

**Meeting Notes from the Regular Meeting of the Peabody Board of Health,
January 28, 2021**

In Attendance: Chairperson Thomas J. Durkin III, Board Member Dr. Leigh Ann Mansberger, Board Member Anthony Carli, Health Department Director Sharon Cameron, and Recording Secretary Lisa Greene.
The meeting was held remotely at 4:00 p.m. Via Zoom

Subject: Meeting to be called to order

Discussion: Mr. Durkin called meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. He explained that the meeting would start off with public hearings today.

HEARINGS:

Subject: Hearing re: Notice of Emergency Suspension of Permit to Operate Swimming Pool at 1 Newbury Street and review of status of variance regarding Lifeguards

Discussion: Sharon Cameron explained that the Board is being joined today by Holiday Inn Regional Manager Sean Smith and Site Manager Jahara Santiago. Ms. Cameron explained that the Health Department had been called out to the Peabody Holiday Inn location after a serious incident, a drowning, occurred at the pool there. The Health Department immediately issued an emergency suspension of the pool permit. Subsequently, an on-site inspection was conducted by the Mass. Dept Public Health, with Peabody Board of Health staff in attendance. She reported that upon their arrival the state inspectors identified some minor violations, but did not determine that any were serious enough to keep the pool closed. One item in need of attention is a need for a request for a variance regarding steps that had been installed in the pool. The main incident that is under scrutiny here is the drowning. She reminded that the Health Department oversees public swimming pool permits and that while the requirement to have a lifeguard is the standard, they allow public pool owners to apply for a variance to that if illustrate that they can safely monitor the pool without the need for an on duty certified lifeguard.

In this instance a variance was issued based upon the hotel's use of a camera at the pool and monitoring system which is supposed to allow for front desk staff to monitor the pool at all times. Upon her site visit, she identified that the monitor at the hotel was positioned behind where the staff would generally be facing. Another issue was identified as well, that, while they were on the site visit at noon, the sunlight coming in through the windows created a glare and a significant portion of the pool surface could not be seen on the monitor due to the glare. Ms. Cameron reported that she noted these things within 5 minutes of coming to the site, but her concern is that this system has been in place for years and management at the hotel never saw this as an issue. Another issue was when questioning about the pool permit and variance requirements, those on site seemed to abdicate responsibility for the oversight of the pool. The response to questions about the content and requirements included in the variance were met with answers deferring responsibility by saying that the variance was applied for by upper management and that they had not been involved in it. She added that she wants to be sure that there is responsibility taken for understanding the requirements of the pool permit and variance at a local level.

Ms. Cameron explained that she does not have the police report so would not be going into specific details of the drowning. She told that on January 11, 2021, Inspector Bill Pasquale was notified of a drowning that had occurred at the hotel. She asked Mr. Pasquale to tell what had occurred. He reported that he had received the notification about the drowning from the Peabody Police Dept and had gone to the site and notified the state immediately as required by the state pool code. He told that a few days later he accompanied the state inspectors and Ms. Cameron to complete the onsite inspection. He told that they identified some smaller issues and some larger ones. He told that the pool was supposed to be closed at 10:00 p.m. but the victim found at midnight, so it was apparent that no one went to the pool area to close it down and to check for issues, and apparently no one was monitoring the pool during the time of the drowning. Some of the other issued identified were things like problems with where the pool chemicals were stored, which had no impact upon this incident but still need to be addressed. Ms. Cameron also added that according to the records provided by the hotel, the person entered the pool area at 8:30 p.m.

Larry Lum, attorney for Holiday Inn, introduced himself and said that, in light of a tragedy like this, it is important for everyone to look at what can be done better going forward. He told that they are willing to do whatever is reasonably necessary to make sure that it never happens again. In hindsight, they now realize that it may have been better to have the monitor facing those working at the front of the desk and at directed at a better angle, and said that his client is now working to rectify this. He also reported that there are some unusual circumstances surrounding this incident that should be noted. Apparently the person was checked into the hotel by her husband, who immediately left. She was not served alcohol on premises but appeared to have consumed alcohol that she must have brought into the hotel on her own. He said that there is no report yet on what caused her to drown, whether it was accidental or not accidental, or if she had not been in control of her senses at the time of her death. The front desk attendant was not aware of the decedent going under the water. It was when staff later went in to do meter readings that she was found. He added that they are here to assure the Board that we are willing to take all reasonable steps needed.

