



MINUTES OF THE PROTECTION AND POLICY COMMITTEE

**MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2018, 5:30 PM
CITY HALL, ROOM 207**

A. ROLL CALL.

Present: Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Randy Scannell, Excused: Mark Steuer

Also Present: Deputy City Attorney Joanne Bungert, Lt. Steve Mahoney, Ald. Barb Dorff, Chief of Staff Celestine Jeffreys, Chief Andrew Smith, Ald. Brian Johnson

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the September 10, 2018 Protection & Policy meeting.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to approve the agenda for the September 10, 2018 Protection & Policy Meeting. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to amend the agenda to take item 5 before Item 1.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes for the August 13, 2018 Protection & Welfare meeting.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to approve the minutes for the August 13, 2018 Protection & Welfare meeting. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

D. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Consideration with possible action on an application for a "Class A" Liquor License by Kwik Trip, Inc. at 515 W. Walnut St. (Currently has a Class "A" Beverage and "Class A" Cider License), previously discussed at the July 9, 2018 P&W Meeting.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to open the floor. Motion carried.
Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to close the floor. Motion carried.
Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to deny an application for a "Class A" Liquor License by Kwik Trip, Inc. at 515 W. Walnut St. based on adverse impact on the peace , quiet, cleanliness of the neighborhood where the establishment is located. Motion failed.
Yes- Randy Scannell, No- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to approve an application for a "Class A" Liquor License by Kwik Trip, Inc. at 515 W. Walnut St., with the approval of the proper authorities (currently has Class "A" Beverage and "Class A" Cider Licenses). Motion carried.
Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, No- Randy Scannell, Abstain- None

2. Consideration with possible action on a "Class B" Combination renewal application for Los Banditos East at 1258 Main St. (filed with Clerk's Office June 26, 2018), previously discussed at the July 9, 2018 P&W Meeting.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to not renew a "Class B" Combination application for Los Banditos East at 1258 Main St. due to the business not being in operation in excess of 60 days. Motion carried.
Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

3. Consideration with possible action on an application for an available "Class B" Combination License by Sunshine N' Wally's Bar, Inc. at 1332 S. Broadway St. with a licensed premises that includes bar, storage, office and patio in back. (previously licensed in the 2017-2018 year as Wet Whistle)

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to approve an application for an available "Class B" Combination License by Sunshine N' Wally's Bar, Inc. at 1332 S. Broadway St., with the approval of the proper authorities and to recommend that Council waive the requirements for an outdoor licensed premises and to approve the proposed outdoor premises as presented.
Motion carried.
Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

4. Discussion on a request by Ald. Wery for review, with possible action, on the City Council's policy

(and/or City's Ordinance) for reconsiderations.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to approve the draft ordinance amending section 2.06(7) of the Green Bay Municipal Code relating to reconsiderations as presented by staff. Motion carried. Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

5. Consideration with possible action on a request by Ald. Wery on an endorsement of Police Chief Smith's proposal for school safety, regarding retired policemen in all Green Bay Public Schools, which was previously held until the Police Department reached out to the School Board.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to receive and place on file an endorsement of Police Chief Smith's proposal for school safety, regarding retired policemen in all Green Bay Public Schools. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

6. Discussion with possible action on a request by Ald. Wery, which reads: "Request a legal opinion from the State Department of Justice Office regarding walking quorums, mayors that are legally a member of the City Council, and the practice of meeting individually with Council members regarding upcoming business that the City Council will be voting on."

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to refer to staff a request by Ald. Wery, which reads: "Request a legal opinion from the State Department of Justice Office regarding walking quorums, mayors that are legally a member of the City Council, and the practice of meeting individually with Council members regarding upcoming business that the City Council will be voting on. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

7. Discussion on a request by Ald. Wery to review, with possible action, city ordinances or policies to allow for action to be taken on the 1st and 2nd readings of ordinances.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Randy Scannell to approve the draft ordinance to amend Section 6.206(8) of the Green Bay Municipal Code relating to the reading of ordinances as presented by staff. Motion carried. Yes- Craig Stevens, Randy Scannell, No- John VanderLeest, Abstain- None

8. Discussion with possible action on General Ordinance No. 22-18 amending Section 27.902(2), Green Bay Municipal Code, relating to penalties for marijuana possession.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to open the floor.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to close the floor.

Moved by Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to refer to staff to present a general report on the research that staff has gathered as to what other communities are doing with respect to fines and other research supporting the proposed ordinance changes amending Section 27.902(2), Green Bay Municipal Code, relating to penalties for marijuana possession. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

9. Discussion with possible action on General Ordinance No. 21-18 amending Section 27.307, Green Bay Municipal Code, relating to animals prohibited at certain events.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to approve General Ordinance No. 21-18 amending Section 27.307, Green Bay Municipal Code, relating to animals prohibited at certain events. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

10. Discussion on a request by Ald. Johnson for consideration and possible action on the creation of a web page on the city's website for residents to submit rat sightings within the City of Green Bay. Data should be used to create map overlays, track progress of inspections, ID problem areas or any other purpose deemed appropriate by city staff to reduce the number of complaints.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to direct staff to implement a request by Ald. Johnson on the creation of a web page on the city's website for residents to submit rat sightings within the City of Green Bay. Data should be used to create map overlays, track progress of inspections, ID problem areas or any other purpose deemed appropriate by city staff to reduce the number of complaints.

Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

E. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Report from the Water Utility Department regarding the lead pipe removal project.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to receive and place on file the report from the Water Utility Department regarding the lead pipe removal project. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

2. Liquor Violation Report from the Police Department for September 10, 2018

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to receive and place on file the Liquor Violation Report from the Police Department for September 10, 2018. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

F. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to adjourn. Motion carried.
Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

Meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Yep, when you're ready, when you're ready.
- OK, now we are gonna use.
- OK, the meeting of the Protection and Policy Committee for 9-10 in room?
- 212? 207.
- 207, 207 thank you. 207 is now in session, it's 5:30, roll call. Alder Stevens?
- Here.
- Alder Vanderleest?
- Here.
- Alder Scannell's here and Alder Steuer is unavailable, he's excused. I'll take a motion--
- One sec. Oh, are you moving on to the next agenda item?

