreciate that. Vice Chair Carter said I'll sit back and let someone else talk. But that those were my concerns after reviewing this and I wanted to make sure I got this up here, making sure it's proper.

Ms. Bemiss asked I understand that you're here just for the variance on the walls, but my first question and maybe this is ignorant of me, is the yellow is completely within the wetlands setback. Is that correct? Mr. Loring replied yes. Ms. Bemiss continued so, essentially, everything in the yellow you will be touching and therefore we will be altering that portion of any wetland in that area. Mr. Loring said yes, there's significant disturbances in that existing buffer already. Ms. Bemiss said right. But what I'm saying is today we have a lot of wetlands that are very important in that area. And everything in yellow you're proposing to touch. Mr. Loring said yes. Ms. Bemiss said OK, so from my perspective, I'm not sure that I can make a judgement on a wall that's more than six feet tall without knowing exactly how that is all going to play out with the other wetlands. Does that make sense? Mr. Spear replied most of the yellow is a parking lot right now, that's pavement. Vice Chair Carter said it's currently disturbed now, per se. Mr. Clough added always has been, yes. Ms. Bemiss said, and I understand that because I've walked in the puddles there. My question is, we're going to further disturb that area with your construction, parking, all of that, and we're... I guess I'm not phrasing my question correctly. Does anybody know? Mr. Clough said not really further disturb it. It's a tradeoff. It's a parking lot for a parking lot. From what I understand, you're raising the grade. I've been there. I walked, just so I wanted to look up the Bow Lane site, during the rainy part of I don't know whether it's 100-year flood or whatever—you're right, that whole lower parking lot was completely flooded. And I think what you're doing here is you need to put in walls to raise the grade, so you don't have the flooding anymore. Mr. Spear added and to provide drainage. Mr. Clough added and structural integrity of the slope of the littoral zone of Riddle Brook. Mr. Spear said correct. Mr. Clough asked does that help? Ms. Ports said but, yeah, they're going to rip up what's there and put it all back in a different way. So it's not really a net change in that yellow area. It's going to go from pavement back to pavement. Ms. Hebert said the whole site, the area in front of the restaurant and behind the restaurant, would be graded to create a commercial pad site. Are you set on the use for the site? Is it a retail Plaza that we're talking about, or? Mr. Sfeir answered I'm proposing retail Plaza. If we get this

approved, it will be an about 11,000 square feet retail Plaza, and I think it will fit perfectly there and it will serve the community. It would be nice.

Ms. Jones said I was just going to suggest maybe if you could pull up the aerial view that's in the packet, that might be helpful to see that in comparison. I'm kind of picking up on what you were trying to clarify. When we get fill, or applications where there's a fill, it appears like that. That's how the map... When I read it at first, it was really difficult for me to discern why the yellow was there, but then looking at the aerial view that helps me see or clarify. I don't know if that will help at all, Kathleen. Ms. Bemiss said yes, I think it will.

Mr. Loring said this is the aerial view of what's there today. The second one here is a little less foliage, so it's probably a little bit easier to see. Ms. Jones said on your attachment, Number 3 for example, you have your yellow area highlighted. Is it about where the property line is right there on that aerial view? Mr. Loring replied no. That yellow area, Attachment 3, that existing conditions plan, that's along the edge of pavement down in this area that's in that buffer. It's this parking lot on the west, and then the one on the east here is the majority of those impacts. There's a little bit on this back area, but it's really that front parking area, that's all. Vice Chair Carter said it would be great if you just inlay this on top of that. Ms. Bemiss said I think that would answer my question. Vice Chair Carter said ...now you're taking Attachment Number 5 and dropping it right on to what the overview shot is. I don't know if that's technologically possible to do, but I think that's what everyone's, or at least what I'm hearing, is trying to figure out where this sit compared to that. That's all.

Ms. Evans asked can you just clarify the underground storage on the north edge in the corner there? Does that collect runoff just from the property, or will it also collect the runoff from 101, which presumably flows from left to right also into Riddle Brook? Mr. Loring answered there's a little bit of this area right in front of the site that does come down when we create that low point, but this northerly drainage system is just capturing I'd say kind of that eastern half of the proposed site. Vice Chair commented I think most of 101 will go into the drainage area before it gets to that parking area. Ms. Evans said thank you. I didn't know if it would help to mitigate what's coming up 101 as well. Vice Chair Carter said you definitely don't want 101 going into that pipeline. That would not be a nice thing if a lot of the runoff from 101 went into his parking lot and had to be treated that way. That would not be good.

