

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Conservation Commission

January 11, 2023

**APPROVED**

In attendance: Rob Clemens – Chair, Rich Hart, Steve Lutz, Christian Littlefield, Frank Montesanto, Lee Gilman [remote], John Harvey, Bill Widmer, Peter Lyon – Board of Selectmen  
Ex-Officio  
Staff present: Kristan Patenaude – Recording Secretary (remote).

Chair Rob Clemens called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

**ADMINISTRATIVE:**

**1. Chair Comments**

Rob Clemens introduced Tom Davies from the Hollis Conservation Commission, Amherst resident Matt Seiler, Will Ludt of the Heritage Commission and a couple of members of the Board of Selectmen. He noted that the Commission recently received another gift from the Rapf family for \$15,000. He will be bringing this to the Board of Selectmen to have it accepted into the Gift Account.

**2. Minutes: October 12, 2022, and December 14, 2022**

**Frank Montesanto moved to approve the meeting minutes of October 12, 2022, as presented. Seconded by John Harvey.**  
**Vote: 6-0-1; motion approved [J. Hardner abstaining.]**

**3. Treasurer's Report**

Bill Widmer explained that the Finance Department has been in the process of trying to update the current budgeting system. He noted that the budget is carrying a higher number in the wage line. Instead of \$2,100 for wages, there is actually \$3,649 in that budget. Two LUCT payments were deposited into the Land Account, with two more pending. Once these items are deposited there should be approximately \$1.42M in the Land Account. He explained that Town Treasurer, Liz Overholt was able to secure a 2.5% new interest rate on the Land Account, which will lead to a dramatic increase in the amount of interest received. There is approximately \$10,000 left in the Commission's budget for this year. He asked Commissioners to consider ideas for productive uses of those monies.

**Jared Hardner moved to accept the Treasurer's Report. Seconded by Frank Montesanto.**  
**Vote: 7-0-0; motion approved unanimously.**

**4. Planning & Permitting**

Steve Lutz explained that a conceptual hearing for the Brook Road property was supposed to be heard by the Planning Board on December 21<sup>st</sup>, but this was withdrawn. This item was previously listed as 38 units of elderly housing. Also, during that meeting, the Planning Board

January 11, 2023

**APPROVED**

heard a design review for Kevin Curran's property. No action was taken. There was plentiful commenting from abutters regarding the proposed design, particularly in the road areas with the cul-de-sac. The Planning Board's January 4<sup>th</sup> meeting was primarily regarding the proposed zoning ordinance amendments. All of the amendments discussed that evening were moved to the ballot, including the citizen petitioned items.

Rob Clemens noted that the Commission has not formally discussed many of the proposed ordinance changes. Some of the presentations for these items have cited the results from the Master Plan survey and items dealing with conservation, open space preservation, protection of wildlife habitat, and protection of water quality as being part of the basis for the proposals. He stated that he is not suggesting the Commission take a formal stance on these items but asked Commissioners to review them.

Rich Hart stated that he believes some of the conservation reasoning given for some of the amendments is stretching the point. One of the proposals looks to amend setbacks on scenic roads to be 300'. This essentially moves houses back quite a ways on a property, splitting up the open space. He stated that he does not believe this is beneficial, from a conservation standpoint.

Rob Clemens suggested that the Commission hold a second meeting on January 25<sup>th</sup>, in order to discuss the proposed amendments more thoroughly. Some of the amendments could have positive and possibly some negative impact on wildlife habitat.

Steve Lutz noted that the Planning Board will hold a public hearing on the Master Plan on January 18<sup>th</sup>. Rob Clemens encouraged Commissioners to participate in this meeting.

## **TOPICS**

### **5. SHS Senior Project Presentation - Corinne McNamara**

Corinne McNamara, senior at Souhegan High School, explained that her senior project is researching why it is important for people to identify poisonous plants. She is also researching how many poisonous species are native to New England, how often people confuse poisonous plants to be edible, if poisonous plants impact other species besides humans, how do outdoor organizations make information available regarding poisonous plants, and how can one effectively make a purposeful infographic to educate the public about plant safety. She stated that her applied piece of the project involves creating signs on trailheads for hikers, bikers, and the general public to look out for poisonous plants. This applied piece allows her to demonstrate what she has learned and help the general public make better and safer decisions. She presented a potential mockup she created for poison sumac.