- Yep.

- Uno memento. OK, yep, now we're good.

- All right, I'd like to amend the agenda to move item number five to our first order of business, so a motion to, well, let's, let's, let's do it this way. A motion to approve our agenda?

- Motion to approve.

- Motion by Alder Vander Leest, second by Alder Stevens, all in favor?

- [Alders] Aye.

- OK, motion to amend agenda, move item number five up to regular business number one.

- Motion to amend.

- Motion to amend by Alder Stevens, Alder Vander Leest. Seconded by Alder Stevens, all in favor?

- [Alders] Aye.

- OK, that motion is now, agenda is now amended. Take a motion to approve the minutes, of August 13, 2018. Motion to approve by Alder Stevens, seconded by Alder Vander Leest, all in favor?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? That passes unanimously. Our first item of business, consideration with possible action on a request by Alder Wery on an endorsement of Police Chief Smith's proposal for school safety regarding retired policemen in all Green Bay Public Schools which was previously held until the police department reached out to the school board. I'll take a motion to receive and place on file.

- I'm sorry, can we pause for one second? My order is not what it should be and I'm trying to find it so I can set--

- Are you out of order?

- I am out of order.

- I guess we're gonna have to just save that item til the very end, then.

- No, we're on the right one now, I would just ask to repeat what the motion was, or who made the motion and the second so I can capture that.

- Motion to receive and place on file.

- Motion to receive and place on file by Alder Vander Leest. Seconded by Alder Stevens, all in favor?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? OK, that is now received and placed on file. Course now, everything that we do here is just a recommendation to the full council, they'll have the final say.

- [Man offscreen] Thank you, sir.

- Thank you.

- Item number two, which is our number one. Consideration with possible action on an application for a Class A liquor license for Kwik Trip Inc at 515 West Walnut Street, currently has a Class A Beverage and Class C cider license previously discussed at the July 9, 2018 Protection and Welfare meeting. Staff?

- Yes, one second. Law department has no objections. This was previously held at Council which is why it's coming back to P and W, or P and P. P and P previously did deny this due to different concerns raised by the public. I just had, I just wanted to advise the committee, which I believe my colleague Kristin Johnson touched on at the last meeting, that if the committee does deny this license, that the reason for the denial has to be stated on the record, and I actually have drafted up a cheat sheet with reasons--

- I love cheat sheets.

- Yep, that can be used to deny. I'll have this for the committee at every meeting just so it's easier. But that was it for us.

- OK. Have we heard from Alder Johnson by any chance on this? He's the one who really kind of took this over and steered it.

- We have not.

- Well, my motion all along was to deny temporarily til situations in that neighborhood were different. So, I think I will make the recommendation to deny this application due to an adverse impact on the peace, quiet, and cleanliness of the neighborhood where the establishment is located. Number two. Is there a second?

- Well, I'd like to move for discussion on it. Is there anyone here from the public that would like to address it?

- I'm from Kwik Trip.

- Motion to open the floor.

- You second the motion? OK, so, motion by me, second by Alder Vander Leest. Second for discussion.

- For discussion, yes.

- So, motion to open the floor, by Alder Vander Leest, second by Alder Stevens, all in favor?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? OK the floor is now open, did you fill out a form?

- I did, yes.

- OK, so just please state your name and address for the record.

- My name is Jessica Hartjes, 516 Stevens Street in Combined Locks. So I'm here to represent Kwik Trip on this, I'm actually the Food Service District Leader for this area. Once those guests come and purchase items from our store, it's really ultimately up to their discretion as to what they're gonna do with those items. We do provide trash cans and recycling bins for their disposal. We do everything we can to keep that area clean and tidy. We also have very strict guidelines when it comes to our tobacco and alcohol policies. We do, within our own internal audits and self-checks. We do Learn to Serve for all of our co-workers, it's mandatory. We also have our own computer-based training that we go through with every co-worker. We really would appreciate a discussion on this, as we have Kwik Trips all over neighboring, I'm sure all of you gentlemen have had the pleasure of visiting our establishments, and we really take pride in being able to offer a variety of items to our guests.

- Do you understand what the whole issues were in the past with?

- Yep.

- OK. It's not just Kwik Trip, it's the whole.

- I'm well tuned into what's happening in that neighborhood, and a lot of it comes down to noise issues which we've been more than willing to work with. We've changed our truck times so that the neighborhood, the neighbors, are able to have a quiet night's slumber. We've also done our due diligence to try to keep up with the trash in our lot and in the area, but once again, once the guest leaves our establishment, we don't have control over what they do with those items once they leave our lot, but we try our best to keep up with it while they're there.

- OK, my problem all along has been that initially when Kwik Trip and some other businesses in that whole belt came forward, I supported it, but it was voted down by the Council because of issues with mainly vagrancy and I think that was the biggest one, and litter and a few other things. The neighbors were greatly concerned on that issue. Then, the other issues came on top of it for Kwik Trip which I think, from what I've heard is resolved, but I haven't heard officially.

- We do our best, we want to make everyone happy.

- Right, so for me, it's just a matter of a level playing field, and I'm hoping soon that we can just approve everyone across the board there because you're the only banned in the city that is kind of prohibited here, 'cuz you know other Kwik Trips and other businesses around do have that license, so I'm hoping that, I think things have gotten better and I think it shouldn't be too long, and I think I can support all the businesses getting a liquor license, but I have not heard from some of the neighborhood associations and anything quite yet, so I'm still reluctant to go forward right now. So, I'm still going to vote no on granting this at the moment until all the businesses are ship-shape and ready and all the neighbors are gonna be happy with our decision and not come knocking on my door saying we didn't want this. 'Cuz for me, this is a neighborhood issue. They're the ones who should determine what kinds of services they want in their neighborhoods. It affects them, and so right now I'm still leaning to denial.

- I just have a couple questions if I may. What are the hours that ya, in other words, basically, is it hard liquor, that's what you're really, that's the issue you want to sell the hard liquor, and what time do they sell to?

- Well, every municipality is different, I'm not sure what Green Bay's ordinance is, I'm not sure, is it 10:00?

