

# SPECIAL MERRIMACK CONSERVATION COMMISSION

JULY 22, 2013

## MEETING MINUTES

A special meeting of the Merrimack Conservation Commission was held on Monday, July 22, 2013 at 6:00 p.m. at the Merrimack Memorial Conference Room.

Chairman Tim Tenhave presided:

Members of the Commission Present: Matt Caron, Vice Chairman  
Ron Davies  
Thomas Lehman  
Gage Perry  
Lauren Kras, Alternate

Members of the Commission Absent: Simon Thomson  
Robert Croatti, Alternate  
Councilor Thomas Mahon

Also in Attendance: Mike Powers, Bay State Forestry Service

---

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

APPOINTMENTS - None

### NEW BUSINESS

#### **1. RFP for Grater Woods – Red Maple Trail / Conservation Drive Access Point**

Commission to review and potentially take appropriate action based on the responses received from the RFP.

Chairman Tenhave stated, for the record, two responses were received; one from BKB Excavation out of Barnstead, NH at a cost of \$44,727 and the other from Hopkinton Forestry & Land Clearing out of Henniker, NH at a cost of \$26,500.

Chairman Tenhave commented what struck him was the large delta between the bids. Commissioner Perry noted both companies have been utilized in the past. Mr. Mike Powers, Bay State Forestry Service, noted Hopkinton Forestry did the actual road work to access the Grater Woods parcel as well as all of the logging, and are very familiar with the area. BKB Excavation did the initial trail work for the loop behind the school. He stated his opinion both companies do great work. When asked if he was confident both companies understood the scope of work, Mr. Powers stated he is. He noted Mr. Cyr relayed to him Hopkinton Forestry has in its fleet rock trucks, which will allow for ease of access to the burrow pit area. Without such equipment it would be necessary to upgrade that section of road in order for it to be passable. There is a cost savings in not having to upgrade that section of road to accommodate passage by tandem or tri-axle dump trucks. Mr. Powers remarked, as a forestry company, Hopkinton Forestry also has the equipment necessary to cut trees, etc. whereas BKB would have to bring someone in. It was noted the Commission has been very happy with work done by both companies.

Chairman Tenhave questioned whether Mr. Powers believed it unnecessary to have access through the school property. Mr. Powers stated his understanding staging would be done off of Conservation Drive, and stated he would check with Mr. Cyr to verify his understanding. Chairman Tenhave noted, should access be required, Vice Chairman Caron should be contacted as the Commission's liaison for the project. He would coordinate with the school district. Chairman Tenhave stated his desire to inform abutters of work being done. Mr. Powers was in agreement residents of Conservation Drive should be notified. Chairman Tenhave noted the schedule of the winning bidder would have to be relayed to Vice Chairman Caron to allow him to coordinate with the Community Development Department to have abutter notifications sent out.

Mr. Powers noted he has met with Kyle Fox, Deputy Director, Public Works Department regarding the wetland notification, which is in the works with NHDES. When asked, he stated the recommendation of Bay State Forestry is to go with the low bidder, Hopkinton Forestry & Land Clearing.

**MOTION BY COMMISSIONER PERRY TO AWARD THE CONTRACT TO THE LOW BIDDER, HOPKINTON FORESTRY & LAND CLEARING IN THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF TWENTY SIX THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$26,500)**  
**MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER DAVIES**

ON THE QUESTION

Chairman Tenhave noted earlier discussion of the funding source being Fund 53.

**MOTION CARRIED**  
**6-0-0**

When asked to describe next steps, Mr. Powers stated the need to contact Hopkinton Forestry and make them aware of the Commission's decision. A contract would be drawn up between the Town and Hopkinton Forestry. Once complete the project can move forward as soon as the weather and schedule allows. It was noted Mr. Cyr is out of the office for the remainder of the week.

Other Projects

Commissioner Lehman questioned grading of the Gateway Trail coming out of the landings. Commissioner Perry noted he is in possession of a simple spreadsheet provided, some time ago, by a local contractor. The spreadsheet identifies size and types of stone that could be used for erosion control (large stones were placed, which, over time, have been pushed away by the type of traffic in the area). The Commission would like Bay State to review the information for suitability. The intent would be to identify the product best suitable for both ATV and foot traffic. The high school would like to utilize the trail for runners, which it cannot currently because of its current condition.

