

Town of Bow
Planning Board
10 Grandview Road, Bow, New Hampshire 03304

Draft Minutes
October 20, 2022

The Town of Bow Planning Board met on Thursday, October 20, 2022 at 7:00 PM In Room C of the Municipal Office Building. Chairman Berube opened the meeting with a roll call of the Board.

7:00 ROLL CALL

Members present were Chair Don Berube, Jr.; Vice Chair Sandy Crystall; Secretary Adam Sandahl; Selectman (Alternate) Bruce Marshall; David Glasier, member; Mike Lawton, Alternate; and Ginger Iverson, Recording Secretary. Garth Orsmond, Mike Wayne, Jonathan Pietrangelo, Kip McDaniel, and Matt Monahan were excused.

Chairman Berube appointed Mike Lawton as a voting member to reach a quorum.

I. MINOR MODIFICATION/CONCEPTUAL CONSULTATION- None

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chairman Berube read the item into the record.

1. Application # 410-22 Town of Bow – Aquarion Water Company Wetlands Protection Conditional Use Permit to provide additional source water capacity for the Village Shore Estates. The community of just under 100 houses has insufficient source of supply and is under a DES mandate to find additional capacity. Block 9-4, Lot 56, RU Municipal located at 104 Page Road, Bow NH 03304

Chairman Berube invited the representative of the application to present the case for this application. Josh Davis, PE of Aquarion Water Company introduced himself. Mrs. Crystall recused herself from this discussion.

Mr. Davis stated he would like to clarify the permit they submitted. There was some confusion for what he should put for disturbance areas for both buffer and the wetlands. Based off a meeting he had with the Conservation Commission, the request is 1200 sq. ft. of disturbance in the buffer zone only. This is for the granting Aquarion access to drill a test well, then determine how much water is in it. They would come back for the pipeline for it and the path, so that would be a separate disturbance.

Aquarion Water operates the White Rock System which serves just under 100 houses in the Village Shore Estates. They do not currently have enough water supply to sustain it. A couple of gallons per minute leak crushes their system. Over the past few decades, they have worked on the wells and over the past two decades they have been declining. In 2004 a study was conducted in the area. It found that Lot 56, site A was the best area. This is the one they are proposing to start with. The access road out to site A is pretty wide. There will be selective clearing to get out there with a drill rig. They are going to add a rock ramp to get over granite boulders. They'll restore what has been done. They will monitor restoration work through all this. The Hydrogeologist feels there is water present, on the wetland border, so they slid this back a bit. None of this work will be in the wetland. There is a potential vernal pool over 50 ft away. It is literally just outer buffer zone impact. The conditional approval received from the Conservation Commission was contingent upon power to supply the pump in the well. This would be drilled in and run the wire through it, or another option is to open/cut. Another contingency from the Conservation Commission was that whether they find water or not, they need a plan to restore the drill

54 site area. They would like a 60-day window to provide a final drawing for that restoration work. If drilling
55 through the winter they are open to discussion to following guidelines for restoration and getting that
56 completed. Their goal is to have as little impact as possible to that area. Another concern is as they are
57 drawing out of the well, and given proximity to wetlands and vernal pools, they are required to install
58 piezometers. That will not only during the testing of well gauge the water level of the ground, but also
59 while permitting the well. They will continue to monitor that they are not drawing down that water level
60 past a sustainable level.

61
62 Mr. Berube stated then once Aquarion gets a test well in there, they will be back in front of the Planning
63 Board.

64
65 *Upon motion by David Glasier and seconded by Adam Sandahl it was voted to accept the application as*
66 *complete. Motion carried by a 5 yes, 1 recused vote.*
67

68 Mr. Sandal inquired what are the impacts for. Mr. Davis, stated with regard to impact to buffer zone, the
69 drill rig being out there requires site clearing. When they drill it there will be some spoils that come out of
70 the ground that they will have to deal with and they will have to make sure that nothing gets into the
71 wetland. Staging area is inside the 75 ft. buffer zone required by the Town and the vernal pool and
72 wetlands will be inside that buffer zone. The staging area cannot be outside buffer zone because that is
73 where well itself is going to go. Mr. Sandahl asked if they do not have success in this area will Aquarion
74 have to come back to request a different spot and Mr. Davis replied yes.
75