- 10:00.

- Is it 10:00? So it must be, again, some are 8:00 AM til 10:00 and some are 6:00 AM til 10:00, and they all range, so I'm gonna assume that we're 8:00 AM until 10:00 PM. That's my assumption, again. I have 33 stores

- They'd be following the ordinance.

- Is the Express that's on Dousman, is that already, do they have a license to sell?

- Hard liquor, no. Neither does Terry Easy Go on Mather and Broadway, and the, is it Marathon on West Mason, and 12th or whatever, something like that over there. That whole stretch there was put under a moratorium by the Council several months ago due to these concerns and I think, like I said, I've been working with the neighborhood associations, I think we're getting 'em to the point where they're comfortable with issuing these licenses, but the last I heard they would still like us to hold off.

- Just one quick question for the police department. Have there been a lot of complaints as far as these establishments, the four establishments that Randy just talked about, has there been a lot of complaints as far as what they're serving right now, in other words with the--

- Beer and cider.

- [Steve] I haven't heard of any. When I came off night shift at the beginning of June a lot of that corridor, there didn't seem to be hardly any that I could even remember or think of, complaints with hard liquor or vagrancy or whatever caused by the liquor.

- It sounds to me they're making some good progress. I think I could support, you know, granting the license, but.

- Yep, yep, question?

- So when this all started, the neighborhood over there was complaining about, I'm gonna touch base on what you said about deliveries late at night. What time does the delivery stop, are you, now?

- Well, usually our delivery is over night, but for them we've come in and we've made arrangements to have our trucks there in the late afternoon or early evenings so that they're not coming at one in the morning. Sometimes they would come, one in the morning, it depends on the driver's route 'cuz everything comes from La Crosse, but since the complaints what we've done is we've changed that delivery schedule to have them late afternoon, early evening while the hustle and bustle is still going on. It's hard for us to make those deliveries because that's a small lot and that we have to cone off a whole area just for that truck, but we've made arrangements to make that happen.

- 'Cuz if I recall, right, that was an ongoing complaint was night deliveries.

- And that should be gone now since we don't do that anymore.

- Well, I move to approve.

- Any other questions, then?

- No, no other questions.

- Thank you.
- OK, anything else you care to say? OK, thank you.
- Thank you.
- Motion to close the floor.
- Motion to close the floor.
- By Alder Stevens.
- Second.
- Seconded by Alder Vander Leest. All in favor?
- [Alders] Aye. OK, first there's my motion to vote up or down, so to deny, all in favor? Aye, opposed?
- [Alders Vander Leest and Stevens] Oppose.
- So that fails two-to-one.
- I'm sorry, we would be able to do a roll call vote?
- You want us to do it on the?

- Yeah, so I can start the vote.

- And the motion is to deny, so this is denying, no is to oppose.

- In other words, I oppose your first motion.

- Right, so it's no. And another one, yep.

- OK, so that failed, motion on a vote of two-to-one.

- And, now Alder Stevens has made a motion to approve, seconded by Alder Vander Leest. Let's do the roll call again. Now you want to play hide. That passes two-to-one.

- Correct, that passes two-to-one.

- Passes two-to-one, OK. So, right now it's granted, but next Tuesday's six o'clock at the City Council will have the final say. Item number, our next item.

- One moment, I just need to--

- Sure.

- OK, we're good.

- Consideration with possible action on a Class B combination renewal application for Los Banditos East, 1258 Main Street, filed with the clerk's office June 26, 2018, previously discussed at the July 9, 2018 P and W meeting. I don't see Pat here, staff any?

- Yes, so this item was previously held over for 60 days at a prior meeting to allow the owner time to find a buyer. 60 days has passed, no new applicant has filed, and the location is still not operational. Accordingly, law department recommends that the license not be renewed pursuant to Green Bay Municipal Code 33.07 for failing to maintain qualifications of all license-holders as detailed by Wisconsin Statute Chapter 125.04 and as modified by the conditions under our codes, specifically Section 33.06 which provides that a license not in continuous use in excess of 60 days is considered void and subject to revocation. And, in further, if the committee does decide not to renew this license, I would advise the committee state for the record the grounds for the non-renewal as the law department has provided.

- That would be, that'd be six, huh?

- It's not one of those. So this is a little different, we're not denying a license, we're not renewing a license.

- Ah, different cheat sheet

- Right, so we just need, we just need the reasons so that we can include that in the non-renewal letter. So we send them, if Council decides not to renew the license then we send them a letter indicating that we're intending to not renew and then they have the ability to request an evidentiary hearing and we'll go through that process. So, it's a little different than denying a brand new license.

- Well, since Pat's not here, I'm assuming he's OK with this, he hasn't contacted?

- No, we haven't had any contact, the clerk's office hasn't had any contact.

- And when they do sell the business, certainly that owner could apply for one, yep.

- It is in a moratorium area, but so long as the business operates as a restaurant they would qualify for the exception.

- So a motion to non-renew?

- Sure, yeah, motion.

- Motion by Alder Stevens to not renew due to the business not being operated for 60 days. Out of operation for 60 days.

- Seconded.

- Second by Alder Vander Leest. Good? All in favor?

- [Alders] Aye. Opposed, OK that passes unanimously.

- There's no category that fits which is why I'm a little confused. OK. Perfect, all right, I'll just put it in that.

- I have one quick question for the Council. Can I ask you ma'am, what it would cost if they were to renew that license?

- It's the standard, I don't know what the standard amount is, we're not in the reserves yet, I think we still have three licenses available. And once those three are gone, then, a reserve license, I believe, is \$10,000.

- So in other words, if they were to renew this license, the next person to renew, what it would cost for the new business?

- I don't know what the fee is for a new license. I think it's around a few hundred dollars, it's nowhere in the \$10,000 range. But I'm not exactly sure what the fees are.

- If I can find out later?

- Sure, I can absolutely find out.

- A million dollars

- No, not that much. Actually, you know what, it may be--

- I found, I'll read it, if I may, Celestine Jefferies, Chief of Staff. Class A beer, 250, class A liquor, including wine only 250. That's all for Class A, Class B, consumed on the premises, Class B beer 100, Class B liquor and beer combination bar 500, then there's a picnic license which is \$10. Class C wine, strictly restaurants is \$100.

