

**From:** [Cathy Baker 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:** 2nd and 3rd readings should not be on same night  
**Date:** Monday, August 3, 2020 8:28:59 PM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Cathy Baker (catherinejbaker@yahoo.com) on Monday, August 3, 2020 at 19:28:57

-----  
address: 127 Gates St.

comments: It is unethical to rush a process for passing an ordinance. The process is there for a reason. That reason is transparency and the opportunity for the public to comment on items relevant to them. I am sure a survey of residents would show an enormous number of residents had no idea this ordinance was even in the works (the paper has been doing a poor job reporting on city government since COVID began). Thank you Councilor Kennedy and Mayor Becksted for standing up for an open, honest government process.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----  
REMOTE\_ADDR: 72.71.240.140

**From:** [David Hudlin 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:** COVID Impact to Operating Budget  
**Date:** Sunday, August 16, 2020 10:15:58 AM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
David Hudlin (dhudlin@hotmail.com) on Sunday, August 16, 2020 at 09:15:56

-----  
address: 260 Miller Ave

comments: Dear Council,

Can you please address the subject of how the City is evaluating the impact of operating budgets for the School, Fire and Police as it relates to the COVID environment?

School Dept: Last year we essentially shut down all in school learning and sports in Mar. Buildings/facilities went unused, teachers/administrators worked remotely. Based on the current plan for the upcoming school year, in school learning is limited to one day/week, and it appears sports will also be put on hold.

Police/Fire: With daily population increases in Portsmouth down significantly due to closing of retail/restaurants, as well as employees able to work remotely at companies throughout the city, demand for resources is down dramatically...especially the downtown, which we know consumes a disproportionate share of resources.

As a 30 year residential taxpayer, one who has been outspoken of the crushing increase in residential taxes due to continuous shift in residential assessments vs. commercial and the annual compounding impact of increases in City operating budgets, I am concerned that we, as residential taxpayers, are being asked to continue to fund budgets that reflect a "normalized" environment. We are ALL being impacted financially by this pandemic. I hope you are protecting taxpaying residents during this situation. We need representation in all situations, this being no exception.

One of the reasons the last Council was ushered out was insensitivity to taxpayer plight as we continuously contend with double digit increases in our tax bills while our Commercial property owners saw annual tax bill reductions, due to assessments that consistently understated the increase in assessed values.

Thank you

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----

REMOTE\_ADDR: 71.235.10.152

**From:** [David Arseneau 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:** Democrat Reforms Pending - No Police, No Guns  
**Date:** Friday, August 14, 2020 5:44:26 PM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
David Arseneau (RealEagleScout@gmail.com) on Friday, August 14, 2020 at 16:44:25

-----  
address: 245 Middle St, Apt 609, , , ,

comments: Could it happen here in Portsmouth?

It most certainly will if Socialists are elected. Voting Democrat is an assurance it would. Senator Shaheen will help guarantee it.

So will our Democratic City Council, backed by our media.

Have we ever heard our Senator speak out once against the violence occurring in Democratically controlled cities from coast to coast? Why?

She's willing to be active in certain local issues, yet absent of any substantive leadership in almost every other aspect of the Constitution of the United States, and the State of New Hampshire.

You see, Democratic Socialists are brave in killing babies, yet will always be cowards to facing an armed citizen. and allow us our Constitutionally granted self defense.

So, my Red-feathered Comrades:

"The right protected by the Second Amendment is of the highest order. It was born out of the lessons of a struggle for Independence, and the hard lessons learned that individual citizens faces threats from many sources, including fellow citizens, foreign powers, and potentially even their own government." - Supreme Court Justice Thomas,-  
April 2020

David Arseneau  
245 Middle St. # 609  
Portsmouth NH 03801  
New Hampshire Republican Congressional Committee  
Portsmouth NH (603) 316 0563

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----  
REMOTE\_ADDR: 185.232.22.110

**From:** [Marsha Robinson 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:** Election / Masks  
**Date:** Friday, August 14, 2020 2:28:36 PM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Marsha Robinson (Marrobi@aol.com) on Friday, August 14, 2020 at 13:28:34  
-----

address: 131 Jones Avenue

comments: I strongly urge city counselors to support a mask mandate in town. I am a select person in Ward 5, and I am very concerned for the safety of poll workers as well as voters. We need a protocol established so that people coming to the polls are wearing masks and social distancing. Safety needs to be the priority for all involved.

I would also suggest that, due to the postal situation, the city provide outside boxes for residents to drop off their ballots rather than rely on mail service.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----

REMOTE\_ADDR: 24.61.220.22

**From:** [William Gum 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 should resign!  
**Date:** Monday, August 3, 2020 7:13:42 PM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
William Gum (backgum@comcast.net) on Monday, August 3, 2020 at 18:13:40

-----  
address: 71 Taft Road

comments: I respectfully request Esther Kennedy's resignation in regards to her unethical behavior in regards to Pop Up Portsmouth.

Thanks

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----  
REMOTE\_ADDR: 174.242.81.121

**From:** [Rich Dipentima 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:** Face Covering order  
**Date:** Friday, August 14, 2020 9:19:56 AM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Rich Dipentima (rdipentima@gmail.com) on Friday, August 14, 2020 at 08:19:48

-----  
address: 16 Dunlin Way

comments: Dear Council members:

Once again I am pleading with you, in the name of public health, and and as your legal obligation to protect the citizens of Portsmouth, to adopt a universal mask mandate for the entire city. i support the current draft ordinance, with certain limited exemptions. The ordinance should include the entire City, not just the downtown overlay district. the virus does not distinguish between areas of the city where it can be transmitted. there are many large retail establishments and restaurants etc. on Lafayette Road, Woodbury Avenue and other locations where large groups can gather and spread the virus. Having an ordinance that applies to only one section of the City will cause confusion and adds a burden to some establishments while allowing others to do as they please.

Please do what is right and best for public health.

Thank you for your consideration.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----  
REMOTE\_ADDR: 71.168.72.174

**From:** [Wendy Kessler 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:** I Support A Mask Ordinance  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 11, 2020 4:36:59 PM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Wendy Kessler (FAGELBAGEL@AOL.COM) on Tuesday, August 11, 2020 at 15:36:57

-----  
address: 790 McGee Drive

comments: Dear City Councilors,

I am writing in support of the proposed mask ordinance.

Thank you for removing the exception for people who are walking down town. If this ordinance passes, perhaps we, the people who live in Portsmouth, will be able to walk around our own downtown again.

Please just make sure the ordinance has teeth for enforcement.

Thank you.  
Wendy Kessler  
790 McGee Drive

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----  
REMOTE\_ADDR: 71.232.209.12

**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:** Mask mandate hearing  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 18, 2020 9:23:40 AM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Jason Walls (jason.sedley.walls@gmail.com) on Tuesday, August 18, 2020 at 08:23:38  
-----

address: 1113 Maplewood Ave

comments: Hi all,

In the event I don't make it to the hearing tonight, I want to make sure that I've re-iterated my points once again and that it matters just as much as speaking personally on call. Sometimes I feel like it doesn't and that bothers me.

Here are some of my chief remaining concerns:

- Have PPD been consulted on this? Has there been a discussion of the costs of enforcement, both monetary and culturally?

- Laws need to be well defined and have well-defined terms. "When social distancing isn't possible" isn't well defined. You're going to have chaos and ambiguity for PPD. People will start calling 911 on each other. How is this enforceable? I've heard people say, "well other towns are doing it", but are they though? Or are they making a mandate with no teeth to try to scare people into compliance?