Ms. Ports asked can you clarify for the Board, we don't have the benefit of a grading plan, so I'm just curious, is the wall the limits of grading? Or will there be grading beyond the wall? Mr. Loring said no. That wall is the limits of grading. Ms. Ports said, so, all the vegetation that's there along Riddle Brook now will stay during construction? It doesn't need to be removed. Mr. Loring answered yes. When you get to the back of the building where that area that we're removing kind of pinches down to the triangle—anything beyond the back of the building—we're maintaining that 50-foot wetland buffer in the rear there. That won't be disturbed. There is a little in this back section with the cut. There's a little bit to minimize those wall heights. There's a little bit of grading beyond that. You can see the tree line up to the property, but that's the only spot where it will go beyond the wall. Vice Chair Carter asked where is the water and the sewage coming in and out? Mr. Loring replied so, the abutting property to the back, there was directional boring under Riddle Brook for sleeves so that the proposed property we service by water, sewer and gas through these sleeves here. That existing septic will go away. Mr. Clough asked that horizontal drilling is all done? Mr. Sfeir replied yes. Vice Chair Carter said I believe that was the deal with Bow Lane. At least it's my belief that's what it was.

Ms. Ports asked is this property designed for, you said drive through? We don't have a footprint here where the drive through is. And is it a two-lane drive through? Is it a fire truck drive through? What is it? Mr. Loring replied yes. It's a two-lane drive through. It's on this easterly side of the building here in order to provide the proper stacking and not impact the parking spaces once you get to the back. So, it's on this side of the building, the east side, and the parking stacking for the drive through would wrap up around in this area. Ms. Hebert said the drive through would need a variance. That would not be an allowed use. Mr. Sfeir said we're not asking for it now. I'm not interested in it at this point. Vice Chair Carter said it wouldn't have anything to do with us anyways—a drive through. Ms. Ports said well, it affects how much space on that side.

Mr. Clough said I think this is really well done, because you didn't have much to work with here. I'm particularly jazzed about the Riddle Brook, because I don't know who was on the Planning Board when the Tux or Bridal Shoppe was put in on the other side, but I've walked that area and it's like there's violations all over the place. And I think this is great that you mitigate this littoral zone, the bank. Are you going to follow New Hampshire DES? Are they going to work with them to—you're not just going to throw seed down, right? Is there going to be some type of erosion control like a coconut mat or anything like that? Mr. Loring answered yes, we'll use all the all the recommended NH DES, the BMP measures for the work adjacent to the wetland. Our wetland scientists will work with us to give us some plantings off of that riparian buffer list so there's native species there on what we should plant in those two restoration areas. That's something, too. If the Commission has any suggestions on that or anything that they'd like to see, we'd be more than happy to provide. The final plan sets will have more detailed notes, but if there's something that the Commission would like to see as far as that, then we can certainly add that on. Mr. Clough said there's a U.S. Army Corps document out there on erosion control of steep banks, and you could take a look at that. And also, if you can plant maybe two or three trees. I don't know what space you'll have, but the tree root systems provide a lot more structural integrity than just plantings. Mr. Sfeir said we will. Mr. Clough said great.

Vice Chair Carter asked are there going to be any more plantings on this site? Or that doesn't work with us until it gets to the Planning Board for what the site plan looks like? Ms. Hebert said you could ask for a more specific restoration plan. Vice Chair Carter said it would be great to be able to not make this just a concrete section that doesn't have anything to catch. Ms. Hebert said because of the location of the retaining walls, there's not a lot of room for landscaping on the southern side of the site or between because of the wetland edge between Route 101 and the edge of pavement. But where they have the pavement being removed next to Riddle Brook, that area could be restored. That kind of striped section would be where you could add additional plantings. Vice Chair Carter said something has to be done with this site. It been there for a while and those that probably have gone to that before. It's tough from my standpoint knowing how tall the walls are, what it's going to look like. I guess something has to be done, and we're only here to recommend moving it to Zoning, right? Or is this going right to the Planning Board? Ms. Hebert replied no, would go to the Zoning Board for the variance request to have the retaining walls greater than six feet in height located within the wetland setback. And then those retaining walls also fall in the structural setback, the dimensional setback from the property line, so it would need the variance for the setback to the property line as well.

