

City of Keene
New Hampshire

CONGREGATE LIVING AND SOCIAL SERVICES LICENSING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, March 24, 2026

6:00 PM

**Council Chambers,
City Hall**

Members Present:

Jennifer Seher, Chair
Tom Savastano, Vice Chair
Robert Hamm
Alison Welsh
Ian Matheson

Staff Present:

Mike Hagan, Building Division Manager
Corinne Chaisson, Board Clerk
Amanda Palmeira, City Attorney
Brandon Latham, Deputy City Attorney

Members Not Present:

All Present

1) Call to Order: Roll Call

Chair Seher called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM. Roll call ensued.

2) Minutes of Previous Meeting: February 24, 2026

A motion by Mr. Hamm to adopt the February 24, 2026 meeting minutes as presented was duly seconded by Mr. Matheson. The motion carried unanimously.

3) Unfinished Business:

Board Staff Liaison Mr. Hagan reported no unfinished business at this time.

4) Applications:

- A) Continued CLSS-2026-07: Applicant, Greg Burdett, Executive Director for Covenant Living of Keene, is requesting a Congregate Living & Social Services License for a Residential Care Facility, located at 100 Wyman Rd., and is in the Rural District and as defined in Chapter 46, Article X of the Keene City Ordinances.**

Chair Seher opened the Public Hearing and welcomed the Applicant, Greg Burdett, Executive Director for Covenant Living of Keene, requesting renewal for their Congregate Living & Social Services License for a Residential Care Facility, located at 100 Wyman Rd.

Chair Seher requested City staff comments. The Board's Staff Liaison and the City's Building Official, Mr. Hagan, reported that City staff completed inspections at this facility on January 15, 2026. There were no comments on the inspections from the City staff.

Chair Seher said she noticed that the inspection mentioned something about a range hood not having been addressed and she asked if that had been resolved. Mr. Burdett said yes, the range hood was rectified within about one week. Covenant Living of Keene works with Encore Fire Protection. Covenant was unaware that it was red tagged. Mr. Burdett said they are pretty diligent about those inspections, so they fixed it immediately, with no issues. He said they also just received a 100% from the City of Keene Health Inspector who assessed the kitchen.

Ms. Welsh said she had typical neighborhood relations questions. She asked for more clarity on some of the volunteer opportunities at Covenant Living of Keene that were referenced in their Neighborhood Relations Plan. Mr. Burdett said Covenant Living certainly welcomes volunteers and has a pretty thorough vetting program to do things within the community, due to being licensed federally and statewide. However, there are opportunities such as for companions, musical entertainers, and readers. He said Covenant Living of Keene does not have a huge volunteer base due to the nature of its business, but they are certainly welcome. Ms. Welsh was keenly interested in all the different things Covenant Living does in the local community, such as donating to community food banks and the literacy program; that all sounded really interesting to her, and she appreciated the good public relations that provides for the community. Ms. Welsh said that part of the Plan was really well done. Mr. Burdett said the organization certainly tries to be a good corporate citizen and is involved in a number of different philanthropic organizations. He provides time off for his senior leadership team to serve on boards and committees in the community, which he thinks is a hallmark of who Covenant Living of Keene is. Ms. Welsh called that wonderful.

Vice Chair Savastano asked how full Covenant Living was at this time. Mr. Burdett replied that there are 140 residential units at 95 Wyman Road and at this time, there were over 100 people on the waiting list for that building. At the Health Center, there are 81 units: 61 assisted living (58 occupied, 3 reserved) and a 20-bed skilled nursing facility that is basically full every single day. Mr. Burdett said Covenant Living had become a significant pressure relief valve for the patients at Cheshire Medical Center. So, he said Covenant Living was essentially 100% occupied and had been for some time.

Mr. Hamm asked whether Covenant Living of Keene has a dementia unit and if so, how it functions. Mr. Burdett said yes, a part of the assisted living community is an 18-bed memory support unit: a secure unit, staffed 24/7 by nurses and nursing assistants, for people who are in various stages of progressive dementia disease. Mr. Burdett noted it is sadly full and there is a constant need. That unit of Covenant Living's skilled nursing facility is licensed by the State of New Hampshire and the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, which is a federal organization.

Mr. Matheson asked about the types of efforts or steps Covenant Living of Keene has taken to mitigate its impact on City staff. For example, the Keene Fire Department having to come out versus contracting with a transport company for more routine, non-emergent needs. Mr. Burdett

said it could be a dilemma. Given the demographics served, there tend to be a higher percentage of issues that involve EMS. Residents are certainly free to call 911 if they deem necessary; that is not preventable. The healthcare unit has nurses on staff but there are times when they do need to call 911 and certainly appreciate the City's efforts, as evidenced by Covenant Living's pilot program: payment in lieu of taxes to compensate the City. Mr. Burdett said transportation is an issue, and the facility has contracts with area companies like Smart Ride, which will come for things like wheelchair transport. Still, he said transportation in the City continued to be an issue.

Chair Seher followed up on the volunteer pieces. She noticed that the Neighborhood Relations Plan was adopted in September 2023, so she assumed that it was current and ongoing. She asked if it was reviewed periodically. Mr. Burdett said yes, each year in preparation for this meeting, so they appreciate the opportunity. He noted that Covenant Living of Keene does not have many neighbors; it is not a downtown community, but they consider the entire City all of their neighbors. He said there are two different things they look at: (1) their contiguous neighbors, which are mostly wildlife vs. (2) their community neighbors. Mr. Burdett thought it was a good plan and said the facility honors it, reviews it, and tries to maintain it.

Chair Seher asked if Covenant Living works with any specific organizations or if there are specific projects that staff or residents volunteer for. Mr. Burdett a number of residents are local retirees and serve on numerous philanthropic boards, and arts and culture groups. The employees also serve on numerous boards, and Covenant Living likes to support a number of local organizations: Keene Lions Club, Keene Kiwanis Club, different arts organizations (e.g., Ashuelot Concerts), the Keene SwampBats, and the Cheshire Health Foundation. Those things are all in Covenant Living's philanthropic charter.

