

SPECIAL MEETING
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, HEALTH & TRAFFIC
October 21, 2025 at 4:30 PM

Chairman Vincent called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Vincent, Kantor, Barry, Goonan

Absent: Alderman Morgan

Messrs.: Alderman Terrio, Alderman Long, Alderman Levasseur, K. Broderick, E. Rice, P. Marr, K. Clarke, P. Alexakos

1. The Traffic Division has submitted an agenda which needs to be addressed:

ONE-WAY

On Central Street, eastbound from Elm Street to Chestnut Street
(see attached memo from Manchester Police Department)

Alderman Long

NO PARKING ANYTIME

On Manchester Street, north side, from a point 149 feet east of Elm Street to a point 180 feet east of Elm Street

Alderman Long

On Milford Street, north side, from Tilton Street to Riddle Street

Alderman Barry

NO PARKING 9PM-7AM

On Amherst Street, both sides, from Union Street to Beech Street

Alderman Fajardo

CROSSWALK

On Lake Avenue, east and west of Belmont Street

On Belmont Avenue, north and south of Lake Avenue

Alderman Sapienza

METERS - 2 HOURS

On Hanover Street, south side, from a point 58 feet west of Union Street to a point 354 feet west

Alderman Long

STOP SIGN

On Rosedale Avenue at Plainfield Street, SWC

Alderman Burkush

RESCIND METERS-2 HOURS

On Hanover Street, south side, from a point 58 feet west of Union Street to Pine Street (ORD 10615)

Alderman Long

RESCIND NO PARKING 6:00AM-10:00AM

On Manchester Street, north side, from a point 149 feet east of Elm Street to a point 180 feet east of Elm Street

(ORD 10607)

Alderman Long

RESCIND CROSSWALK

On Webster Street, east of Pickering Street (ORD 2385)

Alderman Goonan

RESCIND ONE-WAY

On Central Street, westbound from Chestnut Street to Elm Street (ORD 10827)

Alderman Long

Chairman Vincent: I want to talk about the Amherst Street item. I've spoken to Alderwoman Fajardo. She did want me to make it known that there are constituent concerns about Bronstein Park and that what this no parking does is it gives the opportunity for another tool for law enforcement to protect that area as well as the overall effort, these are her words, to avoid any blanket changes around the whole park, given the variable needs and preferences of the abutters. So that is in regards to Amherst Street, both sides of Union and Beech.

Alderman Kantor: What does she need to be protected from?

Chairman Vincent: My understanding is in the park, there are vehicles that are selling illegal narcotics. They are parking at night when nobody's around, and that's where they're dealing from. So, by doing No Parking from 9 p.m. to 7 a.m., it allows law enforcement, if there's a vehicle, they can approach it now and use it as a tool to ask what's your purpose here? There's no parking.

Alderman Kantor: Excellent.

*On motion of **Alderman Barry**, duly seconded by **Alderman Goonan**, it was voted to approve.*

2. Proposed Ordinance Amendment regarding the Use of Traffic Medians by Pedestrians.

Chairman Vincent: Solicitor Rice, can you walk us through this so that we understand exactly what we're all looking at? I want you to walk through the panhandling decisions and how the courts ruled. And basically, the bottom line is what kind of liability do we have as a city?

Emily Rice, Solicitor: I'm going to let my colleague, attorney Katie Broderick, get the ball rolling. And then I'll jump in if needed at the end.

