

Kristen Maher, HR/Finance Director, noted there were a decent amount of the October expenses that did not make it into this report. If additional information had been provided, continuous reconciliation would have been required. The new software for financials is now live. Accounts to call attention to include:

Revenue

40409 – Service Charge (Hydrant Hookup); temporary hydrant hookup has seen a significant increase mostly due to use of the Merrimack Outlets parking area for fairs, festivals, etc.

Expenses

60500 – Motor Vehicle Maintenance; All of our trucks have gone through their annual inspection. Wheel alignments have been added to the annual review/maintenance to increase the life expectancy of tires.

70010.2 – Water Software; although shown as a budget line item, grant funding is being sought as a potential means of covering some of the expense.

Chair Provencher commented there are line items showing a budgeted amount of zero, e.g., 70600.2 and 70600.3. Director Maher explained the accounts roll up to the 70600. The individual line has no particular budget (listed for descriptive purposes).

B. Capital Reserve Balance

The Unassigned Fund Balance is \$22,552,704. Actual cash is \$3,695,820 (15.2% of fund balance). Total percentage considered fund balance is 62.2%.

An update has been received on the New Hampshire PDIP accounts. The paperwork has been signed and will be submitted. The hope is the account will be closed by the end of November, and the line will drop off the report.

C. Billing and Financial Software Update

Director Maher stated she continues to work with the vendor on the formatting of a few reports. The reports the Commission will receive next month will include additional columns. One of the nice things about this new software is that it will show what has been expended to date, outstanding purchase orders, what the total commitment is against what the budget is for each month, and the proposed use.

The GZA and Underwood purchase order reports will be updated. There is the ability to create project reports on all outstanding projects. Commissioner Von Schoen asked if that would be based on actuals or projections and was told it would be based on what the budget was for the particular project.

Commissioner Sabens stated the desire to work with the out-of-the-box version of the software as much as possible to minimize the inability to address any potential issues. Director Maher stated she is working with the vendor to customize the template (not changing codes).

Asked if we can consolidate the profit & loss comparison to include month-by-month trends and prior-year comparison in a single table, Director Maher stated she would inquire.

D. Audit Update

Director Maher commented she awaits final reports, however, all requirements with the Department of Revenue Administration (DRA) have been satisfied and the 535 has gone out.

She spoke of the billing side of the software having been started. Asked if the billing approach is being phased and if the customers would be required to create new accounts, she responded we will begin sending out various forms of communication to customers to make them aware of the need to create a new account to sign up for electronic payments. For a month's time, there will likely be two websites (.org/.gov) active to ensure ease in transition. Her hope is that both will be live so that customers can set up their payment (to begin once the site goes live; date specific) and the other where they will review their bills and make payment. When asked, she stated a significant portion of the customer base is currently utilizing the online payment option. Reminders will be sent out as we approach the date when billing will go live.

REGULAR SESSION

1. Board of Commissioners to discuss brine use on walkways

Superintendent Miner informed the Board of a request received from the contractor for snow removal at Twin Bridge apartments (two buildings by The Commons shopping center parking lot) to treat walkways.

The site is designated as sand only. The request is to be able to address the walkways with ice melt. The contractor does the maintenance for the Twin Bridge apartments as well as The Commons. Superintendent Miner commented he has been working with this contractor over the years and is aware he has been utilizing less salt over time.

Vice Chair Clement spoke of a plan, currently under review by the Planning Board, for an AutoZone in the middle of the parking lot, next to the Chinese restaurant. That would have the plan go through the Planning Board process again resulting in a no salt site. The plan, however, would not involve digging up the entire parking lot. She questioned how that would work. Usually when you go through the Planning Board review process, and are susceptible to the rules, the result is no salt or chemical de-icers.

Twin Bridge is one lot and the plaza a separate lot. AutoZone would be in that separate lot. She questions whether the entire site would be designated a no salt area.

Superintendent Miner remarked in speaking with Robert Price, Director, Community Development, if the MVD Board were in favor of the request, there would need to be a site plan change.

Chair Provencher commented it is not up to us to approve or disapprove the request as the requirement is that of the Planning Board. Vice Chair Clement stated her belief the Planning Board could provide a waiver from the site plan regulations without our input.

Member von Schoen suggested that the Superintendent reach out to the Chair of the Planning Board and raise awareness of the request.