Chair Seher noted it could be an uncomfortable question but asked if residents either in memory care or skilled care have long-term care Medicaid as an option at Covenant Living of Keene. Mr. Burdett said Covenant Living does not accept Medicaid. However, as a mission of the Evangelical Covenant Church of America, Covenant Living does provide benevolent care. So, if somebody comes into the community on the residential side first as a life plan community member and should they outlive their assets through no fault of their own, Covenant Living has a benevolent program so they will never turn that person away, and will cover their costs; this was already occurring for some residents. This is a part of Covenant Living's corporate fund that currently has over \$100 million. Mr. Burdett called this benevolent program one of the things that separates Covenant Living from a lot of other communities. Still, they do not currently accept Medicaid and are very appreciative of other social services who do, stating that they serve a critical role in this community and Covenant Living will do everything they can to help them maintain. Chair Seher appreciated that ongoing commitment. She wondered about a Skills Day, especially being a support to Cheshire Medical Center; she said Medicaid makes a big difference in who you can accept in skills. Mr. Burdett agreed. He said that fortunately, the majority of people who are 65 and over are on Medicare. If they have an appropriate stay at the hospital, Medicare will cover up to 100 days at Covenant Living, which he said is typically enough. He said the majority of Covenant Living patients are on Medicare, and that Medicare Advantage Plans were increasing as managed care had pulled out of Cheshire County. He said Dartmouth Hitchcock does not even accept The Advantage Plans.

There being no public comments on the application, Chair Seher closed the Public Hearing.

A motion by Ms. Welsh to approve CLSS-2026-07 for Covenant Living of Keene to operate a Residential Care Facility located at 100 Wyman Rd was duly seconded by Vice Chair Savastano.

The Licensing Board considered the three Criteria that it is required to when evaluating whether to approve, renew, or deny a Congregate Living and Social Services License Application:

Criteria 1: The use is found to be in compliance with the submitted operations and management plan, including but not limited to compliance with all applicable building, fire, and life safety codes.

Criteria 2: The use is of a character that does not produce noise, odors, glare, and/or vibration that adversely affects the surrounding area.

Criteria 3: The use does not produce public safety or health concerns in connection with traffic, pedestrians, public infrastructure, and police or fire department actions.

Mr. Hamm said that his only red flag would be whether the red tag on the hood was fixed, and Mr. Burdett said it was, so it sounded like they were fully compliant and safe. Chair Seher agreed.

The motion to approve CLSS-2026-07 for Covenant Living of Keene carried unanimously on a vote of 5–0.

Discussion ensued briefly to confirm the Board was following the correct process and they agreed.

B) Continued CLSS-2026-08: Applicant, Amanda McSweeney, Executive Director for Keene Center Genesis Healthcare, is requesting a Congregate Living & Social Services License for a Residential Care Facility, located at 677 Court St., and is in the High Density District and as defined in Chapter 46, Article X of the Keene City Ordinances.

Chair Seher opened the Public Hearing and welcomed the applicant, Amanda McSweeney, Executive Director of Keene Center Genesis Healthcare, requesting a renewal license for a Residential Care Facility located at 677 Court. Ms. McSweeney said she had nothing to add to the application.

Chair Seher requested staff comments. Mr. Hagan reported that Keene Genesis Center operates this facility, consisting of 106 NH-licensed Nursing Home beds along with business operations at this site. City Staff completed inspection on January 13, 2026, with no Departmental comments from Property and Housing, Fire, or Police.

Ms. Welsh asked about the Neighborhood Relation Plan, which she found a little vague. She did not know what, “active and friendly relationships” meant, per se. She did appreciate the Licensed Nursing Assistant (LNA) option. Ms. Welsh asked the applicant to expand upon what exactly Keene Center Genesis Healthcare does with their neighbors and how they enhance neighborhood

relationships. Ms. McSweeney said Keene Center works with a lot of community partners: Home Health Care, Hospice & Community Services (HCS), Bayada Home Health Care, and raise money with the Alzheimer's Association for the Alzheimer's walk. She said Keene Center works with the community, trying to enhance their partnerships in many different ways. Ms. Welsh asked about anything more specific to the organization's neighborhood in terms of relations (e.g., invited tours, sharing information about the Center). At this time, Ms. McSweeney said the facility was hosting a weekly Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) meeting, which is something that one of the residents requested and she said that it had been very impactful for a group of residents and for the community as well; the group had grown in size over the prior year, from eight to 20 people now coming to the Center. In quarter two, Keene Center would be opening a dementia support group, working hand in hand with HCS to try giving the community a little more support for those with loved ones at the facility who have dementia; impacted community members would be welcome to join. Ms. McSweeney also cited her quarters three/four goal to open a grief group. Ms. Welsh said that it all sounded great and she appreciated it. She was curious whether the AA meetings were also open to those with substance use disorders. Ms. McSweeney said yes. Ms. Welsh asked if Keene Center had future plans to offer anything like SMART Recovery or other types of meetings. Ms. McSweeney said not at this time. Ms. Welsh appreciated that the Center had opened to the community.

Mr. Matheson said this was a really detailed application that he found interesting to read. He found the statistics included beneficial to paint a better picture of what Keene Center Genesis Healthcare is doing. He found some of it really eye opening to realize the impact that groups like this and locations like this have on the community with the elderly; he called it really touching to put that into perspective and thanked the applicant for doing that. Mr. Matheson asked what steps the applicant has taken to reduce impact on City staff, specifically the Fire Department and non-urgent transport requests; either through contracting with another company or finding some other solution to reduce that impact. Ms. McSweeney said Keene Center does not use the City of Keene for any non-urgent transportation, only in emergency situations. All transportation to the hospital for appointments is either provided by the facility or by contract through Smart Ride or another transportation company. A lot of the patients served are Medicaid patients or Medicaid pending, so they may not even have a pay; many times, the facility ends up owning that bill themselves or goes through the state of New Hampshire portal to book transportation and they provide a vendor.

Mr. Matheson talked about details in the application on providing a school for LNAs. He asked if that is anything the facility works on with other groups in Keene or collaborates with clinical locations in the community. Ms. McSweeney said yes, Keene Center has LNA classes offered at Applewood Rehabilitation Center in Winchester, New Hampshire. Keene Center hires individuals as staff and from the apprenticeship course at Applewood. She said the Center was partnering with ApprenticeshipNH in hopes of expanding the Center's education and support to get a group of staff through the program for clinical rotations at all three Genesis Centers: Keene, Applewood, and Pheasant Wood.

Chair Seher followed up on the Neighborhood Relations Plan, noting that she was unsure who the Center's neighbors are, and asked if any are private residences. Ms. McSweeney said not at this time, although there was some construction behind them, so there could be the next year.

