From: Richard Stanwood via FormMail.com

To: Mayor Becksted; CC - Splaine; cc McEachern; CC-Peter Whelan; CC - Cliff Lazenby; CC - Kennedy; CC - Huda;

CC-John Tabor; CC-Paige Trace; City Council; CityCouncil Clerk

Subject: 246 Thornton Street

Date: Sunday, August 2, 2020 7:59:51 PM

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Richard Stanwood (rltams29@comcast.net) on Sunday, August 2, 2020 at 18:59:48

address: 566 Dennett Street

comments: To the members of the Portsmouth City Council.

As a directly abutting neighbor of 246 Thornton Street, I wanted to voice my support in the request by James Gould to un-merge the involuntarily merged lot located at this property. I was first made aware of this project when the City gave notice they would appear before the board of adjustment.

It is my understanding that at a prior city Council meeting, the Gould's request for the council to approve the un-merger was sent to the planning board after being sent to and approved by the assessors office.

Pursuant to this meeting, it is also my understanding that a vote to reconsider has been placed on the agenda for the council meeting to occur on August 3.

Given all of this, I submit, for the consideration of the counsel, that I do not have an opposition to the un-merger of this lot.

Respectfully yours, Richard Stanwood 566 Dennett Street Portsmouth,NH

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

REMOTE ADDR: 73.149.192.162

From: Richard Stanwood via FormMail.com

To: Mayor Becksted; CC - Splaine; cc McEachern; CC-Peter Whelan; CC - Cliff Lazenby; CC - Kennedy; CC - Huda;

CC-John Tabor; CC-Paige Trace; City Council; CityCouncil Clerk

Subject: 246 Thornton Street

Date: Sunday, August 2, 2020 8:44:19 PM

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Richard Stanwood (rltams29@comcast.net) on Sunday, August 2, 2020 at 19:44:17

address: 566 Dennett Street Portsmouth NH

comments: To the members of the Portsmouth City Council.

As a directly abutting neighbor of 246 Thornton Street, I wanted to voice my support in the request by James Gould to un-merge the involuntarily merged lot located at this property. I was first made aware of this project when the City gave notice they would appear before the board of adjustment.

It is my understanding that at a prior city Council meeting, the Gould's request for the council to approve the un-merger was sent to the planning board after being sent to and approved by the assessors office.

Pursuant to this meeting, it is also my understanding that a vote to reconsider has been placed on the agenda for the council meeting to occur on August 3.

Given all of this, I submit, for the consideration of the counsel, that I do not have an opposition to the un-merger of this lot.

Respectfully yours, Richard and Linda Stanwood

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

REMOTE_ADDR: 73.149.192.162

From: <u>Leslie Allen via FormMail.com</u>

To: Mayor Becksted; CC - Splaine; cc McEachern; CC-Peter Whelan; CC - Cliff Lazenby; CC - Kennedy; CC - Huda;

CC-John Tabor; CC-Paige Trace; City Council; CityCouncil Clerk

Subject: August 3rd meeting/Esther Kennedy
Date: Monday, August 3, 2020 9:54:49 AM

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Leslie Allen (mlreallen@verizon.net) on Monday, August 3, 2020 at 08:54:47

address: 143 Brackett Road

comments: I feel that an investigation into council person Kennedy's action regarding the Pop Up project should be investigated.

You cannot start the fire and then claim to be the hero that put out the fire. All while using information gained from being a member of the city council.

The mayor and the council are held to certain standards, both written and understood. A violation of these standards cannot be ignored.