76 At 7:14 p.m. Chairman Berube opened the Public Hearing
77

78 Alfred Stawicki, abutter at 7 Shaw Divide, Bow, NH 03304 introduced himself. Mr. Stawicki inquired what
79 kind of water shortage does Village Shore Estates have and what are we looking for. Mr. Davis replied
80 that right now anything helps. If it produces more than 5 to 10 gallons per minute that would be
81 encouraging. The goal is 35-40 gallons per minute. Mr. Stawicki asked if there would be underground
82 storage and Mr. Davis said there already is a system in place so this would go back to that system. Mr.
83 Stawicki asked if in their testing program, have you anticipated any interference testing and any
84 monitoring of wells? Mr. Davis said they are required to have piezometers throughout the area. Mr. Davis
85 stated that the Historical Bureau is concerned all the way out to Turee Pond. Mr. Stawicki asked how this
86 is being financed and Mr. Davis said by state funding and the rest is covered by the company and rates.
87

88 Cynthia Klevins, from the NHDES Drinking Water and the project manager for this project introduced
89 herself. The permitting process requires monitoring levels in abutting wells and the radius is 1,000 ft. and
90 those will be identified in the permitting process. The goal is 40 gpm. The well is 300 ft. deep and the
91 diameter is 6". Marci Stawicki asked if someone would be monitoring their well so it does not drop below
92 the 25 gpm and Cynthia Klevins said the state requires representative wells be monitored, but not
93 specifically their property.
94

95 Roy Bailey, 107 Page Road, Bow, NH introduced himself. Construction in their area has affected their
96 well. They had to drill down to 1200 ft. to get 8 gpm. Mr. Davis said if the well they drill drops down and it
97 drops down others then that would be unacceptable and they would have to find another location.
98

99 At 7:21 p.m. Chairman Berube closed the Public Hearing
100

101 Mr. Berube returned to the board for further questions and then referred to the zoning issues 10
102

103 Mr. Sandahl referred to the Bow Conservation Committee's concerns. The Conservation Commission
104 recommends approval of the Wetland CUP for up to 1200 sq. ft. of wetland buffer impact for the well
105 drilling (at site A) on this town forest property contingent on:

- 106 1. Submittal of a restoration plan for site A
 - 107 2. Addressing the power for the well
- 108

109 Mr. Berube asked Mr. Davis if they had submitted a restoration plan and Mr. Davis replied that it is
110 contingent on that if they could make that within 60 days. If the well does not produce they would present
111 a plan that says the parameters of the restoration plan. Mr. Marshall suggested that it say that it is
112 contingent upon an approved restoration plan. Mr. Sandahl says there should be a plan with particulars
113 for when you are done. Mr. Glasier suggested the board give conditional approval in that they come back
114 to the next meeting that it will get done to best practices and a basic commitment. Mr. Davis said they
115 would come in by next meeting with a game plan for restoration
116

117 Mr. Glasier made note that in the staff report, page 1, section 3, para. 2 wetland and drainage states that
118 a 3rd party engineering review is required.
119

120 *Mr. Glasier made a motion and Mr. Sandahl duly seconded to approve a modified application to a basic*
121 *restoration commitment by next meeting. Motion carried by unanimous vote in favor.*
122

123 Chairman Berube read the following item (s) into the record.
124

125 2. Application #411-22 Coastal Bow Properties, LLC
126 Wetlands Protection Conditional Use Permit to permit impacts to the WC district to accommodate
127 expansion of existing paved stock yard and expansion of existing rail siding at the existing
128 Coastal Forest Products facility. Block # 45-2, Lot 173, I-2 Zoning District located at 652 River
129 Road, Bow NH 03304
130

131 3. Application #205-22 Coastal Bow Properties, LLC
132 Site Plan Review Approval Application. Proposed paved laydown yard expansion at the existing
133 Coastal Forest Products facility with associated access, parking, and stormwater management
134 area improvements. Block 45-2, Lot 173, I-2 Zoning District located at 652 River Road, Bow NH
135 03304
136

137 Chairman Berube invited the representative of the application to present the case for this application.
138

139 Nicholas Golan, PE/TF Moran, Inc. of 48 Constitution Drive, Bedford, NH 03110 introduced himself. He is
140 representing Coast Bow Properties, LLC.
141

