



MINUTES OF THE PROTECTION AND POLICY COMMITTEE

MONDAY, MAY 11, 2020, 1:00 PM

Virtual Meeting

The public may also view at www.youtube.com/cityofgreenbay

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

I. This item contains documents which provide call in information and instructions for the Zoom Meeting.

B. ROLL CALL.

Present: Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Kathy Lefebvre, Mark Steuer

Also Present: Deputy City Attorney Joanne Bungert, City Attorney Vanessa Chavez, Lt. Steve Mahoney, Officer Mallory Meves, Ald. Barbara Dorff, Ald. Lynn Gerlach, Ald. Bill Galvin, Ald. Jesse Brunette, Clerk Kris Teske

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve. Motion carried.
Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the April 27, 2020 Protection & Policy Committee meeting.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve. Motion carried.
Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Consideration with possible action on an appeal by Stephanie Lardnois at 1026 S. Irwin Ave. regarding the denial of her permit to have more than two dogs at her residence.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to close the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to hold until the appellant could rejoin the meeting. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

Item 1 resumed after Item 4.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to close the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to close the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

Moved by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to deny the appeal by Stephanie Lardnois at 1026 S. Irwin Ave. regarding the denial of her permit to have more than two dogs at her residence and recommend the current owner of the dog who is deployed reach out to rehome. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

2. Consideration with possible action on a request by Skogen's Foodliner, Inc. at 2430 University Ave. to amend their license premises to include stalls in the parking lot specifically designated for online grocery pickup.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to deny a request by Skogen's Foodliner, Inc. at 2430 University Ave. to amend their license premises to include stalls in the parking lot specifically designated for online grocery pickup. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

3. Consideration with possible action on a request by Skogen's Foodliner, Inc. at 2250 W. Mason St. to amend their license premises to include stalls in the parking lot specifically designated for online

grocery pickup.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to deny a request by Skogen's Foodliner, Inc. at 2250 W. Mason St. to amend their license premises to include stalls in the parking lot specifically designated for online grocery pickup. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

4. Consideration with possible action on a request by White Dog, LLC at 201 S. Broadway to amend their liquor license premises to include an outdoor patio.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to approve a request by White Dog, LLC at 201 S. Broadway to amend their liquor license premises to include an outdoor patio, with the approval of the proper authorities. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

Appellant Lardinois (Item 1.) was able to rejoin the meeting following the conclusion of this item.

5. Consideration with possible action on a request by Cock & Bull, Inc. at 1237 Main St. to amend his liquor license to include an outdoor patio on the west side of the building.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to close the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to waive the ordinance requirements for an outdoor licensed premise with respect to fence height and approve a request by Cock & Bull, Inc. at 1237 Main St. to amend his liquor license to include an outdoor patio on the west side of the building, with the approval of the proper authorities. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

6. Consideration with possible action on a renewal "Class B" Beer 6-month license for De Pere Dodgers Baseball, Club, Inc. at 1450 E. Walnut St.

Alder Craig Stevens temporarily excused himself from the meeting at the beginning of Item 6. Quorum was maintained.

Moved by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to approve a renewal application for "Class B" Beer 6-month license for De Pere Dodgers Baseball, Club, Inc. at 1450 E. Walnut St., with the approval of the proper authorities. Motion carried.

Yes- John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

7. Consideration with possible action on a change of agent for PH Hospitality Group, LLC at 859 Lombardi Ave.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve a change of agent for PH Hospitality Group, LLC at 859 Lombardi Ave. Motion carried.

Yes- John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

8. Consideration with possible action on a renewal application for a Class "B" Beer license by PH Hospitality Group, LLC at 859 Lombardi Ave., pending the approval of the change of agent at the May 19 Common Council meeting.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve a renewal application for a Class "B" Beer license by PH Hospitality Group, LLC at 859 Lombardi Ave., pending the approval of the change of agent at the May 19 Common Council meeting and with the approval of the proper authorities. Motion carried.

Yes- John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

9. Consideration with possible action on a change of agent for Dino Shell, LLC at 1828 S. Ashland Ave.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve a change of agent for Dino Shell, LLC at 1828 S. Ashland Ave. Motion carried.

Yes- John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

10. Consideration with possible action on a renewal application for a Class "A" Beer & "Class A" Liquor license by Dino Shell, LLC at 1828 S. Ashland Ave., pending the approval of the change of agent at the May 19 Common Council meeting.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve a renewal application for a Class "A" Beer & "Class A" Liquor license by Dino Shell, LLC at 1828 S. Ashland Ave., pending the approval of the change of agent at the May 19 Common Council meeting and with the approval of the proper authorities. Motion carried.

Yes- John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

11. Consideration with possible action on a 2020-2021 renewal application for a "Class B" Combination license for 304 North Adams Green Bay, LLC at 304 N. Adams St. with a change of agent.

Moved by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to approve a 2020-2021 renewal application for a "Class B" Combination license for 304 North Adams Green Bay, LLC at 304 N. Adams St. with a change of agent and with the approval of the proper authorities. Motion carried.