Mr. Sean Smith thanked the Board for being willing to hear from them, adding that he knows that Bill and Sharon are just as upset as we are over this incident. He told that they had their inspection with state and received a list of 20 items in need of attention. He told that they have already completed 14 of the items, that some will take a little time to implement. Mr. Smith apologized to Ms. Cameron if he appeared to not take responsibility on the day of their visit, adding that he understands that he is responsible for overseeing the property. He explained that going forward they are looking to install a new monitoring system which is web based which will be installed next to check in desk intake monitor, that they plan to institute hourly checks of the pool area and checks at the closing of the pool, and to set up alerts that will sound when the door opens and closes. These steps are our plan for ensuring that something like this doesn't happen again.

Chief Carli asked that since this is a such big corporation, is there any other guidance that you can take from other Holiday Inn locations? Attorney Lum replied that this was an aberrant situation, since the victim had been going in and out of the pool area several times, the staff assumed she had left the pool. Dr. Mansberger asked how the front desk is staffed. Mr. Smith replied that in the evening from 6:00-11:00 there is one person on duty. Dr. Mansberger asked if they have to let person into the pool-the front desk person? Mr. Smith replied that they do, and that anyone wishing to use the pool has to sign in, report how many people are going in and what time they go in. Dr. Mansberger asked if there are more people on the desk during the day, to which Mr. Smith replied yes, at times. Dr. Mansberger asked if someone leaves the front desk and leaves the pool monitor unmonitored for any reason. Mr. Smith replied yes, of course there could be a time. Dr. Mansberger added that this was a long time of not checking, not knowing someone had drowned. Chief Carli asked if they thought that the Covid pandemic had an impact on the situation. Mr. Smith replied yes, that normally there is more staff on board because there were many more customers pre-Covid.

Mr. Durkin asked Ms. Cameron what her recommendations were for the Board today. Ms. Cameron replied that she recommends that the Board lift the suspension of the pool permit, but added that she is not completely comfortable with the staffing situation, or how frequently the staff person may be away from the front desk, and feels like the Board needs to hear more, and that the hotel needs to give them a plan, whether it be that a backup person has been assigned to take over in any instances where the front desk staff has to step away, or maybe to hire a pool monitor, or possibly set a policy that if the staff has to be called away from the monitor that they must go to pool and make everyone leave.

Jahara Santiago, On-site Property Manager, introduced herself and told that she has been doing this job for over 20 years and has never had anything like this happen before. She acknowledged that due to Covid a lot of new guidelines were put in place so a lot more is required from the front desk staff. She added that we have all made sacrifices, but certainly not anything that would put anyone into any unsafe situation. The staff know that are not allowed to leave the front desk unless there is an emergency. Their policy is that guests must go to front desk themselves to pick up extra towels or to change rooms. We are certainly taking steps to make sure additional precautions are put in place, and are happy to answer any questions. Larry Lum said to speak to your question on other locations, he represents hotels across the country, one thing we have been taking advantage of is the new technology that has become available recently. He asked if everyone has heard of the ring doorbell, which allows a homeowner to see who is at their door from their phone. He said that the technology can be used to help in this

industry, in that a property manager can be across the country and still see what is on the camera, adding that this gives the front desk the ability to view the desk no matter where they are.

Mr. Durkin said that like Ms. Cameron, while he is comfortable with having the hotel continue to operate the pool, he is still not convinced about the issue of the variance to allow for no lifeguard, and added that if we saw a plan incorporating the steps you have discussed here today we would likely be more acceptable to issue that variance. Dr. Mansberger said that she agreed, and told that she takes this matter very seriously, adding that it is very easy for staff to get distracted and it takes not long for someone to drown

Mr. Durkin said that there are two issues up for discussion today, the continuation of the pool permit and the variance requesting to be allowed to operate with no lifeguard. He asked if there was a motion to allow the pool operation permit to continue. Dr. Mansberger made the motion to allow the facility to continue to operate a pool on the premises. Mr. Carli seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and all unanimously agreed to allow the facility to keep their pool permit. The suspension is lifted.