Superintendent Miner suggested the Commission devise some language, for the future, outlining conditions for properties that are grandfathered. Vice Chair Clement commented on the site plan regulations having recently changed from no salt or winter de-icers and the contractor required to be Green SnowPro certified or equivalent. A Green SnowPro contractor can put down salt. They stripped the Green SnowPro out of it and now it just says no salt of chemical de-icers shall be allowed.

Superintendent Miner stated the need to devise some language that is appropriate for new properties in the Wellhead Protection Area.

Asked what the specific request was for, Superintendent Miner stated he threw the brine out there and the contractor has stated they are concrete sidewalks. The concern is that using that salt solution on the sidewalks would result in damage to the concrete. The desire is to use a calcium chloride mix/ice melt.

Chair Provencher spoke of the Community Development Department actively and effectively enforcing regulations on properties with salt use restrictions. He used the example of the Shaws plaza parking lot and the change from salt use to sand last year.

Superintendent Miner commented Tortilla Flats has a similar restriction of sand only, however they are permitted to use something on their walkways.

Commissioner von Schoen reiterated we have no authority over that. Superintendent Miner noted the Planning Board does take our recommendation into account.

Vice Chair Clement commented on the Community Development Department backing the Board up in terms of no salt use. She feels it is either a line in the sand, so to speak, or not.

Commissioner von Schoen commented at one point we had indicated, in a scenario where there is a parking lot grandfathered in, if committing themselves, in writing, to no longer utilize salt, we would be amenable to permitting the use of brine or some other option on the walkways because the result would be an overall reduction in salt use.

He reiterated he is uncertain this is the right venue for addressing the request as it should be a Community Development and Planning Board decision. Perhaps we can come up with a joint agreement on what the language should be, but in the end, it is up to them to change the ordinance.

Chair Provencher suggested the discussion is around what we might want to provide for a recommendation.

Superintendent Miner noted the contractor is utilizing less materials now than ever before. We have a good relationship with the contractor for The Commons parking lot. That being said, if the AutoZone doesn't go in, we cannot get a site plan change, and nothing would be holding the contractor to using sand in the parking lot, but Twin Bridge apartments would now be able to use ice melts or whatever is agreed upon. The only sticking point is it would be a gentleman's agreement.

Vice Chair Clement commented it is hard to believe that he would salt The Commons and then turn off the salt machine and go do Twin Bridge. Superintendent Miner responded he has to; it is a no salt area.

Chair Provencher spoke of the concern with setting precedent. Member Sabens asked if the amount of salt reduction that would result is understood. Superintendent Miner commented the contractor had indicated he would utilize one bag of ice melt per storm. He really has been using just sand on The Commons parking lot (uses salt only when necessary/or when asked).

Vice Chair Clement remarked it is a slippery slope. She understands the thought process of a reduction in salt use if the parking lot were sanded and the walkways treated, but what happens if there is a change in the contractor and then the situation changes.

Chair Provencher stated he would not want to see the Town relax their regulations.

Superintendent Miner remarked if the Board is acceptable to approve the request, he would advise the contractor and could speak with Community Development and suggested, if required, that consideration be given to a site plan change for sand only and ice melt permitted on walkways only.

Vice Chair Clement commented on that parking lot having a very poor line between The Commons and Twin Bridge apartments. There is actually parking for the Twin Bridge apartments on The Commons' site because they tied the parking lots in together so well. There is not a very good delineation between the two sites, even on the site plan.

Asked if a site plan has already been submitted for the AutoZone, Vice Chair Clement stated her belief it was before the Planning Board once for review and has been continued because the board had not received comments from the Town's peer review engineer.

Chair Provencher stated a concern we have not seen any real salt reduction improvement in any of our wells. Vice Chair Clement stated her belief the Planning Board had concerns around, if putting a new building in an existing site, where is the line for what the new building has to adhere to versus what the site has to adhere to. The rest of The Commons is not ADA accessible, etc. She is uncertain how they will address salt use. Adding the AutoZone would not result in redeveloping the entirety of the lot but instead 30 parking spaces within the lot.

Commissioner Allen commented that if you can get someone to sand the parking lot by allowing walkway treatment, that is a win. Vice Chair Clement reiterated she is uncertain that we can legally enforce the trade. She is uncertain the Planning Board could either.