Mr. Powers questioned whether consideration has been given to both projects being done simultaneously to take advantage of possible cost savings, e.g., equipment onsite, etc. Vice Chairman Caron noted the need for separation given the Red Maple Trail project is mitigation for a wetland impact on another project in town and has NHDES involvement. Chairman Tenhave noted for projects costing between \$1,001 and \$3,500 the need exists to obtain "a minimum of three (3) electronic, written, or verbal estimates for consideration." "In the event less than three (3) estimates are available, evidence of an attempt to obtain them shall be attached to the purchase order." Because someone is already in place doing the job, the policy would allow for flexibility.

Commissioner Perry stated he would provide the preliminary information (spreadsheet) to Vice Chairman Caron. He is hopeful they will be able, in the near future, to walk the site and ensure distances cited remain accurate.

Gateway Hill is an area of wetland requiring a crossing. One side goes straight up a hill and a determination needs to be made as to how to best mitigate it to avoid it being washed out and to fix the trail to maintain the desired multi-use. Vice Chairman Caron commented the area is damaged to the point where it likely needs some type of geo-technical solution. Commissioner Perry questioned whether a culvert could be put in place and covered with material. Chairman Tenhave stated the Commission is aware the project will be extensive and not one that can be performed by volunteers. The desire is to identify the scope of the project and for the project to be completed this year. He stated the desire of the Commission to utilize Bay State to identify the most prudent course of action.

***It was the unanimous decision of the Commission to request Bay State move forward in providing a scope of work.***

Mr. Powers stated the site would be visited within the next 1-2 weeks. Commissioner Lehman stated a desire to better understand the extent of the work. He remarked he had first considered the project to be that of a re-grading operation as the road is already laid out. He questioned whether the desire of the Commission was to create an area for cross-country runners. It was noted improving the road would be beneficial to walkers, hikers, etc. Commissioner Lehman stated a concern with cost and a desire to discuss the scope of the project in more detail. Chairman Tenhave remarked whatever is considered, the Commission has to ensure improvements meet the classification of the trail, e.g., if a Class A trail for all users, improvements made should accommodate all users. Mr. Powers reiterated the potential for cost savings if able to increase the scope of work being performed by the contractor while onsite.

Vice Chairman Caron stated the areas that would be looked at in the coming week to be; out of Wildlife Opening #1, across from the Pond View area out of Wildlife Opening #2, the crossing over the wetlands before going up Gateway Hill, and the repair of Gateway Hill. Commissioner Perry spoke of two sections located on school property, which should be addressed with the school; out of the ball field and at the bottom of the loop. He volunteered to coordinate the involvement of the School District.

Chairman Tenhave noted while going through the bid process for a forester some long-term projects were identified, e.g., forestry plans, etc., and stated a desire to meet with Bay State to begin moving those discussions forward. Mr. Powers commented the best time for Bay State with regard to the writing of forestry plans is during the fall and spring.

Commissioners Lehman remarked he would like to attend the site walk if he is available to. Commissioner Kras stated her desire to attend. Chairman Tenhave stated a notice of the site walk would be posted as it is likely a majority of the Commission would be present. The site walk was scheduled for 3:00 p.m. on July 31, 2013.

## **2. RFP for a Beaver Trapper and related Services**

Commission to review and potentially take appropriate action based on the responses received from the RFP.

Chairman Tenhave noted two responses were received; one from Nuisance Wildlife Control out of Weare, NH (trap and dispose; \$275 ea., trap and relocate; \$675 ea., consulting; \$150/hr. with a 1 hr. min., dam removal; \$120/hr.) and the other from Michael Westcott out of Nashua, NH (trap and dispose; \$130 ea., trap and relocate; \$170 ea., consulting; \$25/hr. with a 1 hr. min.)

Commissioner Lehman stated he had been surprised a response was not received from Critter Control out of Merrimack, NH. After making an inquiry of Critter Control he was informed a response had been submitted the prior Wednesday. He brought with him copies of bid information he was provided (trap setup with 24/7 video monitoring; \$320 plus catch and relocate \$120 ea. or catch and disposal \$140 ea., dam removal \$80-240, consulting \$80/hr.). Chairman Tenhave noted the Finance Department has no record of that response. Commissioner Perry questioned whether the bid could be considered.