Katie Broderick, Attorney, Solicitor's Office: I've reviewed three proposed ordinances thus far and just purely from a legal perspective, the ordinance that was proposed lacks factual predicates behind it. We don't know what the specific behavior is that is considered hazardous and we have no evidence before the board to determine whether or not that there are hazards. There's no evidence regarding issues of impacts on vehicles or anything specific besides what the proposer defines as the medians, what hazards are occurring in those places. This is important because the court, under which the city is under an injunction, spent a substantial portion of its order discussing what evidence the board had before it when it was determining whether or not that ordinance would be passed. Even if there were factual predicates that existed as a matter of law, the proposed

ordinance is facially unconstitutional. It will likely be viewed as content neutral restrictions on speech by virtue of the place that the ordinance is restricting, that being a median. And it's worth noting also that the court did comment on medians. So, in order to survive that kind of content neutral restricted space in a traditional area, the court will look to see if it survives what's called a narrowly tailored standard, and it's not likely to survive legal muster. The court does address medians, as I indicated, and the court will likely conclude that this ordinance burdens protected speech of pedestrians who are not standing in the road and not physically obstructing traffic. It will likely violate the injunction.

Alderman Barry: Attorney Broderick, we've dealt with this before, right?

K. Broderick: We have dealt with a similar ordinance before. Yes.

Alderman Barry: Same results?

K. Broderick: The language of the ordinance is different. The language is a difference without a distinction, in a legal perspective. I do expect the same result.

Alderman Kantor: Did you say that there wasn't a problem with any safety issues?

K. Broderick: No, I said that the board has before it an ordinance which has, for example, you haven't had any information from a police department about what they've experienced at different actual medians in the city. You haven't had any information before the board about whether it's one particular meeting, for example, or all these types of meetings throughout the entire city. So, there is a lack of information before the board with the proposal of this ordinance, such that the court will likely find that the factual predicates which the board needs in order to make the decision, are not there.

Alderman Kantor: I have often complained to the police department and I know other people that have complained, so I'm surprised that there's nothing from the police department about it being an issue. I have an email right in front of me that, and I've explained this before, a woman was driving down the road with her daughter, probably around ten years old. A gentleman fell into the street. She nearly ran him over. And she got out to help him up. He fell off of his walker, and so she swerved. She got out of the car and helped him, and then his pants dropped down. So not only did she put herself in danger, but now she's being exposed to inappropriateness. I mean, we're not helping people that are falling off the median. We're not helping people continue their drug addictions. It's really sad. For me, I would like to hear from Troy because he brought this forward. We need to find a lawyer, a city lawyer, that's going to protect the citizens of Manchester and the police department to uphold that ordinance.

E. Rice: If I may respond; I'm more than happy to take a look at the email and call that constituent. I think our point is that when we litigated this issue back in 2017, there was an extensive discovery process. Part of that discovery process included data from the Manchester Police Department on arrests, their policies on roadway obstruction and panhandling, deposition testimony by the the police officer, etc. We're not saying that there isn't an issue. It's that if we were to pass an ordinance without a well-established factual predicate, we're simply going to go in and repeat the same result, which in our

opinion would be a waste of city resources. We're more than happy to hear from anyone who has data regarding public safety concerns. Right now that data, to our knowledge, has not been developed. If one is able to take a look at the 65-page decision of the court, one would see that many of those pages are consumed with the factual information that was collected in the discovery process in that lawsuit. So, we're not suggesting that the city ignore constituent concerns. We're not denying that there is a safety problem, but we have very little information about the specific data underlying the impetus for the two most recent drafts at this point. Even if that were true, even if that factual predicate were established, the bottom line is that panhandling on a median strip, not disrupting the flow of traffic, has already been addressed by the court. We are prohibited by law from enacting an ordinance that does just that. That is the opinion that we were requested to provide. It's not that we're saying that these concerns are not real. We're saying that the ordinance as proposed is facially unconstitutional regardless of the factual predicate, as we understand it at this point. We're not suggesting that anyone ignore constituent concerns or safety concerns. The court itself, in its opinion from 2017, suggests a number of alternatives, and I have no reason to believe that those alternatives are not being pursued by the Manchester Police Department. There are a number of statutes under which people can be cited for standing in the roadway, obstructing traffic, interrupting the flow of traffic. There are a boatload of measures that the Manchester Police Department can take, and I do believe does take in the appropriate circumstance. But as to this particular ordinance, from a constitutional perspective, it is identical to the ordinance that was struck down at significant expense to the city. I had only been the City Solicitor for a couple of months when the injunction was put into place. I do know that later we settled with the plaintiff. I don't recall the exact amount, but I think it was something like \$80,000. Also, there was an outside law firm that was retained by the city that was active in litigation for a period of about 18 months. It was necessary to pay them, and not only that, if you violate a federal injunction, then the result is a contempt citation. And I certainly, as City Solicitor, do not want the city to be in a position where we have acted in a contemptuous manner vis a vis a federal judge's order. I'm happy to hear any specific concerns. Those concerns are important from the constituents.