Commissioner Sabens asked if, as a board, they could get to the point where any salt reduction is good and the net reduction of salt is a positive thing but our stance is no salt or chemicals. It is always the best solution but not always the safest. You are trading one safety for another; potentially damaging your drinking water supply so people don't slip, which would impact a lot more people? They are both human safety issues, which is top priority. Which one has the greater impact?

Vice Chair Clement commented she feels it would be a different scenario if we were at a point where we were watching salt numbers go down. We are not.

Commissioner Sabens reiterated that any reduction in salt use is positive. Vice Chair Clement remarked, as it stands right now, if we permit walkways, we are increasing not decreasing.

Chair Provencher reiterated the concern with creating a situation where sites that are currently restricted to sand use come forward with requests to salt walkways. Noted was that Twin Bridge apartments is already restricted where The Commons is not. Commissioner Sabens stated the exception would be to stop salting the parking lot. Superintendent Miner stated it would be a gentlemen's agreement that the contractor would only salt when he absolutely needs to in the Twin Bridge apartments and is requesting to use ice melt on the walkways (something that has a sand only restriction).

Vice Chair Clement remarked she has a hard time with why he feels that his apartment complex should be able to salt walkways if the other ones built in the same timeframe cannot. She added it is not a 55+ development. It is workforce housing.

Superintendent Miner added that the contractor also maintains the Tortilla Flats site as well. He knows that restriction over there.

Commissioner Sabens remarked he would be more amendable to it if there was enforcement capability e.g., fines.

Chair Provencher reiterated the Town was diligent about enforcement last winter. There were sites that were restricted to sand only but were salting. Letters were sent out by the Town and then those sites abided by the restrictions.

Commissioner von Schoen stated the desire to understand why properties are grandfathered in and if they have to be. Vice Chair Clement stated they do. Member von Schoen asked if an ordinance could be approved that overrides the grandfathered properties. In absence of an answer to that, he would not want to talk about a solution. The solution really would be to say parking lots can no longer be salted, they can only be brined and once that is out there and people comply then we can talk about brine or even salting sidewalks. Otherwise, we will have different arrangements with different sites.

Vice Chair Clement suggested requesting the Town Council review the need for a salt ordinance would be a good direction to take for properties within the Wellhead Protection Areas.

Chair Provencher recalled a discussion with the Town Council years ago that resulted in seeing what the Commission can do regarding limiting salt use voluntarily by grandfathered properties with the system in place. We have been down this road for a few years now and are not seeing improvement.

Member von Schoen spoke of heartburn over parking in 55⁺ communities and the inability to allow them to do this. We do not have that authority. It would be good to have clarity across the Town in this regard. We don't have the authority to do that. The Town does.

The argument of something being grandfathered in doesn't seem to stand if we can make other ordinances in town that limit other situations/behavior.

With regard to the request, Member von Schoen stated "I think the answer is no, right now". It stinks for the gentleman who wants to be doing the right thing, but we're getting eaten up by this every year. We are having more and more discussions about it. We are fighting a problem that we don't have control over. The Town needs to address this.

Asked, Vice Chair Clement stated a request could be put forward to the Town Council. We could make the Council aware we have played this game with the site plan regulations for years, are not seeing results when it comes to the aquifers, think it is time to take additional action, and this is what we would propose, e.g., sand on parking lots and brine on walkways.

Chair Provencher commented he would like to see some improvement in our wells before we agree to recommend any relinquishment of the requirements. Vice Chair Clement remarked maybe we go with a full on no salt or chemical de-icers in the Aquifer Protection District.

Commissioner von Schoen remarked if that ordinance were to be adopted and the parking lots are being cut out of salt use the walkways are not the issue. Vice Chair Clement noted there would probably have to be a discussion of driveways and where they fell into it as well.

Chair Provencher commented if we leave things status quo this contractor could say I will put tons of salt down on the Tractor Supply site because I can and that would harm the wells. That is what we are trying to avoid. Commissioner Sabens added if we put forth a proposal for an ordinance that will restrict the parking lot, which would allow him to do what he is trying to do. If the contractor can assist in that effort by providing public comment at the Town Council meeting, etc. that would be helpful.