Commissioner Lehman stated he had also contacted Michael Westcott questioning insurance. During that conversation he questioned the cost for placement of a pipe, and was informed the cost for installing a pipe would be \$350 plus cost of materials. He was also informed liability insurance would be obtained if contracted to do the work. At present, he does not have the insurance coverage; however, requested an estimate when he bid for the project. When asked if the cost of liability insurance was factored into the bid price, Commissioner Lehman stated he had not posed that question.

Commissioner Lehman stated his belief there is some leeway in the purchasing policy relative to liability insurance if the project is under a certain dollar threshold. Chairman Tenhave stated his belief the RFP specified the need for a million dollar liability policy. Chairman Tenhave informed the Commission the Finance Department expressed a concern with the bid received from Michael Westcott relative to language regarding the method of beaver disposal, e.g., that the method was neither appropriate or legal. Commissioner Perry commented he had considered speaking with the Public Works Department to understand requirements for disposal of road kill, as he believes it would be similar. It was noted the bid received from Nuisance Wildlife Control simply stated the rules of disposal are adhered to.

Commissioner Davies commented, although a higher cost, he was more impressed with the bid received from Nuisance Wildlife Control because of the completeness and professional presentation. He noted the bid from Michael Westcott included language regarding no dam removal or draining of the pond. Commissioner Kras remarked when making such a statement an explanation should be provided.

Commissioner Lehman provided copies of the bid from Critter Control. He remarked one of the reasons he wished for the bid process to be less formal was to have more of a one-on-one interaction with those the Commission is looking to retain to perform the work. He would like to conduct site walks to identify first-hand work that needs to be done so that the best price can be obtained.

Commissioner Perry remarked something has changed with the situation on Madison Lane; the building pattern has been disrupted enough that the beavers are not rebuilding in the same spot. The water level has stayed down since the prior Wednesday. Typically the water level begins to rise again within 2-3 days after work is done

in the area. Commissioner Lehman commented document states, based on the extensive area, capturing or killing beavers is almost a futile effort as they will return. Commissioner Lehman stated his preference the beaver be relocated. There are a few locations available for relocation, which would have to occur prior to the end of August.

Vice Chairman Caron questioned whether the bid received from Critter Control could be accepted. Chairman Tenhave was unsure. When asked, Commissioner Lehman stated the bid had been sent through the mail. Commissioner Perry noted the RFP was specific with regard to deadline for submission, etc. Commissioner Davies remarked his experience in such matters is if not in complete compliance, it cannot be considered. Commissioner Lehman stated the ability exists to put the project out for bid a second time. He stated if the project cost is below \$10,000 the purchasing policy requires three estimates be obtained. There is a section that speaks to Professional Services, which states "Professional services shall be exempt from the purchasing guidelines..." He suggested, beaver trapping may not have been considered as a type of professional service at the time the language was drafted; however, he believes that a matter of interpretation. He suggested there to be enough leeway to show due diligence in that calls be made, the same job be specked out to all, a bid received from each, and a record kept.

Commissioner Perry remarked had the Commission simply gone out and requested bids from three entities it would be a different situation than having gone through a formal RFP process, which is a stepping stone to a contract. Commissioner Davies agreed and suggested bidders who followed the requirements of the RFP could take issue with the consideration of a bid that did not. He suggested if proof could be provided the bid was received by the Town in accordance with the published deadline he would be willing to consider it.

***The Commission recessed at 7:01 p.m.***

***The Commission reconvened at 7:06 p.m.***

Chairman Tenhave informed the Commission he was unable to gain additional information during the recess. Commissioner Davies suggested the item be tabled and that it be taken up at the end of the agenda should any additional information become known.

***The consensus of the Commission was to address the remaining public business.***

#### OLD BUSINESS

##### **1. Sub-Committee Proposal Form**

Commission to review and potentially establish a form our sub-committees can use to propose funding and project approval for projects on their associated properties.