The citizens of Portsmouth deserve better than this.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

REMOTE_ADDR: 174.196.192.62

From: <u>Matthew Glenn via FormMail.com</u>

To: Mayor Becksted; CC - Splaine; cc McEachern; CC-Peter Whelan; CC - Cliff Lazenby; CC - Kennedy; CC - Huda;

CC-John Tabor; CC-Paige Trace; City Council; CityCouncil Clerk

Subject: Bicyclist "doored" but the solution some of you propose is worse

Date: Sunday, August 2, 2020 10:24:09 PM

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Matthew Glenn (matthglenn@gmail.com) on Sunday, August 2, 2020 at 21:24:07

address: 34 Harrison Ave Portsmouth

comments: Dear City Councilors,

I sent the below LTE to the Portsmouth Herald. In summary, I would love to see a bike lane design that prevents the possibility of "dooring", but putting bikes back between parked cars and moving cars doesn't do that. Please let the experts on city staff look at details of this specific accident and work toward a smart solution.

Matt Glenn

A bicyclist is "doored" and some are quick to blame bike lanes but offer a worse solution

I was sickened to hear that a bicyclist was hit by a car door on Sunday on Middle Street, and sickened further to hear Mayor Becksted and Councilor Whelan jump on this opportunity to attack the design of the bike lanes without any details about the crash. I don't know from the short police report if the car was properly parked or if it was encroaching on the buffer and bike lane. I don't know if the rider was positioned in the middle of the bike lane. I do know that when a car is properly parked there is space for the passenger side door to open into the buffer without hitting riders in the lane. I do know that NH RSA 265:96 puts the burden on the driver and passenger not to open a door into moving traffic. I also know that bicyclists are "doored" all the time in this country, often with fatal consequences, and too often the blame is put on the victim.

Several of our city councilors want to move the parked cars back to the curb, but this isn't a safety solution-- it will just put riders between opening driver's side doors and fast moving traffic. If we care about making the bike lane safer on Middle Street we need to ask the parking department to first issue warnings, then tickets for cars parked with wheels on the painted buffer. Better yet, we need to push for a long term plan with a real curb or barrier separating parked cars from riders. Dare I mention, some bollards could do this in the short term? When bike lane opponents bring up this crash as evidence, ask exactly how their plan would prevent "dooring" and keep all road users safer.

includeInRecords: on	
Engage: Submit	

REMOTE_ADDR: 66.31.0.67

From: Jason Walls via FormMail.com

To: Mayor Becksted; CC - Splaine; cc McEachern; CC-Peter Whelan; CC - Cliff Lazenby; CC - Kennedy; CC - Huda;

CC-John Tabor; CC-Paige Trace; City Council; CityCouncil Clerk

Subject: Compromise on masks

Date: Monday, August 3, 2020 8:55:29 AM

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Jason Walls (jason.sedley.walls@gmail.com) on Monday, August 3, 2020 at 07:55:27

address: 1113 Maplewood Ave

comments: Hi all.

I know you have a lot on your plate right now but I wanted to make one more official plea to not create an ordinance that fines people for not wearing masks, specifically outdoors in public. By doing so, you make the following situations realistic scenarios. By voting for such an ordinance, this is what you are saying you're okay with:

- An officer can ticket anyone downtown for any reason. There is no evidence for or against whether they were actually "six feet apart" or "social distancing wasn't possible". How could anyone possibly fight such a ticket?
- An officer is now spending their time walking around policing mask-wearing than on other more important and more respectful duties. Who is paying for it? What's the opportunity cost? Once again has PPD been consulted on this?
- A person may call the police to try to enforce the mask-wearing ordinance on random strangers walking around (especially homeless individuals). If you don't believe this will happen, look at any PPD log from any week.
- A person may call the police because they see some kids playing together not wearing masks. Yes, it will happen.
- A person that now feels justified in doing the above may lash out at anyone not wearing a mask when they feel they're supposed to be doing so. We've now set an adversarial tone for anyone visiting our city.

Even with exceptions, we know how unenforceable and weird this is. Some people definitely can't wear masks - are those people going to have to have their privacy invaded to prove they can't? How, through the legal system when fighting an already unfightable ticket?

Besides that fact that cases in Portsmouth are well under control (the recent "increase" was again in LTC facilities), we all know what the real issue is: people refusing to wear masks when restaurants and businesses ask them too. Perhaps, as a compromise, that is what the ordinance can speak to?