Chair Seher wondered how an immediate neighborhood would know the best way to contact the Center with a concern about a resident or something on the property; does the Center ever send letters to neighbors, even businesses? Ms. McSweeney said the Center would absolutely be willing to do that. She explained that the Center is open 24 hours per day and a lot of the surrounding businesses are dentists open 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM, Monday through Thursday. She said they know if they ever need anything or have a concern about a resident, that they can come right up to the building or call the facility to speak with her or her team, which happened before. Chair Seher called that great.

Mr. Hamm appreciated the detailed application but hoped the font could be larger in the future for greater readability. He still found it really interesting. He followed the Chair's observation about Keene Center knowing its neighbors, noting that it is important just to have the addresses of abutters and the new Cottage Court developments behind the Center; he called it an opportunity for a real neighborhood relationship, which may be an chance for new neighbors to use some of the Center's community rooms. He said that outreach may foster something good for that community. Ms. McSweeney agreed that she looked forward to the partnership as well. Mr. Hamm suggested knowing who abutters are, their addresses, and their primary focus to interface with. Ms. McSweeney agreed. Chair Seher added that it is important for the abutters to know how to reach the Center. Even if it is open 24/7, neighbors might not always know the best contact for an issue or be comfortable reaching out to know who to ask. Ms. McSweeney thought that if any of her abutters were asked, they would say they feel comfortable coming up to the facility. If they call the building, they will get the extension for the administrator, which has her personal cell phone, so anybody can reach her at any time. Chair Seher appreciated having Ms. McSweeney present as the face of the facility, calling it great for the community.

There being no public comments on the application, Chair Seher closed the Public Hearing.

A motion by Mr. Hamm to approve CLSS-2026-08 Keene Center Genesis Healthcare to operate a Residential Care Facility located at 677 Court was duly seconded by Ms. Welsh.

The Licensing Board considered the three Criteria that it is required to when evaluating whether to approve, renew, or deny a Congregate Living and Social Services License Application:

Criteria 1: *The use is found to be in compliance with the submitted operations and management plan, including but not limited to compliance with all applicable building, fire, and life safety codes.*

Criteria 2: *The use is of a character that does not produce noise, odors, glare, and/or vibration that adversely affects the surrounding area.*

Criteria 3: *The use does not produce public safety or health concerns in connection with traffic, pedestrians, public infrastructure, and police or fire department actions.*

The motion to approve CLSS-2026-08 for Keene Center Genesis Healthcare carried unanimously on a vote of 5–0.

- C) **CLSS-2026-01: Applicant, Melissa Castor, Executive Director for Alpine Healthcare Center, is requesting a renewal Congregate Living & Social Services License for a Residential Care Facility, located at 298 Main St., that is in the High Density District and as defined in Chapter 46, Article X of the Keene City Ordinances.**

Chair Seher opened the Public Hearing and welcomed the applicant, Melissa Castor, Executive Director for Alpine Healthcare Center, requesting a renewal license for a Residential Care Facility located at 298 Main Street.

Chair Seher requested staff comments. Mr. Hagan reported that Alpine Healthcare Center operates this facility, which includes 85 New Hampshire-Licensed long term care beds along with business operations at this onsite facility. City Staff completed facility inspections on February 4, 2026, with no comments from the Police and Fire Departments. There was one comment on the Property and Housing Inspection about missing and damaged ceiling tiles, which the Inspector said had since been resolved.

Ms. Castor said she had nothing to add to the application at this time.

Ms. Welsh asked about the Neighborhood Relations Plan, which mentioned tours. She asked how people tend to tour the facility and if there are any community events. Ms. Castor replied that tours occur essentially anytime somebody would like to do one; she cited a couple per week at this time, but some ebb and flow with the nature of their business. Typically, when there is a lot going on at the hospital, there will be more tours. She noted that it is a very small facility, so community events are a bit harder. Still, Ms. Castor said the facility is definitely open to the community. They had tried a couple of open house nights, without great turnout, and were working on the process for another one during nicer weather with more outdoor space. Alpine Health also works with the school behind them and was in very preliminary conversations about the holidays (e.g., trick or treating) and a block party-style barbecue during nicer weather.

Vice Chair Savastano wondered if Alpine Healthcare is owned by a larger corporation that owns other locations too; he noticed its headquarters in Brooklyn. Ms. Castor said yes, this Alpine Healthcare facility is a part of 13 buildings within the state of New Hampshire. She said right now, it was in a “in-between phase”: the ownership is with five buildings, but the managing company is also with some of the other local buildings, including Langdon Place of Keene, LPK. Alpine’s managing company at this time was 603, so Ms. Castor said it was in-between technically not being owned but working with its sister centers.

Mr. Matheson asked what kind of steps Alpine Healthcare has taken to reduce impact on City staff (i.e., Fire Department) regarding transportation requests for services. Ms. Castor said they are much like the Keene Center Genesis Healthcare versus Covenant Living of Keene. Alpine Healthcare does have a Medicaid population, with a lot of contracts through the State of New Hampshire. They also use MTM Health, which decides what services Alpine Healthcare will use within their contracts. Smart Ride does a lot of Alpine Healthcare Center’s transport for anybody in a wheelchair, both for Medicaid patients and a lot of private clients who already had established relationships with them while still in the home. So, Ms. Castor said Alpine

Healthcare Center does not really use the City's transportation unless it's urgent, which would go through the Center's Director of Nursing. Also, either the nurse practitioner, doctor, or third-party helpers are on call nights and weekends to decide whether to call 911 or if something can be scheduled out (e.g., lab or X-ray). She said they try everything within their capabilities before calling 911. That said, Ms. Castor stated that she also has a very active population who likes to call 911 more often than she wishes; thankfully, she said the emergency responders usually call back into the building and ask if it is a true emergency so they can talk through it with the staff on call first before sending EMS to the building.

Mr. Hamm liked what he heard about Alpine Healthcare Center's proactive work with the school for the block party, calling it tremendously important, both for the students and the Center; he cited available outdoor space behind the Center and the courtyard in front. Mr. Hamm asked if Ms. Castor knew all her neighbors by name and had a way to communicate with all the abutters in a way that lets them know who the Center is and their contact information. Mr. Hamm said communication with neighbors can be tremendously fruitful for community relations. Ms. Castor said she could personally say that she knew all the abutters by name but there are long standing neighbors who have come and asked to speak (e.g., about maintenance of fences). There are surrounding residences. She said the Center had been very fortunate that neighbors came to speak to about concerns; they are a 24/7 facility, so they can come in anytime and staff will alert Ms. Castor, whether nights or weekends. Fortunately, she said they did not have to do that but absolutely could. About the open house, she noted that she would like an indoor-outdoor event because there had been a lot of improvements and drastic changes to the interior of the building. Specifically, the dementia care unit (e.g., amazing murals), which she would like the neighbors to experience, so they can understand who Alpine Healthcare Center is. Chair Seher appreciated the answer and said that it sounded wonderful for the community to see those changes.