Vice Chairman Caron remarked the intent of the form is to provide sub-committees a mechanism for requesting project funding; however, an additional benefit it would provide is advising the Commission of projects being undertaken by the sub-committees. Commissioner Perry commented the Commission is often looking at issues the sub-committees may not be aware of, and being aware of projects proposed by the sub-committees the Commission would have the opportunity to coordinate projects that may be in the same general vicinity. He spoke of the advantage of a paper trail of work performed on the properties. By having the form on file historical information on projects could be more easily obtained.

Commissioner Davies recommended the form be amended to include: date the request is made to the Commission, project estimated completion date, and who the project will be completed by. Commissioner Perry proposed the same changes as well as the inclusion of a logo.

***The consensus of the Commission was to approve the form inclusive of all recommended changes and establish it as a tool for sub-committees to request project funding from the Commission.***

Commissioner Lehman suggested an area be included where the Commission can identify file location(s) for the individual forms. When asked, Chairman Tenhave stated the town does have electronic file folders, which would eliminate the need for paper copies in the files. It was suggested a paper copy could be attached to management plans until an electronic file strategy is identified.

## **2. Land Evaluation Criteria**

Commission to review and potentially accept criteria the Commission will use when evaluating parcels for purchase, donation acceptance, easement establishment, or other similar means.

Commissioner Lehman Stated the Conservation Biodiversity Plan as well as the Town's Master Plan was reviewed. The plans were used to identify the desired direction with regard to land acquisition. One of the largest items stressed is the desire for large contiguous acreage and Conservation Focus Areas (CFA). Major areas of conservation focus are the Horse Hill Nature Preserve, Grater Woods, Baboosic Brook Corridor, the Merrimack River Corridor, and the Souhegan River Corridor. The Biodiversity Plan specifically states "conservation protection should primarily focus on permanent land protection within Grater Woods and Horse Hill CFAs."

The information obtained was used in the creation of a yes/no questionnaire against which each parcel could be considered/compared. Commissioner Perry spoke of greenways where animal migration occurs. Commissioner Lehman noted wildlife corridors are mentioned in the Biodiversity Conservation Plan; however, the priorities are identified with the CFAs. Commissioner Perry requested wildlife corridors are included in the evaluation criteria.

Chairman Tenhave questioned whether weighting would be applied/considered. Commissioner Lehman remarked if particular parcel(s) meet all criteria/contains all attributes; the Commission would then need to make a determination based on other factors, e.g., ecological assessment, which utilizes a point system. Commissioner Perry suggested each item on the questionnaire could represent a point, and the Commission could come to a determination of the number of points required for a parcel to be considered for acquisition and/or easement. Chairman Tenhave questioned the will of the Commission with regard to a point system. Commissioner Lehman stated a concern that is likely very subjective, which is why the Biodiversity Plan and Master Plan were looked to as a means of identifying priority areas. Commissioner Davies remarked the questionnaire is a tool to be used subjectively to allow the Commission to consider each parcel without assigning a point system.

Commissioner Perry provided the example of a parcel that may include a great many attributes some of which may render the parcel unlikely to be developed, e.g., wetlands, or the reverse may occur where a parcel has few attributes but serves as a wildlife corridor, etc. He suggested a point system would help identify the conservation significance of each individual parcel. Commissioner Lehman stated the questionnaire simply identifies parcel attributes, which outlines, for the Commission, which attributes should be considered when reviewing parcels for potential purchase, etc.

Chairman Tenhave stated his desire was to simply identify the intent of the Commission in the use of the questionnaire. He remarked if the intent was to develop a point system under which a particular number of points would be associated with each attribute and properties achieving a certain number of points would be considered for purchase, etc. he would be acceptable to that plan of action providing the Commission was committed to adhering to that evaluation tool. Commissioner Lehman was not in favor of utilizing the questionnaire in that fashion and stated his desire to identify attributes for consideration when looking at individual parcels being considered for purchase, etc. He does not wish for the questionnaire to be the sole determining factor in making such decisions.

***The consensus of the Commission was to add the sentence: "Does this parcel support the creation or continuation of a greenway or wildlife corridor"***

Vice Chairman Commissioner suggested question #s 4 and 5 could be combined into a single question. Commissioner Lehman stated they should remain separate as there could be extenuating circumstances with the location of the parcel in relation to other parcels that are available and strategizing which should be given priority. As an example he spoke of one parcel having a higher probability of development than another or one which may be rendered undevelopable if the adjacent parcel were purchased.