Ms. Ports asked and if they're requesting the drive through? Ms. Hebert answered I don't know if you're going to be proposing a use at the same time that you go to the Zoning Board, or if you're just looking to kind of create the commercial pad site? Mr. Sfeir said actually, we will move forward with the project, building it. We will build this building at the same time we're building the retaining walls. It will be done within eight months once we have all permits in hand. You have my commitment. I'll make sure

everything around the brook is protected. We will use all the measures needed to protect the brook. The whole idea is to basically not affect the brook as much as the site does right now. Vice Chair Carter asked is there any blasting going to be done? Mr. Sfeir said no. That big rock that you see there, I will remove it with a hammer. Vice Chair Carter said you've got to have a big hammer. Mr. Sfeir said that's one of the reasons I could do this because I'm a site contractor, by trade. I could absorb that extra cost. If you really have to sub this job to someone, the economics would never work. That's why so many people looked at it and they're like, this is a bone, and you want to walk away from it. I see it. It's a jewel and I think it's a great opportunity and it's going to serve Bedford for years to come. The location is great. It's close to the school, close to our neighborhood. We could use this location here. Vice Chair Carter said the look of it will come down to Zoning and Planning to make it make it look like it should be something that should be there, not just another concrete building. Mr. Sfeir said I will make it beautiful. Vice Chair Carter said again, this is this is just conservation. Your path is further down.

Ms. Ports asked for circulation versus drive through, is there a different need there on that side of the property? Mr. Loring replied the circulation would be—if it was a drive through lane, it would go to one-way traffic on that side. But the drive through lane requires the bypass lane, so the width of that driveway wouldn't change, so to speak, from two-way traffic to the drive through. Ms. Ports said I'm not sure I understood that. It sounded to me like if there was no drive through, it would just be a one-way lane around the back, and so it could be narrowed. Mr. Loring said no. If there was no drive through, these would be 2 lanes around the side. And if there was a drive through it would go to a single lane with a bypass. So you'd have two-way traffic everywhere except for this one area along the side of the build. Ms. Hebert asked could the building be not quite so wide? Because it looks like you have 6 retail tenant spaces in the building. What are the dashed lines through the building? Mr. Sfeir asked the boxes in the back? Ms. Hebert clarified, no, there are dashed lines that go northwest to south. Mr. Loring replied so, typically in these larger buildings, they're constructed in 25-foot sections and that's what those lines represent is the dividing of the either whether it's an individual unit for different uses, or if someone decides to take the whole space, those are the 25-foot breaks. With these larger buildings, 25 has always been the magic number and how it's been explained to us more from the architectural standpoint is that's how the buildings are broken up. It's mainly cost and being efficient with these and that's always the number that we try to shoot for. So that's what those dashed lines are, the 25-foot increments.

Ms. Evans said I assume this will be a single-story building. Mr. Loring replied yes, and then there's a a mezzanine in the back. Mr. Sfeir said it's a tall, single story, about 20 feet.

Ms. Ports said I just have one clarification. What is the distance now between the edge of the building and the wall where the drive through is? Mr. Loring replied the pavement width there is 24 feet. Ms. Ports said OK. And regardless of whether there's a drive through, can that distance be narrowed? Mr. Loring replied no, it's necessary for the traffic. Ms. Ports said but you could have one-way traffic without the drive through. Mr. Loring answered well I guess the argument of putting that drive around it is to provide access. Mr. Sfeir said if you want to do a pickup window, you need a lane for it. Ms. Ports said I understand that, but if you didn't have a pickup window, it could be narrower. Mr. Sfeir said yes. If you make the building shorter—I know where you want to go with this—you make the building smaller, then we can just stay out of that buffer zone completely. But then we go into the economics of it—the cost of the site, the cost of the site work then putting the building. We thought about this very well and we know the cost of construction, how high it is right now. If we're going to shrink this building or impede on it anymore, we're going to divert to plan A, which I didn't want to go there. It's just used the building the way it is, which is the worst thing we can do to the brook, if we're all concerned about the brook. We're

spending all that money to protect the brook. But then to basically shrink the building and just restrain us from operating there, it becomes not feasible for the project, economic wise.