Rich Hart noted that there is a lot of poison ivy at Lindabury Orchard and that some people have trouble identifying it. This could be a good location for some of the signs.

In response to a question from Rob Clemens, Corinne McNamara stated that part of her project will be to investigate what types of poisonous plants likely exist in New Hampshire, beyond the

January 11, 2023

**APPROVED**

obvious ones. Rob Clemens noted that the New Hampshire Association of Conservation Commissions is a good source of information and that he would get her a contact.

Jared Hardner stated that he does not believe there are a lot of poisonous plants around this area, but the ones that do exist can be particularly nasty for people that are allergic to them. It might be beneficial for this educational effort to include information on what to do if someone is exposed. An infographic could be included on the signs and available on the Commission's website. He noted that the preferred way to make these signs would be to print them on PVC board. This can be done by Speed Pro, located in Town. The signs could then be posted on trees or in the kiosks.

Rob Clemens suggested that these could be posted on stakes in areas with a preponderance of poison ivy.

Corinne McNamara stated that all of her research is due by March 15<sup>th</sup>. She stated that she would come back before the Commission for a second meeting to present this research. She stated that she is happy to create the designs for the Commission to use as it sees fit. The only purpose of this work is to benefit the Town.

#### **6. Invasives Management Program - Jared Hardner**

Rob Clemens noted that the Commission's agenda for this evening was not posted on the Town website until late today. It was posted on the Town Hall bulletin board and was noticed on the Town calendar. He noted that the report from the Invasives Management work group may be presented again at a future date, in order to make sure the information reaches all residents.

Jared Hardner explained that the working group was created due to a resident's petition expressing concern regarding the use of herbicides on properties in Town. This was likely specifically driven by an event that occurred at the Alice Towne lot, with a main focus on glyphosate, in particular. There were questions regarding how these chemicals are used to control invasive plant species on public land in Amherst. This does not have anything to do with a Town-wide ordinance regarding the use of herbicides; that is regulated at the State level. The Town can have a policy regarding herbicide use on public land, including rights of way along roads. The working group included Rob Clemens, DPW Director Eric Slosek, Matt Seiler, Jeanne Johnson of the Amherst Garden Club, and himself.

Jared Hardner explained that the group's research included calls to other conservation commissions and the New Hampshire Association of Conservation Commissions, interviews with State regulators, and a discussion with the Director of Pesticides for New Hampshire DES and the Invasive Species Coordinator for the New Hampshire Department of Agriculture. The group also read a number of peer reviewed scientific papers and literature reviews on the topic. There was some confusion within the group regarding what invasive species are and why they are controlled. He explained that invasive species are defined by the Department of Agriculture as non-native or alien to the ecosystem and have the potential to cause economic or environmental harm, or harm to human health. Common examples of invasive plants in Amherst

January 11, 2023

**APPROVED**

include Japanese knotweed, bittersweet, autumn olive, purple loosestrife, etc. These plants are controlled because they displace native plants, which affects the viability of native animal populations that rely on those plants, they reduce the diversity of plant and animal species, and they permanently alter natural habitats.

Jared Hardner explained that it is still manageable to control invasive species in Amherst. This is a problem worldwide and it has become non-negotiable to get invasive species under control or lose a lot of biodiversity. One way of controlling invasive woody plants is to dig them out. This becomes less feasible with large infestations. A backhoe could be used for larger areas, but this would lead to the disturbance of a lot of soil. This method can also be expensive, time consuming, and it destroys most of the other plants utilizing that area. Another option is to mow the plant, however most invasive species have robust root systems and will simply regrow. This process would need to be repeated over and over again. One of the best management practices is to cut the plant and then put herbicide on the stump. Alternative approaches, such as using livestock, were considered. Goats, for example, will eat woody invasives, but they can be selective. Livestock will likely need to be brought back multiple times in a year to actually kill the plants. The most important thing is preventing the roots from coming back and reestablishing in the area. Another option is simply to kill the plants outright with an herbicide. This is done by mixing the herbicide with an oil that will stick to the trunk of a tree and then spraying it around the trunk, making cuts into the tree and spraying the herbicide, or spraying the leaves. In Amherst, a combination of mechanical and spot treatments with herbicides have been used.

Jared Hardner explained that the Commission has ramped up its treatment of invasives in the past years. One of the purposes of the LUCT funds is to control invasive species. Certain lots in Town have been targeted, along with a pretreatment in areas where logging will occur. The DPW similarly selects a small set of sites to treat on an as-needed basis.