- What are our empirical criteria for making the mandate? Under what conditions will the mandate be rescinded? Is it when there's a viable vaccine? Is it when cases go to zero? The latter is a wildly unrealistic goal, and the first may take so long as to make a mask requirement rather onerous. I currently do not see an end date or end conditions in the proposed ordinance.

Again, I must reiterate that we can and should simply make the mandate for inside businesses and when following the outdoor dining guidelines. That's where the real pain-point is. There are enough jerks trying to throw their weight around at hostesses and retail employees such that they could use some "teeth" behind their business policies.

Lastly, after \*months\* of being open for indoor and outdoor retail and restaurants, Portsmouth has seen a decline in cases. We've had a LOT of tourists, hence the demand for the mandate in the first place. But we've never seen a second wave nor an outbreak caused by alleged irresponsible visitors. There are now only 6 in Portsmouth. Six.

That leads us to one of two conclusions: either masks aren't worth it, or people are voluntarily wearing them \*when it actually matters\* and it's working. Since we know masks do work, it must clearly be the latter, but in EITHER of those two cases, a mandate is categorically unnecessary. People have been doing the right thing for a while, and it shouldn't all be for naught.

Please do the smart thing, with actual thought of the consequences put into this. Let's not do something that simply appeases fears for the sake of it.

-Jason

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit



---

REMOTE\_ADDR: 72.65.104.217

**From:** [Paula Harrington-Purinton via FormMail.com](mailto:Paula.Harrington-Purinton@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 Mandate  
**Date:** Sunday, August 16, 2020 7:08:35 PM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Paula Harrington-Purinton (dotgale1231@comcast.net) on Sunday, August 16, 2020 at 18:08:33

-----

address: 9 STAYSAIL WAY

comments: As a resident of Portsmouth I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed FACE COVERINGS DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC Ordinance as it is currently written. The way it is stated is far too broad. Following the town of Newmarket's lead, it should specify that "people using sidewalks or other outdoor recreational land are not required to wear masks, but officials are strongly encouraging it when they're unable to practice social distancing." It seems contradictory that I can be sitting at a restaurant's outside table on the sidewalk without a mask, but if I am walking by that same table on the sidewalk without a mask I would be considered in violation of the proposed ordinance. Also stating that the act of eating or drinking must take place at a "business establishment licensed by the City of Portsmouth for that purpose" is too restrictive. Does that mean that if I buy a cup of coffee to go at The Works, Popovers, Starbucks, Cup of Joe, Kaffee Von!

solln or Tuscan Kitchen it will be illegal to drink it as I walk or sit with it on a public bench or bring it to Prescott Park to enjoy beside the water?

The Exceptions should be expanded to exclude persons walking, biking or exercising as long as physical separation of 6' is maintained. (originally stated in your resolution dated July 13, 2020 "These requirements will not pertain to persons six years of age or younger, or to persons who believe that they have a medical or other condition which may pose a risk to that person for health or related reasons. "Nor will these requirements pertain to persons walking, biking, or exercising so long as physical separation of at least six feet is maintained. When an individual is in any situation where at least six feet is maintained, no face covering is required."

It is important that we residents are allowed to walk as a form of exercise, without a mask, through our city without feeling as if we are breaking the law. It is critical that those residents who feel more comfortable wearing masks be educated to other information regarding close contact in order to refrain from judging those who feel differently about the benefits of wearing a mask. An excellent example of promoting safe sidewalk etiquette can be found on the Ottawa Canada Public Health web site page titled "Being Active During COVID-19", updated August 12, 2020 Their recommendation is to "Step-aside or pass others quickly and courteously on sidewalks." The site continues "Passing someone on the sidewalk is not considered a close contact or a significant risk for exposure to COVID-19." Per a recent article on seacoastonline.com Mayor "Becksted said Police Chief Robert Merner advised he would need four or five more patrol officers to enforce a mask ordinance throughout the city and the money for that is not in the budget." This is another reason the mandate should be re-evaluated.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----

REMOTE\_ADDR: 71.233.81.112

**From:** [Mary Lou McElwain 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 mandate  
**Date:** Sunday, August 16, 2020 3:46:24 PM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Mary Lou McElwain (ml259@comcast.net) on Sunday, August 16, 2020 at 14:46:22

-----

address: 259;South Street

comments: I am in full support of a mask mandate in Portsmouth. Data from health experts supports this. Over the past month I have been checking out downtown at different times and days. . My guess was about 60% compliance yesterday when sidewalks were packed. This is pretty much what I have seen on a regular basis. I spoke with a shopkeeper who was concerned at the lack of mask wearing.

As you consider a mandate, downtown should be at the top of your list. If I may suggest, the mandate would include streets from the middle bridge to Maplewood Ave ( north to south), and Bow-Deer Streets to Court Street (west to East) .

This mandate should include pedestrians, cyclists, joggers, moped-motorcycle riders, scooter riders.. Also anyone in a downtown shop, both shopkeepers and customers.

Exceptions:

Medical condition

Children under age 6

Anyone at tables or benches , indoors or outside, consuming food or drink .

The City could work with chamber of commerce and businesses to print fliers for each business, similar to flyers that were on all downtown establishments when “lockdown” occurred.

The info should be on city websites, chamber website, and websites for all downtown businesses. This info could include a

map outlining just the parameters, not every street in downtown. And notices can be put at the parking garages, and municipal lots.

I would be glad to volunteer to help with distributing flyers and am sure I can get a crew to assist.

Good luck in getting a mandate to pass.

Thanks,

Mary Lou McElwain

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----

REMOTE\_ADDR: 71.235.15.119

**From:** [Kathleen Bergeron 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 Mandate  
**Date:** Thursday, August 13, 2020 2:31:04 PM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Kathleen Bergeron (khbergeron@aol.com) on Thursday, August 13, 2020 at 13:31:02

-----  
address: 199 Wibird Street

comments: Hello, I am writing today to voice my support for a mask mandate in the downtown core of Portsmouth. In spending time in towns with clear mask mandates, it appears that even signage increases compliance significantly. I have a hard time believing that our police department would need four additional patrol officers to enforce this. Please reach out to other towns and ask how they are enforcing this. However, the mandate is necessary now.  
Thank you,

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----

REMOTE\_ADDR: 71.168.112.239

**From:** [Donna Westbrook 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 Mandate  
**Date:** Monday, August 17, 2020 5:47:03 AM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Donna Westbrook (dmwestbrook@comcast.net) on Monday, August 17, 2020 at 04:47:01

-----  
address: 76 Manor Drive

comments: To the mayor and all members of the city council,  
I am writing again in support of a mask mandate and hope you will conclude tomorrow evening, that a mask mandate for Portsmouth is in order.  
The people of Portsmouth do not live in a vacuum. We are not an island. Covid-19 knows no boundaries.  
CNN: More than 170,000 people with coronavirus have died in the United States as of 7:30 p.m. EST Sunday, according to the Johns Hopkins University tally.  
You have the opportunity to be on the right side of history. Do the right thing and make a mask mandate ordinance for Portsmouth.  
Sincerely,  
Donna Westbrook

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----

REMOTE\_ADDR: 66.30.230.6

**From:** [Michael Sanders 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 mandate  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 18, 2020 10:17:05 AM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Michael Sanders (mikejsand80@yahoo.com) on Tuesday, August 18, 2020 at 09:17:03  
-----

address: 10 Marjorie St

comments: I apologize for my third message regarding mask mandates to pass your inbox, but given we are still debating them, the situation warrants it.