- OK, it's not exorbitant then as far as the cost, thank you.

- Everything goes, if the business, the previous owner still had that license, they'd include that in their sale, and if they don't have it they'll exclude that I'm sure, renegotiate it, whatever, but anyway, yes, between the owners. Next item, consideration with possible action on an application for an available Class B combination license by Sunshine n Wally's Bar, Inc. at 1332 South Broadway Street with licensed premises that includes bar, storage, office, and patio in back. Previously licensed in 2017-18 year as Wet Whistle. Staff?

- Staff has no objections. The establishment is in the moratorium area set by resolution, however it does qualify under one of the exceptions as the applicant filed within 60 days of the expiration of the prior license for this location. However, they are asking for an outdoor patio as part of their licensed premise, and it doesn't conform to our height requirements currently under our ordinances. Accordingly, we need a waiver by 2/3 of the Council to waive the requirements set forth in the ordinance and then the outdoor premise can be approved as presented by Sunshine n Wally's Bar. So an example motion would be to recommend that Council waive the ordinance requirements for an outdoor licensed premise and to approve the proposed outdoor premise as presented by Sunshine n Wally's Bar.

- That fence is pretty high.
- It's about, like four feet, I think? And our ordinance requires six.
- A bit more than that, from the picture.
- I think one side is higher, it seems like if you look at the photo there's one side that's higher and the other side's about four feet.
- Ah, I see, I didn't catch that.
- It's a technicality, but we just want to make sure all of our i's are dotted, t's are crossed.
- Very good, excellent. Anything from the police?
- [Steve] PD concurs with law.
- So, a motion to approve with a waiver?
- Motion to recommend that Council waive the requirements and approve as presented.
- Is there such a motion?
- Motion to approve.

- Motion by Alder Vander Leest, seconded by Alder Stevens, discussion, all in favor?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? OK, that passes unanimously.

- One moment before you move on. All right, we are good to move on to the next item.

- OK, discussion on a request by Alder Wery for review with possible action on the City Council's policy and or city's ordinances, ordinance for re-considerations. And we do have in our packet here a little bit of, if you go online.

- Mhm, we added in what the current ordinance is for re-considerations. Which basically provides that our motions for re-consideration shall conform to Robert's Rules would be revised. Robert's Rules provides that a motion to reconsider can only be made on the same day that the vote is to be reconsidered was taken, so the exact same meeting, unless it is part of a session, which then it can be taken on the next session day. The Council's past pattern and practice has treated the term of the alders as one continuous session rather than defining each meeting as a session, which is what has allowed reconsiderations to be taken up after the original council meeting has adjourned. However, that can be changed by ordinance. Our staff has prepared, actually, a draft, a proposed draft to the current ordinance which, I can hand this out, which basically allows any member that voted with the majority to present a motion to reconsider at the same meeting or at the next subsequent meeting. And it would just require that if it's going to be at the next subsequent meeting, in order to comply with the open meetings law, it just needs to be placed on the agenda.

- And if it's, if we do this for the next meeting, do we need to include any kind of language that would include as long as no action has been taken on this item?

- Yeah, that could be part of your motion, correct. That could be part of your motion to reconsider. 'Cuz I think, if action's already taken, I don't know how problematic--

- But it would be, if the vote took place in the first meeting of the month, and then it would have to happen at the second meeting, or at least the motion to reconsider can be made at that second meeting if it's not on the agenda, no action can be taken on that reconsideration vote, it would then be taken at the subsequent meeting. Once it appears on the agenda, the action would have to be taken to reconsider.

- Right, I'm not actually referring to the actual motion of reconsideration, I'm talking about, we take a vote on an item, and before the next meeting, that particular item, whatever the item was, action has been taken on it. So that reconsideration would really complicate.

- That could be made as part of the motion, and then that could be what would be discussed by the body, by the Council as to whether to approve. Whether to reconsider or not reconsider the vote, that would be a basis to not reconsider.

- OK, so we don't really need, yep.

- Rather than preventing someone to bring a motion simply because, right.

- OK. Yeah.

- Just one quick question, as far as, let's say I reconsidered my motion, I would have to, before that, in other words, let's say I did it at the September 15, just a date I'm giving. By the time we had the next meeting, by the 30th, I'd have to have written request to have it put on the agenda?

- To the clerk's office, yep.

- So it could be reconsidered.

- And if you either forgot or failed to or didn't have enough time, you made a decision after the agenda had been set, you can make that motion at the meeting and request for it to be referred to the next meeting. But no action would be taken, correct.

- It would be done with Council, OK, I understand.

- But either way, it has to either be placed on the agenda for the next subsequent meeting, or it has to be addressed or raised as a motion at the next subsequent meeting.

- I think the last conversation we had on that was it was a little bit too far out, is that correct? It was two months out. So this just clarifies what we're trying to do if we want to reconsider.

- Right.

- OK, I got it, thank you.

- Now, if one waited until the next meeting and made a late communication, that would not be up for a vote.

- No, it would be up for a vote--

- The following?

- Correct.

- Okie doke. Any other questions, discussion?

- So if the committee does approve this draft, this can go for first reading at the next council meeting unless you have any changes, or we can make changes as well.

- Looks good to me. Motion to approve the draft?

- Alder Scannell?

- Yep.

- Could I just make a point before you move to vote?

- Did you want to take a look at this?

- I don't necessarily need to look at that so much as is a comment that one thing I've heard at council meetings repeatedly is per past practice. And we have this set of policies that nobody seems to know where they are. And so, I just want to state or voice my support for us to start to codify some of this inside of our city ordinances so that way we can eliminate this discussion of past practices and policies that nobody knows about, so I think it's a good move for us to do this.

- Second that motion, I think we should.

- I'll make a motion to approve the draft? Second by Alder Vander Leest, all in favor?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? OK, that passes unanimously.

- All right, you're on to the next item.