Jared Hardner explained that he would like to clarify some misleading statements that were made in social media, regarding the Commission and DPW conducting widespread spraying of the Town's right of ways and other public lands. That statement is patently false. That treatment has never and will never occur. The Town has a Town-wide permit which allows the flexibility to work where it is needed, but this is not intended to facilitate any kind of broad treatment to the right of ways or conservation areas.

Jared Hardner stated that there are two types of risks to examine when using herbicides. The ecological risk is what happens to non-target species if they are exposed to herbicides. The human health risk reviews if herbicides are toxic to humans under normal exposure and if they cause cancer under normal exposure. He noted that all pesticides sold or distributed in the United States must be registered by the EPA showing that they can be used without posing unreasonable risks to people or the environment. The herbicides used in Amherst are registered with the EPA and have been shown not to pose unreasonable ecological or human health risks. These herbicides are only applied by licensed applicators and used sparingly and infrequently. Regarding concerns about these chemicals running into water sources, both of the main

January 11, 2023

**APPROVED**

herbicides used in Town, triclopyr and glyphosate, break down quickly after application. These are mostly or completely non mobile in the soil.

Jared Hardner noted that there are some aspects of glyphosate that may cause people to be cautious. In the United States, there are some areas in which glyphosate is sprayed more than 114 pounds per square mile per year. Every 15 years, the EPA has to reregister all pesticides. At that time, they review all of the complaints and concerns registered with the EPA and consider any studies conducted. In its 2020 glyphosate review decision, the EPA did not identify any human health risks of concern from exposure to glyphosate but did identify potential ecological risks. Some mitigation measures were proposed, such as label changes. Overall, it was determined that the benefits of glyphosate outweigh the potential ecological risks. This decision was challenged in court. He read from the EPA's website, "underlying scientific findings regarding glyphosate, including its finding that glyphosate is not likely to be carcinogenic to humans, remain the same. The agency intends to revisit and better explain its evaluation of the carcinogenic potential of glyphosate and to consider whether to do so for other aspects of its human health analysis." The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) did its own examination on the safety of glyphosate, and they concluded that it is probably carcinogenic to humans. However, while the EPA included certain studies, the IARC did not. The IARC depended only on independent peer reviewed scientific papers. Also, the EPA's evaluation was largely based on pure glyphosate, whereas the IARC's review included mixtures of the chemical. The EPA's evaluation was focused on normal citizen exposures and the IARC's assessment included highly elevated exposure scenarios. He explained that, if someone in the United States wants to sell a product with these chemicals, and be registered, that person helps fund the studies. There are some that will say that, as long as the proponent is paying for the studies, the researchers are in their pocket. Reasonable people will likely argue about whether or not to trust a study which is not fully independently funded. Regarding studying mixtures versus pure glyphosate, mixing glyphosate with benign compounds can create insidious, unexpected effects. Finally, the EPA's evaluation focused on normal citizen exposures and the IARC included very high exposures. A very high exposure might consider a scenario similar to someone taking a shower in glyphosate every day, which no one is likely planning to do. The IARC review examines the whole world, including the developing world, which contains people who are not properly trained or possibly working with poorly maintained equipment. Some of those people may receive a very high exposure rate. In those cases, it is important to know that glyphosate could be carcinogenic, and measures should be taken to protect people in those situations. This is not the case in Amherst. It is not likely to even be exposed to glyphosate if all guidelines are followed.

Jared Hardner stated that the first conclusion is that glyphosate appears to be necessary to kill the roots of certain woody invasive plants, according to all the guidance reviewed. Without using it, the Town will be stuck in a seemingly endless cycle of mechanical removal, including the use of goats. Federal and State regulators are confident about the safety of glyphosate, if used properly. It is important to acknowledge that the reregistration process remains to be completed, as it was challenged in court. Amherst residents have little chance of being exposed to glyphosate from ACC or DPW applications, principally because it is used sparingly and infrequently over very small areas. When it is used, glyphosate biodegrades naturally in the soil. He stated that the ACC