Alderman Barry moved to receive and file. **Alderman Goonan** duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Vincent: Chief, do you deal with this a lot? What's your take on this?

Peter Marr, Chief of Police: Nobody likes having them out there, right?

Chairman Vincent: It's the safety side I'm more concerned about.

P. Marr: Our officers are encouraged, if they do see people stumbling into the roadway, falling into the roadway, to stop and address it, and get them out of there. Under that context, we're certainly allowed to do that. We're not violating any injunction or anything like that when we do that. If they're literally sitting there in the median, there's really nothing that we can do about that unless if that median is on private property. Then we can kick them out of there. The vast majority of them, they're legal and they're usually just sitting in the middle with their signs or petting their dog.

Chairman Vincent: Would you say you get a lot of calls on this kind of stuff?

P. Marr: No. Not really.

Chairman Vincent: I mean, the bulk of what I see is usually South Willow. I don't see it very many other places.

P. Marr: The bulk is over there, also Salmon and Elm, at Granite and Canal. Those are the main ones you see.

Chairman Vincent: I just want to say that the concern of the board, I'm sure as well as everybody else, is the safety of these people. It's not just of the people, it's of the drivers. It is in the best interest of the safety for everybody because it's an issue. Is this something we can look at a little deeper, maybe? I would look to you, what would be the best course of action for us to really dig into this? We obviously can't put ourselves at a liability from a legal standpoint. I would never want that.

E. Rice: I don't think there's any liability to the extent you're just asking me about the sort of pure black letter code liability, I don't think there's any liability on the part of the city. For individuals utilizing a median strip that is in good repair and with respect to which the city has not been notified of any defect, I think you can rest easy on the legal exposure standpoint. However, I think what the board is concerned about is the human element. In other words, we don't want people falling into the roadway. We don't want individuals and vehicles obstructing traffic because that's dangerous to the other drivers on the road and to that person themselves. We're certainly happy to take another look at it, but I think that the board has been very watchful and hyper-vigilant about any measure that can be taken vis a vis individuals who are putting themselves in danger, both on median strips and otherwise. But we're certainly happy to take another look at what can be done. I think that probably should be done in conjunction with DPW because they know a lot more about medians than the City Solicitor's office does. I'd be more than happy to work with them to see if we can come up with some creative approaches.

Chairman Vincent: Would it be an option instead of receive and file, to possibly table so we can allow time for the Solicitor's Office to work a little bit?

Alderman Barry: It won't have anything to do with this.

Chairman Vincent: You're right. We can receive and file this, and then you can come back in another time. They'll come back with more information from DPW, and we can try to dig a little deeper into this because there is a concern.

Chairman Vincent called for a vote. The motion passed, with **Alderman Kantor** duly recorded in opposition.