There were no further questions from the Board. There were no questions or comments from the public.

MOTION was made by Mr. Clough that the Conservation Commission recommend approval of Bow Lane Next Gen, LLC's request for a variance for the construction of a retaining wall greater than 6 feet in height within the 50-foot wetland setback, for the site located at 206 NH Route 101, Lot 20-22-14-1, for the reasons discussed by everyone at this meeting.

Ms. Donovan duly seconded the motion. Chair Grogan, Ms. Donovan, Ms. Evans, Ms. Jones, and Mr. Clough all voted in favor. Vice Chair Carter opposed. Motion carried 5 to 1.

Mr. Sfeir said we appreciate it. Thank you. Mr. Loring said Thank you all for your time. Chair Grogan said have a good evening.

3. National Trails Day - June 4, 2023 1:00 PM to 5:00 PM

Ms. Ports said we've penciled in a National Trails Day for June 4th from 1:00 PM to 5:00 PM. That's a Sunday. The thought was that it would be a nice way to recognize all the trail work of the trail stewards by potentially having a guided walk on some of the recent work they've accomplished, or a guided walk on one of the other properties just connecting the community with the trail system that we have, and potentially also organizing a workday. We have a fair amount of backlog of trail work to be done. This might be a way to gain some additional community participation. I think it would be helpful to have a couple of folks who might be interested in volunteering to organize either some of the projects, identifying what they should be and just working out logistics and/or working with me to identify some people who might want to lead a walk. We're also hoping to open the Fairy House Trail that day. I'm not 100 percent sure it'll be ready, but that's a goal. So, that could potentially be one of the extra events that we do or one of the two trail walks that we do. If we think this is a good idea, it's something you guys are excited about, it could become an annual tradition that the Commission organizes or champions. So, I'm just looking for your thoughts on that and if anyone's interested in helping out. Chair Grogan said if you want to help out, just contact Kathleen. Vice Chair Carter said I'm not available that weekend. Ms. Ports said before that you could help identify some potential speakers for walks or something if you wanted to. Chair Grogan added anything you can contribute. Ms. Ports said right.

4. October Workshop Topics

Ms. Ports said I wanted to make sure I started earlier, if there's a specific topic or something that you're interested in, so that I had the time to look into a potential speaker or make sure I had enough time to prepare if there was some other big thing that you wanted to explore or do at the workshop. It would be helpful to have a list of things that you guys would be interested in learning more about or doing or how do you want to use that time, basically. You can throw out some thoughts or we can ask for some ideas at the May meeting because our next meeting is in two weeks. Vice Chair Carter said obviously, I would think that it would be nice to give us a couple weeks to think about it and having the April 11th meeting would be probably a better time to give us something to think about for the next couple weeks to be able to do this because it is just around the corner. Ms. Bemiss said yes, summer flies by. Mr. Carter said and then we're going to have six weeks until our next meeting. That's why it's probably best that, just to make sure that we all have some understanding, and we can get this done, which it's only two weeks away. Ms.

Ports said we could also do a field trip. So if you guys wanted to visit a property that you're not familiar with or look at some trail work or look at some trail issues and concerns, we certainly can do that as well—get outside.

V. Old Business:

1. Website Content

Ms. Ports said I just went ahead and printed out a little graphic for you guys. There's a clip of our existing website. I know that we can change the center and the right side. I think that we can change the left side. So what I did was went ahead and just outlined some of the content that I thought would be nice to have. I stole this concept from or borrowed the concept from the Amherst Conservation Commission, where they have the '*How to get outside, get informed, get involved.*' I sorted the links that way, and then had the meeting information super clear and obvious up on the right there. I keep thinking of more content. I would love to hear what you guys think should be covered under the *Get Informed* section and what we would like to see covered there. And I would encourage you to look at the Town Master Plan and what they identified in the Master Plan in terms of their hopes and dreams for open spaces and conservation and the future of Bedford, because that might give you some direction about what we should be thinking about for content. Vice Chair Carter said another good thing for two weeks from now.