Let's remove the "when social distancing isn't possible" and simply say "in accordance with state guidelines" of patrons going into stores and when traveling to and from their seats in restaurants. That seems to address the true issue, gives our businesses some teeth to work with when demanding compliance, and is a reasonable compromise that doesn't create any weird ambiguous situations.

Lastly, whatever ordinance is crafted, it's incredibly important that there is a definite sunset date on it. A short one.

Let's be smart about this and not simply try to satisfy the mob.

-Jason Walls
includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

REMOTE ADDR: 72.65.104.217

From: Gerald Duffy via FormMail.com

To: Mayor Becksted; CC - Splaine; cc McEachern; CC-Peter Whelan; CC - Cliff Lazenby; CC - Kennedy; CC - Huda;

CC-John Tabor; CC-Paige Trace; City Council; CityCouncil Clerk

Subject: Councilor Kennedy - Bike Lanes

Date: Sunday, August 2, 2020 3:25:43 PM

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Gerald Duffy (gduffy44@gmail.com) on Sunday, August 2, 2020 at 14:25:42

address: 428 Pleasant St., Unit 3

comments: Dear Mayor and Councilors:

When the topic of bike lanes comes up for discussion this evening, I urge the Council to carry out due diligence and collect all relevant data regarding any crashes before making any motions or taking any action. This would include detailed Police reports of any crashes and professional assessments by the experts on our City staff, especially Juliet Walker and the traffic experts in our Planning Department. This is the work we pay them to do.

Because you are a modern policy-making body, your actions, whenever appropriate, should be based not on anecdotes (for example, Councilor Kennedy's broken wing mirror or "near misses") or the complaints of individual residents, but on hard, verifiable data and professional recommendations.

The Mayor and Councilors Kennedy and Whelan still seem bound and determined to undo a project that has been in the making for a couple of decades and that represents the policy directions baked into our Master Plan. Anyone can say "I think biking's great, but..." and then offer reasons for moving backwards. We need to protect the current design as an interim step until — as several Councilors have already wisely suggested — we can move towards a brand new concept for the Middle Street corridor in general, creating yet another attractive gateway to our City.

Best wishes, Gerald Duffy	
includeInRecords: on	
Engage: Submit	

REMOTE ADDR: 71.233.87.81

From: Maria Sillari via FormMail.com

To: Mayor Becksted; CC - Splaine; cc McEachern; CC-Peter Whelan; CC - Cliff Lazenby; CC - Kennedy; CC - Huda;

CC-John Tabor; CC-Paige Trace; City Council; CityCouncil Clerk

Subject: Councilor Kennedy's unethical actions Date: Monday, August 3, 2020 9:48:44 AM

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Maria Sillari (Msillari14@gmail.com) on Monday, August 3, 2020 at 08:48:39

address: 171 Jones Avenue

comments: Dear Mayor and Councilors,

I am unable to attend tonight's meeting to enter public comment in support of the ethics complaint against Councilor Kennedy, so I am writing instead.

We can debate ad nauseam whether PopUpNH was or is officially a nonprofit, and I believe city recordkeeping will show that CARES Fund monies reimbursed the city, not PopUpNH for costs associated to setting up the Bridge Street lot for this purpose. The issue at hand is whether Councilor Kennedy's actions were unethical. I believe they were, and I believe she should be removed from her seat on the Council.

PopUpNH (nee PopUp Portsmouth) shared information transparently and in good faith with the Council that was not yet public in advance of its registering as a NH nonprofit, to enable the city and the organization to move forward in a timely fashion with its plans. The Council approved the plans.

Rather than raise concerns during Council meetings, or approach the organization or the City with her concerns, with a similar transparency and the spirit of collaboration on which this city prides itself, Councilor Kennedy used the information to knowingly obstruct the organization's filing.

It is common practice, and fully legal, for a fledgling, not-yet-incorporated nonprofit organization (PopUpNH) to engage a 501c3 nonprofit (Seacoast Repertory Theater) to act as a fiscal agent, allowing it to accept charitable contributions and provide fiscal oversight.