There being no public comments on the application, Chair Seher closed the Public Hearing.

A motion by Ms. Welsh to approve CLSS-2026-01 for Alpine Healthcare Center to operate a Residential Care Facility located at 298 Main Street was duly seconded by Mr. Hamm.

The Licensing Board considered the three Criteria that it is required to when evaluating whether to approve, renew, or deny a Congregate Living and Social Services License Application:

Criteria 1: *The use is found to be in compliance with the submitted operations and management plan, including but not limited to compliance with all applicable building, fire, and life safety codes.*

Criteria 2: *The use is of a character that does not produce noise, odors, glare, and/or vibration that adversely affects the surrounding area.*

Criteria 3: *The use does not produce public safety or health concerns in connection with traffic, pedestrians, public infrastructure, and police or fire department actions.*

The motion to approve CLSS-2026-01 for Alpine Healthcare Center carried unanimously on a vote of 5-0.

- D) CLSS-2026-04: Applicant, Jennifer Houston, Executive Director for Live Free Recovery Services, a Residential Drug/Alcohol Treatment Facility, located at 106 Roxbury St., that is in the Downtown Edge District and as defined in Chapter 46, Article X of the Keene City Ordinances.**

Staff Liaison Mike Hagan explained that the Renewal Application was sent to the address the City of Keene had for Live Free Recovery, but they had changed locations; they are no longer based in Manchester, New Hampshire. Mr. Hagan said City staff would work with the Applicant to get their updated information and recommended that the Board continue the Application until the next month's meeting.

Chair Seher opened the Public Hearing.

A motion by Mr. Matheson to continue CLSS-2026-04 for Live Free Recovery Services until the April 28, 2026 meeting at 6:00 PM in the City Hall Council Chambers was duly seconded by Ms. Welsh. The motion carried unanimously on a vote of 5-0.

- E) CLSS-2026-09: Applicant, Michael Johnson, Executive Director for Langdon Place of Keene, is requesting a renewal Congregate Living & Social Services License for a Residential Care Facility, located at 136 Arch St., that is in the Rural District and as defined in Chapter 46, Article X of the Keene City Ordinances.**

Chair Seher opened the Public Hearing.

Chair Seher requested staff comments. Mr. Hagan reported that Applicant Michael Johnson requested a renewal license for a Residential Care Facility located at 136 Arch Street, which is in the Rural District. Langdon Place of Keene operates this facility, which includes 156 New Hampshire-licensed beds in the Supported Residential Care section and 24 New Hampshire-licensed beds in the Nursing Home Section, along with business operations onsite at this facility. Mr. Hagan said City staff completed inspections of this facility on February 12, 2026, with no Departmental comments from Property and Housing, Fire, or Police.

Chair Seher welcomed the applicant, Michael Johnson, Administrator at Langdon Place of Keene (LPK), requesting renewal for their facility's application. Mr. Johnson noted that their rehab unit actually has 25 beds, but Mr. Hagan had cited 24 beds. Mr. Hagan said he would address it.

Mr. Matheson asked what kind of steps LPK has taken to reduce any impact on City of Keene staff, especially the Fire Department, with any contracts with outside companies for non-urgent transports, for example. Mr. Johnson replied that over the prior year, LPK hired a full-time driver for a lot of its own transportation (i.e., anything non-emergent). For emergencies, they use Cheshire EMS, sometimes Great Brook EMS, or Smart Ride occasionally. Otherwise, LPK performs all of its own non-emergency rides; this includes all wheelchair van transportation. Mr. Matheson commended all of that. He asked whether LPK's agreements with Cheshire EMS and Great Brook EMS were contracts. Mr. Johnson said yes, and they have a contract with Smart Ride as well if needed.

Ms. Welsh asked if the facility knows its neighbors and what LPK's community involvement is with them. Mr. Johnson replied that LPK does know its neighbors, including sharing a driveway with two of its neighbors; LPK plows the driveway. He said he communicates with his staff to watch their speed in the driveway. One neighbor has a young family. So, Mr. Johnson said LPK does know its neighbors and the neighbors are good at communicating if they need to. He also cited a storage facility neighbor, who they do not know, although LPK had reached out in the past; sometimes they hear parties there on weekends. Mr. Johnson said Langdon Place of Keene knows its neighbors. He knew about some intention for construction behind another facility across the street but did not know more details yet.

Mr. Hamm asked whether the LPK facility is open for outside groups to use, and how the community interfaces with the staff and residents. Mr. Johnson cited a few opportunities at this time for LNAs to learn and grow in this good environment: Keene High School students taking an LNA class at Langdon Place of Keene is going well (third or fourth time; there are consecutive classes for graduates), and LNA Health Careers comes to the facility (5-Star rated for care) to perform all their clinicals. LPK has heavier care at the very acute nursing home setting, with 22 of 25 beds being short term rehab (a lot of people come directly from the hospital for therapy). With the community, Mr. Johnson cited a community brunch, when people are invited to tour the building, but it is more for marketing and admission purposes. He said LPK has some involvement with Home Healthcare, Hospice & Community Services (HSC). LPK is a member of the Keene Chamber of Commerce and a part of the CNT Network of business leaders that meets at HCS and are invited to LPK for some meetings. Mr. Johnson thought Langdon Place of Keene has a pretty good rapport with the community and they open a lot of their good, available space to the community.

Chair Seher recalled that LPK was in the process of updating a part of its dementia facility. Mr. Johnson said no, it was a part of its shower whirlpool spa, which occurred about four years prior and was the last major update. Chair Seher asked if LPK accepts Medicaid for skilled nursing stays. Mr. Johnson said there were three residents on Medicaid at this time and the rehab unit is licensed through the State of New Hampshire, so half of the 25 beds are for Medicaid patients.

There being no public comments on the application, Chair Seher closed the Public Hearing.

A motion by Ms. Welsh to approve CLSS-2026-09 for Langdon Place of Keene to operate a Residential Care Facility located at 136 Arch Street was duly seconded by Mr. Hamm.