Chair Provencher questioned if members felt moving forward with a request for an ordinance is the follow-up action to this request. He noted there are private wells in Town that are also in salt restricted areas. It is not just MVD wells. He suggested Superintendent Miner inquire as to whether Director Price is amendable to that discussion. If we could make it work through an ordinance that all of the grandfathered sites that are dumping loads of salt in the wellhead protection areas become restricted and are allowed to do walkways, then all of the restricted sites now would fall into the same category.

Vice Chair Clement commented if the restriction is on the site plan they still have to abide by it. All of those site plans would have to be amended. They could choose not to enforce the walkway on the site plans, but the site plans still say what they say.

Superintendent Miner suggested a work session where this issue could be discussed further.

Commissioner von Schoen remarked the very first question should be is the grandfathered aspect set in stone or can we get past it. Vice Chair Clement stated you cannot get past it because it is part of the site plan review ordinance. A site plan regulation only controls what is going through review right then and there. If you change the site plan regulations tomorrow it will only have an impact on plans that go through after it.

Commissioner von Schoen requested legal counsel be asked what leverage there is to change the ordinance for grandfathered properties going forward. If we cannot, is there another way around it, e.g., could it be a global ordinance for the Town that supersedes whatever site plan regulations that were put in place.

Superintendent Miner stated his belief that the Bylaws were a way to get around that. It wouldn't hit everybody, but with a change to the Bylaws, anyone wanting to be a customer of the MVD could only use brine or would be a salt free site. Commissioner von Schoen noted proposing a change to the Bylaws requires a Warrant Article approved at the Annual Meeting. Vice Chair Clement remarked that it would give us more enforcement capabilities, etc.

Commissioner von Schoen reiterated the desire to start by putting the question before the Town because a change in our Bylaws would not reach everyone in the Town.

2. Superintendent's Report

Maintenance:

Treatment Facilities

- 2&9 media change out has been scheduled for removal Tuesday, December 3rd with 4&5 to follow when they return the regenerated media for 2&9.

Chair Provencher noted the Monitoring Summary is still showing "changeout criteria alert (effluent detection or 8 months)" instead of "6 months".

When asked, Superintendent Miner stated we are changing the lead vessel. Commissioner von Schoen remarked that means we will have the short chains continue to leak through. Chair Provencher stated they would be immediately saturating the LAG vessel. He asked for clarification whether the short chains are already coming through the LAG vessel into the drinking water.

Commissioner von Schoen asked if that would stop because we are going to have clean lead vessel water flushing out the contaminant from the LAG for a while. Chair Provencher responded it will be okay for a while until it breaks through the new LAG.

Commissioner von Schoen stated the currently leaching LAG is going to be the new lead vessel so the new LAG vessel will be able to catch it until it gets saturated.

Chair Provencher added the new vessel with the brand-new media is going to be the LAG vessel. Commissioner von Schoen responded that is the question; should the current LAG vessel remain the LAG vessel. Chair Provencher stated long chains are never going to come through.

Superintendent Miner stated he has to throw the LAG into the lead for a short period of time while waiting for the regenerated media to come back.

Commissioner von Schoen suggested the new lead vessel, which will hold everything back for a while, will then send clean water through the LAG vessel and potentially flush out whatever short chains we have coming through.

We keep doubling up the short chains on the old LAG vessel that becomes the lead vessel. Chair Provencher remarked the hope would be if we could get through 6 months before short chains break through the LAG vessel. We were going with 8 months and that wasn't working. He is uncertain we have had sufficient opportunity yet to see what that change does. Vice Chair Clement suggested we will probably have to go through 3 changes to really see what a 6-month changeout does. Chair Provencher indicated that it is not really the best way to do it every 6 months because it is really the usage that dictates it. We are going to be going through 6 months of winter and will not get as many gallons through that vessel during that time. The 6-month approach was so that it works with the budget.

Chair Provencher stated the desire to see how that change works before trying something else. The suggestion was to let the 6-month approach run through a few changeouts to see where we are at.

Chair Provencher commented that the only thing we know here is that for wells 2 and 9 short chains are already breaking through the LAG vessels. When we change the media out on December 3rd we will be changing again on June 3rd because we know it is already breaking through the lead vessel so the 6 months is going to start. Then maybe we can catch up in June.

Vice Chair Clement remarked it is a balance between ensuring we have the budget right for them and making sure we have enough water go through them, but then we also want to make sure we efficiently use the media.