It appears to me that PopUpPortsmouth acted appropriately and in full transparency with the City Council in their pursuit of funding. Given that, I am left with one of two conclusions with regard to Councilor Kennedy's actions:

She either does not understand the process that was properly underway or she simply did not agree with a properly approved decision by the City Council and covertly obstructed the process to satisfy her personal agenda.

In either case, Councilor Kennedy has shown herself to be incapable of faithfully and ethically performing the duties if a City Councilor and should therefore be removed from that position.

includeInRecords: on		
Engage: Submit		

REMOTE ADDR: 74.75.167.142

From: Katherine Mallen via FormMail.com

To: Mayor Becksted; CC - Splaine; cc McEachern; CC-Peter Whelan; CC - Cliff Lazenby; CC - Kennedy; CC - Huda;

CC-John Tabor; CC-Paige Trace; City Council; CityCouncil Clerk

Subject: Esther K.

Date: Monday, August 3, 2020 3:34:03 PM

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Katherine Mallen (katemallen44@gmail.com) on Monday, August 3, 2020 at 14:34:02

address: 140 Woodlawn Circle

comments: I have lived in Portsmouth all my life & I have never seen anything like the vicious vendetta against Esther. To think that 60 people got together to bring down a good woman is frightening. Who are these people? Where did they come from. Do they even live in Portsmouth? If so, how long?

Esther please please remember that we, the quiet majority of voters voted you right back on the Council last election. We voted Pearson & the others off because we didn't like her or the other arrogant members.

We don't make a lot of noise but We watch. We listen. We wait. We vote. And we will vote you back on the Council next election. This will blow over, until then....keep the faith. Karma is a witch & Pearson, you'll get a double whammy. I hope we get to witness it.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

REMOTE ADDR: 66.31.1.146

From: <u>Kathy Bergeron via FormMail.com</u>

To: Mayor Becksted; CC - Splaine; cc McEachern; CC-Peter Whelan; CC - Cliff Lazenby; CC - Kennedy; CC - Huda;

CC-John Tabor; CC-Paige Trace; City Council; CityCouncil Clerk

Subject: Esther Kennedy

Date: Monday, August 3, 2020 4:25:00 PM

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Kathy Bergeron (khbergeron@aol.com) on Monday, August 3, 2020 at 15:24:58

address: 199 Wibird Street

comments: I am writing to express my dismay with the actions of Esther Kennedy in regards to the Pop Up New Hampshire name registration. This type of act is not becoming to any City Council.

I am also very confused about Kennedy's statement in Seacoast Online today, August 3. She stated that she will listen to the residents, but 'many' of the letters were written by non-residents. I went through the letters in public record. I counted 2 that were non-residents among the over 60 from residents that had written on the subject. Miss Kennedy, could you elaborate on this? My hope is that you were misquoted.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

REMOTE ADDR: 71.168.112.239

From: Linda Briolat via FormMail.com

To: Mayor Becksted; CC - Splaine; cc McEachern; CC-Peter Whelan; CC - Cliff Lazenby; CC - Kennedy; CC - Huda;

CC-John Tabor; CC-Paige Trace; City Council; CityCouncil Clerk

Subject: Gould house project

Date: Monday, August 3, 2020 4:53:10 PM

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Linda Briolat (lbriolat@comcast.net) on Monday, August 3, 2020 at 15:53:08

address: 260 Thornton St

comments: iPad

To the members of the Portsmouth City Council.

As a directly abutting neighbor of 246 Thornton Street, we wanted to voice our support in the request by James Gould to un-merge the involuntarily merged lot located at this property. We were first made aware of this project when the City gave notice they would appear before the board of adjustment.

It is our understanding that at a prior city Council meeting, the Gould's request for the council to approve the un-merger was sent to the planning board after being sent to and approved by the assessors office.

Pursuant to this meeting, it is also our understanding that a vote to reconsider has been placed on the agenda for the council meeting to occur on August 3.