Mr. Durkin then addressed the second issue, the variance that allows for the facility to have no lifeguard. He said that the ideas suggested for better managing the oversight of the pool sound good, but they need to be presented in writing. He asked that the facility submit another plan which improves upon the originally submitted plan from when they got their original variance. Mr. Smith said that they would do so. Ms. Cameron restated for the record, that at this point they may operate the pool but must operate the pool with a lifeguard or not at all. Mr. Carli made motion to uphold suspension of lifeguard waiver, and to not allow the pool to be used unless a lifeguard is present. Dr. Mansberger seconded. Mr. Durkin added that the Board is asking to see a new plan, and that they will take the matter up again as soon as possible after it is submitted. A roll call vote was taken, and it was unanimously agreed to uphold the suspension of the lifeguard variance at this time. Attorney Lum asked that the record show that this is an extension of that temporary suspension, and that it is temporarily extended pending approval of a new plan. Mr. Durkin agreed and asked that the record be so noted. Ms. Cameron stated that she also suggests that they submit the request for variance for the projections into the pool before next meeting. Chief Carli thanked Mr. Smith for coming and for making many of the requested changes even before the hearing. He also asked if they have security at the location. Mr. Smith replied that they do, but only after 11:00 p.m. Mr. Carli asked if that does not coincide with the time of the pool closing? Mr. Smith replied no but said that they are having security check the pool going forward, so that when the lights go off at 10:00, security will be required to go into the pool area to check. At 4:36 Mr. Durkin closed the hearing.

Subject: Hearing re: application to operate a body tattooing establishment at 145 Summit Street; Application for permit to perform Body Tattooing Submitted by Scott Crooker.

Discussion: Mr. Durkin opened the hearing at 4:37. Applicant Scott Crooker was present and, when asked if he would like to say anything, he replied that he has submitted everything the Board should need to know. Ms. Cameron said that John Yale has reviewed Mr. Crooker's application and asked him to speak on this. Inspector Yale told that he had visited the establishment and found that it meets requirement of the code. He told that it has two stations, with handwashing at each, and has a separate waiting area. He said that Mr. Crooker has experience and, since everything was in order in his application, he feels comfortable recommending Mr. Crooker for a permit to do tattooing. Mr. Carli said that he saw the sign for the new parlor as he lives in the area. He asked why, if the application says New England tattooing, why the sign says something different. Mr. Crooker replied that actually there are two shops going in, and there was an issue with the name, and prior to this we had plans to open at the new place, so had to come up with a new name going forward. He told that the name of store is Intricate Ink, but on the old application it said New England Ink. Mr. Durkin asked if there was anything else anyone wants to hear? Ms. Cameron asked for information on Mr. Crooker's planned Covid protocols. Mr. Crooker told that he will be taking temperature, asking covid questions, taking an application, having everything sanitized, using gowns and full facemasks, and having booths 6 feet apart. John Yale asked for updated application that says Intricate Ink and Mr. Crooker replied that he would. Mr. Durkin asked if anyone had anything else to ask? No one replied. Dr. Mansberger made motion to allow a permit for Intricate Ink Tattoo Parlor, and for Mr. Crooker to be permitted as a tattoo artist. Mr. Carli seconded the motion, and a roll call vote was unanimous in favor of granting the permit. Mr. Durkin closed the hearing at 4:42 pm.

Subject: Hearings re: Application for Permit to Operate a Body Tattooing Establishment at 106 Lynn St., and Application for Permit to Perform Body Tattooing submitted by Vivian Ong; Application for Permit to Perform Body Tattooing submitted by Maryanne Cheng. Votes anticipated whether to grant or deny permits.