142 This is a phased project, the first phase and expansion of existing paved stock yard by approximately 13
143 acres. The area is comprised of a few components, a portion that needs to be paved, a portion for gravel
144 storage. There is a large wetland complex in that area of approximately 78,000 sq. ft. Future parts of the
145 phase include repaving a part of that paved stockyard, providing a 100,000 sq. ft. warehouse expansion,
146 adding trailer storage and relocation of the existing maintenance building to the upper plateau adding
147 refueling and cleaning capabilities . Exterior shed storage and addition to their loading canopy. Another
148 primary component is the expansion of the existing rail spur. They have had two meetings with
149 Conservation Commission, preapplication meeting with DES, Fish & Game, Army Corp of Engineering,
150 EPA and other agencies. They conducted a site walk with some of these groups in May to see areas they
151 would impact . They deleted the element of an access road as it was not the least impactful design.
152 There was a great concern that this was a habitat for endangered species. Femoral streams will form
153 after high intensity storms these channels will form and become subterranean and will directly recharge
154 into the ground. Flow needs to be managed through added storm water management areas particularly to
155 upper stock yard. They will stabilize those areas and control those peak flows. They have coordination to
156 do with Fish and Game to show they have met the criteria for avoidance and minimization of impacts.
157 This is a man-made element. It is naturalized but they need to meet all the criteria. They have avoided
158 other sensitive wetlands areas on site. They are improving things by restoring that existing drainage
159 channel. In coordination with the Conservation Commission, they are trying to find a mitigation parcel that
160 they can do upland buffer(?) preservation.
161

162 At 7:42 p.m., Chairman Berube opened the Public Hearing.

163 At 7:43 p.m., Chairman Berube closed the Public Hearing.
164

165 Chairman Berube asked if the Board had any questions and there were none. Chairman Berube
166 entertained a motion.

167
168 *Upon motion by Mr. Glasier and duly seconded by Mr. Sandahl both applications are accepted as*
169 *complete. Motion carried by unanimous vote in favor.*

170 Chairman Berube proposed a Saturday morning site walk. The site walk is scheduled for Saturday,
171 November 12, 2022 at 9:00 a.m.

172
173 *Upon motion by Mrs. Crystall and seconded by Mr. Glazier it was proposed to continue the Public*
174 *Hearing to November 17,2022. Motion carried by unanimous vote in favor.*

175
176
177 Chairman Berube read the item (s) into the record.

178
179 4. Design Review – Redi-Mix

180 To modify the existing concrete batch plant including storm water management and treatment
181 elements. Map 41, BL 2, Lot 202 located at 321 River Road, Bow, NH 03304

182
183 Chairman Berube invited the representative of the application to present the case for this application.
184 Neil Rapoza, PE of Civil Consultants, P.O. Box 100, of South Berwick, Maine 03908 introduced himself
185 on behalf of Redi-Mix Concrete.

186
187 Mr. Rapoza stated that travel to Redi-Mix site is very arduous. .
188 It is a very inefficient process to get the big trucks through. In addition, there is an existing water
189 treatment swale with a small retention pond in the back which was intended for treatment for all the runoff
190 coming off the site. Functionality not great over the years. The conceptual idea is to modify it.
191 Per Mr. Rapoza’s memorandum dated October 17, 2022, describes the proposed modifications below:
192

193 **Current Condition:**

194
195 The existing plant utilized a single combined entrance and exit. This access handles all incoming mixer
196 vehicles, delivery trucks, maintenance vehicles and passenger vehicles. Workers at the plant, as well as mixer
197 drivers, utilize the on-site passenger vehicle parking areas.

198
199 The congestion at the single access creates an environment on site that results in several inefficiencies. These
200 include:

- 201
202
- Inadequate turning radii within the site, requiring 3-point turns to enter the batch plant building prior to being loaded.
 - Hazardous entrance conditions when delivery vehicles and mixers are entering and existing the site simultaneously.
 - Potentially dangerous conditions for passenger vehicles and pedestrians due to the requirement that they share travel ways with the regular operation of the plan.
 - Excessive wear on the receiving portion of River Road due to all traffic being concentrated to a single location.
 - Delivery vehicles blocking access to portions of the plant utilized by other processes and vehicles.
- 203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212

213 Current records of deliveries to the site and concrete sales indicate that approximately 80 trips per day are
214 generated during the busiest operating period, with all of these occurring at the single access point. A single
215 entrance to accommodate mixers and delivery vehicles will be constructed at the east edge of the lot. The
216 entrance will have a similar slope and width as the current access and will allow mixers to enter the site and
217 plant without crossing the paths of other activities on site.

218
219
220

Proposed Conditions:

221 To improve the functionality of the site, it is proposed that the single access point be abandoned, and four new
222 curb cuts be created with specific functions. It is not intended that the changes increase the capacity of the
223 plant or generate any additional trips, only to improve the function of the existing operations.

224 A single entrance to accommodate mixers and delivery vehicles will be constructed at the east edge of the lot.
225 The entrance will have a similar slope and width as the current access and will allow mixers to enter the site
226 and plant without crossing the paths of other activities on site.

227 Parking for passenger vehicles and outside service/vendor vehicles is proposed to be constructed in the area of
228 the existing entrance and will be at the elevation of River Road. This parking will be access by a one- way
229 driveway with an entrance and an exit onto the roadway. Pedestrians from this lot will utilize a stairway to travel
230 into the plant, with appropriate safety signage and traffic controls.