Yes- John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

12. Consideration with possible action on a 2020-2021 renewal application for a "Class A" Liquor and Class "A" Beer license for Walgreen Co. at 1995 Main St. with a change of agent.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve a 2020-2021 renewal application for a "Class A" Liquor and Class "A" Beer license for Walgreen Co. at 1995 Main St. with a change of agent, with the approval of the proper authorities. Motion carried.

Yes- John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

13. Consideration with possible action on a 2020-2021 renewal application for a "Class A" Liquor and Class "A" Beer license for Walgreen Co. at 1401 E Mason St. with a change of agent.

Ald. Craig Stevens returned to the meeting.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to approve a 2020-2021 renewal application for a "Class A" Liquor and Class "A" Beer license for Walgreen Co. at 1401 E Mason St. with a change of agent and with the approval of the proper authorities. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

14. Consideration with possible action on a 2020-2021 renewal application for a "Class B" Combination license for Wisconsin Apple, LLC at 2420 E. Mason with a change of agent and change in description.

Moved by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to approve a 2020-2021 renewal application for a "Class B" Combination license for Wisconsin Apple, LLC at 2420 E. Mason with a change of agent, change in description and with the approval of the proper authorities. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

15. Consideration with possible action on a 2020-2021 renewal application for a "Class B" Combination license for South Bay Marine Center, Inc. at 101 Bay Beach Rd. with a change of agent and change in description to "buildings as indicated in the attached map consisting of the office and storage areas, pool area, grassy area, surrounding patio-, mc Donald marina."

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve a 2020-2021 renewal application for a "Class B" Combination license for South Bay Marine Center, Inc. at 101 Bay Beach Rd. with a change of agent and change in description to "buildings as indicated in the attached map consisting of the office and storage areas, pool area, grassy area, surrounding patio, mc Donald marina.," with the approval of the proper authorities. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

16. Consideration with possible action on a renewal application for the 2020-2021 license year for Tenet, LLC at 2475 W. Mason St.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to open the floor for discussion.
Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to close the floor for discussion.
Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to approve a renewal application for the 2020-2021 license year for Tenet, LLC at 2475 W. Mason St., with the approval of the proper authorities. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

17. Consideration with possible action on the various liquor and/or beer licenses renewal applications for the 2020-2021 license year with changes in their license description from the 2019-2020 license year (see attached).

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to approve on the various liquor and/or beer licenses renewal applications for the 2020-2021 license year with changes in their license description from the 2019-2020 license year (see attached), with the approval of the proper authorities. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

18. Consideration with possible action on the renewal applications for various liquor and/or beer licenses for the 2020-2021 license year (see attached).

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve the renewal applications for various liquor and/or beer licenses for the 2020-2021 license year (see attached), with the approval of the proper authorities. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

19. A request by Ald. Brunette for consideration with possible action on Green Bay Common Council to begin meeting a minimum of twice a month effective June 2020. There are too many critical issues requiring attention and action to meet once a month. We answer to the public and more regular meetings are necessary and convenient for the public, previously discussed at the April 27 Protection & Policy Committee meeting.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to refer to the Mayor's Office a request by Ald. Brunette for consideration with possible action on Green Bay Common Council to begin meeting a minimum of twice a month effective June 2020. There are too many critical issues requiring attention and action to meet once a month. We answer to the public and more regular meetings are necessary and convenient for the public, previously discussed at the April 27 Protection & Policy Committee meeting. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

20. A request by Ald. Brunette to the Protection & Policy Committee for consideration with possible action on allowing the public to address the city council on non-agenda items at each full common council meeting. For example, this could be to allow up to 3 or no more than 5 minutes per speaker.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer to refer to staff and develop the rules necessary on a request by Ald. Brunette for consideration with possible action on allowing the public to address the city council on non-agenda items at each full common council meeting. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

21. A request by Ald. Wery to the Protection & Policy committee which states: "Request obtaining bids/quotes from consultants for an external election review of processes and administration of the April 7, 2020 Election. Preference should be given to attorneys with election law experience, current or former municipal clerks or inspector general positions."

Ald. John VanderLeest made a motion to refer to staff. Motion failed for a second.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to receive and place on file a request by Ald. Wery to the Protection & Policy committee which states: "Request obtaining bids/quotes from consultants for an external election review of processes and administration of the April 7, 2020 Election. Preference should be given to attorneys with election law experience, current or former municipal clerks or inspector general positions." Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, No- John VanderLeest

22. Consideration with possible action on a request by Ald. John VanderLeest to the Protection & Policy Committee to request to review the policies and procedures for curbside voting for the remaining 2020 elections and how to communicate curbside voting information to all voters and poll workers in Green Bay.