Over the last two weeks, despite the influx of tourists this summer, Portsmouth has experienced a stunning 66% drop in covid cases (from 15 to 5). This alone shows that despite the tourist high season, we have succeeded in doing the right thing.

Now, college kids are the new threat. Yet, the influx of the UNH student population is far less than tourists and a demographic with a zero percent fatality rate in New Hampshire.

If the concern is their effect on others, let UNH do their job and require covid tests and expel students who violate local business rules.

Speaking of businesses, a mask mandate provides no support that existing laws do not provide. Despite anecdotal stories of mean customers not wearing masks, what data does Portsmouth PD have that customers verbally assault employees en masse? Trespassing laws should suffice to remove belligerent people from businesses. If employers are not training their employees to call police on trespassers, the failure is on them.

For those who say people who don't want to wear a mask outdoors, on city streets they pay to maintain while staying six feet away are selfish (which by the way is only difficult if you choose to crowd others, even downtown), I suggest they take some personal responsibility for their health and either stay at home or buy a full goggle and visor protective kit. Instead, they choose to try and create bogus laws to force others to comply with their political views.

If indeed the mayor is seeing 50/50 feedback, the right answer is put it to vote.

As an example of how ridiculous this will get, how do we pay the police to enforce this? Add a tax totaling a half million or more to our downtown businesses or our taxpayers who can't work because schools won't open?

How many times per day do you think people will call 911? One unmasked in market square, even if maintaining six feet of distancing, will result in numerous calls to police.

How can Portsmouth police, who I personally witnessed two of unmasked this week writing an unmasked woman a ticket? Sorry guys. But I saw it.

What about people wearing neck gaiters which according to Duke University studies spray 10% more particulates into the air than being maskless?

How will cops judge six feet of spacing? What if I take it to court? Will they have actual evidence like pictures or video with CAD showing six feet is violated?

This mandate is simply unnecessary by data driven standards and will turn Portsmouth into a unified city into a divided (and poorer) one full of hate and divisiveness because of those who fail to take care of themselves but rather

tattle on those who don't conform to their political (which is all this is - not health) viewpoints.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----

REMOTE\_ADDR: 174.196.192.170

**From:** [Marc Stettner 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:** Friday, August 14, 2020 9:38:32 AM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Marc Stettner (marcstettner@yahoo.com) on Friday, August 14, 2020 at 08:38:30  
-----

address: 91 Fairview Avenue

comments: Dear City Council,

While I support the concept of requiring masks to prevent the spread of COVID-19 I do not support the ordinance as written for the following reasons:

1. How will Law Enforcement know if an individual has a medical condition preventing the person from wearing a mask? Is the individual required to produce papers upon demand provided by a medical provider exempting them. There are privacy concerns that would have to be addressed. Will there be training provided to Law Enforcement how to deal with this situation?
2. The exception for eating and drinking in "...business establishments licensed by the city of Portsmouth for that purpose." is wrong! The words "business establishments licensed by the city of Portsmouth for that purpose." MUST be removed. Without this removed someone drinking water or eating a sandwich on a park bench with their family will be subject to getting tickets. This is discriminatory and unfair. The virus does not care if your eating at a "business establishments licensed by the city of Portsmouth for that purpose." or on a blanket with your family at a city park. The language is also flawed since all those outdoor seating sites created are not a "business establishment" but a city owned property.
3. There is no Due Process. [https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/due\\_process](https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/due_process) If there is due process to contest a parking ticket there must be due process to contest a fine under this ordinance. For example maybe someone has a medical condition and got a ticket. How would they contest the ticket? Any process set up to contest a ticket must be fair and the person(s) reviewing the contested tickets must be unbiased and in no way benefit from the fine.
4. All fines must not go into the City General Fund. They should only go to direct medical prevention measures or donated to charities that are working to prevent the spread of COVID-19.
5. People from all over the place and world come to Portsmouth. This is going to be an enforcement nightmare and law enforcement will require additional funds and employees. They should have full discretion to determine if a ticket is warranted or a warning. Does this city council expect Law enforcement to issue tickets to 7yr olds for example? Full discretion must be added to the Ordinance so they can use their judgement.
5. The fine if any must be nominal. Lets not forget millions of people across the country are currently unemployed or do not have sufficient \$\$ for large fines. How exactly will that kid below the working age but above 6 yrs old going to pay the fine? I guess they could sell lemonade but that would require permits from the city so I think they can't.

DO not rush this ordinance. Take the time to get it right! A bad ordinance can make this terrible situation worse.

Sincerely  
Marc Stettner

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

---

REMOTE\_ADDR: 71.233.87.19





**From:** [Rachel Kurshan 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:** Monday, August 17, 2020 6:44:01 PM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Rachel Kurshan (rk00@comcast.net) on Monday, August 17, 2020 at 17:43:59  
-----

address: 33 Humphrey's Court

comments: I am strongly in favor of the proposed mask ordinance. I don't go downtown anymore unless it is absolutely necessary, as it is impossible to stay at least six feet away from people on downtown sidewalks. The few times it has been necessary for me to go downtown, I have had to walk by plenty of people who are not wearing masks and have felt very uncomfortable.

I don't think it's fair to our downtown restaurants and shopkeepers not to have a city ordinance backing up their request that their customers wear masks.

There are also other places where one cannot stay six feet away from people; for example on New Castle Ave., the Portsmouth side of Memorial Bridge, Marcy Street, etc.

The science is clear on the value of masks along with physical distancing, in helping to decrease the spread of Covid-19, and I urge the city council to approve the ordinance. Portsmouth would not be unique in having a mask ordinance, as several nearby towns have already done so.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----

REMOTE\_ADDR: 24.61.219.95

**From:** [Mark and Nancy Mininberg 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:** Monday, August 17, 2020 4:21:05 PM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Mark and Nancy Mininberg (mark@hospitalenergy.com) on Monday, August 17, 2020 at 15:21:03

-----  
address: 7 Portwalk Place Portsmouth

comments: We urge the Council to adopt the ordinance to compel the wearing of masks in public places, (with the exceptions noted in the current draft). This is a vital first step given the evidence that a majority of people walking the downtown streets are unmasked and not voluntarily protecting themselves or others. Further, we would respectfully suggest that the Council add the following clarifications that will make enforcement of the ordinance more effective:

1. The definition of outdoor public places should more explicitly include streets and sidewalks, since it is apparent that a majority of people walking downtown do not wear masks despite the density of foot traffic..
2. The ordinance should state a specific dollar figure fine to be imposed per violation. This would allow pedestrians to easily understand the cost of not wearing a mask.
3. Signs should be prominently posted in the downtown area warning that masks are required on the streets and sidewalks and that failure to wear them will result in the specified fine.
4. The police department should be directed to sweep the downtown area during high traffic times to enforce the ordinance. If this is done periodically, it should create a deterrent effect and encourage compliance by a large majority of citizens and visitors.

Thank you to our wise elected officials for taking this important step to protect and serve our citizens and visitors and to support the economic livelihood of our beloved city.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----

REMOTE\_ADDR: 69.140.123.184

**From:** [Lawrence Cataldo 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:** Saturday, August 15, 2020 8:38:06 AM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Lawrence Cataldo (larrycataldo@yahoo.com) on Saturday, August 15, 2020 at 07:38:04  
-----

address: 133 Islington Street, Portsmouth

comments: Distinguished Councilors,  
I urge you to pass the mask ordinance. There is ample evidence that the reactive cost to our community is far greater than the proposed preventive one. Many of us feel that it is too risky to go into any retail store where customers do not wear masks. This directly affects our fragile retail community. The ordinance can fix that.  
Make the logical choice; do the right thing for all of our sakes.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----

REMOTE\_ADDR: 71.168.89.152

**From:** [Peter Somssich 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:** Friday, August 14, 2020 7:12:44 PM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Peter Somssich (somssich@myfairpoint.net) on Friday, August 14, 2020 at 18:12:42

-----  
address: 34 Swett Ave.

comments: Dear Councilors,

I want to express my support for a face mask ordinance.