Ms. Evans said I really like the layout, but we have meeting dates in three times. Vice Chair Carter said well, they're just placeholders. Ms. Evans said oh, yes, I think that would give you space to put other content in, but I really like the way you've divided it up. I think it's much more user friendly than our existing website. Ms. Donovan said I loved it. The font is beautiful. As Ms. Evans said, the layout is really nice. The colors are lovely, and I don't think we need to have the old meeting house pictured because there's not many wetlands running through it. But yeah, I think it looks great. The only other thing I'd just say, it says meetings fourth Tuesday. You should say usually fourth Tuesday, else you get people turning up here on fourth Tuesday. Ms. Ports said I did have something about workshops, but then it got too wordy. Ms. Donovan said I love the font, and everything looks great. Vice Chair Carter said there actually should be space for our calendar in here too, so that will help you with your 'usually fourth' because now ours we do twice a year meet due to school vacation. Ms. Jones asked can you insert a calendar? Ms. Ports said I don't know. I'll have to look into that. Ms. Hebert said the website is somewhat structured. There are forms that you can modify, but you can't change the overall layout of the website. So Kathleen has done a good job of fitting information in using the options that we have available to us. Ms. Ports said and we'll see. I don't know yet if it's going to work. Ms. Bemiss said I do know that the Town website as a whole is on our agenda. But it has been on our agenda. Ms. Ports said and I think would put a picture in the back again, but a different picture. Vice Chair Carter said maybe a nice picture of the Marston property there or something. Some of our recent accomplishments would be nice to have there.

2. Marston-Dunlap Archaeological Study

Chair Grogan asked do you have an update on the archaeological assessment? Ms. Ports replied no, there is no update. That last storm set us back again. It stays snowy in there for a while. I'm going to do a field visit out there this week and report on snow conditions to our consultant. And then we'll have a better idea when they're starting to schedule the work. I think that they've probably started the background research. Ms. Hebert said I drove by tonight and the snow has melted, especially around the site that's

being studied. Ms. Evans said can I ask if we have an update on the trails for Marston, when they might be operational? Ms. Ports said we wanted to wait until we had the study completed because we might end up doing some permanent changes to what we had originally proposed, but they're there and people are using them. So, you can use them. Ms. Bemiss asked may I ask a couple of questions or offer something? I was chatting with the one of the gentlemen from the Historical Society and he was providing me with some really interesting information about some of the research that they're coming up with from artifacts on the property. I won't give away his thunder, but very, very interesting. And then the thing that did concern me is that there are still break-ins going into the house, and there are architectural things related to that property as well. So, I'm concerned about loss and if we have any thoughts of how we can... Vice Chair Carter asked that's not on the property we own, is it? Ms. Ports replied no, it's not. And the state Historic society has been in the residence. They were invited into the residence, and they have recovered anything that they felt was of value and significance to the Dunlap history, in particular, and have removed those articles from the home. There is still a lot in there, and we've tried to offer our assistance or request access and it just hasn't been accepted at this point. The landowner knows the Town and the Historical Society are available and willing to help in any way they need. Ms. Bemiss said alright, because I'll buy a camera system and monitor it... go out and take care of it.

VI. Other Business:

1. Update on previously reviewed permits and ZBA applications

Ms. Ports said the January review at 37 Oak Drive with the enclosed porch in the wetland setback was approved by the Zoning Board. In December of 2022, you also heard a request for a variance to fill the wetland for a commercial building at 265 South River Road, and actually that permit was issued by the State. And then thinking back to June 2022, when we were considering the gas station and Wholistic Pet warehouse, that permit has also been issued to the SV 101 LLC. And that permit is valid for five years. I assume the same for 265, but I didn't confirm that. So there's been a little activity at SV101, but not a ton over the winter so I expect that will pick up again.