January 11, 2023

**APPROVED**

and DPW should respect the informed opinions of residents and, if a resident believes there is an unreasonable risk posed to them, the groups can accommodate it. He has thus proposed an Herbicides Policy that the ACC and DPW should follow. The elements include an online posting of herbicides allowed for use in Amherst, including information about the regulatory status, and links to regulatory information regarding ecological and human risks. The website will also contain an online map of the sites in Town where invasives of concern will be controlled. There will also be an up-to-date calendar of planned invasives management, and the type of controls planned for each site. Nearing the time of treatment, the ACC and DPW will notify abutters at least seven days before the herbicides will be used. Residents who do not want herbicides used near them, could opt out using an online registry. The resident may then choose to work collaboratively with the ACC and DPW to determine alternative solutions. When the herbicides are being used, signs will be posted on the land explaining what was used, when it was applied, and what the advisory time is for avoiding exposure. That notification will be posted for a minimum of five days. The ACC and DPW also want to make a commitment to pilot the use of alternative control methods. Matt Seiler has volunteered to do a pilot program with goats and report back.

Rob Clemens noted that someone from the State will be speaking on this topic during a speaker series in Hollis on February 21<sup>st</sup>. This includes a remote participation process.

Rich Hart stated that this presentation involved invasive plants but did not mention poison ivy, which is noxious but not invasive. Jared Hardner agreed that this is not an invasive species but is a plant that the groups like to control. Control of poison ivy will be treated in the same way as previously outlined.

John Harvey noted that, a number of years ago, the Cemetery Trustees gave him permission to do a non-chemical treatment in the back half of the Forestview Cemetery. The permission was to cut each plant at the base, cover it with black plastic, stake down all four corners, and put a label on top. He noted that the 15-20 plants never grew back. He advocated for that as a study for nonchemical spot treatments.

Frank Montesanto stated that he appreciates all the work completed by the work group. He stated that it was disheartening to hear such an uproar over this item in Town. He noted that this information will be presented to the Board of Selectmen, and he hopes people will listen to it.

Rich Hart noted that the apple trees in Lindabury Orchard were covered in invasives 20 years ago. All of this was removed using physical labor.

In response to a question from Will Ludt regarding how many months the ACC actively sprays, Jared Hardner stated that active spraying occurs in the course of one day for one hour. These treatments will typically involve one spot treatment in the fall.

January 11, 2023

**APPROVED**

In response to a question from Will Ludt regarding the treatment at Forestview Cemetery and its impact on bird species in the area, John Harvey stated that he did not notice an increase in the population of birds, as there are very few anyway.

Jared Hardner explained that the group was pursued by a citizen fairly earnestly, alleging that the herbicide activity in Town was somehow being driven by a member of the ACC, Lee Gilman. It was stated that Lee Gilman had a financial conflict of interest and that he was effectively receiving money from the Town for the invasive species work, thereby protecting this activity. This item was responded to immediately by Chair Clemens but continued to be spouted. Thus, Bill Widmer pulled all ACC financial records from the Town which shows all money spent on invasive species control. This shows that \$0.00 has been paid to Lee Gilman for these services. These items are billed to Vegetation Control Services (VCS). Lee Gilman has nothing to do with VCS. It is not his company, he does not work for it, and he has no business relationship with it. Lee Gilman did receive \$200 from the Town in April of 2017 to cut a tree down that was hanging onto a resident's property. No other person on the ACC or DPW has a financial interest in how invasive species are controlled in the Town. Both groups have fairly strict controls regarding how money is spent in Town. Expenditures are voted on and there is plenty of oversight in this process. There is very little risk regarding conflict of interest in the future.

Matt Seiler noted that he was likely one of the people who helped spread the idea that the permit was insidious. He apologized for that, having since learned the process for the permit. He supports the proposed policy, though he is not sure the ACC and DPW need to have the same policy. The DPW Director has given good information as to why he would find a smaller buffer 25' from the property line impractical, due to right of way issues. It was also noted how difficult it is to keep temporary signs on roadways. Matt Seiler stated that he would like the ACC's policy to commit to a longer posting period than five days. He suggested 60 days for certain areas. The half-life for glyphosate, depending on conditions, could be a couple of months. His main concern was, without notifications and postings, people might accidentally be exposed to a larger amount than under normal conditions. Hopefully this will be avoided now with the new policy. He stated that he does not personally trust VCS, which is why he requested a larger buffer than 25'. He would like to know more about future commitments to alternative methods.