I support requiring face-masks be worn by all staff of businesses and by customers who enter a business.

My local hardware store, which is not in the downtown area, does not a sign asking customers to wear face-masks, and in fact not all of their staff was wearing a face-mask the last time I visited. I told the owner, that while I want to support his business, his policy on face-masks was not giving me the safety and security I should feel when entering a business.

I don't think that a mandate to wear face-masks outdoors makes much sense, if you can social-distance.

As far as the fines are concerned, \$25. seems too low to me to be any kind of disincentive. It should be higher.

Thanks for taking action, Peter Somssich

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----  
REMOTE\_ADDR: 72.71.240.138

**From:** [Judy Miller 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:** Thursday, August 13, 2020 3:49:06 PM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Judy Miller (jamiller37@gmail.com) on Thursday, August 13, 2020 at 14:49:04

-----  
address: 77 Hanover Street, Unit #7

comments: I have been following Portsmouth's proposed mask and social distancing ordinance. To date, a number of towns have passed an ordinance with a fine system as the primary means of enforcement. Durham's police officers will carry masks to offer those without one on hand. If the mask is refused a fine will be issued, ascending from \$100 at first offense to \$200 at the second and \$500 for subsequent offenses. I assume you are all aware of what other NH towns and cities have proposed or have adopted.

The proposed penalty in Portsmouth's draft ordinance will receive a civil citation; the penalty for a first offense is only \$25.00, if paid within 7 days. I think Portsmouth's penalty is merely "slap on the wrist" and not forceful enough to change human behavior.

I strongly recommend that the Portsmouth mask ordinance include a fine system aligned with the town of Durham as well as other nearby towns that have adopted the same penalties.

Every day as a downtown resident, I witness many visitors who are not following mask or social distancing. Vehicle license plates attest to a high number of out-of-state visitors. I now avoid Vaughan Mall, especially on weekends. Our narrow sidewalks for on Market, Fleet, Ceres, Marcy, and parts of Bow streets are charming but are now filled with many people who are not wearing masks or following safe distancing guidelines.

I understand businesses and restaurants need to survive and why our Chamber of Commerce is encouraging a StayVacation. I strongly urge the Council to adopt a fine system which is aligned with those adopted by the town of Durham..

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----  
REMOTE\_ADDR: 24.147.240.9

**From:** [Gavin Bourbon 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:** Monday, August 17, 2020 8:05:04 PM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Gavin Bourbon (gavinbourbon@yahoo.com) on Monday, August 17, 2020 at 19:05:02

-----  
address: 40 Summer Street, Apt 3

comments: I disagree with the cities decision to pass an ordinance mandating masks be worn in public. I do not believe the city has the right to dictate what business's in Portsmouth can require upon customer entry. I also disagree with the decision to hand out a fine to citizens that do not comply with this ordinance. I would ask that the city be more clear on where this new found income would benefit the public.

In defense of the ordinance, I do appreciate a response to the pandemic. The downtown area has handled this very well with help from the city. I understand that this ordinance is to reduce the risk of transmission between people in public.

I believe that the city should let the public decide for themselves if they should wear a mask or not. Business's have already complied with state and nation wide rules and guidelines to keep there business open during a time of crisis. This ordinance would just become another burden created by the pandemic.

It should be up to the citizen to decide if they feel comfortable being in public with or without a mask. I ask the city to let the business owners or Portsmouth dictate how they run their business and not pass this ordinance.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----  
REMOTE\_ADDR: 174.196.213.118

**From:** [Gerald W.R. Ward 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:** Monday, August 17, 2020 6:49:03 PM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Gerald W.R. Ward (ward4staterep@gmail.com) on Monday, August 17, 2020 at 17:49:01

-----  
address: 16 Nixon Park

comments: Greetings:

I write once again in support of the mask mandate, and to suggest that it be made city wide (not restricted to the downtown area). A piecemeal approach will not work; a holistic response (which should be statewide or, better yet, nation-wide) is the only way to succeed.

As one of your members urged the good folks in Dover to do, it's better to be proactive rather than reactive.

The police department's suggestion, as reported in the paper, that 4-5 additional personnel would be needed to enforce the measure outside of downtown sounds to me like someone who is opposed to the measure and wants to kill it for budgetary reasons, a common bureaucratic technique.

Best of luck in your deliberations and thank you for all your hard work.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----

REMOTE\_ADDR: 71.235.8.223



**From:** [Joe Mulqueen via FormMail.com](mailto:Joe.Mulqueen@msn.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:** Masks are ineffective and harmful  
**Date:** Sunday, August 16, 2020 7:59:57 PM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Joe Mulqueen (njmulqueen@msn.com) on Sunday, August 16, 2020 at 18:59:55  
-----

address: 38 Fells Road

comments: Masks are ineffective and harmful.

For example, a study in the Annals of Internal Medicine in April 2020, found:  
“Neither surgical nor cotton masks effectively filtered SARS-CoV-2 during coughs by infected patients.

Viral particles move through face masks with relative ease. Studies show that about 44% of viral particles pass through surgical masks, 97% pass through cloth masks, and about 5% through N95 masks.

Oberg and Brousseau demonstrated that surgical masks did not exhibit adequate filter performance against aerosols. Contamination was found on the outside of the masks, wrote the researchers:  
“Of note, we found greater contamination on the outer than the inner mask surfaces.  
In conclusion, both surgical and cotton masks seem to be ineffective in preventing the dissemination of SARS-CoV-2 from the coughs of patients with COVID-19 to the environment and external mask surface.”

While SARS-CoV-2 is spread by breathing in tiny liquid virus-containing droplets, there is evidence it can enter the body through mucus membranes, including the mucus membranes on the surface of the eye and inner eye lids.”

Russell Blaylock, MD had this to say about the science of masks:  
As for the scientific support for the use of face mask, a recent careful examination of the literature, in which 17 of the best studies were analyzed, concluded that, “None of the studies established a conclusive relationship between mask/respirator use and protection against influenza infection.”

Here’s what a group of physicians wrote regarding Universal Masking in Hospitals in the CoVID-19 Era in the New England Journal of Medicine:  
We know that wearing a mask outside healthcare facilities offers little, if any, protection from infection. The chance of catching CoVID-19 from a passing interaction in a public space is minimal. In many cases, the desire for widespread masking is a reflexive reaction to anxiety over the pandemic.

Denmark boasts one of the lowest COVID-19 death rates in the world. Danish health officials noted there is little conclusive evidence that face masks are an effective way to limit the spread of respiratory viruses. “All these countries recommending face masks haven’t made their decisions based on new studies,” said Henning Bundgaard, chief physician at Denmark’s Rigshospitale.

Dutch public health officials recently explained why they’re not recommending masks.  
“From a medical point of view, there is no evidence of a medical effect of wearing face masks, so we decided not to impose a national obligation,” said Medical Care Minister Tamara van Ark.  
Others, echoing statements similar to the US Surgeon General from early March, said masks could make individuals sicker and exacerbate the spread of the virus.  
“Face masks in public places are not necessary, based on all the current evidence,” said Coen Berends, spokesman for the National Institute for Public Health and the Environment.  
“There is no benefit and there may even be negative impact.”