Given all of this, we submit, for the consideration of the council, that we do not have an opposition to the un-merger of this lot.

Respectfully yours, LInda and Randy Briolat 260 Thornton St. Portsmouth, NH

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

REMOTE ADDR: 66.30.229.158

From: <u>Jill L. Vranicar via FormMail.com</u>

To: Mayor Becksted; CC - Splaine; cc McEachern; CC-Peter Whelan; CC - Cliff Lazenby; CC - Kennedy; CC - Huda;

CC-John Tabor; CC-Paige Trace; City Council; CityCouncil Clerk

Subject: Mandatory Masks

Date: Monday, August 3, 2020 1:01:50 PM

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Jill L. Vranicar (jlvranicar@gmail.com) on Monday, August 3, 2020 at 12:01:48

address: 500 market st unit 6

comments: I'm pleading with the city council to make masks mandatory for the sake of our community, local businesses and my business in particular. I am a self employed massage therapist whom will get shut down again if the numbers of infected surge again. I feel the masks are a necessary part keeping our community safe, without them we are risking visitors from other areas or even those with unsafe practices from within infecting our residents taking down people and businesses alike. It is such a simple request that I can't even believe that not everyone is on board. If you want this community and it's businesses to survive through this pandemic you will take the necessary steps to mandating masks. Thank you Jill

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

REMOTE ADDR: 72.65.125.119

From: <u>Donna Westbrook via FormMail.com</u>

To: Mayor Becksted; CC - Splaine; cc McEachern; CC-Peter Whelan; CC - Cliff Lazenby; CC - Kennedy; CC - Huda;

CC-John Tabor; CC-Paige Trace; City Council; CityCouncil Clerk

Subject: Mask Mandate

Date: Monday, August 3, 2020 10:32:44 AM

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Donna Westbrook (dmwestbrook@comcast.net) on Monday, August 3, 2020 at 09:32:42

address: 76D Manor Drive, Portsmouth, NH

comments: To the city manager, mayor, and city council members,

Today I write another letter to you requesting that you vote on and support a mask mandate for Portsmouth. I am hoping you are getting closer to a vote as time is of the essence. Public Health is THE most important thing for you all to consider.

Thank you, Donna Westbrook 76D Manor Drive Portsmouth, NH 03801

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

REMOTE_ADDR: 66.30.230.6

From: Susan Dewhirst via FormMail.com

To: Mayor Becksted; CC - Splaine; cc McEachern; CC-Peter Whelan; CC - Cliff Lazenby; CC - Kennedy; CC - Huda;

CC-John Tabor; CC-Paige Trace; City Council; CityCouncil Clerk

Subject: Mask Ordinance

Date: Sunday, August 2, 2020 3:15:53 PM

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Susan Dewhirst (sdewhirst04@gmail.com) on Sunday, August 2, 2020 at 14:15:51

address: 44 Cliff Road

comments: Dear City Councilors,

Thank you for your service during this difficult era in our history.

I am writing to request you support the city's proposed mask ordinace for the forseeable future. Looking at the data, it's clear the number of cases in the city and throughout the region is increasingly rapidly. A mask ordinance is a wildly supported, easy to implement, concrete action you, as the leaders of this city, can take to protect the health of citizens (especially our older and vulnerable neighbors and those who care for and love them) and visitors and the longterm viability of businesses (the lower the number of Covid19 cases the quicker businesses can fully re-open). As adults, it is also our responsibility to do everything in our power to keep our students, teachers and their families healthy so in-person learning, and extracurricular activies, may resume sometime this fall.

My family is doing it's best to stay healthy so we can regularly visit and care for two Grandmothers (age 89 and 91), who are extremely isolated and need us for their physical and mental well-being. We are also working to support all of the local businesses we love so they can survive the Covid era. As we see the numbers rise, and without a mask ordinance, we'll be less likely to feel safe shopping locally; for example grabbing picnic subs from Moe's, burgers at Lexie's, bread and sweets at Ceres Bakery, tools and house project materials at Ricci Lumber, clothes at the Wear House and Sweet Pea, produce at the Farmer's Market and groceries at Hannaford or Market Basket and other businesses we love. Instead, we'll be forced to make our purchases online and have them delivered.