- Discussion with possible action, which one did I skip? OK, discussion with possible action on a request by Alder Wery which reads, "Request a legal opinion from the State Department "of Justice office regarding walking quorums, "mayors that are legally a member of the City Council, "and the

practice of meeting individually "with council members regarding upcoming business "that the City Council will be voting on." Did we?

- Hold on. So, we, what staff would recommend that this be referred to staff so that we can request an opinion be provided by the Attorney General's office. As to Alderman Wery's inquiry, we can basically say that his inquiry and a request for an opinion from the AG's office, in the public records, and the meetings division and that they will be able to provide an opinion as to Alderman Wery's questions. We just need a direction from the committee whether that was sufficient or if there were any additional questions.

- Well, I would like to see again, us kind of codify a walking quorum, which is what I believe this is getting at. It has been kind of a slippery slope, I think, for a number of years now. It wasn't an issue in my first election, but a few years after that, it's become a bit of a sticky wicket, and I'd like to really nail down what a walking quorum is, what discussions can alders have amongst themselves, with how many alders and so on, so I'd like to include that in this, if possible.

- Well, so the Attorney General's office wouldn't be able to cause over that, so they can give us a legal opinion as to what it should be, and then we can, the committee can consider that and then staff would be able to potentially draft some ordinances that would reflect that opinion. We could rely on the attorney general's opinion as law, and use that as a reference point rather than codifying it ourselves.

- OK, so we'll wait til we get the opinion and we can look at it then, all right. Motion to refer this to staff?

- Is there a motion? Motion by Alder Vander Leest to refer this to staff.

- In other words, you're gonna send it on to the attorney general?

- Correct, yes.

- That would be my motion, to send it on.

- Motion by Alder Vander Leest, second by Alder Stevens, all in favor?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? OK. Onward. Discussion on a request by Alder Wery to review, with possible actions, city ordinances or policies to allow for action to be taken on the first and second readings of ordinances.

- All right. So, currently our ordinance provides that our ordinances, our ordinance provides that all ordinance have three readings unless the rules are suspended by 2/3 vote, but no ordinance can be passed at the first reading unless the rules are suspended by a unanimous vote. This means that an ordinance can be passed at the first reading, so the meeting that it's introduced at, but the Council would have to first vote to suspend the rules by a unanimous vote, and then take up the actual ordinance to adopt it. Additionally, the Council can skip the second reading by voting to first suspend the rules by 2/3 vote, and then advance it to the third reading, and then they would take action on it at the third reading. So, similarly, the Council would vote to suspend the rules, and then actually vote to advance it to the third reading. The Council has the ability to, with an ordinance, to receive and place on file, or refer it back to the committee at the report level. So when each committee is reporting out their reports to Council, that report gets approved first, and if that report contains an ordinance that has been recommended by that particular committee, then that ordinance is up for first reading at that same meeting. So if an alder person would like more tweaking done or would like more discussion on it, or would just like to table the ordinance altogether, that can be done at the report level before Council gets to the first reading on the agenda. However, we did prepare some draft changes to the current ordinance. It eliminates the second reading, and it provides that an ordinance, so it would just provide that we have two readings instead of three because it's very rare that, I think, Council ever goes to--

- Yes, we tend to jump that, I always thought it was weird.

- Right, it's almost kind of second nature that that second reading is skipped over for the third. So, the ordinance now provides that it would have two readings, or a new ordinance would have two readings, and that the ordinance can be acted upon, meaning either passed or denied at the meeting it's introduced, so at its first reading, so long as the rules are suspended by a unanimous vote.

- OK, what about at the second reading, can the Council still?
- Yes, so the second reading would act as the third reading has previously.
- But could the Council send it back to committee at that point if something came up?
- Council would be able to send it back to committee. They can amend it on the floor, so whatever changes they would like to make, they can amend it on the floor. If they want to send it back to committee, they can still do that at the report level, just like they can right now.
- Even at the second reading?
- No, that would have to happen at the report--
- At the first reading.
- Right, the same, the day that it's being introduced at the report level.
- So, no action can really be taken upon an ordinance other than to pass or deny at the second reading.
- Correct. It can be passed or denied at the first. It can be referred back, it can be placed.
- Or amended.
- Or received and placed on file at the report level. So, for example, the ordinance we were just talking about regarding the reconsideration, it will be reported, it will be part of the report for P and

W, so if an alder person would like for that to go back to committee for additional discussion, additional changes, when that report is up for vote, for approval, that item would be polled separately, and then a motion would be made to send that item back. And then amendments can always be made on the floor by Council.

- I'm just thinking of the second reading. I mean, a lot of times there can be input from the community or an alder may come up with other things in between. But, at the second reading, no amended, amendment, no amending can happen?

- It can be amended on the floor, it just wouldn't be able to be sent back.

- Oh, all right.

- You can always amend on the floor.

- OK. Then, the motion would be to adopt the changes as presented? Would that be sufficient? Any discussion on this?

- I'll weigh in on it. I'm not really in favor of changing how we're doing business right now as far as the readings. I think by the third reading, a lot of the time, we don't get a chance to really look it over at the first reading. We get into the second reading then there's changes. I think the third readings still gives us more opportunity to weigh in on situations we want to tweak or whatever, so I'm not in favor of changing the ordinance as is right now. I'd just as soon keep it at the three readings, before it actually goes. Just like the wheel tax and then the three readings. We talked about it the first meeting, we talked about it the second meeting, and the third meeting it was pretty much--

- I thought the wheel tax, was that one that didn't go right to a third?

- It went to the third.

- No, but usually, almost all these ordinances--

- We skip the second.

- We skip the second. We go right to the third.

- [Alder Johnson] First one was the debate on the issue. The second and third meetings were the actual ordinance hearings.

- We did vote on it three times on that one.

- Right, but the first time wasn't the actual ordinance. The first time was whether or not to do it.

- It wasn't in ordinance form yet at that point.

- Right.

- Right, but then when it came to ordinance, we skipped the second reading. We went from first to third. We almost always do.

- Well if we almost always do, then I'm just gonna leave it as is. That way we get more discussion involved. That's my thoughts, thank you.

- Sure, yep, Alder Stevens, any thoughts?

- Very good changes.