The CDC published a study in May 2020 that was conducted in preparation for the development of guidelines by the

World Health Organization on the use of non-pharmaceutical interventions for pandemic influenza in non-medical settings. This study was supported by the World Health Organization. “In our systematic review, we identified 10 RCTs 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.”

However, while masks are ineffective, they can cause a long list of harms:

Schools in China are now prohibiting students from wearing masks while exercising because it was killing them. It was depriving them of oxygen and at least three children died during Physical Education classes.

Jenny Harries, England’s deputy chief medical officer, has warned the public against wearing facemasks “as the virus can get trapped in the material and causes infection when the wearer breathes in.”

Nationally recognized board-certified neurosurgeon Dr. Russell Blaylock also believes face masks are capable of causing serious harm: “Several studies have indeed found significant problems with wearing such a mask. This can vary from headaches, to increased airway resistance, carbon dioxide accumulation, to hypoxia, all the way to serious life-threatening complications ... By wearing a mask, the exhaled viruses will not be able to escape and will concentrate in the nasal passages, enter the olfactory nerves and travel into the brain.”

The elderly are at risk, too, he warns:

“Unfortunately, no one is telling the frail elderly and those with lung diseases, such as COPD, emphysema or pulmonary fibrosis, of these dangers when wearing a facial mask of any kind — which can cause a severe worsening of lung function. This also includes lung cancer patients and people having had lung surgery.”

While most agree that the N95 mask can cause significant hypoxia and hypercapnia, another study of surgical masks found significant reductions in blood oxygen as well. The researchers found that the mask reduced the blood oxygen levels significantly. The longer the duration of wearing the mask, the greater the fall in blood oxygen levels. The importance of these findings is that a drop in oxygen levels (hypoxia) is associated with an impairment in immunity. This sets the stage for contracting any infection, including COVID-19 and making the consequences of that infection much graver. In essence, your mask may very well put you at an increased risk of infections and if so, having a much worse outcome.

As medical masks lower oxygen and raise carbon dioxide in the blood, the brain senses the changes and the risk they pose to the maintenance of normal physiology. To obtain more oxygen and remove more carbon dioxide, the brain tells the lungs to increase the frequency and depth of breaths. Unfortunately, struggle as they may, your brain and lungs cannot fully compensate for the negative effects of the mask. Some may even suffer the symptoms of carbon dioxide toxicity.

For people with diseases of the lungs, especially chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), face masks are intolerable to wear as they worsen breathlessness.

Viral particles move through face masks with relative ease. Increasing tidal volume (depth of breaths) results in literally sucking more air, more forcefully through and around the mask. The changes in respiratory rate and depth may also increase the severity of CoVID-19 as the increased tidal volume delivers the viral particles deeper into the lungs.

These changes may worsen the community transmission of CoVID-19 when infected people wearing masks exhale air more heavily contaminated with viral particles from the lungs.

These effects are amplified if face masks are contaminated with the viruses, bacteria, or fungi that find their way or opportunistically grow in the warm, moist environment that medical masks quickly become.

Low blood levels of oxygen is a critical issue in the pathogenicity of CoVID-19. The virus’ ability to infect cells is markedly enhanced by oxygen desaturation, which we know occurs when wearing a surgical mask. One of the features that make SARS CoV-2 uniquely infectious is the “furin cleavage” sequence in the virus that activates increased ACE2 receptor attack and cellular invasion in low oxygen environments.

Inappropriate use of face masks:

People must not touch their masks, must change their single-use masks frequently or wash them regularly, dispose

them correctly and adopt other management measures, otherwise their risks and those of others may increase.

Wearing a face mask makes the exhaled air go into the eyes.

This generates an uncomfortable feeling and an impulse to touch your eyes. If your hands are contaminated and you touch or rub your eyes, you are infecting yourself.

Masks compromise communications and reduce social distancing

The quality and volume of speech between two people wearing masks is considerably compromised, so they may unconsciously move closer to improve communications.

This increases the likelihood of becoming exposed to respiratory droplets containing infectious viral particles.

#### Decoding Facial Actions Helps Categorize Emotion

Masks have removed a crucial way in which people use visual cues to communicate and understand each other.

Smiles, cheek twitches and lip movements are all lost under a mask. These visual perceptions of expression are part of how people recognize and understand communication.

For example, people who are deaf can no longer read lips, which severely hinders communications with a person who doesn't know sign language.

#### Masks Can Trigger a PTSD Episode

There is concern that the pandemic is also affecting those who have a history of trauma. PTSD is not limited to people who served in the armed services. Men and women who are victims of domestic abuse or sexual assault may have significant difficulty wearing masks.

"The one we worry about the most is trauma. Sexual trauma, an attack. What might not seem like a big deal to you or I might be a really big deal to a kid or an older person or a female."

Children are also experiencing distress from adults wearing masks. Further investigations into infants' abilities to differentiate emotional expressions have revealed that within the first six months, babies learn to recognize emotion and distinguish physical characteristics associated with those emotions.<sup>20</sup>

Educators have long known that many young children have difficulty when masks are worn. At some elementary schools masks aren't allowed during Halloween, as the children become stressed. Kang Lee, Ph.D., from the University of Toronto, says that children don't have full facial recognition abilities until they're about 14 years old. When adults and children use masks, it becomes more difficult for children to recognize individuals and understand emotional signals. This is especially difficult for children on the autism spectrum who often have trouble understanding and reading nonverbal cues.

Young children also look to their parents and caregivers to interpret new situations. This reliance on facial expressions and even tone of voice is distorted by a mask, and may make it challenging for them to regulate their response. Psychologists call this "social referencing" and it develops in children through the early preschool years.

The mask will muffle your voice somewhat, so be sure you are speaking loud enough for the other person to hear you. They may stop asking you to repeat yourself after several times and just give up.

And part of a list from the World Health Organization:

The likely disadvantages of the use of mask by healthy people in the general public include:

- potential increased risk of self-contamination due to the manipulation of a face mask and subsequently touching eyes with contaminated hands;
- potential self-contamination that can occur if nonmedical masks are not changed when wet or soiled. This can create favourable conditions for microorganism to amplify;
- potential headache and/or breathing difficulties, depending on type of mask used;
- potential development of facial skin lesions, irritant dermatitis or worsening acne, when used frequently for long hours;
- difficulty with communicating clearly;
- a false sense of security, leading to potentially lower adherence to other critical preventive measures such as physical distancing and hand hygiene;
- poor compliance with mask wearing, in particular by young children;
- waste management issues; improper mask disposal leading to increased litter in public places, risk of contamination to street cleaners and environment hazard;
- difficulty communicating for deaf persons who rely on lip reading;
- disadvantages for or difficulty wearing them, especially for children, developmentally challenged persons, those with mental illness, elderly persons with cognitive impairment, those with asthma or chronic respiratory or breathing

problems, those who have had facial trauma or recent oral maxillofacial surgery, and those living in hot and humid environments.

The scientific evidence is clear. Masks for the general public are ineffective and harmful.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----

REMOTE\_ADDR: 66.31.3.124

**From:** [Kate Hatem 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:** Meeting  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 4, 2020 11:25:36 AM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Kate Hatem (katemph@gmail.com) on Tuesday, August 4, 2020 at 10:25:34

-----  
address: 1 Ash St

comments: Hello Portsmouth City Council,

I wanted to thank the council for their time last night in discussing important issues pertaining to our city and for listening to the concerns of our citizens.