Please don't put us in a position where we are in the same situtation as the spring, with stay-at-home orders, isolation and wide-spread depression creeping in as the long, dark months of winter loom ahead.

_	

REMOTE ADDR: 73.149.193.135

With appreciation,

From: Ramona Dow via FormMail.com

Mayor Becksted; CC - Splaine; cc McEachern; CC-Peter Whelan; CC - Cliff Lazenby; CC - Kennedy; CC - Huda; CC-John Tabor; CC-Paige Trace; City Council; CityCouncil Clerk To:

Subject: Mask Ordinance

Date: Sunday, August 2, 2020 10:27:58 AM

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by

Ramona Dow (rdow@comcast.net) on Sunday, August 2, 2020 at 09:27:56

address: 571 Dennett St

comments: I fully support passage of the Mask Ordinance at Monday's meeting. Thank you.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

REMOTE_ADDR: 73.167.216.24

From: <u>Joe Mulqueen via FormMail.com</u>

To: Mayor Becksted; CC - Splaine; cc McEachern; CC-Peter Whelan; CC - Cliff Lazenby; CC - Kennedy; CC - Huda;

CC-John Tabor; CC-Paige Trace; City Council; CityCouncil Clerk

Subject: Masks - Science vs. Politics

Date: Thursday, July 30, 2020 8:05:08 PM

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Joe Mulqueen (njmulqueen@msn.com) on Thursday, July 30, 2020 at 19:05:05

address: 38 Fells Road

comments: Science clearly shows face coverings of various kinds do little, if anything, to prevent respiratory illnesses caused by aerosolized viruses. Influenza viruses, such as coronaviruses that cause the common cold and SARS-CoV-2, all spread via the air, not just via droplets or touching contaminated surfaces. Preventing droplet contamination does not mean you also prevent the transmission of the aerosolized virus

N95 masks can filter particles as small as 0.3 microns, so they may prevent a majority of respiratory droplets from escaping, but not aerosolized viruses. Lab testing has shown 3M surgical masks can block up to 75% of particles measuring between 0.02 microns and 1 micron while cloth masks block between 30% and 60% of respiratory particles of this size. Regardless of the mask, it will not prevent you from exhaling or inhaling the aerosolized virus, but cloth masks are clearly the least preferable option if you actually want to reduce the spread of infection, as their ability to block respiratory droplets is also limited

As published on February 17, 2020, Dr. Anthony Fauci said,

"If you look at the masks that you buy in a drug store, the leakage around that doesn't really do much to protect you. People start saying, 'Should I start wearing a mask?' Now, in the United States, there is absolutely no reason whatsoever to wear a mask."

On March 8, he told 60 Minutes:

"Right now, in the United States, people should not be walking around with masks. There's no reason to be walking around with a mask. When you're in the middle of an outbreak, wearing a mask may make people feel a little bit better, and it might even stop a droplet, but it's not providing the perfect protection that people think that it is."

A policy review paper published in "Emerging Infectious Diseases" in May 2020 (the CDC's own journal) reviewed "the evidence base on the effectiveness of nonpharmaceutical personal protective measures ... in non-healthcare settings." According to this policy review:

"Although mechanistic studies support the potential effect of hand hygiene or face masks, evidence from 14 randomized controlled trials of these measures did not support a substantial effect on transmission of laboratory-confirmed influenza. We similarly found limited evidence on the effectiveness of improved hygiene and environmental cleaning."

Pages 970 to 972 of the review include the following quotes:

"In our systematic review, we identified 10 RCTs [randomized controlled trials] that reported estimates of the effectiveness of face masks in reducing laboratory-confirmed influenza virus infections in the community from literature published during 1946–July 27, 2018. In pooled analysis, we found no significant reduction in influenza transmission with the use of face masks ...