Commissioner Lehman noted both the Conservation Biodiversity Plan and the Master Plan include language relative to protective space. While he was surprised to read that the Horse Hill Nature Preserve is not thought of as protected space as he thinks of it as protected because the Town signed off on the plan relative to its purpose. Chairman Tenhave stated that to be the extent of the protection. There is no deeded protection, therefore, at a future date the Town could determine it is not in the best interest of the citizenry to hold the parcel any longer and put it up for sale/development. Commissioner Lehman stated the Master Plan speaks to incorporating more formal protection into acquired parcels. He noted not all of the parcels identified in Grater Woods are actually protected by Deed.

Commissioner Lehman stated the need to identify the best course of action for parcels identified as priorities; purchase or conservation easement. The questionnaire includes areas to be considered when coming to such a decision such as does the parcel contain structures. He remarked if containing a structure, there is a good chance an easement could be obtained. If the parcel has a low potential for development the property owner may be inclined to consider a conservation easement.

***The consensus of the Commission was to utilize the questionnaire as a tool to assist in the determination of priority parcels, which the Commission may pursue for purchase/easement, and that the questionnaire can be refined as the process progresses.***

Commissioner Lehman stated his opinion the Commission should consider utilizing the services of an individual/entity more experienced in approaching landowners with the possibility of purchase/easement. The New Hampshire Association of Conservation Commissions has provided a reference for consideration. When asked what the structure of the relationship would be, Commissioner Lehman stated the individual for whom the reference was provided works as a consultant and has stated Commissioners could perform a great deal of the legwork as a way of keeping costs down, and could identify a percentage of the sales price as the form of payment. Payment would not be made until completion of a sale. He commented there is negotiation to take place. When asked for a rough estimate of cost, Commissioner Lehman stated his belief the consultation fee is \$100/hour. When asked what the charge would be to attend a meeting for a question/answer session, the response was \$100. The request was made that some specifics be provided in advance to allow the opportunity to be adequately prepared to highlight services that could be provided.

Chairman Tenhave questioned the individual's level of familiarity with this particular area and the real estate market. Commissioner Lehman stated he had not posed that specific question. Commissioner Perry suggested the possibility for video conferencing.

Commissioner Kras spoke of the number of neighboring Towns and Land Trusts that hold conservation easements and might be willing to provide guidance. Commissioner Perry agreed those are resources that should be sought out. Commissioner Kras suggested if the end result is to conserve land, there is no reason not to work with neighboring land trusts with the end result being the trust holding an easement. Commissioner Perry stated his support of having a consultant on board for instances when assistance is required; however, he is not supportive of having an individual/entity on retainer. Commissioner Lehman was in favor of hiring an individual/entity that would work directly for the Commission. Commissioner Davies was interested in seeking an individual/entity that might be in closer proximity to avoid additional costs associated with travel. Commissioner Kras suggested reaching out to neighboring land trusts for a recommendation. She agreed to obtain and provide a list of names for consideration.

#### RFP for a Beaver Trapper and related Services

Chairman Tenhave questioned the will of the Commission. Commissioner Perry recommended the Commission consider all proposals with the intent of moving forward once receiving a response to the questions posed. Commissioner Lehman stated a concern with the large disparity in cost of the two bids received and the lack of insurance associated with the low bidder. He requested additional clarification be provided. Chairman Tenhave stated he does not believe the low bidder met all criteria, e.g., liability needs of the Town. He questioned whether the informal bid from Critter Control included information relative to insurance, and was told it did not. Commissioner Perry remarked Critter Control is used by another commission in town, which would lead him to believe insurance is in place.

Vice Chairman Caron remarked, at this point, the Commission has one bid, which is believed to meet the stated criteria. Commissioner Perry agreed, if making a decision at this time, he would agree there is only one viable bid to consider; however, the question of whether or not the bid from Critter Control was received under the guidelines of the RFP will be posed. Understanding that, consideration can be given and a formal decision made at a later date. Commissioner Davies questioned whether the purchasing policy would allow for the project to be re-bid if the Commission so desired. Chairman Tenhave stated the purchasing policy allows the Commission to not accept any of the bids and put the project out to bid again if desired or take another course of action. When asked if that could be done without any particular reasoning, Chairman Tenhave stated when the project was last re-bid the reasoning was receipt of 1 response when a minimum of 3 is desired. The intent is to be able to clearly show the RFP went out to a number of individuals/entities. After the last bid process he did not believe

enough information was available to move forward and that the majority of the Commission shared that opinion. As a result he requested the project be put out to bid a second time.