231
232 A separate exit-only connection to River Road will be constructed at the west edge of the lot. This will allow
233 the heavier vehicle traffic to utilize the least amount of public roadway after being loaded and will also direct
234 traffic leaving the site to the preferred truck route indicated on River Road.

235
236 The proposed changes will result in approximately 30 vehicles per day utilizing the east entrance to the plant
237 during the heaviest time of use, with no vehicles entering the roadway from that location from the subject lot.
238 The proposed one-way truck exit will also continue to allow this traffic from the site to enter River Road closer
239 to Dunklee Road, the preferred truck traffic route, creating less impact on the public roadway then currently
240 exists.

241
242 The passenger vehicles utilizing the parking lot at the road edge will no longer need to contend with truck or
243 delivery traffic, improving safety and preventing unnecessary travel through the site.

244
245 It is our opinion that the traffic and site movement layout as presented will create a safer, more efficient, and
246 less detrimental condition for the users of the site and River Road.

247
248 Redi-Mix has set aside a location for water treatment and this plan is preliminary and has not gone out for full
249 survey. This will likely change to meet the DES requirements.

250
251 The passenger vehicle only lot on River Road will keep all passenger vehicles out of circulation on the site.
252 This will be strictly for maintenance or delivery vehicles.

253
254 The building and materials will remain the same.

255
256 They have been in talks with Until, utility pole would have to be shifted slightly.

257
258 The intention is to maintain existing water service and existing sub surface septic field somewhere on the site
259 and is yet to be determined.

260
261 Chairman Berube asked if they had checked with DPW on the driveways, and they said it looked like it made
262 sense. Mr. Rapoza has put together a traffic assessment but will submit with preliminary application . Mr.
263 Marshall asked the distance from exit driveways to gymnastics building. Mr. Rapoza stated that the requirements
264 have been met. Mr. Glasier suggested giving more space as they exit onto Dunklee. Mr. Berube inquired about
265 landscaping. Landscaping will be fairly significant. Mrs. Crystall said to stick to native where possible.

266

267 Mr. Berube asked about cleaning out storm water management. Washout for trucks is on site. They should have
268 approved washed out area, Big concrete bins . Several sous sleighs. Fills each one as it goes to the next you have
269 more clarified effluent there. This particular plant is an evaporation system. Treatment swale gets overloaded.
270
271 Mr. Berube asked if they hoping to do this through the winter. Mr. Rapoza said initial talks were to do through the
272 winter but it is taking longer. Mr. Sandahl asked if this kicked them into AOT. Technically this is not an AOT
273 but a modification.
274
275 Mr. Berube stated that he liked it. Although not a Public Hearing
276
277 Stan Emanuel of Bow Recycling Center 330 River Road, Bow, NH 03304 introduced himself.
278 His concern is the trucks and the traffic. Driveway situation is going to be a firing range of trucks. Mr. Emanuel
279 thinks there is a potential for a problem. Mr. Berube stated that this is more turning in, not turning out therefore
280 less impact.
281
282 Peter Emanuel, of Bow Recycling Center 330 River Road, Bow, NH 03304 introduced himself.
283 Mr. Emanuel stated that 4 driveway cuts is way too much. He stated they are trying to make the roadway as part
284 of their yard. They simply need more property. He said they are trying to cut corners by using the town's
285 property. He said they track dirt from their yard into roadway and Mr. Emanuel's trucks pull it up into their
286 driveway it makes it look like their trucks are dragging sand into the roadway.
287
288 Mr. Berube asked the Planning Board if there were further questions and there were none.
289

290 **III. OLD BUSINESS – None**

291 **IV. NEW BUSINESS - None**

292 **V. CORRESPONDENCE AND OTHER BUSINESS – None**

293
294 **VI. REVIEW OF MINUTES: August 18, 2022 and September 15, 2022**

295
296 *Mr. Sandahl made a motion, and Mr. Glasier seconded, that the August 18, 2022 amended minutes be*
297 *approved. Motion carried by a 4 yes, 2 abstain votes.*

298
299 *Mr. Sandahl made a motion and Mrs. Crystall seconded that the September 15, 2022 amended minutes*
300 *be approved. Motion carried by a 4 yes, 2 abstain votes.*

301
302 **VII. NON-PUBLIC SESSION RSA 91-A:3**

303
304 **VIII. ADJOURN**

305
306 *Mr. Glasier made a motion and Mrs. Crystall seconded that the meeting adjourn.*

307
308 Respectfully submitted,

309
310
311
312 Adam Sandahl, Secretary