3. Discussion regarding congested on-street parking due to use by business vehicles.

Alderman Terrio: This has been going on for at least five years. This business has been spoken to many times. They clean up their act for a little while and then they go back to doing it again. I want to thank the police. The police were over there recently. What they found was that somebody was attaching plates from other cars. They were taking plates off of cars, which is illegal, and sticking them on other cars and parking them in the street. The police went over there, ran all the tags, and they found at least four cars with illegal plates, so they towed those. That's just part of the problem. This is what the person is willing to do to park on city streets. I've driven by there on Wilson Street. I've driven by there and walked by there on several occasions. There's a sign you can't park within 20ft of an intersection. There's actually a sign that says don't park from here to the corner. On multiple occasions, I have seen them with cars right at the corner, right in front of that sign, working on the car. The hood is up. It's right diagonally across from the mechanic shop. Somebody was under the hood doing work in that same spot where it says don't park. They basically have so many cars that they can't do all the work in their own parking lot. So now they're actually out in the street working on cars, but people get upset, so I get calls. I've gotten probably at least ten calls from people in the neighborhood. It's a very tight neighborhood. The houses were probably built 100 years ago when people didn't have cars. There are twelve family units without a garage, without a driveway. So, you have ten and twelve units with no parking on the property so they have to park in the streets. Well, now you have this business parking all their extra cars. Now, somebody mentioned there's an ordinance that you can have resident only parking. We do have that ordinance, but the problem with that is I have relatives that live in Somerville and they have that. I don't want to punish the residents to have to do that. It's administratively a lot of work for the city and the residents to have to go to City Hall, get a resident parking pass, you get visitors, and so you give it to friends and workers who are coming out. And then if they forget and they drive home with it then you lost your parking pass. That seems to me a lot of extra work for the city and for the residents. The best way, I think, is to deal with the gentleman who is just using city streets as his parking lot, and he's incorrigible because he's been spoken to many times by the police department, by code enforcement. He uses them to death and says he's going to change, but he doesn't.

Chairman Vincent: We deal with the same thing on the west side, too. It's not one individual person, it's multiple people. The streets in Ward 11 are very tight. When you have somebody that parks their commercial vehicles there overnight, it takes up six, seven, eight spots. When there are 400 residents on a stretch of road, there's not any parking as it is. I believe there's something out there where you can't park commercial vehicles on the streets between 12 and 5 a.m.

Kristen Clarke, Traffic Engineer: That doesn't help.

Chairman Vincent: It's not going to help his particular situation. What do you think? Signage?

K. Clarke: It's going to be difficult from a signage perspective because there technically isn't a residential zone down there. So, you would need to establish a residential parking zone through ordinance change and then allow them to get permits annually to park in there. It is difficult with a lot of the high turnover type places, someone moves, how many permits are you giving out? It's just this one side of one block or maybe both sides that

they're using sometimes, but it's one block. So, creating a residential zone to handle this doesn't really solve the problem.

Chairman Vincent: I'm not thinking of making it a residential zone as much as I am just putting up signs for that.

K. Clarke: Well, to make it a residential only parking, you have to create a resident parking permit area.

Chairman Vincent: So, we can't put signs that show that we can enforce vehicles on the road from 12 to 5? It's an issue now and it's going to get worse. Correct me if I'm wrong, when winter comes and we have to park on one side of the street and then half the city is looking for parking. What do you think from your standpoint?

K. Clarke: I think they will pay the fine, and they have to. I mean, it's a police issue of them switching plates.

Chairman Vincent: I'm not worried as much about that as I am how we help the residents that don't have the parking versus people with businesses parking their vehicles overnight, taking up all those spots.

P. Marr: In this instance, we have the problem businesses identified. Can we revoke their business license and put them out of business?

Alderman Barry: Resident only parking is a terrible idea. You open the floodgates. Many people would love to put signs in front of their house saying parking for me only. Where does it end? Is it for the people that live on the right side of the street, or the left side, or both? Where does it end? Where does it start?

Chairman Vincent: I'm not in favor of that. I just want some sort of identification to be out there that you can't park your business vehicles from 12 to 5.

Alderman Barry: This is an auto shop?

Alderman Terrio: Yes.