For those citizens looking to view the meeting on the YouTube channel after the fact, it seems only 2 of the 5 hours were posted. Iâ€™m just wondering if you can point me in the right direction to get the entirety of the meeting posted for our community to have access to all that was discussed.

Thank you ahead of time for your response.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----  
REMOTE\_ADDR: 71.235.12.71

**From:** [Roland Cote 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 St Bike lane  
**Date:** Wednesday, August 12, 2020 10:33:53 PM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Roland Cote (coter3530@comcast.net) on Wednesday, August 12, 2020 at 21:33:51

-----  
address: 188 Union St

comments: Though it was not your mistake, you NEED to get rid of it. The extremely experienced cyclist who was "doored" calls it "a kiss of death" He calls for it to be removed before "someone is killed". I do not think that someone would be a cyclist. It will either be an elderly person who rear ends a vehicle parked directly in the middle of the road, or a driver of a parked vehicle who opens their door and is "vehicled" because a UPS truck across the street made the road too narrow. The article by a very experienced cyclist establishes an incredible potential liability. I think you have around 90% of residents calling for its removal. Now you have an extremely accomplished cyclist calling for it. Though I am not an attorney, this would be a lay-up for me when(not if) the first person is killed because the city failed to act when 90% of the residents and an experienced cyclist forewarned you all of of a liability hazard. Thank you for your time.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----

REMOTE\_ADDR: 66.31.1.91

**From:** [Cathy Baker 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:** NO Mask Mandate -  
**Date:** Sunday, August 16, 2020 12:09:42 PM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Cathy Baker (catherinejbaker@yahoo.com) on Sunday, August 16, 2020 at 11:09:40

-----  
address: 127 Gates St

comments: We are giving up liberty for a pretense of safety.

Mask downsides:

- \*Wearer doesn't get amount of oxygen that OSHA mandates for workplaces
- \*Dentists seeing epidemic of new gum disease in regular mask wearers. gum disease tied to heart disease and other health issues
- \*May increase complacency & decrease distancing
- \*Inhibits communication - blocks sound and facial cues
- \*Throwing liberty out the window in an unconstitutional manner

Pretense of safety - watch 2 minute video at this link  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SrPCgh4UkAU>

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----  
REMOTE\_ADDR: 72.71.240.140

**From:** [Michelle Wirth 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:** no mask ordinance.  
**Date:** Saturday, August 15, 2020 12:51:16 PM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Michelle Wirth (wirthsicle@gmail.com) on Saturday, August 15, 2020 at 11:51:14

-----  
address: 439 Hanover St. Portsmouth NH

comments: No mask ordinance.  
You are overstepping your bounds, you have no authority to take away basic liberties.  
You may not punish free, healthy citizens for breathing unobstructed.  
This is oppression..... read the 2nd amendment.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----  
REMOTE\_ADDR: 73.234.7.11



**From:** [Kate Beland 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:** Our young adult community  
**Date:** Wednesday, August 12, 2020 7:38:46 AM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Kate Beland (katembeland9@gmail.com) on Wednesday, August 12, 2020 at 06:38:44  
-----

address: 373 Union Street

comments: Just sharing information...in light of last night's devastating announcement...PHS Athletics and extracurriculars are going to be more important than ever. We know you all don't make the decisions...but I think we as a community just threw in the towel and are willing to accept failure on behalf of our youth. How is it that we can think outside the box for our downtown businesses....but not for our kids???? Here is the link below in case you are interested.

<http://chng.it/j5QmghSD>

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----

REMOTE\_ADDR: 107.3.15.93

**From:** [sally.minkow 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:** parking in Worth Lot  
**Date:** Thursday, August 13, 2020 3:15:00 PM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
sally.minkow (sally.minkow@gmail.com) on Thursday, August 13, 2020 at 14:14:58

-----  
address: 18 McDonough St.

comments: Portsmouth Health Food is a critically important anchor for our city's downtown area. They provide a service that is not offered by any other vendor in the center city. With all the economic disruption of the past months making it considerably more difficult for patrons to access this market will impact the market's ability to keep their doors open.

Please consider designating 8-10 parking spots for 30 minute limit. AND, please involve local businesses in decision making process.

In addition, I am very disappointed that the new city manager could not find time to respond to PHF's request for a meeting. Poor communication creates additional stress in this already very difficult time

Thank you for your consideration.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----  
REMOTE\_ADDR: 107.3.14.146

**From:** [Erik Anderson 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:** PDA BOD 8/20/20 meeting  
**Date:** Wednesday, August 5, 2020 7:24:38 AM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Erik Anderson (andy42152@aol.com) on Wednesday, August 5, 2020 at 06:24:36

-----

address: 38 Georges Terrace

comments: Dear Councilors,

Knowing of your late night adjournment on Monday I want to thank you for your diligence and dedication to the issues of Portsmouth.

In addition I feel obligation to inform you of a PDA BOD meeting scheduled for Thursday 8/20/20 at 8:30 am. I'm not sure if it will be virtual or in person but the last one was in person at the Pease Golf Course Simulator room with more than adequate social distancing. If there are any matters that the city council wants to be brought forward please let me know

In other information I've inquired on the following if their wasn't a complete understanding.

1) Pease Golf Course water supply. - Pease Golf Course is entitled to 15 million gallons of "no charge" water annually and the source of that water was not well understood. Upon my inquiry I was told that the Smith well at Pease is the source of any golf course water serviced by 2 - 8" mains to both courses. There is NO demand from Portsmouth's Madbury reservoir except for the restaurant which the city services and charges usage rates.

2) The PDA entry way from Rte 4 & 16 is more or less the town demarcation line between Portsmouth and Newington. Sig Sauer and other business's north of the entry way are completely in the town of Newington but the City of Portsmouth collects ALL property tax revenue in exchange for the MSA agreement to supply plowing, road maintenance, police and fire service . Portsmouth also collects revenue from water ans sewer usage. It is thought that there is more revenue benefit to Portsmouth than used services. It is also thought that Newington does not like this arrangement but because of the MSA agreement must live with it.

Pending any result from the 8/20/20 meeting I will report to you anything of interest concerning the interests of Portsmouth

With Thanks,  
Erik Anderson

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----

REMOTE\_ADDR: 71.192.187.202

**From:** [Jerry Zelin 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:** Proposed mask ordinance  
**Date:** Saturday, August 15, 2020 3:25:20 PM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Jerry Zelin (gmzelin@yahoo.com) on Saturday, August 15, 2020 at 14:25:18

-----  
address: 70 Kensington Rd

comments: Dear Members of the City Council, Thank you for your public service and leadership during these challenging times. I am writing in strong support of the proposed ordinance requiring face masks. I much prefer that the ordinance apply throughout the city, not just downtown,. A city wide ordinance is necessary for the safety of customers and employees at supermarkets and other establishments throughout the city.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----  
REMOTE\_ADDR: 216.107.198.34

**From:** [Barbara Stuart 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:** Sagamore Sewer Project  
**Date:** Saturday, August 8, 2020 3:46:11 PM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Barbara Stuart (Baschpn@hotmail.com) on Saturday, August 8, 2020 at 14:46:09