Commissioner von Schoen added we also have the option to layer media in the vessel. By the time we go through another cycle or two we might have additional polishing options that we don't have right now because we will have more data.

- Business Manager Lavoie and Superintendent Miner will be PFAS media sampling tomorrow.

Leak repair Mainline/Entrance:

Leak Detection Equipment

- We have met with one vender and are working on getting the other vender scheduled to gain information for budgeting purposes.

Administrative:

PFAS Watermain Extensions (MVD)

- Gerard & Mullikin Certificate of Substantial Completion was issued last week for this project. Our final construction meeting is Thursday; we will be going over the punch list and final pavement restorations (for spring).

- Farmer and Mason Rd.

All watermain is in, pressure tested, sampled and ready to go from Farmer to Foster. For Mason were waiting on bacteria results.

Business Manager Lavoie stated they came in today and are clean.

- Contractor is now installing services from main to property line.
- First project meeting is on Thursday.

Vehicle undercoating

- Twelve trucks and two backhoes have been done at this time. The dump truck and our service truck are too heavy for their lift, so they are not going to be able to do them.

Salt Reduction

- Salt letters will be going out this week to all within the Wellhead Protection Areas, (Merrimack, Amherst, and Hollis).

Baron and Budd

- On Wednesday, November 19th, Jason Julius and Celeste Edwards from Baron & Budd will be here for a site visit. They will be joined by their air modeling expert and a couple of representatives from their hydrogeologic expert team. They plan to visit all our facilities to get the lay of the land.

Asked if anyone from GZA is attending, Superintendent Miner stated they are not.

Merrimack Hazard Mitigation Plan

- Our final meeting for updating the Town's Hazard Mitigation Plan was this past Thursday, and the draft should be available soon and will be available to view on the share drive.

Asked about the status of the paving on the waterline installations, Superintendent Miner stated pavement is in. Both projects came in under budget. We’re looking at possibly repaving both roads. We’re checking with NHDES to see if we can use remaining funds for that. The project called for trench patching. Asked, he stated final pavement would likely be in the spring. Asked if we have seen connections, Superintendent Miner stated there have been a few.

Superintendent Miner remarked for Farmer, Mason, and Gerard, we are looking at doing an overlay on those with funds remaining (originally planned on patching). Asked if there is any downside to utilizing those funds (rather than returning it to the State), Superintendent Miner responded he does not believe so. Even with overlaying the road, he believes some funds will continue to be returned. He is concerned it could jeopardize future opportunities. It is for a good purpose, but not an MVD purpose, it is a Town purpose. Business Manager Lavoie stated if they are not agreeable to it, they will make that known.

- 3. Board of Commissioners to review the minutes from the October 20, 2025, regular meeting and Non-Public meeting

Board of Commissioners Meeting – **Non-Public**. October 20, 2025

**MOTION BY COMMISSIONER CLEMENT TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF NON-PUBLIC MEETING OF OCTOBER 20, 2025, AS PRESENTED
MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ALLEN
MOTION CARRIED
5-0-0**

Board of Commissioners Meeting October 20, 2025

The following amendments were offered:

Page 7, Line 4; replace “\$60-\$80/truck” with “\$260-\$280/truck”.

**MOTION BY COMMISSIONER VON SCHOEN TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF OCTOBER 20, 2025, AS AMENDED
MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ALLEN
MOTION CARRIED
5-0-0**

- 4. Board of Commissioners to review Action Items from previous meetings.

The Commission reviewed the Action Items. New dates were added to several of the items.

- 5. Old Business – Underwood Engineers, Inc. (UEI) Engineering Services Request (ESR) Consolidation

The scope of the work provides study phase services to evaluate the costs and benefits of various potential additional supply options.

Noted was the schedule; work will begin within 30 days of authorization to proceed and project deliverable provided within 180 days thereafter.

Under the heading of “Options needing further study phase evaluation”, the first bulleted item refers to a potential new source location on Daniel Webster Highway. Chair Provencher questioned if what is identified is with or without PFAS treatment if using the wholesale agreement with Pennichuck Water Works long-term.

The same question was asked about the wholesale agreement with Manchester Water Works (MWW). Superintendent Miner questioned if PFAS treatment would be needed with MWW.

Chair Provencher asked if PFAS treatment cost evaluation could be added as a separate option into the scope if not already included.