The Licensing Board considered the three Criteria that it is required to when evaluating whether to approve, renew, or deny a Congregate Living and Social Services License Application:

Criteria 1: *The use is found to be in compliance with the submitted operations and management plan, including but not limited to compliance with all applicable building, fire, and life safety codes.*

Criteria 2: *The use is of a character that does not produce noise, odors, glare, and/or vibration that adversely affects the surrounding area.*

Criteria 3: The use does not produce public safety or health concerns in connection with traffic, pedestrians, public infrastructure, and police or fire department actions.

The motion to approve CLSS-2026-09 for Langdon Place of Keene carried unanimously on a vote of 5–0.

5) New Business:

A) Presentation from City Attorney

Chair Seher welcomed City Attorney Amanda Palmeira, who provided handouts to the Board. The City Attorney explained to the Board that a change to New Hampshire State Statute RSA 674:16 took effect in September 2025. RSA 674:16 is the granting power for regulating land use law locally. Specifically, the change directly addresses how the City can and cannot regulate the occupancy of dwellings. At this time, City staff and the City Council were working to adjust to this change in state law.

One of the changes already introduced by City staff in response was a change to the definition of “family” used in Keene’s Land Development Code (LDC). The City Attorney said that it would be a significant shift for the LDC, Zoning Code, and how things are regulated in Keene; not the least of which is the definition of “family” described in ordinances. This change in definition would also affect this Board, as the categories it had been using to license for some time would be changing in response. For example, the definition of “Group Home” is one that directly relies on and would be changed by the “family” definition. The same would be true for Lodging Houses. There could also be buildings or residences [agencies] that would now fall into the family definition that this Board would now have to account for regulating. Therefore, with all this coming up, the City Attorney was before the Board to advise and suggest a pause on Board operations to allow these new ordinances to take effect. City staff and City Council were reconfiguring the LDC to be in line with state law at this time. Rather than continuing to license Congregate Living facilities for one year at a time, with what may soon be outdated definitions, City Attorney Palmeira recommended halting. She provided the Board with a draft motion that in her opinion would accomplish the logistics of allowing everyone who has outstanding licenses for the rest of 2026, who would typically come in for renewals, to be issued automatic renewals for one more year, with the same expiration date in 2027; everyone already licensed to date in 2026 would proceed with their same 2027 expiration dates. She also gave the Board a part of the City Code that lists the deadlines for each of the agencies, which includes language about being able to postpone renewals for “good cause.” City Attorney Palmeira suggested that this was good cause. So, per her recommendation, the Board would adopt the motion and allow this postponement for the rest of the 2026 licenses.

Another logistic the City Attorney wanted to review was the inspection timeline, to which these licensees would still be subject during the Board’s pause. Many of the agencies have State of New Hampshire licensing requirements, which depend on the City of Keene’s inspections. So, City Attorney Palmeira said that during this proposed pause, City inspections of these facilities would remain ongoing, despite the agencies not appearing before the Board for renewal. As she understood, most of these inspections were already pre-scheduled for the upcoming year. She noted that there was also a stipulation within the recommended motion for any first-time License

Applications during this pause: to delegate that work to Community Development Department administrative review using the Code and inspection information. Then, in 2027, the Board would be able to provide full input to those new licensees. The City Attorney welcomed questions.

Mr. Hamm said this looked like the Board ceasing operations for one year. The City Attorney had it going until the end of 2026, so nine months. Mr. Hamm asked if that was only for this board specifically, The City Attorney said yes. Mr. Hamm asked if this would be the last meeting for the 2026 calendar year. City Attorney Palmeira said the Board could convene for other reasons; for example, to talk about related draft ordinances with the City Attorney. That would have to wait for the “family” definition to work its way through the City Council process, which was happening at this time. However, in terms of meeting with licensees and adjudicating applications, Mr. Hamm said that would cease for the calendar year. The City Attorney agreed.

Vice Chair Savastano asked what procedures there would be for neighborhood relations issues; if neighbors have challenges with any one of these facilities, what recourse would they have. The First, the City Attorney thought the ones who would be coming in for the rest of the calendar year would be renewals, so the Board would have seen how they function before, have their contact information, their Neighborhood Relations Plans, and know how they have addressed concerns in the past; assuming nothing has significantly changed, she thought the Board could be pretty comfortable thinking that is how they would continue to operate for the rest of the calendar year. For new licenses or new issues that have not been addressed, she talked with City staff about the ways Code Enforcement or Law Enforcement might otherwise be able to address certain things. She said the City has a very robust ability to address disruptions on the property: from trash to noise complaints, all of those things exist in other areas of the law that can be addressed through City Code Enforcement.

Mr. Matheson asked if the pause had to be for one year or if the Board could choose six months instead, at which time to revisit and get an update from the City Attorney. The City Attorney agreed that it would be possible, noting that she picked December 2026 to revisit for two reasons: (1) what makes the most sense on the license cycle with inspections and when applicants are subject to certain deadlines in the City Code, and (2) to provide enough time for the typical process of City Code Ordinances to go through, which is extensive and lengthy (i.e., several months). So, City Attorney Palmeira thought nine months was a happy medium, and the Board could reconvene at the end of 2026 to decide whether another postponement would be required if the process were not completed by then. She agreed that it could be for a shorter period and hopefully City staff would know by then what is on the horizon for City Code changes.

Vice Chair Savastano followed up about the recourse question and procedures the City Attorney mentioned, asking what public knowledge would be; would the process for addressing things be on the City’s website? He thought about those who had educated themselves about this Board and knew that it would be an opportunity to speak out about anything. He wondered what means the Board would have to communicate with the public during this time. Vice Chair Savastano provided examples of noise complaints, loitering, or vagrancy. The City Attorney thought that, for example, City Hall (City Manager, Mayor, Community Development Department) gets

questions regularly, which are directed to the most appropriate places. Noise complaints go to the Police Department, and loitering would depend on the specifics, like time of day and whether Police need to respond to things like trespassing. Mr. Hagan added that on April 6, 2026, the City would be rolling out OpenGov, a software/app for residents to pinpoint and log their complaints and see how they are being tracked by the City in live map view. He said it would be a really great system. That way, people do not have to call into the City to find out what is happening with a particular issue, they can find out through the user-friendly app/software. If there were a lot of complaints in one area, it could be indicative of something in that community. He said it would also be a really good system for people to find out whether their neighbors have building permits, which would be listed. Other activities would be flagged on the map: Fire, Building, or Community Development Department complaints. The City Attorney said that OpenGov would be advertised and broadcast wide across the City. Mr. Hamm hoped it would be easy to use, and the City Attorney agreed. Mr. Hagan said 12 other communities were using it at this time, and he heard good feedback from contractors about how user friendly it is for tracking information throughout a process and to show workflow. The City tried to keep its process to three pages, so that users can be in and out; it can save their information for easy log-in the next time. Mr. Hamm recommended inviting the public, especially certain demographics, in for tutorials. Mr. Hagan said City staff would absolutely see what they could do.