2. Legacy Trails / Snowshoe Program Update

Chair Grogan said OK, good. I just want to talk a little bit about our outing on February 16th. It was like 10:00 AM in the morning. It was across the street from Joppa Hill Farm. And unfortunately it was for snowshoeing, but we had to walk through, which was fine. And we went to the big Maple tree. So, I was a little disappointed. Ms. Ports said yeah that poor girl, she's hurting. Chair Grogan said yes, she's so sad. Vice Chair Carter said it's the state's largest one. Ms. Ports said I took someone out there yesterday and I have to admit that he was like you're looking at the tree now? I'm like. Yeah, it's right there. Look how big it is. Chair Grogan said I was like, wait a minute. There's got to be a bigger one. Ms. Ports said it is dying. But it's still the champ while it's alive. Ms. Bemiss asked is there anything we can do to help it survive? Ms. Ports said it's old. Chair Grogan said it had buds on it. Mr. Clough asked what species is it? Ms. Ports said it's a red Maple. They don't get very big. It's unusual to have a big red Maple like that. The top, with the last few storms, it just really... Chair Grogan said but anyway, it's a great group of people. We had so much fun. I only knew like one person there, but after we were done, we know everybody. It was so much fun. So it's such a short walk to the red Maple tree that we decided to do the whole field. We just talked, and it was good time. So if anyone is interested in joining, they can go on to the Parks and Rec and get the schedule for all of the hikes. It's great. So much fun. We had a lot of interest in the 55 and over like the senior hikes. And I led a trip on The Heritage Trail, and we talked about the bald Eagles that nest on Cartagena Island and we actually got the snowshoe on that one and it was interesting. Even at

Joppa Hill, a lot of the residents didn't even realize that we owned that side of the road. And so these little things are just such a nice opportunity to promote the Commission and the work that we do and let people know what's going on. They'll say well, I can never find a trail map. And I'm like, I promise we're working on that. And it just gets them excited again. We did the snowshoe trails out at legacy because we built new trails out there this year to try to reduce some of the conflict on the ski area with some of the walkers. And we had a moonlight snowshoe on January 6th, and we had like 15 people come and walked out at night and stopped and did some interpretive stuff. And then we did another one in March during the day. We had about 6 people and we talked about wildlife adaptations in winter. Chair Grogan asked is anything coming up? Ms. Ports answered no, but I think there's enough interest that if the Conservation Commission wanted to partner with Parks and Rec and do like a monthly senior walk, I think it would be really well received. Chair Grogan said we should do that. Ms. Ports said they were the most consistent group. Chair Grogan said all right. Do you need anything from the Commission at this time? Ms. Ports said I guess if someone's interested in helping coordinate or pioneer that idea because the Women's Club also does guided walks and so there might be a way to partner and just I think it's fun to hire somebody or have someone come and do an interpretive walk, so, finding somebody. I have a few contacts but getting that scheduled would be helpful. So I can give somebody the information and they can get it scheduled.

3. Trail Stewards Update

Ms. Ports said the trail stewards are meeting tomorrow night. We're having an open house and we're hoping to recruit a few more volunteers. We do have a backlog of trail maintenance that we are hoping to really go at gung-Ho this year. And so we're looking for some more of our weekly repair crew volunteers. And then we have a few special interests. Like getting some help, maybe with the National Trails Day, the Fairy House trails. The Pulpit Rock Subcommittee has, I think, 7 or 8 members and it has capacity for 12. So we would really like to get some new membership on that subcommittee. So that'll be tomorrow from 6:30 to 8:00, and you can stop by anytime. Chair Grogan said I posted it on the BBT site, and I got a few likes. So hopefully those are people that will come. Ms. Ports said that's great. We do have a new Facebook page. It's called Friends of Bedford, NH, Trails. So, you can follow it. We post when we're out working or where we're going to be, any meetings, trail status. Vice Chair Carter asked friends of New Hampshire Trails? Ms. Ports replied Friends of Bedford, NH. Ms. Hebert said it's being managed by a volunteer, too. Ms. Jones said Friends of Bedford Trails - Bedford, NH, is the right one. I just typed it into Facebook, and it pretty much redirected to me where I wanted to go. Ms. Bemiss said 73 followers. Nice. Ms. Ports said getting there. I have a volunteer who's managing all that for me, so that's great. I just send her posts and she makes it happen.