Disposable medical masks (also known as surgical masks) are loose-fitting devices that were designed to be worn by medical personnel to protect accidental contamination of patient wounds, and to protect the wearer against splashes or sprays of bodily fluids ...

There is limited evidence for their effectiveness in preventing influenza virus transmission either when worn by the infected person for source control or when worn by uninfected persons to reduce exposure.

Our systematic review found no significant effect of face masks on transmission of laboratory-confirmed influenza ... In this review, we did not find evidence to support a protective effect of personal protective measures or environmental measures in reducing influenza transmission."

There has been no break-through research that over turns the science that face masks do little, if anything, to prevent

respiratory illnesses caused by aerosolized viruses.

Please consider the science and ask the state to provide actual evidence that masks are safe and effective for Covid-19. Then put the resolution on hold and move on to the many pressing issues we currently face.

Don't let fear, emotion, and politics mask the scientific evidence.

includeInRecords: on	
Engage: Submit	

REMOTE_ADDR: 66.31.3.124

From: <u>Jacqueline Cali-Pitts via FormMail.com</u>

To: Mayor Becksted; CC - Splaine; cc McEachern; CC-Peter Whelan; CC - Cliff Lazenby; CC - Kennedy; CC - Huda;

CC-John Tabor; CC-Paige Trace; City Council; CityCouncil Clerk

Subject: Masks

Date: Monday, August 3, 2020 10:15:17 AM

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Jacqueline Cali-Pitts (cali0917@aol.com) on Monday, August 3, 2020 at 09:15:15

address: 40 Bedford Way

comments: It is not so difficult to wear a mask. Please if an ordinance is passed it should be reviewed in the Fall and this provision should be contained in the ordinance. There also should be exemptions for those who can not tolerate facial covering. When there are pop up gatherings where the rules are not strictly enforced the license to hold these should be withdrawn immediately.

Masks, Social distance, and respect for others are the keys.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

REMOTE_ADDR: 75.68.180.157

From: Lee Roberts via FormMail.com

To: Mayor Becksted; CC - Splaine; cc McEachern; CC-Peter Whelan; CC - Cliff Lazenby; CC - Kennedy; CC - Huda;

CC-John Tabor; CC-Paige Trace; City Council; CityCouncil Clerk

Subject: McIntyre Property Survey

Date: Sunday, August 2, 2020 6:30:12 AM

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Lee Roberts (lnr4@comcast.net) on Sunday, August 2, 2020 at 05:30:10

address: 66 State Street Unit 403

comments: Dear Councilors,

I must apologize. that, In completing the recent survey, I believe I may have used the numbering system in reverse.

Basically, I support more open space indoors and outdoors, far less density, a return of our post office, sufficient parking, and a mix of traditional architecture, particularly on the Bow Street side, and contemporary architecture using glass giving the structure an open feeling.

Regarding that request, I ask that you visit the back of the extraordinarily excellent restoration of the building on Congress State being done by the Labrie family.

Many thanks for your consideration of my requests.

With warmest regards,

Lee Roberts

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

REMOTE ADDR: 99.203.56.69

From: CJ Fleck via FormMail.com

To: Mayor Becksted; CC - Splaine; cc McEachern; CC-Peter Whelan; CC - Cliff Lazenby; CC - Kennedy; CC - Huda;

CC-John Tabor; CC-Paige Trace; City Council; CityCouncil Clerk

Subject: Middle Street Bike Lane Improvement **Date:** Monday, August 3, 2020 11:54:12 AM

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by CJ Fleck (cj.fleck@gmail.com) on Monday, August 3, 2020 at 10:54:10

address: 6 Rockaway Street

comments: After the dooring, I see that the bike lane is back on the agenda. Will our council advocate to improve the bike lane by smoothing out the "merge" at the point of incident, or will they use this as a way to denigrate the entire project?