Alderman Barry: We had one in ward ten also, and that's exactly what they were doing. If they were in there for repairs, they weren't getting to them right away. So, they'd park on the street for who knows how long. Could be three days, could be two weeks, and they just sit there. Kristin's not even probably the right person; parking enforcement would probably be the better one. There was another one on Blaine Street where the auto shop was, parking vehicles that weren't even registered and didn't even have a plate on them, they'd go and sticker them, and then they hopefully go back the next day and they were still there so they would tow them away. Sometimes they move them and they're back again the following day. So it's a tough situation.

Alderman Terrio: Correct me if I'm wrong; to sell cars in New Hampshire, you need a license. But to fix cars, you don't need a business license. So, it's my understanding this

business does not have a business license and it is not required, unfortunately. So, I think this is going to be a process that we need to work with the city solicitor's office. I don't know if we have an ordinance that businesses can't store cars on city streets. This isn't like I'm going to a convenience store; I'm just going to park on the street and run into the business. These people bring their car to this business, but it can't be fixed for weeks or maybe a month. The parking lot is not that big. So, what they do is they just park, they store the car in the street for weeks and months, and it's like a cat and mouse game because I have residents a block away saying, I'm seeing the mechanics from this thing drive it all the way there, driving like 500ft away because they don't want to get caught. So, it's not just in front of their business, they're parking like a block or two away. And it's like a little cat and mouse game. Then the police will find them and say, oh, that's that. I would like the city solicitor's office to explore an ordinance where businesses, I think especially car businesses, can't just store cars on city streets for long periods of time; basically, they're using our street as a parking lot.

E. Rice: We're happy to take a look.

Alderman Terrio: This is not something that can be fixed today, but it's a problem all over the city. Obviously, it's a problem on the west side, too.

Alderman Long: Residential parking is helpful when you're paying to park. That's more helpful. Business vehicles are not publicly parking. So, these businesses that are putting vehicles in a public space, they're not publicly parking. They're storing. So, they're not using the public space as it's intended to be used. It's not public parking. They're storing those vehicles. So just under that, I would say they're not allowed to publicly park to use a public space again.

Alderman Barry: How do we know which cars are with the business and which cars are not?

Alderman Long: Well, you look up.

Alderman Barry: You're not going to know if they're coming from ward ten and they're in ward seven.

Alderman Long: Yeah, you could figure that out.

Alderman Barry: I think we need to do some research on it.

Alderman Terrio: Personally, this is probably illegal and unconstitutional, I'd love to put a camera across from the business and just watch them put the cars in the street so that we would know. I'm pretty sure that's not going to pass constitutional muster.

E. Rice: It's not.

Chairman Vincent: The Solicitor's Office will work a little deeper on that to see if we can find out and we'll backtrack on it again.

4. Discussion regarding home-based food production in the City of Manchester.

Chairman Vincent: I want to read something really quick. And then what I'm going to do is I'm going to ask some questions, and we'll certainly open it up after that. I just want it to be clear, because there was a lot of misconceptions out there on how this runs, but the purpose of this meeting is to have a discussion regarding homesteading activities in our city. Ultimately, the task of this committee is to work with the Health Department, the City Solicitor and the City Clerk to draft language in accordance with the wishes of this community, so that we may make recommendations to the full board for discussion. This particular item has been on the books for over six decades, and it's a lot to deal with, and we're doing the best we can with what we have now in front of us. So that's where we sit today, and that's what we're trying to fix and move forward on. So, with that being said, Phil, can you talk me through what non-potential hazardous foods are and give some examples?