4. Pulpit Rock Subcommittee - February 2023 Meeting Update

Chair Grogan said in February, Deborah and I went to the Pulpit Rock Subcommittee meeting. Ms. Evans reported the subcommittee met on February the 8th. Ms. Ports updated the subcommittee on the Status of the Camping Policy, and it has since been finalized and posted on the Conservation Commission website. The subcommittee reviewed their priorities for 2023 and agreed on working to accomplish the following tasks: Firstly, update the trail maps and install new maps at kiosks and key junctions. To clean, update and repair all the kiosks. To update and install new trail signs throughout the conservation area. To remove and replace the damaged property name sign at New Boston Road, and to sponsor workdays. The first Trail Workday at Pulpit Rock will be May the 6th from 9 to 1. Planned for the workday, the trail stewards and members of the subcommittee are walking trails and identifying needed trail work. Projects will be selected at the next meeting on April the 19th. Thank you. Chair Grogan said thank you. When is

the next meeting? Did I miss that? Ms. Evans replied April 19th. Ms. Ports said that's the Pulpit Rock subcommittee, 6:30 in the police training room.

5. Cub Day - April 15, 2023

Vice Chair Carter said Cub Day is coming up real fast. You delay Election by two weeks and the Cub Day comes up really quick. It will be April 15th from 9 to 1. The bins will be out in the five locations by the end of this weekend. The library, there is already one at the Town Office. There'll be one at the Safety Complex. And then there's always going to be one up at the Transfer Station and there will be one at Joppa Hill. It's a great event, the 3rd Annual Cub Day. Clean up Bedford, April 15th 9 to 1. I hope to see everybody out with the blue bags. Once you fill them, leave them on the roadside and the Town will come and pick them up. If it doesn't continue to snow, we'll be ready to go on April 15th.

VII. Announcements:

Chair Grogan said OK, I have a couple announcements.

1. The next meeting of the Conservation Commission is April 11, 2023.

A reminder for all of you that our next meeting of the Conservation Commission is in only two weeks, April 11th.

2. On March 29, 2023 there will be a Trail Stewards Open House between 6:30 and 8PM in the McAllister Room at the Bedford Public Library. Stop by any time to learn more.

On March 29th, 2023, there will be a Trail Stewards Open House 6:30 to 8:00 at the McAllister Room at the Bedford Public Library.

3. There will be a Pulpit Rock Workday on May 6 from 9AM to 1PM with a rain date of May 7 from 1PM to 4PM. Meet at the New Boston Road Parking Lot.

And there will be a Pulpit Rock workday on May 6th, 9:00 AM to 1:00 PM. (The rain day is May 7th, 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM). Meet at the New Boston Road parking lot. More details will be made available when it comes near the date.

Reminder for Recycling and Composting:

This Commission and the Bedford recycling and Composting Committee urge you to recycle and compost. Food waste can be disposed at the Transfer Station where they convert it to compost used to treat our sports fields. That way, we, as taxpayers save twice. You can also recycle most of your garbage at the Transfer Station. The less we throw out, the less we pay for solid waste disposal and the better care we give to our planet.

VIII. Non-Public Session:

Per RSA 91-A:3, II(d) for consideration of the acquisition, sale, or lease of real or personal property which, if discussed in public, would likely benefit a party or parties whose interests are adverse to those of the general community.

Chair Grogan said I understand there's a nonpublic session tonight.

MOTION made by Vice Chair Carter to go into nonpublic session per RSA 91-A:3, II(d) for consideration of the acquisition, sale or lease of real or personal property which, if discussed in public, would likely benefit a party or parties whose interests are adverse to those of the general community. Ms. Bemiss duly seconded the motion. Roll Call vote taken: Mr. Sullivan Ms. Donovan, Ms. Evans, Ms. Bemiss, Mr. Clough, Chair Grogan, Vice Chair Carter, Mr. Killian, Ms. Jones all voted in favor. Unanimous. Motion carried.

The Commission moves to nonpublic session.

The public portion of the meeting ended at 8:33 p.m.

IX. Adjourn

MOTION was made by to leave nonpublic session at 8:44 pm seconded the motion. Roll Call vote taken: Mr. Sullivan Ms. Donovan, Ms. Evans, Ms. Bemiss, Mr. Clough, Chair Grogan, Vice Chair Carter, Mr. Killian, Ms. Jones all voted in favor. Motion carried.

MOTION to adjourn was made by Mr. Carter at 8:44 pm. Ms Jones duly seconded the motion. ALL IN FAVOR – unanimous. MOTION CARRIES.

The next meeting will be held on April 11, 2023.

Respectfully submitted by Sue Forcier