Jared Hardner agreed that there is likely a need for the DPW and ACC to have separate policies. Regarding future work into alternative methods, the ACC always needs more people to volunteer and help to take ownership over new initiatives. The ACC will work with Matt Seiler on the goat pilot, which will be a visible project to the public.

Matt Seiler noted that the area to be treated is actually very small geographically, so he is unsure how visible it will actually be. Jared Hardner noted that the property has the attributes for goats or other mechanical controls. He stated that he hopes the ACC is almost out of the phase where it has infested properties. It will hopefully soon be at a point where things will only need a quick spot treatment.

January 11, 2023

**APPROVED**

Rich Hart stated that, over the past few years, himself, Frank Montesanto, and Lee Gilman have run apple tree pruning workshops at Lindabury Orchard. These workshops could be used as a model for workshops on invasives.

DPW Director Eric Slosek stated that he believes the ACC has made a genuine effort to address concerns that were raised by the petition. He stated that the proposed online maps and posting plans for invasives management are positive outcomes from this working group. This proposal gives abutters choices and lets them be part of the decision-making process. He noted that the DPW has a lot of the same concerns as the ACC regarding invasive species. He stated that the DPW and ACC policies can likely be largely similar, aside from the posting requirements and the buffer zone proposed.

#### **7. Trail Steward Program and Project Update – Steve Lutz**

Steve Lutz explained that he has created an updated trail steward's guideline document. It has been aligned a bit better to the ACC's trail standard maintenance items. The document outlines responsibilities for new trail stewards to review. He stated that he has been in contact with most of the trail stewards so far. There needs to be a bit of a rebalancing in terms of which stewards are assigned to which locations. He has asked trail stewards the overall health of the trails they manage, and any basic maintenance items needed. This should also help with ACC with budgeting.

Rob Clemens noted that he and John Harvey have spoken regarding similar programs for wildlife and doing a better job of outreach and communications to capitalize on people's interests.

Steve Lutz stated that, regarding the Pulpit Brook project, he sees two phases of this project. Phase 1 will deal with the repair of the bridge that goes by Beaver Brook, and Phase 2 will tackle the tremendous erosion problem in the area.

Frank Montesanto explained that this area is heavily used and there is a great group of trail stewards willing to help with the projects. High water events continue to wash out existing wooden structures and make the trail impassable. He presented the proposal for a new structure. It will include a 12'x12' observation deck in the middle. This could contain a plaque with information regarding the beaver deceiver. This will likely need to be done in phases. As this in an accessible area, this would be an ideal spot for a wider walkway. Instead of a giant handrail on both sides, he is considering other options to keep the space open. The deck will be elevated and placed on abutments. This should allow for good clearance for heavy rains. There is currently approximately \$2,500 left in the budget for bridges and water crossings, and there is some existing lumber and materials stock. The approximately cost for the 172' long structure is \$2,882.43. Rob Clemens noted that the Gift Account can be used to supplement this amount.

**Frank Montesanto moved to expend \$2,500 from the Water Crossings budget line to be used toward the project as discussed. Seconded by John Harvey.**



January 11, 2023

**APPROVED**

Discussion:

Christian Littlefield stated that he is concerned with buoyancy in this area and would like to make sure the structure is properly anchored down.

Frank Montesanto noted that there are some very large, heavy boulders to block the trail from vehicles which he would like to move for access to the site. These would then be replaced.

John Harvey asked how far north this structure could be extended. Jared Hardner stated that it could be extended for quite a ways. This one project will cement Amherst into a very long trail which will be more heavily used than without this project. This project is a chance for the Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee to advocate for it as a multimodal trail opportunity.

**Vote: 7-0-0; motion approved unanimously.**

Rob Clemens asked the Commission to consider other projects or repairs that can be completed cooperatively with the trail stewards.

**8. Other Business**

Jared Hardner suggested a postcard with a QR code/URL on it which will link to the trails' section of the ACC's website. Speed Pro has given a quote of 500 cards on card stock for \$312. These could be placed on bulletin boards at Town businesses, or handed out at Town events.

**Jared Hardner moved to expend up to \$320 from the Educational Outreach budget line for printing of 500 trail cards. Seconded by Bill Widmer.**

**Vote: 7-0-0; motion approved unanimously.**

Jared Hardner stated that the ACC owes \$152 for another year of website hosting.