If certain councilors would please spare us the faux concern for cyclist safety while trying to remove the protected nature of the lanes, that would be wonderful.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

REMOTE_ADDR: 66.31.224.24

From: Kenneth Goldman via FormMail.com

To: Mayor Becksted; CC - Splaine; cc McEachern; CC-Peter Whelan; CC - Cliff Lazenby; CC - Kennedy; CC - Huda;

CC-John Tabor; CC-Paige Trace; City Council; CityCouncil Clerk

Subject: Ordinance Requiring That Face Coverings Be Worn At Specific Times In The City of Portsmouth

Date: Monday, August 3, 2020 4:27:39 PM

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Kenneth Goldman (krgoldman@comcast.net) on Monday, August 3, 2020 at 15:27:38

address: 271 Islington St, Portsmouth, NH 03801

comments: All,

I strongly request that all City Councilors put their support behind the Ordinance Requiring That Face Coverings Be Worn At Specific Times In The City of Portsmouth.

We have managed to keep the levels of COVID-19 low in Portsmouth, and now, with more and more establishments opening up, we have more people on the streets. It is only prudent that the city take measures to help prevent spreading the disease.

Additionally, there are constant reports from businesses of their employees being verbally abused, and sometimes threatened, by customers who do not want to wear a mask. Putting the weight of the city behind this requirement should help by taking a lot of pressure off these employees, and hopefully reduce or end the abuse and threats.

Ken Goldman	
ncludeInRecords: on	
Engage: Submit	
	_

REMOTE_ADDR: 75.68.182.8

From: <u>Judy Miller via FormMail.com</u>

To: Mayor Becksted; CC - Splaine; cc McEachern; CC-Peter Whelan; CC - Cliff Lazenby; CC - Kennedy; CC - Huda;

CC-John Tabor; CC-Paige Trace; City Council; CityCouncil Clerk

Subject: Protective Face Coverings

Date: Sunday, August 2, 2020 10:07:10 AM

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Judy Miller (jamiller37@gmail.com) on Sunday, August 2, 2020 at 09:07:06

address: 77 Hanover Street, Unit #7

comments: I strongly request the Council to adopt an ordinance requiring protective face coverings. The proposed ordinance states a protective face covering is not required when "at least 6' distance" is maintained.

I'm a downtown resident; every day I observe individuals not wearing a protective face covering when walking closer than 6 feet apart. This is especially prevalent in Vaughan Mall, Market Square, and on our narrow sidewalks - Market, Fleet, Ceres, Penhallow, and parts of Bow Streets for example.

Each day, I have observed an increase of out-of-state visitors (based on vehicle license plates) who do not wear masks and do not follow the "at least 6' distance".

As you know, the number of positive COVID cases in Portsmouth have significantly increased. I strongly request that protective face covering should be required in Portsmouth and enforcement measures are adopted. Thank you.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

REMOTE ADDR: 24.147.240.9

From: <u>James Davis via FormMail.com</u>

To: Mayor Becksted; CC - Splaine; cc McEachern; CC-Peter Whelan; CC - Cliff Lazenby; CC - Kennedy; CC - Huda;

CC-John Tabor; CC-Paige Trace; City Council; CityCouncil Clerk

Subject: Un-merging of lot at 246 Thornton Steet

Date: Friday, July 31, 2020 9:11:43 AM

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by James Davis (davis530@outlook.com) on Friday, July 31, 2020 at 08:11:41

address: 530 Dennett Street

comments: To the members of the Portsmouth City Council.

As a directly abutting neighbor of 246 Thornton Street, I wanted to voice my support in the request by James Gould to un-merge the involuntarily merged lot located at this property. I was first made aware of this project when the City gave notice they would appear before the board of adjustment.

It is my understanding that at a prior city Council meeting, the Gould's request for the council to approve the un-merger was sent to the planning board after being sent to and approved by the assessors office.

Pursuant to this, it is also my understanding that a vote to reconsider has been placed on the agenda for the council meeting to occur on August 3.

Given all of this, I submit, for the consideration of the counsel, that I do not have an opposition to the un-merger of this lot.

Respectfully yours,

James Davis

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

.....

REMOTE ADDR: 174.63.76.100