Phil Alexakos, Deputy Public Health Director: We've been working diligently since the September 2nd meeting to do sort of a landscape assessment. Our ordinance is, as you mentioned, very dated. We wanted to look at all the practices that were happening across the country to get a better understanding of tolerances for risk as they are in current time. Part of that scan was also looking at other communities in New Hampshire including cities and towns, larger cities and towns that are also known as self-inspecting communities some of which allow home based preparation. Several don't allow it under any circumstances. To answer your question about what is a potentially hazardous food, it's also known as a temperature control for safety food. Those two terms are somewhat interchangeable. And basically, that designation comes from the Food and Drug Administration's model food code. And it's important to know that this just isn't a process that is a federal agency coming up with a set of regulations. It's actually a collaborative effort through what's called the Conference for Food Protection that is a partnership between research, academia, and industry. So those who are practicing food service on a daily basis, as well as state, local and other regulators. So, it's a let's get together, discuss the best science and make modifications. So basically, the temperature control for safety foods are things that you might understand to require refrigeration. And that is to prevent bacterial growth. So those foods are things like meats and poultry and cheeses and eggs and milk and things of that nature. Over my 30 years at the health department, there have been things that have been added to that list based on our understanding of bacterial contamination and the ability for pathogens to grow in those foods. So, things like sprouts, cut melons, and some cut fruits, leafy greens, cooked vegetables or heated vegetables, those are all things that can support the growth of bacteria. So those are foods that require refrigeration for safety. And the things that we look at just for those who are interested are the pH or the acidity of the food and also the water activity. So, the ability for bacteria to use those items as food.

Chairman Vincent: It is pretty cut and dry. So can you talk me through what the exemptions would mean in a practical sense for this.

P. Alexakos: Some of the things that we've learned in our research is in just about every state, local communities that have health departments have made exceptions or exemptions for some home based prepared foods. Everything that we do is a balance of

risk. So, we're looking at the things that are not likely to support the growth of bacteria. So, we call those the non-food or non-potentially hazardous foods. So, things like whole fruits and vegetables that haven't been cut, baked goods, cookies, brownies, double crusted pies, breads, dried spice rubs and dried pastas, and things of that nature. Because either the acidity is at a level that doesn't support the growth of bacteria, or they're dried products so they don't have the moisture available for those bacteria to grow. So, in our scan across the country over the last 11 years since we last updated our ordinance, that has become a common practice. We are always listening and trying to process what's best. Ultimately, as you know, the board makes policy and we will follow through on enforcing them. If we want to look at a risk profile, those baked items represent the lowest possible risk. And across the country, that has been pretty universally accepted as a tolerable threshold for risk tolerance.

Chairman Vincent: How do we treat lemonade stands, food service codes, bake sales, things of that nature?

P. Alexakos: Lemonade stands. In 2021, the New Hampshire Legislature, the General Court, passed a law and it was signed by the governor which exempts all lemonade beverage stands operated by children under the age of 14 from all local permitting. So that would include a health permit, a business license, or any other type of permitting. So that is something that the legislature felt strongly enough to just say we want to level set that across the board. I think most people would agree that we don't want to be regulating those.

Chairman Vincent: Currently you're working with the Solicitor's Office, and we're working on the wording and the language for an upcoming ordinance change, which I'm hoping will still be able to be put before the board somewhere on or around November 18th. Can you give us a little update, a little insight on where we are in that process, so we can actually review it at this committee and then put it before the board?

P. Alexakos: Back in May, we started moving forward with an overhaul of our food service regulations, looking at the FDA model food code to make sure that all of our policies and procedures and practices were in line with the best available science and information. So, we brought forward a reference to that FDA model food code. Coincidentally, that food code actually has evolved and does exempt bake sales. That's the first time that I've seen the Model Food Code recognize home production in any way. Again, I don't think people are interested in regulating charitable bake sales. We have not been permitting them since at least 2013. That's the furthest back that I was able to find a memo to that effect. So, it actually will codify our current practice and my understanding is obviously when ordinances change, there's several layers of review. That whole body has been through just about all of the levels of review. My understanding is that if we want to add an exemption for non-potentially hazardous foods, that we would be able to make those alterations as part of that final approval process. At least that's the guidance that I was told or given.

Chairman Vincent: Do we feel good about being able to meet that timeline of November?

P. Alexakos: Yes, we have a great relationship with the City Clerk's Office as well as the City Solicitor's Office, and we've been going back and forth on several pieces of ordinance to improve and change. And so, I think we will have no problem meeting that timeline.