-----  
address: 131 cliff rd

comments: We are so disappointed. When my husband and I purchased our home from my parents 20 years ago, we had a septic designer look at the property. He recommended using the existing system until it failed. "Putting in a new system will ruin your yard." When the Sagamore Sewer Project was first presented to residents of the area we were thrilled it was finally going to happen. Though the initial cost to residents was shocking we had faith the City would do the right thing. We were proven right when the October 2019 proposal was put forth. It seemed fair for both the City and residents. Now we are shocked and disappointed to hear that thru no fault of our own, our little neighborhood may be left out of this project as it focuses on the more affluent areas on the water and potential developers on the south side of the Creek. We thought our newly elected Council was going to focus more on the residents of Portsmouth and not just the potential for development. We live wit!

hin 1 1/2 mile of Market Square and will be a small island lacking the most basic of city services, sewer. Please reconsider. As long time residents of Portsmouth we are counting on you.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----  
REMOTE\_ADDR: 72.65.103.67

**From:** [Paul Messier 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:** Sewage  
**Date:** Friday, August 7, 2020 5:51:13 PM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Paul Messier (pemess@icloud.com) on Friday, August 7, 2020 at 16:51:12

-----  
address: 171 Walker Bungalow Road

comments: Busse-GT  
Way less intrusive, quicker, better and less expensive,

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----  
REMOTE\_ADDR: 73.68.36.252

**From:** [Katherine Saunders Biddle 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:** Status of Schools for the 2020 - 2021 Year  
**Date:** Thursday, August 13, 2020 9:42:11 AM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Katherine Saunders Biddle (kate.biddle@comcast.net) on Thursday, August 13, 2020 at 08:42:10

-----  
address: 1152 Washington Road

comments: Hi there, I am writing in response to the recent decision by the Portsmouth School District to overturn its original decision of in person school to now a remote learning plan. We have been made aware that this decision was caused by not enough teachers being willing to return to work - and that our teachers have been seeking doctors notes to avoid returning to work. Also, we have heard that teachers are chalking this off to a 'lost year' for students. This is unacceptable to us as parents, and furthermore as taxpayers. Our kids deserve more than this. Remote school does not take the place of in school learning, and we as a State / Country are no longer in lock down / quarantine. People are returning to work. Many people have never been able to not report to work during this pandemic. Providing our children with an education is an essential duty - the public school system is not a virtual classroom / online school. It is not set up to be this way, and it cannot be !

done effectively. Even the teachers / union states it by saying that this will be a 'lost year' for kids. Please consider supporting a change in this decision. We need to do EVERYTHING in our power to give the kids the school (and athletic) experience they want and deserve. We all know - they are only kids once, they will never get this time back. Thank you!

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----

REMOTE\_ADDR: 24.61.222.49

**From:** [Joe Mulqueen via FormMail.com](mailto:Joe.Mulqueen@msn.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:** Suggested edits to the Face Coverings Ordinance  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 11, 2020 7:25:43 PM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Joe Mulqueen (njmulqueen@msn.com) on Tuesday, August 11, 2020 at 18:25:41  
-----

address: 38 Fells Road

comments: Some suggested edits to the Face Coverings Ordinance:

In section 3.1101 B, change “is not” to “cannot” or “be” to “being”

In section 3.1103 C, add to the end of the sentence “or other public place where eating and/or drinking is permitted”

In section 3.1103, add “D. According to WHO guidance “people should not wear masks when exercising.” (see below)

And, most importantly, for the “WHEREAS, the Portsmouth City Council has determined that the wearing of face coverings during the time of the pandemic is one means of reducing the spread of COVID-19” add a list of references showing the evidence that “determined” that face coverings would have a net positive effect. This is critical considering the constant conflicting information that this situation has generated. As recently as JULY 29, 2020, the Dutch government said it will not advise the public to wear masks to slow the spread of coronavirus, asserting that their effectiveness has not been proven. The decision was announced by Minister for Medical Care Tamara van Ark after a review by the country’s National Institute for Health (RIVM).

Consider a few other examples:

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. ... 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), 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 ....”

As reported by The National Academies of Sciences in its Rapid Expert Consultation on the Effectiveness of Fabric Masks for the COVID-19 Pandemic report, published April 8, 2020:13



"The evidence from ... laboratory filtration studies suggest that ... fabric masks may reduce the transmission of larger respiratory droplets. There is little evidence regarding the transmission of small aerosolized particulates of the size potentially exhaled by asymptomatic or presymptomatic individuals with COVID-19."

Lisa Brosseau is a retired professor of public health who still consults for businesses and organizations. Brosseau, however, says that though masks can limit the spread of larger particles, they are less helpful for smaller ones, especially if they fit only loosely. "I wish we would stop relying on the idea that face coverings are going to solve everything and help flatten the curve," she says. "It's magical thinking—it's not going to happen." Brosseau does believe the evidence is trending toward the conclusion that airborne transmission is "the primary and possibly most important mode of transmission for SARS-CoV-2."

#### WHO Says People Should Not Wear Masks When Exercising

August 01, 2020

The World Health Organization [CO1] has again revised its guidelines on wearing masks, saying that masks may reduce a person's ability to breathe comfortably, especially when exercising, and therefore people should not wear masks when exercising.

Masks become more difficult to breathe through when a person is working out and sweating, WHO officials said, adding that unmasked people should also keep a distance of "at least 1 meter (3.2 feet)" from others while exercising.

Also, remember that "an effort to protect the public health" means not doing more harm than good. There is a long list of harms and disadvantages associated with wearing masks. There has been no break-through research that overturns the science that face masks do little, if anything, to prevent respiratory illnesses caused by aerosolized viruses.

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

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

---

REMOTE\_ADDR: 66.31.3.124

**From:** [Cathy Baker 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:** The Face Mask Ordinance is NOT following a transparent political process  
**Date:** Friday, August 14, 2020 8:32:48 PM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Cathy Baker (catherinejbaker@yahoo.com) on Friday, August 14, 2020 at 19:32:46

-----  
address: 127 Gates St

comments: Passing first reading with nothing to read? Second and third readings rushed through on the same day?

Councilors. What happened to the council of ethics, of transparency? I voted for many of you because that is what you promised me. The secretive and rushed ordinance process which you are following, first with the new parking ordinance, now with the face mask ordinance, is the polar opposite of transparency. Parking rates for residents will increase because of the parking ordinance, which was rushed through with second and third readings on the same day, claiming an urgency to capitalize on August tourist revenues. I watched last week on Zoom as you passed first reading on an oppressive, controversial ordinance which was still in the discussion stage, posted in the council packet as a 'placeholder,' and not even in a form to be read for 'first reading.' Now, at the same legal meeting, the extension of the August 3rd meeting, only seven days later, we have finally an ordinance to read. One, far more draconian than the mask resolution. An ordinance the working group of health !

experts convened to study the matter said was not necessary as they mentioned NH is not facing a COVID health emergency, but rather our lowest active case load since March. This ordinance would require me to wear a mask to take a walk with family members or close friends anywhere in the city or face fines. I was told it would be discussed, amended, and passed with both second and third reading on Tuesday in a similar fashion to the parking ordinance last week. This from councilors who have always run on ethics and transparency. To which I say, meet the new boss, same as the old boss. Wait, I thought you were my elected representatives " but clearly you are trying to show us who's the boss!

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----  
REMOTE\_ADDR: 72.71.240.140

**From:** [Evan McDermod 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:** The Unknown of Masks: Mandates are Not the Answer  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 4, 2020 3:21:34 PM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Evan McDermod (emcdermod@gmail.com) on Tuesday, August 4, 2020 at 14:21:32  
-----

address: 1205 Islington Street

comments: Greetings,

I hope this finds you well. Attached below are a list of studies showing the ineffectiveness and unreliable outcomes in regards to imposing a mask mandate and how they protect against viruses such as COVID-19. I understand you have all been simply following CDC guidelines, but I encourage you to research a bit deeper, as they have not provided scientific evidence backing their guidelines. Much of the public outcry for masks comes from that same narrative, so I am here to hopefully present you with objective material to engage with.