- I'll take a motion.

- Motion to change it.

- Motion to adopt the changes as presented. I'll second. We'd better do this on the board. So yes adopts it, no stays the same. Passes two-to-one?

- Yes.

- OK, that motion passes two-to-one. You ready to move on?

- One moment.

- Sure, whatever you need.

- OK, you are good to move on.

- Discussion with possible action on general ordinance 22 dash 18 amending section 27.902, subsection two, Green Bay Municipal Code relating to penalties for marijuana possession, staff?

- So this ordinance should be in your packet. The intention of this ordinance is to make the penalties for marijuana possession less severe. It lowers the fine amount from a thousand to 500. It removes the requirement that a municipal citation only be issued to someone without a prior offense for possession of marijuana. Under the old language of the ordinance, if someone had a prior offense or prior offenses for possession, they had to be issued a citation for circuit court charges regardless of the nature and circumstances of the second or third possession offense. So that discretion was taken out of the officer's ability. And it removed the possibility of driver's license suspension.

- Anything from the police?

- We concur with the law department.

- I have had some discussions with some people about, is there any way we should add any kind of language about medical use, if someone's using it for medical purposes?

- So we discussed that a little bit with staff today, and unfortunately we wouldn't, based on state and federal laws, we wouldn't be able to make that distinction because in the state of Wisconsin there is no medicinal marijuana, so we wouldn't be able to make that distinction and provide a different fine because doctors can't prescribe marijuana medicinally in the state of Wisconsin.

- Right, and, but I do believe that this is still all at the discretion of our city attorney and judge, municipal judge which can take any number of factors into account--

- Right, and as far as the nature and circumstances, and the officer, as well, can take into consideration the circumstances and the nature of the offense when issuing a citation, and the prosecutor when prosecuting the offense, and the judge when issuing sentence.

- OK, care to speak on this? Motion to open the floor? Motion to open the floor by Alder Vander Leest. Seconded by Alder Stevens, all in favor?

- [Alders] Aye.

- The floor is now open, please, just, you can just give that to. Please state your name and address.

- Hello, my name is Erik Bertand, I live at 810 Lime Kiln Road Number Six. Thank you, again, for the opportunity to speak on this. Again, I apologize for the sunglasses, these fluorescent tubes really wreak havoc with my condition. I am in support of any step that the county wants to take to decriminalize this--

- But this'll be city, not county.

- Or the city would like to take. I would like to see it go even a little bit more extensively in that the fine be reduced to more like a hundred or less. Also, I think that one of the structures in place is somewhat flawed in that a ticket can be issued for each item in one person's possession. So if they say they have a pouch with two pipes and a bag of marijuana, they can get a ticket for one pipe, a ticket for the second pipe, a ticket for the marijuana, and a ticket for the pouch that it's in, and at the officer's discretion, the vehicle can also be called a container. I think it should be like one ticket per person, and that's about it. I thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak.

- I'll go ahead. I'm a little unprepared for this today. Oh, I gotta do the name and address.

- Name and address, please, yep.

- Wendy Cornell, 1473 Grignon Street here to speak in favor of a zero dollar fine. Some of you already know I have M.S. I use cannabis for medical use. As far as a doctor not being able to prescribe marijuana. Here, in all 10 milligrams of synthetic THC, so they can, they just can't prescribe the plant. The problem with pill form is sometimes it doesn't work as quick as you need it to, or if you're throwing up, it doesn't stay down. \$500 is a lot of money. It's a lot of money to ask somebody that may only possess cannabis for medical reasons. It's a lot of money to ask somebody to pay when we've had a local death due to synthetic cannabis that was laced with rat poison. Lowering the fine to zero dollars or at least \$100 or less doesn't legalize cannabis, but it would save people from losing jobs, from losing student aid, from losing the right to vote, and more. Other cities that have lowered their fines to more reasonable amounts, Racine has a zero dollar fine for up to 25 grams. Stevens Point has a \$100 fine, Milwaukee, \$50 fine for 25 grams, Madison, \$100 for 10 grams of cannabis. I guess, the other thing, too, as this moves forward, I'd like to remind the people that are on the City Council as far as, it seems to me like you're just trying to still milk the people so that we can have things like Northland Hotel and stupid bridge lights, and things that the people shouldn't be paying for to treat their disease, for whatever reason they're using. I don't have anything else to say, thank you for your time.

- I am Kristin Mickle, I live at 150 Winchester Way. I would like a zero dollar fine, especially on personal private property. That should be a non-issue in somebody's home. Thank you.

- Good evening, my name is Dawn Radford, I live at 408 South Van Buren Street, Apartment One. I would welcome any movement in a more progressive direction with regard to this issue. I certainly

do want to commend you on considering this matter of decriminalization. My concern is simply that it doesn't quite go far enough. As another said here, \$500 is still quite a hardship for somebody. My concern, more than the money, is that a record is created which may prove discriminatory against that person to secure student loans or to partake in safety net programs such as housing assistance and so on. Considering that the people who are using medically are the people who are most likely to be absolutely dependent on these programs. The potential for prejudicial action against them is just all that much more consequential. Now, I lived in Los Angeles for about 23 years, used to hang out a bar where a number of LAPD people tended to hang out and so on. I should probably mention I was raised by a drill sergeant in a cop family, I do understand a little bit about all this. Now, the LAPD and a number of jurisdictions around there gave the officers in the field considerable discretion what to do when they found marijuana. Far more often than not, they would either destroy the contraband or confiscate it if it was so much that just grinding it into the pavement with the heel of their boot, somebody might still be able to pick some of it up later. Beyond that, that was the end of it, there was no record, there was no other action taken. The law was still on the books, so if they did believe they had, say, the next Jefferey Dahmer or what have you on a traffic stop, they could still use the possession to hold that person for awhile, check him out. So I would certainly hope you all might consider amending this measure to allow a little more leeway, thank you.

- Question for you, did the LA, did they have that codified into their ordinance, do you know? 'Cuz our officers have discretion, I don't know how codifying that would work.

- And I will have to say, I don't know either. I think it's considered more a practical matter of working in the field than anything. Still, the policy existed.