**John Harvey moved to expend \$152 from the Subscriptions budget line for a year of website hosting. Seconded by Frank Montesanto.**

**Vote: 7-0-0; motion approved unanimously.**

John Harvey stated that he was recently allowed by the ACC to purchase two trail cameras. He purchased and placed one in a swampy area of Buck Meadow, with Kristan Patenaude. This has not yet picked up many photos of wildlife yet. He will work to place additional cameras on ACC property around Town.

Will Ludt stated that on January 24<sup>th</sup> at 6:30pm, the NRPC and Heritage Commission are sponsoring a webinar to discuss the Heritage Commission's GIS mapping application. He invited all ACC members to attend.

Tom Davies thanked the Commission for referencing the February 21<sup>st</sup> invasive species seminar that will occur in Hollis. He noted a program that allows anyone to register their property to

January 11, 2023

**APPROVED**

make a commitment to accommodate biodiversity. This is a free program and being used to demonstrate the movement of protecting and increasing biodiversity on specific plots of land. On February 1<sup>st</sup>, the seminar deals with diversifying lawns, and on May 2<sup>nd</sup>, there will be a one-hour seminar on how to landscape backyards for wildlife. He noted that Hollis has a separate Trails Committee from its Conservation Commission. This keeps the Conservation Commission a bit less familiar with the trail system but allows it to focus on other items. He stated that pesticides are killing the birds and the diversity.

Bill Widmer stated that he is proposing that the ACC find co-sponsors for Clean-Up Day. He will draft a generic letter seeking co-sponsors for Clean-Up Day. This could help provide resources for signage and coordinate the distribution of blue bags and supplies. If no co-sponsors are interested, he would like to consider not moving forward with Clean-Up Day this year.

Rob Clemens noted that the ACC has taken the lead on this event for the last four years. Coordination and setup for the event has been largely on Bill Widmer and Kristan Patenaude's shoulders. Bill Widmer explained that participation in the event has not necessarily declined, but it has not gained steam either. Collaboration with co-sponsors could allow this event to take on a life of its own and continue forward.

Steve Lutz stated that he likes the co-sponsor idea. He stated that there seems to be a coordination issue with determining who will clean which areas of Town. Bill Widmer explained that, in past years, a large map of Town was placed at the collection sites for people to mark which roads they would be cleaning. However, most people currently pick up their supplies ahead of Clean-Up Day and, thus, do not visit the collection sites until they are done cleaning. Bill Widmer noted that Milford actually assigns quadrants to those cleaning. This is something that could potentially be undertaken through co-sponsorship.

Rob Clemens asked, from an ACC standpoint, if the group believes that an annual Clean-up Day is a good item to be responsible for. Bill Widmer stated that he believes the event has been successful but has not grown in its success. He stated that he and Kristan Patenaude have put in dozens and dozens of hours for each annual event and would like to see other advocates involved.

Jared Hardner stated that he believes each event has been amazing and he has seen so many people in Town mobilize on that day. He stated that he is unsure if continuous growth is the metric of success for the event. He suggested putting out a plea to the general public on Facebook to ask someone to take responsibility. Rob Clemens suggested that there may also be trail stewards interested in helping. Steve Lutz stated that he is happy to assist with the event but would require some background knowledge.

Frank Montesanto asked about an uptick in coyote activity in Town. Bill Widmer stated that he has seen some locally that look like full grown wolves.

January 11, 2023

**APPROVED**

Christian Littlefield stated that he received a quote for 350' of fencing at Bragdon of approximately \$7,000. He has also reached out to find a mowing contractor for Lindabury Orchard.

**9. Non- Public Session per RSA 91-A:3, II, (d)**

**- 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.**

**Rob Clemens moved to enter Non-Public Session per RSA 91-A:3, II, (d) 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. Seconded by John Harvey.**

**Roll Call Vote: Harvey – aye; Widmer – aye; Montesanto – aye; Littlefield – aye; Clemens – aye; Lutz – aye; and Hart – aye; 7-0-0; motion approved.**

**10. Adjourn**

**Frank Montesanto moved to exit Non-Public Session at 10:05pm. Seconded by Christian Littlefield.**

**Roll Call Vote: Harvey – aye; Widmer – aye; Montesanto – aye; Littlefield – aye; Clemens – aye; Lutz – aye; and Hart – aye; 7-0-0; motion approved.**

**The meeting adjourned at 10:06pm.**

*Respectfully submitted,*

*Kristan Patenaude*

*Approved: March 8, 2023*