Chairman Vincent: The ordinance is something like six decades old. I'm sure there's a lot of room for improvement and growth.

Alderman Kantor: Are you aligning all the ordinances with the state homestead law? So, is it going to be even?

P. Alexakos: You know, we have been asked that question before. I think it's important to note that the the General Court, the state legislature, has given communities and cities especially the ability to look at what works; what works best for cities may not work best for towns. We want to put forward the information so that this board can make a decision about what it feels is an appropriate level of risk and also permitting. If the board wishes to allow the same things that the state allows, then that is certainly your purview. Our feeling, and looking at the landscape of food safety, is that we're very comfortable with non-potentially hazardous foods but we feel that the state has carved out some things that have an added layer of risk that we are mindful of. We're talking about things that require acidification or special process. There's a potential for botulism. That's something that has a very serious health adverse health outcome. We're always balancing the risk and how much are we going to intervene as a government agency? And when you have something like botulism, albeit rare if that were to happen, it has a pretty high mortality rate if it isn't treated promptly. So that is a line that we don't feel comfortable supporting at this time. If the science were to change or we have data in the next few years that says we've had no outbreaks in states that have just brought that forward, we are certainly willing to revisit that.

Alderman Kantor: So, what's the percentage in New Hampshire that is allowed for?

P. Alexakos: I have that information. It's about 30 percent; 33% of the state does not allow any homesteading whatsoever. That's not what we feel is something that we're comfortable with from a risk tolerance. So, we are actually saying that we feel that non potentially hazardous non-processed foods, baked goods, things of that nature we feel confident in supporting an alteration to the ordinance to allow those items based on those being the lowest risk.

Alderman Kantor: So, what are the numbers for botulism with the other surrounding towns? Since they're allowed to can?

P. Alexakos: Botulism is a reportable disease. I don't believe that we've had any botulism cases this year or in the last few years. But certainly, we have to balance the possibility with something that is so significant of a poor health outcome if things are not done properly.

Alderman Kantor: I just believe in freedom of choice and this is government overreach here. I really believe that we should be aligning with the state 100%. We shouldn't, as Manchester citizens, be treated any differently than our surrounding towns. We deserve

healthy foods and we can take our own risk if we're going to purchase it from someone else. So, for me and the people that I hear from, they want to align with the state 100%. I trust real science, all science, not just certain sciences, and that's been an ongoing problem since the Covid epidemic with the push of the vaccines. So, for me, when we talk about science, it's what are the facts with everything on the table?

P. Alexakos: Well, I appreciate your perspective. Thank you.

Alderman Kantor: Thank you. I appreciate that.

Alderman Barry: Has anyone from the state reached out to you or your office for your input or your concern?

P. Alexakos: With regard to the previous or alterations to the state food code? Yes, the city has provided testimony mostly as it pertains to the General Court trying to preempt local communities from making their own decisions around food safety and other public health issues. You know that the law that I had cited before that allowed cities to establish boards of health back in the early 1800s, it was recognized that cities have different issues that may be more important to them. A one size fits all approach doesn't necessarily work. But in this instance the state does allow for local communities, and there are 15 of them, to have their own food regulations. Certainly, that could change. I know that there's some effort to level set in a sense, and preempt local decision making in this arena. And that's the prerogative of our elected officials. Our job as your health department is to provide you with information about risk and what we do and hopefully you can make the best decision. We will follow what this board comes up with for any changes to our ordinance.

Alderman Barry: I have full confidence in our health department and everything that you guys do. Thank you.

P. Alexakos: Thank you. I appreciate that.

Alderman Levasseur: May I ask a question?

Chairman Vincent: We're going to wrap it up now because of time. We're going to wrap it up, but I want you to continue to do what you're doing and I look forward to November 18.

*There being no further business, on motion of **Alderman Goonan**, duly seconded by **Alderman Barry**, it was voted to adjourn.*

A True Record. Attest.



Clerk of Committee