- OK, thank you. Anyone else?

- Hi, sorry, Joey Spencer, I 144 Stewart Street. I was not fully prepared for this, but I do want to speak out in favor of this measure. Like many others that spoke already, I feel it does not go far enough. Like everyone said, \$500 only, this is Green Bay. There's not a lot of people that are making the kind of money where they can afford \$500. I completely agree with at least \$100 or less would be a reasonable fine. That's something as we've all said can ruin a life for really no particularly good reason. That's my piece.

- Anyone else?

- Motion to close the floor?

- Motion to close the floor.

- Alder Vander Leest, second by Alder Stevens, all in favor?

- [Alders] Aye. The floor is now closed. Discussion, gentlemen, anything?

- I guess I would weigh in on it. I haven't had any requests from anybody in my district about this particular issue. I'm on the county board and we did discuss medical marijuana, it's gonna be on the referendum in November. We didn't have a lot of weighing in from the district attorney's office on this particular request. I can't really support it at this time. I'd like to hear from the district attorney as far as what his thoughts would be. They handle a lot of these cases on the county side as well, and I know the city handles a lot of cases as well. And as far as setting the dollar amounts, I don't think I have the jurisdiction to support at this time--

- We have the jurisdiction.

- I'm not supporting it at this time, I'd like there to be more discussion on it. I think a little more education is good as far as how the county's dealing with it with the sheriff, and that's where I'm at at this point, thank you.

- Perhaps we could hear about the county, and this would just be for the city, so it'd be the city attorney, correct, dealing with this, not the district attorney? So that would be separate.

- Right, this only effects municipal citations.

- Yeah, so anything that reaches that level for a district attorney, we have no jurisdiction over. So that would be a considerable offense. These are for more minor offenses, we'd consider misdemeanors?

- Right, yep. It's a forfeiture because it's municipal court, it's not even a criminal charge, so it's just considered a fine.

- There is, however, a record.

- For Municode, correct, but that doesn't show up on C-CAP, 'cuz, again, it's not a criminal charge.

- OK.

- It's the same as getting a parking ticket.

- I, myself, I brought this forward quite some time ago to talk with the police department staff and legal department, and Circuit Judge Hanson, and I, too, pushed for a zero fine, but there's some pushback in that they wanted simply, this is a maximum fine. In practice, it's usually much less if not even community service. So they felt that, our attorney and Judge Hanson felt the, would like to have some wiggle room, some leeway to do plea bargaining if it was necessary, then this gives them that leverage. So, I recognize their need to do their job, it's helpful for them to be able to have a maximum fine of 500, and I think we've reduced it in half. And like I said, in practice, in speaking with them, it's usually less. And really, as far as our laws go, it really does depend a lot on the people implementing. If we've got a good judge, a good city attorney, and good officers out there using good discretion, I think we're gonna be in good shape. And if we don't, then that's gonna need to be addressed, not by codifying law, but through other measures. I'm kind of happy with what staff's done, I think, I wish we could do more, but from a practical standpoint, at this point in time, I just don't think it's very realistic for us to do that. So I'm gonna support it and make the motion to amend our ordinance. Yeah, certainly.

- I guess I'd just like to make a recommendation that rather than rushing into that motion. One thing I don't feel like I've seen based on your comments. I mean, we heard some testimony from what other cities are doing. To my knowledge, staff hasn't done any type of research on bringing that content to us to review. I would like to recommend that we refer this to staff, because I think I would like to see what other communities are doing. We've heard that normally the fines aren't that heavy. I guess I'd like to see the data that supports that. I'd like to better understand when they say, hey, we'd like to have some flexibility with plea bargaining, I'd like to better understand what that means, you know, what are they bargaining? In what instances are they actually trying to use that as leverage? And I

think it's important that as a committee or as a full council that we understand the full ramifications of this decision that we're making, but more importantly, I think, again, that we're not rushing to judgment without having the data to support what we're doing, and right now, I think that's exactly what's happening. So I'd recommend referral to committee so that we can further study what other communities are doing. So that way, we're not inadvertently keeping penalties harsher than what they ought to be if in fact there is an opportunity for us to do something that looks different. That's all I got, thank you.

- I think then, perhaps, the thing to do is to refer this to staff, and they've done some of this legwork, but they just haven't reported it. So, if we could get a report from staff on the work they've done...

- What other communities are doing for fines.

- What other communities are doing for fines, a report on supporting the ordinance, the changes, was mentioned, the need for leverage. So just a general report on how staff came up with these changes, including as much information as they can possibly give us on that.

- That's a motion?

- Mmhmm. So, motion to refer back to staff? By Alder Stevens, seconded by Alder Vander Leest, all in favor?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? OK that passes unanimously, so it will go back to staff, so we'll have another kick at the ball.

- Also, Randy, I got one question for you on this. As far as when people go for employment and they flunk a drug test, in other words, if they have marijuana in their system, generally, they flunk the test, is that correct? I think we have to look at some of those statistics as well as ours. Some businesses claim they can't find enough staff to do the, leverage enough employees to do the work. We should look at some of--

- Their employees are going up in smoke.

- In other words, there's many issues that are addressing this. We'd like to keep our workforce going.

- This ordinance would not, I don't know if we have an ordinance that could address telling businesses, I mean, businesses could simply stop doing drug testing. That's their own preference, I don't think we want to codify into law that they can't do drug testing, so I don't know from our, what we need to do--

- Does the city of Green Bay, do they do drug testing, Celstine?

- Yes, especially for protective services, DPW people who are driving if you have a known DWI and you're a person who's driving for us for your job and you will have a problem keeping your job.

- Certain positions.

- So, in other words, the city of Green Bay's already on top of it?

- Absolutely.

- OK, thank you, good information.

- Did we vote on this?

- Mmhm, it was unanimous. I was just typing up the--

- Thank you, Randy.

- Sure. OK, let's move on. I'm gonna get there. Discussion with possible action on general ordinance 21 dash 18 amending section 27.307, Green Bay Municipal Code relating to animals prohibited at certain events. And we've got some file on this. I remember working on this before, and I don't remember--

- Right, so, this will be a little bit of deja vu. This ordinance was previously approved by the committee and by Council, however, it never advanced to first reading on the agenda. It was just an oversight, so the report contained, we approved the recommendation of, then P and W, to approve and Council approved the report, but it never appeared as a first reading on the same, and it also just kind of

- Redoing it to go?