Mr. Matheson asked which licensees specifically would be impacted by this RSA change. The City Attorney said it was a great question and what she was actively trying to work on. She explained the few parts that had made it challenging: (1) currently, the LDC is written with all definitions in Article 29, and how those affect each other would have to be determined, so City staff were beginning with the “family” definition and how it would change “single-family dwellings” and what that means for the Code; (2) Short-Term Rental, Group Home, and Lodging House definitions all have terminology that have to change based on the new law regardless of changes to the “family” definition; (3) anything the Board addresses that qualifies as a “family” based on the new definition would have to be addressed differently under the Board; (4) another obstacle had been that it was not 100% clear how the existing CLSS licensees were assigned their categories (i.e., Lodging House), so those might change the definitions too.

Chair Seher initiated discussions about Board members’ points of concern. In particular, if community members were to have an issue with any facility during this pause, would it be made clear somewhere that there is still a process for participation with the Board if needed. Chair Seher heard a process for lodging complaints with City staff. She wanted to know how this nine-month pause would be messaged to the public. Chair Seher heard the Board expressing that one year may be a long time to suspend the Board’s role, specifically what messaging that would indicate about the Board’s relevance. Board members understood that there would be a website for complaint lodging and tracking, but asked what about concerns for a CLSS facility in one’s neighborhood or if someone is worried about how long-term care is going for people with Medicaid versus those without; how could the public participate in those conversations for the next nine months? Chair Seher noted that the City’s handling of complaints during this time would not be participatory like the Board’s process would be. The City Attorney thought the strictly legal answer was that the CLSS Licensing Board, as it exists right now, was partially created for that public engagement opportunity. Now, the Board is subject to be changed in the City Code because there is a need to adjust the Ordinance and what this Board will be authorized

to do. Therefore, the City Attorney said there would have to be a Board pause to accommodate that. She was unsure there would be 24/7 Board response to the public because the vehicle constructed for that (i.e., the Board) would be pausing. However, City Attorney Palmeira's legal analysis showed that it was necessary to take this slight break to allow adjustment of the City Code, so that going forward it will be coherent, licenses will not need to be tailored later, and the City is not setting itself up for any issues under the state law.

Mr. Hamm and Vice Chair Savastano reiterated their concerns that this pause would telegraph to the community that this Board is redundant and by saying "one year," it indicates there is no "vehicle" to raise concerns and that there will not be. The concern was for accountability. Ms. Welsh felt that the recommended motion indicated this would be left in the hands of the more than capable Community Development Department staff to address reports or complaints. The City Attorney agreed that her intention would be for new applications and complaints to go through City staff. In line with Vice Chair Savastano's point, though, City Attorney Palmeira noted that for the applicants licensed at tonight's meeting, the Board would not have another opportunity for accountability for one full calendar year, until their next deadline in 2027—with or without this recommendation from the City Attorney. It was also her understanding that the Board does not convene to address complaints; it takes up complaints during the renewal phase. The City Attorney reiterated that this would not be a one-year pause, but nine months, until December 2026. Therefore, it would only affect a portion of the year's licensees expiring during that time and the Board would not have an opportunity to address any complaints until their 2027 renewals. If the Board started reconvening in 2027, it could start addressing the complaints then as well, bringing them up earlier. The City Attorney hoped to have more guidance on who would be subject to this Board and what the Board could address based on the correct definitions by December 2026.

Mr. Matheson and Chair Seher agreed that their perspective was not a negative perception of City staff. Mr. Matheson stated that he was still incredibly apprehensive about a one-year pause. As someone who was affected by seeing that an overnight warming shelter was going around the corner from his residence all the sudden with no word from the City or anything in the news. He thought it was great for new licensees to get a more streamlined process through City staff and that is really important to make it easier for everybody all around. However, he said it really eliminates knowledge of what is going on in your community. Neighbors do not know about the new licensees coming in necessarily; he lives in an apartment, where it is hard to come into the building and intentionally share information, so he had no idea. Therefore, Mr. Matheson was apprehensive about completely closing Board business for one year and the public not having knowledge of what is going on that could have an adverse impact or a positive impact on their community. He understood that the Board continuing operations would present a very significant liability for the City, but if the Board stopped immediately and turned everything over to City staff's responsibility, Mr. Matheson said the community voice that the Board provides would be lost. He was unsure whether the Warming Shelter was reviewed by the Board, but said he would have loved to have spoken his piece about it, and say he thought it was really great as someone who works in this field and that we need more locations like this, but that he had questions about residual impact on the community; he said the facility draws people in at no fault on any of the individuals that access those services, but it does create an impact on the neighborhood. Mr. Matheson said this Board is the vehicle for the community to address those impacts because they

may not always get results from the Community Development Department, Police Department, Fire Department, or Mayor. He reiterated his apprehension with a one-year pause and suggested revisiting in six months instead and perhaps there could be another vehicle during that time for the community to voice concerns or at least hear about new applicants. He suggested the Board could still meet but the licenses could be arbitrarily approved, with the opportunity for public comment.

The City Attorney noted that any new applicants would go to the Planning Board for a Conditional Use Permit and those hearings are all publicly noticed (probably better than this one) by law. So, she thought that would resolve the concern about public comments on new applications. Regarding the Warming Shelter, City Attorney Palmeira noted that it would never have been subject to the CLSS Licensing Board because it was a partnership with the City and thus, exempt. Mr. Matheson did not think that it mitigated the fact that people in the community would have similar situations to his, and he felt the Board needed to continue to provide a space for people to come forward on their own accord and speak their concerns. He suggested developing a different method than stopping carte blanche. Mr. Matheson thought it would require a balance of City staff and the Board so that issues would not end up across the street in court. He feels this Board is about providing that space for the community. Ms. Welsh appreciated the concerns raised but stated that she felt like they would be issues addressed by the Zoning Board of Adjustment and Planning Board.