Discussion: Mr. Durkin opened the hearing at 4:43 and both Vivian Ong and Maryann Cheng indicated that they were present and explained that they had applied together for the business and were both applying for permits. Ms. Ong told that together they were opening Lavish beauty bar at 106 Lynn Street. She explained that she had spent two years doing apprenticeship for micropigmentation. Mr. Durkin asked if they would be only doing permanent makeup tattooing? Ms. Ong replied yes. Mr. Durkin asked Inspector John Yale for his feedback on these applications. Mr. Yale told that Maryanne Chang and Vivienne Ong had submitted all of the necessary paperwork, and that everything was in order, and added that they also gave him an additional binder with their safety measures and procedures for close contact work. He explained that since they operate a beauty bar that offers different services, our regulations require a separate room for the micropigmentation work, which they have. He reported that the medical requirements were reviewed by the public health nurse who said they are all in order. Mr. Durkin asked if the Board had any questions. None were put forth. A motion to approve the Body tattooing establishment permit and for both permits for Ms. Ong and for Ms. Cheng to perform body tattooing was made by Dr. Carli and seconded by Dr. Mansberger. A roll call vote was held and all approved the three permits. At 4:48 pm Mr. Durkin closed the hearing.

Subject: Hearing re: Application for Permit to Perform Body Tattooing submitted by Alicia Thomas. Vote anticipated whether to grant or deny permit.

Discussion: At 4:49 pm Mr. Durkin opened the hearing and asked the applicant why she wanted to perform body tattooing in Peabody. Alicia Thomas replied that she had been looking for a change and was ready to work for a good friend. Mr. Carli asked Ms. Cameron as a point of clarification if these permits to perform tattooing have to be attached to a certain establishment. Ms. Cameron replied that we generally need to know that they have an association with a specific establishment so that we can confirm that they have access to the necessary facilities for hygiene and cleaning. John Yale said that he has met the owner of the Speakeasy Gallery and did a routine inspection there and found it in good order. He reported that Alicia's paperwork was also in order and that her medical documentation has been approved by public health nurse. Ms. Cameron asked applicant about her Covid protocols. Alicia said that she follows the shop protocols put in place at the establishment where she works, and in this instance they take temperatures of clients at the front desk, fill out a survey, artists wear an apron and a medical mask, all stalls are separated by walls, no additional people are allowed in the tattoo areas, and they wrap every client with saniderm before going out. Dr. Mansberger made a motion to approve application to perform body tattooing, and Mr. Carli seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the vote was unanimous in favor of issuing the permit. Mr. Durkin closed the hearing at 4:54 pm.

Hearing re: Order to Correct Violations and Citation issued to Northeast Arms. Vote anticipated whether to uphold, modify, suspend, or revoke Order and associated penalties.

Discussion:

Ms. Cameron told that she had been contacted by the state Dept. of Labor regarding some complaints about this establishment. She explained that a customer reported they had visited this store three times and had not observed any masks being worn, and that is why she had her staff go there to follow up on these complaints. She asked Inspector Bill Pasquale to tell of his visits there. He told that in October he was called to inspect for Covid compliance at Northeast Firearms. He explained that this is a firearms dealer, and that he was asked to go with inspector Suckney to conduct the inspection. He told that this is a small shop, approx. 800-1000 sq feet. He told that when he entered there were about 5 customers and 2 employees present and none were wearing face coverings, and no one was practicing social distancing. He explained that he told the owner that they were there for informational purposes, and to look into the complaints received. He told that the business had a poster on their door regarding face coverings being required. It was reported that one of the owners had a medical exemption because he had suffered a heart attack in the past and was told that he should not wear a mask. Since he is dealing with the public, Mr. Pasquale said that he told the owner that he really should use some other form of barrier to protect the public,

like maybe a face shield. He then told of the second time we went to the establishment, on December 9th, still no face coverings were being used, so Inspector Suckney had issued the \$300 fine.