First, here are some of the unknowns of mask wearing that I encourage you to ask yourself:

1. Do used and loaded masks become sources of enhanced transmission, for the wearer and others?
2. Do masks become collectors and retainers of pathogens that the mask wearer would otherwise avoid when breathing without a mask?
3. Are large droplets captured by a mask atomized or aerolized into breathable components? Can virions escape an evaporating droplet stuck to a mask fiber?
4. What are the dangers of bacterial growth on a used and loaded mask?
5. How do pathogen-laden droplets interact with environmental dust and aerosols captured on the mask?
6. What are long-term health effects on HCW, such as headaches, arising from impeded breathing?
7. Are there negative social consequences to a masked society?
8. Are there negative psychological consequences to wearing a mask, as a fear-based behavioral modification?
9. What are the environmental consequences of mask manufacturing and disposal?
10. Do the masks shed fibers or substances that are harmful when inhaled?

Next, here are some clinical studies on mask wearing to look over:

#### Review of the Medical Literature

Here are key anchor points to the extensive scientific literature that establishes that wearing surgical masks and respirators (e.g., "N95") does not reduce the risk of contracting a verified illness:

Jacobs, J. L. et al. (2009) "Use of surgical face masks to reduce the incidence of the common cold among health care workers in Japan: A randomized controlled trial," *American Journal of Infection Control*, Volume 37, Issue 5, 417 – 419. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19216002>

"N95-masked health-care workers (HCW) were significantly more likely to experience headaches. Face mask use in HCW was not demonstrated to provide benefit in terms of cold symptoms or getting colds."

Cowling, B. et al. (2010) "Face masks to prevent transmission of influenza virus: A systematic review," *Epidemiology and Infection*, 138(4), 449-456. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/epidemiology-and-infection/article/face-masks-to-prevent-transmission-of-influenza-virus-a-systematic-review/64D368496EBDE0AFCC6639CCC9D8BC05>

"None of the studies reviewed showed a benefit from wearing a mask, in either HCW or community members in households (H). See summary Tables 1 and 2 therein."

bin-Reza et al. (2012) "The use of masks and respirators to prevent transmission of influenza: a systematic review of the scientific evidence," *Influenza and Other Respiratory Viruses* 6(4), 257–267.

<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/j.1750-2659.2011.00307.x>

“There were 17 eligible studies. ... None of the studies established a conclusive relationship between mask/respirator use and protection against influenza infection.”

Smith, J.D. et al. (2016) “Effectiveness of N95 respirators versus surgical masks in protecting health care workers from acute respiratory infection: a systematic review and meta-analysis,” CMAJ Mar 2016

<https://www.cmaj.ca/content/188/8/567>

“We identified six clinical studies ... . In the meta-analysis of the clinical studies, we found no significant difference between N95 respirators and surgical masks in associated risk of (a) laboratory-confirmed respiratory infection, (b) influenza-like illness, or (c) reported work-place absenteeism.”

Offeddu, V. et al. (2017) “Effectiveness of Masks and Respirators Against Respiratory Infections in Healthcare Workers: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis,” Clinical Infectious Diseases, Volume 65, Issue 11, 1 December 2017, Pages 1934–1942, <https://academic.oup.com/cid/article/65/11/1934/4068747>

“Self-reported assessment of clinical outcomes was prone to bias. Evidence of a protective effect of masks or respirators against verified respiratory infection (VRI) was not statistically significant”

Radonovich, L.J. et al. (2019) “N95 Respirators vs Medical Masks for Preventing Influenza Among Health Care Personnel: A Randomized Clinical Trial,” JAMA. 2019; 322(9): 824–833.

<https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2749214>

“Among 2862 randomized participants, 2371 completed the study and accounted for 5180 HCW-seasons. ... Among outpatient health care personnel, N95 respirators vs medical masks as worn by participants in this trial resulted in no significant difference in the incidence of laboratory-confirmed influenza.”

Long, Y. et al. (2020) “Effectiveness of N95 respirators versus surgical masks against influenza: A systematic review and meta-analysis,” J Evid Based Med. 2020; 1- 9.

<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/jebm.12381>

“A total of six RCTs involving 9,171 participants were included. There were no statistically significant differences in preventing laboratory-confirmed influenza, laboratory-confirmed respiratory viral infections, laboratory-confirmed respiratory infection, and influenza-like illness using N95 respirators and surgical masks. Meta-analysis indicated a protective effect of N95 respirators against laboratory-confirmed bacterial colonization (RR = 0.58, 95% CI 0.43-0.78). The use of N95 respirators compared with surgical masks is not associated with a lower risk of laboratory-confirmed influenza.”

No RCT study with verified outcome shows a benefit for HCW or community members in households to wearing a mask or respirator. There is no such study. There are no exceptions. With that in mind, I feel it is safe to say the city council does not have in its power the ability to implement a mask mandate, even though you may cite we are in an emergency situation. Based on the scientific evidence, this implementation does not address the emergency we are facing. I know you want to focus on educating residents in regards to masks, but it seems that the council and health officials need to educate themselves first. Please do consider these studies. I am attempting to help shed light on the narrative from the CDC. That narrative is one of deception and misinformation for the purpose of categorical fear.

I hope you find these studies useful and deeply consider them. Thanks for your time.

Be well,  
Evan McDermod

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

---

REMOTE\_ADDR: 66.31.5.223

**From:** [Randal Heller Heller 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:** Water Quality at Bellamy Reservoir  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 18, 2020 6:50:10 AM

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
Randal Heller Heller (RGHeller50@aol.com) on Tuesday, August 18, 2020 at 05:50:08

-----  
address: 113 Tolend Rd., Barrington, NH

comments: As of 25 June 2020, Seacoast Media, specifically Foster's Daily Democrat chose to no longer publish my submitted letters to the editor. Numerous inquiries as to why have gone unanswered. The below letter was submitted on August 7th. It is a community service concern and should be brought to the attention of both city councils. Thank you for your attention.

"Foster's front page news announced the city of Dover is working to upgrade a treatment system to prevent dangerous chemicals in groundwater located within the Dover Municipal Landfill on Tolend Rd. from migrating any closer to the Bellamy Reservoir, which is the city of Portsmouth's primary drinking water supply. Dover's city manager was noted for looking back on how the landfill operated. He is quoted, "If we saw it operated that way today we'd be horrified." From local hearsay circulating regarding the landfill, I share his concern. City administrators should be concerned not only with groundwater contamination and migration, but the quality of the water within the reservoir as well.

A quarter page editorial appearing in the February 18, 2011 edition of Foster's revealed that chromium-6, a major byproduct of tannery waste, was detected in one sample of the Bellamy Reservoir. This metal has been shown to cause cancer in laboratory animals, and the National Institutes of Health defined it as a "probable carcinogen" in 2008. California established a maximum chromium-6 content in its drinking water. As far as I am aware, no such limit has been established in New Hampshire.

On at least two separate occasions, the EPA Project Manager for the Tolend Rd. superfund cleanup site was queried regarding chromium contamination. A promise to return with further information was never realized. I respectfully challenge both Dover and Portsmouth city officials to pursue this issue further to determine what risk, if any, exists."

Randal Heller  
Barrington, NH  
603-332-7209

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

-----

REMOTE\_ADDR: 69.161.127.32