Chairman Tenhave noted there are concerns relative to the length of time involved should the project be put out to bid again. He suggested the Commission could seek a response to the question of the acceptability of the bid received from Critter Control after which a special meeting could be convened to come to a formal decision, the item could be tabled until the Commission's August 19<sup>th</sup> meeting, or the Commission could decide not to take any formal action. He stated a concern with the situation at Mitchell Woods and Madison Lane and the unintended consequences of delaying the process further. Commissioner Perry reiterated it appears as though the beaver are not rebuilding in the same location. The water level remains up; however, is down considerably from earlier in the year. He questioned whether the Commission was willing to identify the preferred bidder and wait for confirmation all are eligible for consideration before taking a formal vote. Commissioner Lehman questioned whether the Commission was prepared to move forward with the project based on the two responses known to have been received in accordance with the RFP. Commissioner Davies remarked, although professionally presented, the bid received from Nuisance Wildlife Control is at a much higher cost. Commissioner Perry stated he is uncomfortable with the two bids received; one due to the actual work and disposal and the other with the price. Commissioner Davies suggested, if the bid from Critter Control was not received in accordance with the RFP criteria, he would recommend the Commission put the project out for bid again.

Commissioner Perry questioned the number of times a project could be put out to bid. Commissioner Lehman suggested the Commission utilize a process whereby Commissioners use the formal RFP and reach out to potential bidders themselves without going through the Finance Department. He stated his belief the purchasing policy allows for such a process to occur. Chairman Tenhave questioned what additional or different information would be asked for that is not included in the RFP. Commissioner Davies questioned, with two bids in place, why the Commission could not send out additional requests to other companies asking the same questions. Chairman Tenhave stated his belief the RFP was sent out to everyone the Commission is aware of that offers these services and was publicly noticed in newsprint and on the Town's website.

It was re-stated the one bid that was received, which met all of the stated criteria is one the Commission is not pleased with it. Chairman Tenhave stated the Commission has the option of going back to that bidder to negotiate. Commissioner Perry suggested there to be two options; make the decision to award the contract to Critter Control subject to confirmation the bid meets the minimum criteria of the RFP or negotiate pricing with Nuisance Wildlife Control.

**MOTION BY COMMISSIONER PERRY TO AWARD THE CONTRACT TO CRITTER CONTROL  
CONTINGENT UPON VERIFICATION THE BID MEETS THE MINIMUM CRITERIA OF THE RFP, AND IN THE  
ABSENCE OF SUCH VERIFICATION TO AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO INITIATE NEGOTIATIONS WITH  
NUISANCE WILDLIFE CONTROL IN AN ATTEMPT TO REDUCE THE TOTAL BID PRICE**

**MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER DAVIES**

**MOTION CARRIED**

**6-0-0**

PUBLIC COMMENT – None

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS - None

NON-PUBLIC SESSION

**MOTION BY COMMISSIONER PERRY THAT THE COMMISSION GO INTO NON-PUBLIC SESSION BY ROLL  
CALL PURSUANT TO RSA 91-A:3, II (D) TO CONSIDER 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**

**MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER CARON**

*A Viva Voce Roll Call was conducted, which resulted as follows:*

Yea: Commissioner Caron, Commissioner Davies, Commissioner Kras, Commissioner Perry,  
Commissioner Lehman, Commissioner Tenhave

6

Nay:

0

**MOTION CARRIED**

*The Commission went into non-public session at 9:04 p.m.*

*The Commission came out of non-public session at 10:21 p.m.*

Chairman Tenhave stated the non-public meeting minutes were sealed during the non-public meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION BY COMMISSIONER PERRY TO ADJOURN**

**MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER CARON**

**MOTION CARRIED**

**6-0-0**

*The July 22, 2013 special meeting of the Merrimack Conservation Commission was adjourned at 10:22 p.m.*

Submitted by Dawn MacMillan