Attorney Marc Salinas told that he is representing Northeast Arms, a firearms sale office and gunsmithing shop which makes repairs to firearms. He added that there are always either 1 or 2 people in the establishment, and one is the owner, Steven Bruno III, and rarely any more people are working in the store. He also stated that it was his understanding that there was just one employee not wearing a mask. He told that his client has a medical condition, and that under Covid order #55, he is exempt from wearing one. He also explained that the second individual from the shop is no longer working there. He explained that the man was very heavy set, and had trouble breathing and couldn't wear the mask, so the decision was made to no longer have him work there. He went on to say that an employer can question and require proof of medical issues. As to customers, their memory was different, there may have been customers not wearing masks, but he said that there were some who were. We understand that a store owner may ask a customer to leave but are not allowed to ask any questions regarding medical conditions. Mr. Bruno has been trying to do what is necessary without driving away his clients. Mr. Salinas went on to say that they will set up sanitizing stations, but already had hand sanitizer station on the wall at the entry but will have even more available. Given these circumstances, he asked that the board revoke the fine. He said that the situation is not related to Mr. Bruno wearing masks, inspector acknowledged he has medical condition, the other person was not well enough to wear a mask, and no longer works there. Also on the topic of masks, he proposed, it is unnerving situation in a firearms store to have people come in wearing masks. He also reminded that his client has put up signage about the requirement and hopes the Board takes this into consideration.

Dr. Mansberger questioned Bill Pasquale, asking if the same employee without a mask was there in October and December. Mr. Pasquale said it was the same person, a larger set fellow at the desk. Dr. Mansberger added that social distancing was also not being maintained, small establishment, owner with heart issues, it is in best interest of owner to be very clear about the mask requirement for customers and social distancing. Marc Salinas disputed about the number of customers wearing masks. He has had people wait outdoors if too many in the store. Sometime customers might not take it seriously, but it doesn't mean Mr. Bruno doesn't take it seriously. A lot of people coming in feel very strongly about their rights to bear firearms, and have issues with government intrusion, so it is a very big issue for him. There are going to be customers who go into the store and refuse to wear a mask. Some may say they have a medical condition, and he can't do much about that. It is not Mr. Bruno that doesn't take it seriously.

Ms. Cameron wondered if there are other opportunities for Mr. Bruno to set expectations, wear a face shield, or have a plexiglass barrier. People may enter and assess the culture there and may read that as someone who does not care about Covid compliance. Mr. Salinas stated for Mr. Bruno to wear a face shield would not work because he uses special optics on his face to make repairs to firearms. But the barriers are a very good point. Where main transactions go on, at the cash register, Mr. Bruno is going to install plexiglass from ceiling at the most frequented areas where transactions occur, and hope that this might change the culture in there. They plan to do this as soon as possible, but it will be a bit of a challenge to get this done at this time as everyone is installing plexiglass, but said that they will get this done. Unfortunately they cannot do plexiglass at every location. He told that some items being sold are long guns, which need to be checked and cleared and given to the customer. This is a constant back and forth, which needs to be done in a safe manner. Mr. Salinas also informed the Board that the owner does gunsmithing. He explained that people with problems with a firearm, which might be a round jammed in a chamber, come to him for help. He told that he has to make sure no one gets killed, has had to go out and take a gun from someone to bring it back to the firearms area.

Mr. Durkin asked if anyone present had any questions. Ms. Cameron told that we have the City Solicitor Don Conn here by phone and asked if he had any questions. Attorney Conn had no questions. Chief Carli suggested that they should perhaps table this item until next month to see if he has addressed this, he understands Mr. Salinas's point, but we need to take this seriously.

Mr. Durkin stated that the Board of Health is not imposing fines as a revenue generator, but wants to get people to get into compliance and to be safe. He sympathizes with the issue of the clientele. If it is the issue of people objecting to wearing a mask, the Covid virus doesn't differentiate. Attorney Salinas said he is actually at the shop,

and Mr. Bruno has been listening on the hearing, when he mentioned the culture of the clientele, Mr, Bruno is not supportive of being more assertive with his customers about mask use other than the signage. It was also mentioned in the citation that the business owner was argumentative when the inspectors were there. Mr. Bruno was concerned, said that one of the inspectors was confrontational with the customers, saying that the customers would be fined, which is not true, but there needs to be something done there to take the temperature down.