City Attorney Palmeira noted that this Board can decide to meet whenever it chooses. The City Attorney's recommended pause duration was to prevent any additional risk in light of the law changing (i.e., the legal rights of the agencies being licensed under the law). She stated her intention for the Board to operate with that understanding through the correct ordinances that would be coming. If the Board wants to address concerns about public comment, she said there may be a way to convene and take public comment without doing the licenses renewals, in addition to collecting the Board's thoughts on any ordinances the City staff are drafting during this postponement. Vice Chair Savastano thought that it was an interesting option to meet and have the forum available for residents; in a sense, the Board would be collecting information, so it has a history, while waiting for the legal clarification. Mr. Hamm agreed, reiterating that he would hate if the Board were to stop functioning for one year. He said this proposed function would still allow the public to raise any concerns in the appropriate forum. He asked if there is another place where that can happen. Mr. Hamm was sympathetic to some other options than the City Attorney's recommended motion as written. Chair Seher wanted it to be clear that the recommended motion was just about the licenses, it was not about the Board. City Attorney said that was correct. Chair Seher thought it was not about whether City staff would be able to manage complaints but how the Board would be communicating. Perhaps the Board could decide to hold public meetings quarterly during the license extension, so concerns could be voiced. Chair Seher was less concerned with renewing the licenses for one year and more so with what the interim message to the public should be.

The City Attorney said she could help the Board decide its preferred next steps. She agreed that the recommended motion was about the pausing the license renewals, but meetings did not have to cease, and the Board could recommend to City staff how frequently they would like to meet. If there were no communications to the Board via the Community Development Department,

public comments, or ordinances to review, the Board could spend time asking questions of the City Attorney as needed about the ongoing process. Ms. Welsh proposed quarterly meetings for updates on statutory language and interpretation from the City Attorney, as well as public input if needed at appropriate times.

Chair Seher still thought there needed to be a clear message to the public about what is happening during this time. She was less concerned about this Board and more about what message the public would hear, beyond the process for OpenGov; she loved that it would provide more transparency about City processes, but she thought people wanted more forums to come together and talk about facilities in their community and specific neighborhoods. Chair Seher felt like the collective message about community involvement in supporting or talking with these facilities and neighbors would be the Board's job to message now.

Vice Chair Savastano asked if it made sense to change the motion from renewing licenses for one year to renewing them for six months. The City Attorney was unsure, noting that Board staff would need to review what licenses are due during that period and how it would adjust them. She had tried to account for inspection dates ahead of licenses, ensuring someone does not have to go through inspection before their renewal is deferred one year, etc. There is a gap in licensing during the summer. The City Attorney said the plan she proposed was to automatically renew 12 of the Board's 20 annual licenses, so she would want to know how many fall within those six months before picking a time frame, as well as the Board's meeting schedule, which is driven by City Code.

Mr. Hamm questioned whether the Board could rewrite the recommended motion all together. He asked whether it was the City Attorney's opinion/suggestion that this Board no longer had the authority to renew/grant/refuse any licenses. The City Attorney referred to the issue she explained at the beginning of her presentation, which was the state law change that called into question the compliance of the definitions that the City had been using. City Attorney Palmeira stated that she would not opine about the legality of the operations of this Board because there are agencies coming in who have been licensed and are currently subject to the Code of Ordinances and those licenses. So, at this time, there were people actively regulated by this body. However, the City Attorney reiterated that the Land Development Code, the Zoning Ordinance, and the City Code concerning this Board had to be updated in line with state law. Mr. Hamm said that was not what he heard three months ago when he first met with the City Attorney. City Attorney Palmeira called it a little more simplified.

Mr. Matheson reiterated that if the Board continued operating as normal and issuing licenses, which it could in theory, and the Board refused a license to someone on grounds related to the law changes, it could be a liability for the City down the line. The City Attorney said that was a part of it. The other part was responsible governance: she said it would not be responsible to license someone as a Group Home and then halfway through their license, change the definition of that use to be more/less stringent, or so that different people are subject to it, for example. City Attorney Palmeira said it would not be advisable governance or helpful to the licensees either. The City Attorney said again that this would only be a "momentary" postponement to allow the City Ordinance to work out correctly, so that everything would be seamless going forward vs. setting the Board up with outdated language or definitions.

Discussion ensued very briefly among Board members about how they wanted to approach the recommended motion. Ms. Welsh was prepared to make the motion.

Mr. Hagan agreed with the City Attorney that there were 12 applications remaining in 2026. Before the Board made a motion, Mr. Hagan wanted to provide some information. If the Board waited six months to take this action (i.e., commence postponing renewals), it would see six of those applicants during that time. If the Board chose to pause six months at this meeting (vs. the nine months recommended), they could discuss with the City Attorney seeing the remaining six applications at the end of 2026. Conversely, he suggested that the Board could accept the nine-month pause and continue meeting quarterly (June, September, and December 2026) for updates from staff on the “family” definition, applications, and any public comments. The Council would meet about the definition change mid-June, so it would align well for a Board update.

Chair Seher heard that the responsible and legal thing to do would be for the Board to continue renewing the licenses for as long as needed (whether six months or one year to start), with regular updates from City staff on progress, while being able to continue meeting as a Board quarterly in the interim. Mr. Hagan agreed. Chair Seher still had questions about messaging to the public. Ms. Welsh confirmed whether the quarterly meetings could be public and have public comments. The City Attorney said yes, as a public body they would need to be public. Mr. Hamm wondered what the Board could do during those meetings; would they still see applicants. Mr. Hagan said no, the meetings would be for updates on the Code revision process and staff could provide reports on any of the administrative license renewals and inspections (required to continue under City Ordinance) during that quarter. Chair Seher said the three quarterly meetings started to meet her concern about an interim plan for public community participation and the Board continuing to meet and talk about Congregate Living during the licensing pause. She was comfortable if that was not an issue for the City.

Vice Chair Savastano favored deferring license renewals for six months vs. one year, because when the Board meets again in six months it could extend again if City staff advise it is needed. He felt that one year was a long time and hopefully within six months, the City would know more about these definitions. Chair Seher supported that recommendation. Ms. Chaisson clarified that the recommended motion only suggested suspending license renewals until December 2026 (i.e., nine months). Vice Chair Savastano and Mr. Hamm felt the recommended motion read as though deferring for one year. So, Vice Chair Savastano preferred the idea of meeting quarterly for updates and a six-month extension on licenses instead, while these legal things are ironed out, vs. a 12-month extension. City Attorney said a six-month license extension vs. the full 12 months to their normal 2027 expirations would be fine as long as it makes sense for the deadlines set in City Code. Vice Chair Savastano said he could not support renewing Lodging House licenses from November 2026 until November 2027 without Board review; he could support six months and otherwise it would be telegraphing quite a long time before review. The City Attorney appreciated that but unfortunately the Board’s application deadlines are written in the City Code and she cannot legally allow the Board to completely separate from City Code and suspend those deadlines. She said if the Board does not see that Lodging House in November 2026, it does not get to see them again until November 2027; they could adjust the license term, but she wanted to be mindful that these license types are spread throughout the year

for a reason for a proper cycle and interval of inspections and more. Vice Chair Savastano felt that this was a hiccup and wondered about a period of six months. The City Attorney thought it might be possible for existing licenses by altering the license terms and new licensees would have to come in at regular intervals anyway. Vice Chair Savastano agreed he was thinking about existing licenses.