- Right, 'cuz the new council felt it was cleaner to just bring it back and have it approved formally by Protection and Policy, and then it will go to first reading at the next council meeting.

- And Alder Johnson actually brought this to our attention asking whether this was actually on the books, and I could have sworn that it was done and it was adopted, and then sure enough, it never actually advanced to the reading so it was never fully adopted by Council, so, it's kind of a backtracking way of getting it.

- Well that's good to know, 'cuz for a minute there I thought I was in trouble.

- In general, for the new members, it provides generally that animals are prohibited at special events unless otherwise permitted by the special events committee and the safety manager pursuant to our special events process under our ordinances. So in general, animals would be prohibited from the farmers' market and other special events unless the organizer of that particular event has sought permission through the special events process to have animals on site.

- OK, I understand that one, thank you.

- And we also got rid of this, the boundaries here which made no sense whatsoever.

- Yeah, just had it cleaned up and kind of brought it.

- Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve by Alder Vander Leest, second by Alder Stevens, all in favor?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? That carries unanimously.

- We're good.

- Discussion on a request by Alder Johnson for consideration of possible action on the creation of a web page on the city's website for residents to submit rat sightings within the city of Green Bay. Data should be used to create map overlays, track progress of inspections, ID problem areas or any other purpose deemed appropriate by city staff to reduce the number of complaints. Alder Stevens, did you want to--

- Alder Johnson.

- Johnson. Oh boy, hasn't been that long. I need to eat something, I'm light-headed.

- I just think that this is an issue that continues to plague our west side residents. The county has stepped up and actually provided funding for traps, but I don't think the traps have actually proven to do much of anything, and so. We've allocated funding for a part-time inspector. I know we've done some sweeps, but look, data's king. Data's everything and right now, I know city staff does some minor tracking of sightings that are reported to them, but we need to make it easier for our residents

to be able to report this information so that we can use it in a way that allows us to target areas, to understand where the problem is, where it exists, and ultimately identify solutions that are gonna have long-term effects for people. It's a lot of times, to me like the rat traps in the area, and to me that was just the cart before the horse. We gotta take a step back and understand where the problem is and why it exists the way that it does before we can identify reasonable solutions. We haven't done that yet, so this to me is a really simple no-brainer thing that we can do to. In fact, I talked to Inspector Paape who's indicated that the framework's all there, they can do it. I think they just need the green light from us and they'll be able to do that and we can take all that data and make it easy, again, for residents to submit. Alders can submit if we hear from residents within our district. We can start to compile the type of information we need to successfully eradicate this problem for good.

- Do you know, did, Alder, Alder, oh, man am I? Mr. Paape, did he talk to IT about this, is this, do we need to include IT in this?

- Yeah, look, this is something you've seen in other cities, I think Chicago and New York in particular have done this, but it allows them to, when you take those sightings you can overlap it with other services that are going on in your community so that you can understand, again, how to better target those services in a way that can actually cure the problem. Think of the way that we address other issues when we know like a water main needs to be fixed, we do it at the same time that we can do the road. This is the same thing, the same principle applies here.

- So, would you want us to refer this to staff to actually come up with it to show us, or just refer it just to do it?

- I would like, to me it just makes sense to just direct staff to do it.

- Direct staff to do it.

- Staff has already been working on it and knows that they can do this. It's an easy thing for them to flip on, we just need to give them permission to do it, or the direction to do it.

- Quick question. Was it much of a financial impact as far as the, in other words, is this data they've already got on hand?

- In terms of adding the website? Yeah, that's, there's no financial impact. Little bit of staff time and this thing'll be up and running.

- Now they did some sweeps on the west side where they were trying to educate some of the tenants and some of the residents that have major problems with their garbage out and all that type of stuff, and I think when they first got the traps out there, they did some inspections on the west side here, and we'd like to know what happened on all that, and would we find that information then.

- Yeah, and maybe that's something we can just have staff come to the next Protection and Policy Committee report out on, what happened during those sweeps, I think that would be a good move. But I think you could do that separate from this particular issue.

- OK, sounds good.

- I like that idea.

- Motion to move forward.

- Motion to move forward by Alder Stevens. Seconded by Alder Vander Leest. Any further discussion? You guys feeling rat-trapped here? Did you, oh? All in favor?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? OK, that passes unanimously.

- OK we're set for the next one.

- OK, report from the water utility department. I believe we've got the PDF there. I don't think there's anyone here from water so I don't know if we need anything.

- Motion to place and file?

- Motion to receive and place on file, yep. We're making good progress here. I don't think I have any direction to give to them or anything.

- They're still working on it?

- Yep, they're still working on it, they're still making progress. Motion to receive and place on file by Alder Stevens.

- Second by Alder Vander Leest, all in favor?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? OK that carries unanimously. Liquor violations report from the police department for September 10, 2018.

- We had no violations at any establishments.

- Motion to receive and place on file.

- Motion to receive and place on file by Alder Vander Leest, second by Alder Stevens. Not even, nothin'? How's the situation going on Washington Street, South Washington? I heard they were going to be meeting with business owners, the noise?

- We're still trying to set up the meeting, I haven't heard of any complaints from any of the tenants across the street. I do know the establishments want to work with the neighbors and solve it, but in the past four or five weeks I haven't heard any complaints.

- Looks like good news.

- Good news, my district, very good news. OK, motion to receive and place on file by Alder Vander Leest, seconded by Alder Stevens. All in favor?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? OK, that is received and placed on file, thank you. And I will take, are we all set to adjourning?

- Now we are.

- I'll take a motion to adjourn.

- Motion to adjourn.

- By Alder Vander Leest, second by Alder Stevens. All in, all in, all in favor?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? We're adjourned.

- Good job, Randy.

- Yep, thank you. Make sure you log out. You heard about Kwik Trip?

- Yeah, what was the decision?

- It was granted.