Dr. Mansberger said that, given the fact that the state has sent three cases their way, then she is disinclined to waive the fine. Mr. Durkin said he sees it the same way and is inclined to uphold the violation. Ms. Cameron said that she is encouraged by what we have heard with respect to implementing additional procedures, and wonders if the Board would consider to reduce the fine, to perhaps \$150. Dr, Mansberger said she is ok with reducing the fine but feels very strongly about getting compliance. Mr. Durkin said he can see cutting the fine in half. Mr. Pasquale said the attorney mentioned that the face coverings are hard, but it doesn't make a difference, a public building where people are coming in from outside, it's being said that just because this is a gun store we should deal differently, but we need to enforcing it across the board with all types of retail establishments. Attorney Salinas read from the regulations saying that an owner may ask a person with no mask to leave, but it is not a requirement that he do so. Said Ms. Cameron as she brought up, the plexiglass may get across the culture. The safety order says plexiglass is going in but is that going to be sufficient. Mr. Pasquale said as long as it is at the register it will be at least something. Mr. Pasquale pointed out that it is not fair to a customer to have people not wearing masks.

Mr. Carli made motion to uphold the fine but to reduce the fine to \$150. Dr. Mansberger seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and all agreed to uphold the violation but to reduce the amount of the fine to \$150.

Subject: Dr. Mansberger question regarding pool permits going forward and consistency with other applicants

Discussion: Dr. Mansberger asked, if it's a question of consistency, many of our pool permits allow for a variance from lifeguard requirements with the use of camera monitors, so do we need to add an inspection of the monitoring systems to the approval process for these permits? I know it is a rare situation, but we can almost guarantee that there are people with these permits who are not paying attention to the monitors. The question is, should we stop issuing these variances?

Ms. Cameron replied that going forward we should require more info on staffing, is there backup, ask the parameters on how frequently they physically check the pool area, on close up procedures, and periodic check-ins. She told that in some cases we require a pool monitor to be used, which is another thing we can think about, or we may prohibit people from swimming alone. She said that we need to look at tightening up the procedures on these variances. Mr. Pasquale agreed that there needs to be additional oversight. He added that we all know that front desk workers get interrupted and are not monitoring all the time, but these permits are issued across the state, not just here, so it's not just an issue here, but we can still find ways to at least tighten these things up. Ms. Cameron told that we used to bring in everyone who was applying for a variance before the Board to drill them on their safety procedures, and we may need to return to that. Then we can do the in-person questioning of the actual staff who will be overseeing, since the staff in this case said it was the headquarters who filled out the application. Mr. Carli said his heart sank when he heard of this as well, he has approved these as part of the board and wants to make sure we are doing everything we can to make it safe. Dr. Mansberger added that as onerous as it may seem to require 20+ applicants to come in for hearings, we should do it, just to be sure they take these requirements seriously. Mr. Carli agreed. Mr. Durkin said that this is an opportunity to revisit these protocols. Ms. Cameron agreed, and said the Board should expect to see a large number of applicants before them on this going forward.

Subject: Approval of minutes of November 19th meeting.

Discussion: Mr. Carli made a motion to approve the minutes of the November 19th meeting, and Dr, Mansberger seconded, all were in favor and the minutes were approved.

Subject: Update on Covid-19 Response Actions- Data update

Discussion: Ms. Cameron reported on the latest Covid statistics. She told that the active caseload is much higher than these numbers show as they also work with nonresidents, for instance, people who work or go to school in Peabody who are not residents and are not represented in these numbers. She reported that they are currently at 82 cases per 100,000 which is down from 110 per day, but is still very high, which shows that COVID still has a very high prevalence in our community.

Subject: Update on COVID-19 response actions- Revisions to state directives

Discussion: Ms. Cameron reported that the Governor has rolled back some regulations: curfew has been rescinded, now businesses can stay open after 9:30. We have been doing testing 2x per month. Tonight Mayor Bettencourt and Ms. Cameron are presenting to the City Council, and will make a presentation which she will share with Board.