Mr. Hamm asked whether the Board could not postpone expiration dates of all outstanding CLSS Licenses slated to expire in the next six months by six months. Mr. Matheson did not think so, he thought it went back to the City Attorney's point about not being able to rewrite the City Code. Mr. Hamm asked if granting a license extension of six months would be a violation of City Code. The City Attorney replied, considering what applicants could argue if they were granted the six-month extension based on the November deadline example and how that would play out, attempting for May 2027 if the next deadline is in November. Mr. Hamm asked if she was saying "no." City Attorney Palmeira said, "I don't love it. I'm not going to say don't do it, because we are kind of in a weird area here and I think probably the agencies would be more grateful to get some extension versus none, and probably we'll have some direction before those six months expires, and we could address it then." It struck Vice Chair Savastano that then the Board would have direction.

The City Attorney wanted to clarify what the Board was asking: (1) grant all the 12 licensees who would come up for renewal between now and the end of 2026 an extra six months? or (2) any licensee who comes up for renewal within the upcoming six months to be granted an extra six months? Mr. Hamm expressed favor for Option 2 because the Board could come in six months and City staff could say whether they need more time and another extension could be granted for a full year. Mr. Hagan described Option 2 in terms of the actual licenses for the Board. The license that the Board had just continued to the end of April would be extended to October 2026. He said that is where the "log jam" and overlap would come into play. He said the Board would not see the November applicants until June again if extended. Mr. Hamm said he saw the log jam. Mr. Hagan called the City Attorney's recommendation a pretty clean way that City staff looked at based on their inspection process. He said it would be the easiest way for staff to collect all the inspections and continue reviewing licenses under the Ordinance, while taking a reasonable amount of time to rehear them later on with the same process once the updates happen.

Vice Chair Savastano was not terribly worried about the log jam. Chair Seher thought this was getting at the messaging. Mr. Matheson asked whether applicants are required to appear before the Board; he did not think they had to. The City Attorney said yes, for renewals and new applications. Mr. Hamm said they appear remotely if not in person. Chair Seher recalled that for a renewal, if the Board is comfortable with the application, they can take action without the applicant present. Mr. Hagan said that the Chair was correct. Mr. Hagan said staff purposefully provide the application in its complete form and with all the information that would be needed to deliberate; if more information was needed, the applicant could be requested to come to the next meeting or to submit information. Traditionally, they want to represent their organizations.

Mr. Hagan added that extending these licenses by six months would not only create a log jam, but it would also require re-writing the Ordinance, which he called "sticky," creating a lot of

other issues. The City Attorney thought she could help the Board with what it wanted regarding the log jam. Given the Board was talking about more meetings before the October/November break in the log jam, she thought the Board could pivot then (i.e., at the quarterly meetings) if staff get more information about how many renewals are going to come into that first November meeting. Although, she thought that it was less organized than what she proposed. However, if the Board was looking for less than one year, she said fortunately there were only a couple dozen agencies. The City Attorney stated that it was possible, not her favorite, but the Board could do it; it would be their decision. Mr. Hamm asked about extending all licenses that expire before July 1, 2026 for one year. The City Attorney did not see a problem with that.

Ms. Welsh saw a recommended motion to suspend this Board's process until December 2026 (i.e., nine months) not for one year. Mr. Hamm said the motion was still to extend the licenses by one year. Mr. Matheson asked if per this motion, the Committee's process would resume in January 2027, and the City Attorney said yes. So, she did not think they should squabble about these six months and create a log jam when it is really just a nine-month period. Mr. Hamm said it would be suspending the Committee from March 2026 to March 2027. Ms. Welsh said no, suspending until December 2026.

The following motion by Ms. Welsh was duly seconded by Mr. Hamm: to postpone the expiration date for all outstanding CLSS Licenses slated to expire in 2026, which would end December 31, by one year (December 31, 2027), and to delegate the review and approval of new License Applications received in 2026 to the very capable hands of the Community Development staff, and for the CLSS Licensing Board to meet quarterly after this date (June, September, December 2026) during this period.

Vice Chair Savastano was still not content with the one-year language. For an application set to expire in November 2026, he said the stipulation was really one year plus the seven months to this meeting date of the Board's suspension. He thought the six-month language would be more effective because it could be changed again in October 2026 before the applications in November, or the Board could find it needs to extend another six months. In the meantime, this felt like pushing it off a very long time to Vice Chair Savastano if there were the need to address something. His personal preference was to change it to six months.

Discussion ensued about amending the motion on the table to extending licenses six months instead of one year and revisiting at the next quarterly meeting in June. The City Attorney agreed that the Board had discussed this option and it would be the Board's decision based on what it wanted to accomplish. She did say the ordinances would really need time to prepare and those would shift licenses and operations. The City Attorney reminded the Board that the six-month option would start making licenses overlap rather than the current calendar year under Code, where the applicants cycle through; that is something staff would have to help everyone to keep track of and licenses might be compounding with others. It is more administrative overhead, but that is the Board's choice and there would be quarterly meetings to check in.

Mr. Hamm moved to amend the motion to grant any CLSS Licensee with an expiration date within six months of March 24, 2026 a six month extension from their expiration date and to delegate the review and approval of new License Applications received in the next six months to

the very capable hands of the Community Development staff, and for the CLSS Licensing Board to meet quarterly after this date (June and September 2026) during this period. Mr. Matheson duly seconded the amendment. The motion to amend carried unanimously on a vote of 5–0.

On a unanimous vote of 5–0, the Congregate Living and Social Services Licensing Board moved to grant any CLSS Licensee with an expiration date within six months of March 24, 2026 a six month extension from their expiration date and to delegate the review and approval of new License Applications received in the next six months to the very capable hands of the Community Development staff, and for the CLSS Licensing Board to meet quarterly after this date (June and September 2026) during this period.

6) Adjournment

There being no further business, Chair Seher adjourned the meeting at 7:57 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
Katryna Kibler, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by,
Corinne Chaisson, Board Clerk