Asked what quantity is being looked at, e.g., is it going to be based on UNDERWOOD’s evaluation of what we need for make-up water volume? He is uncertain of what the volume is that is being evaluated.

Under the heading of Owner’s Responsibility, noted is the requirement for updated information on alternatives being considered to be made available to the engineer.

Old business

Member von Schoen questioned the status of the radio tower. Superintendent Miner stated the Town is still looking to do their own. It will be some time before they shift over. They will continue to monitor us. There will still be communication there, but we are not moving with them. They will continue monitoring wastewater and PWD who remain on their own as well. It is really just police and fire that are moving over.

Asked what the impetus is for doing that, Vice Chair Clement stated they had reception issues, e.g., couldn’t reach parts of town.

Commissioner von Schoen asked why we are not following them and merging onto their system instead of maintaining our own. That was the issue because they kept disconnecting our system. That was the original issue because they didn’t know that we had our own system and that it was in the same enclosure. That was the reason we started talking about piggybacking on their system. In addition, our system was getting outdated and they had a newer system.

Superintendent Miner stated he could follow up on that again. We are updating our radios. To him it was more of a concern that they were not going to be monitoring us if there was ever activation of the emergency operations center, communication should be there. They will be able to monitor us, we can talk to dispatch, dispatch can talk to police and fire and vice versa. He is fine if that is the way the system is going to work. He has been assured that everyone can talk back and forth.

Chair Provencher stated in September of 2024 we sent a request to the NH DOT, on MVD letterhead, for salt reduction on Industrial Drive and Continental Boulevard. Their response was

that it had to be on Town letterhead. The Town Council signed it. The school board was reluctant and submitted their own letter.

We missed the whole of last winter without having these roads restricted to reduced salt status.

In July, 2025, the DOT informed the Town Council they needed the school board to sign the letter. We went to the school board in September, 2025. Their response was why don't we write a new letter; however, they did not because the State representatives and Senator put together a letter and sent it to DOT. The letter said we really think the school board doesn't have a purpose to have to sign this letter and we're asking DOT to not require the school board to sign the salt reduction request letter.

In October, we got an email back from DOT saying we are working on it and will have a response. Chair Provencher sent an email to DOT on 11/13/2025 asking if DOT had a response. No response was received.

Jamie Emery, Emery & Garret Groundwater Investigations, has suggested he contact Bob Scott, DES Commissioner, to see if we can get DES to reach out to the DOT to move this along. He asked that the idea be run by the Commission to see if there is agreement with him reaching out.

Business Manager Lavoie noted she emailed Lori Peters, Chair, Merrimack School Board, who indicated they are still waiting on a response from DOT with regard to the letter sent by the State Representative and Senator.

Chair Provencher commented he is seeing us go through another winter with no salt restrictions.

Commissioner von Schoen commented he does not believe communication from our paid consultant would have the same weight as one from the Superintendent or Chair. He believed the last time the Commission discussed this it was stated legal counsel would be asked to review the validity of the request of the DOT to have the school board have a say in any of this. The school board has no authority on this matter. It is the Town and DOT that have the authority because they have to secure roads.

Chair Provencher remarked if that is the legal opinion of the Town's or MVD's legal counsel, the DOT can still say that is not their opinion, that is your legal opinion, and they don't think that is accurate. He suggested applying pressure from any possible direction.

Superintendent Miner stated the question has been posed of legal counsel.

Chair Provencher spoke frustration with the additional time that will pass and the number of salt applications that will take place while waiting to get this resolved.

Commissioner von Schoen remarked at this point, he believes we need to use the law to our advantage.

Vice Chair Clement commented she does not see any harm in letting Mr. Emery try to get DES to write a letter.

Chair Provencher commented if it goes nowhere at least we have another request that went nowhere in the public record, and that points us into taking our own legal action or we go to the school board and ask them to sign the letter.

Superintendent Miner will inform Mr. Emery the Commission is acceptable to him reaching out.

6. New Business - None

7. Questions from the Public/Press - None

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER VON SCHOEN TO ADJOURN

MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SABENS

MOTION CARRIED

5-0-0

The November 17, 2025, meeting of the Board of Commissioners was adjourned at 7:59 p.m.

Submitted by Dawn MacMillan, Recording Secretary