Subject: Update on COVID-19 response actions- Pooled testing

Given where we are in the school season, the School Committee recommended not to go forward with the school testing program.

Discussion

Subject: Update on COVID-19 response actions- Vaccination Plan

Discussion: Ms. Cameron said that we developed a regional vaccination plan with surrounding towns with the expectation that the state would be able to provide enough vaccine to cover the region, but we were notified we would get only 100 doses per week. She said that in Peabody there are over 12,000 people in the 65+ category, so it is not possible to run a regional program with that small number of doses. They are hearing that many are really upset because they can't get vaccine from the health department, because they look to us because we give their flu vaccinations so effortlessly, but that is not the case here. She said the state wants boards of health to be gap fillers for those who are home bound, have transportation issues, undocumented people, or those with other barriers to access. The State wants to administer vaccine primarily through large scale site immunization events and pharmacies.

Mr. Durkin asked what is the number of doses to be administered at an event like the one being held at Doubletree mass vaccination site. Ms. Cameron replied that they are administering 5,000 doses per day, 7 days a week, so 35,000 doses compared to our 100, so they want people to go to an event like that. Ms. Cameron said some health depts are pushing back and fighting the state on this, but she does not think it is even feasible for that volume to be done on the local level. Social distancing is also an issue, everyone has to be observed for 15-20 minutes after receiving their dose, so we would have to have space for that, so our flu clinic model is not the right model, and we have to direct people to other venues.

Chief Carli agreed, saying that in Everett they have been talking about some different ideas, but no one really anticipated the contagion issue so we can't really do the things we have practiced for in the past, so it's better to have people go to pharmacies and doctors. He added that 95% of his staff have received their vaccinations, and are going back for second. He said that he has so much respect for those on the front line fielding calls, and that in his town he has only two people fielding hundreds of calls asking when is it my turn. He added that he hopes it slows down.

Mr. Durkin asked if, like the channel where first responders are being given the vaccine, is there a channel for larger employers to get a vaccination clinic in place. Ms. Cameron replied that we have directed employers to the pharmacy chains, but right now the large pharmacy chains are under contract with the state to do the long term care facilities and the congregate care providers, so they are booked up. She also told that there is a glitch with state website, one problem is that even though we are only supposed to be vaccinating front line people, there is no barrier preventing people from registering who do not fit that category. She explained that a whole bunch of people showed up to the last first responder clinic and had come from quite a distance, but when they got there and we had to turn people away, people were quite upset, and we were upset as well, and it and took an appointment slot away from health care workers, so it was unfortunate. She reported that we are going to do an outreach project use money to address vaccination hesitancy among Latinx populations in which we will work with trusted community leaders to

help make people more confident in the vaccine. We want to take steps to address their concerns, as data shows that they have been disproportionately impacted by the virus.

BUSINESS

ENVIRONMENTAL UPDATES

Subject: Rousselot & Rodent Complaints

Discussion: Reviewed. Rousselot has had a couple of complaints. We haven't seen any of the DEP-mandated reports from Rousselot, but expect to see something soon. Rodent complaints reviewed.

Subject: Code Enforcement

Discussion: Ms. Cameron reported that Covid enforcement continues, Forever Flawless continues to refuse to comply. We have not been actively monitoring them, but we had been up at the mall on other business, and if we see they are operating not in accordance with the Orders we had previously issued, we are citing them. We have issued them 6 or 7 violation notices. She also told that a Boston Globe reporter had reached out to her on them, as someone on the South Shore complained and so they are investigating. They did receive a cosmetology license but are not following those protocols either, but we do not have bandwidth to monitor them constantly right now,

Subject: Permitting

Discussion: List of permitting reviewed.

PUBLIC HEALTH NURSING UPDATES

Subject: December 2020 Surveillance Reports

Discussion: Reviewed.

CORRESPONDENCE

Subject: Correspondence

Discussion: Reviewed

Subject: Next Meeting February 25, 2021@ 4:30 p.m. **Meeting Adjourned:** 6:06 p.m. p.m.