Ald. Craig Stevens left for a short duration during discussion of this Item.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to refer to the ad hoc committee a request by Ald. John VanderLeest to review the policies and procedures for curbside voting for the remaining 2020 elections and how to communicate curbside voting information to all voters and poll workers in Green Bay. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

23. Consideration with possible action on a request by Ald. Bill Galvin to the Protection and Policy that plans be made and implemented by July 20th to avert any future problems with in person voting and absentee voting. This is to include, training of staff and volunteers, obtain necessary equipment, establish secondary voting sites, and any other resources needed.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to refer to the ad hoc committee a

request by Ald. Bill Galvin to the Protection and Policy that plans be made and implemented by July 20th to avert any future problems with in person voting and absentee voting. This is to include, training of staff and volunteers, obtain necessary equipment, establish secondary voting sites, and any other resources needed. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

F. INFORMATIONAL.

I. The Liquor Violation Report for May 11, 2020.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to receive and place on file the liquor violation report for May 11, 2020. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to adjourn at 3:17 p.m. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

VERBATIM MINUTES

- [Bungert] Steuer you can begin with opening the meeting.

- All right, thank you. Welcome to Protection and Policy for May 11th at 1 p.m. I'll take a roll call on all the stores here. Do we have Alder Vander Leest?

- Here.

- Alder Lefebvre?

- Here.

- Alder Stevens?

- Here.

- All present and accounted for.

- Okay, on to the agenda.

- I enter a motion for the approval of the agenda.

- Motion to approve.

- Okay by Vander Leest second by Lefebvre all in favor?

- [Panelist] Aye.
- Okay, that passes unanimously. Next, we have the approval of the minutes. We have a motion.
- Motion to approve.
- By Stevens second by Lefebvre. Any other discussion, all in favor?
- [Steuer, Leest & Lefebvre] Aye. That passes that's a hard word to say. I will wait for you, Joanne.
- [Bungert] Yeah, we are set for item number one.
- Okay. Item number one consideration of possible action on an appeal by Stephanie Lardnois 1026 South Irwin Avenue regarding the denial of her permit to have more than two dogs at her residence. I don't know if you wanna start with Attorney Bungert or Mahoney you know, whatever way you think we should start on this. Attorney Bungert.
- [Bungert] I'm a little bit ago, she may be a little late due to an emergency animal call. Yes, so I'm not sure if we can.
- I prefer to hold off on this until she arrives.
- [Bungert] Okay, we can do that, so we can just hold and move on to the next item.
- Okay. I'll wait till she comes in and then we can adjust accordingly.
- [Bungert] Yeah, I don't think I see her on.
- Okay.
- [Bungert] Okay.
- One thing I was gonna say to everybody present, you know, these meetings are long, often times and we need to hold our comments for past to three minutes and for others twice for five minutes so let's hold to that and I think we can keep the meeting moving. All right.
- [Bungert] All right, one second. Okay, we are on to item number two.
- Okay. Next consideration with possible action on a request by Scogans Food Liner Inc at 2430 University Avenue to amend their license premises to include stalls in the parking lot specifically designated for online grocery pickup.
- [Bungert] Yes, so staffs recommendation at this point is to deny the request. As the Alder's probably recall, we've had several discussions on this type of activity staff did present an ordinance to regulate click and go order as requested on a couple of occasions, and that ordinance was not passed by Council. And accordingly because we do not have an ordinance in place that would appropriately regulate this type of activity staff's recommendation is denied at this.

- How about police?

- [Lt. Mahoney] The police concur.

- Okay, I have another question about that. You know, I know we were dealing with that issue with alcohol pickup I believe correct Joanne?

- [Bungert] Yes. So what we had recently passed is an ordinance with a sunset provision, that ordinance does expire, once the restrictions on bars and restaurants decides and that what is allowed specific under state statute for municipality to enact and that allows for the sale of intoxicating liquor from a Class B establishment. So a restaurant or bar that normally is limited to premise, I'm sorry, limited to sales for on premise consumption. And that allows the sale of sealed original containers of intoxicating liquor for off premise consumption. So basically, in layman's terms, that would mean somebody who would go into a restaurant or bar, purchase a bottle of vodka in the sealed original container and leave the bar or restaurant with that bottle for consumption at home.

- I guess one of the questions I had was. I was looking at this maybe I'm wrong, but looking at an in terms of grocery pickup as well,

- [Bungert] No, that does not apply to grocery pickup because that is limited to class B licenses, specifically a grocery store it has a license for off premise consumption, meaning you purchase beer or alcohol, on such as at a grocery store or liquor store for consumption at home. That is a class A license.

- All right.

- [Bungert] The ordinance that we enacted, allows for a class B license which normally doesn't allow sales for off premise consumption to be able to do that for this limited duration during the Covid-19 shutdown period.

- Okay, so it has nothing to do with groceries at all. It's just all that.

- Correct, yes.

- Plus committee does anybody have any Alder Barb, go ahead

- Is this about parking stalls or is this about liquor? I thought it was about--

- [Bungert] Yes. So it is about a basically a festival as a class A licensee, they want to add parking stalls to be part of their license premise description, so that they can do online sales of alcohol and beer or liquor and beer. And for those to be part of a grocery pickup or a singular pickup of just alcohol and beer to be carried out to those parking stalls. The reason that staffs recommendation is to deny is because that we don't have an ordinance to allow that type of activity and to regulate that activity to ensure sure that the licensee is complying with all statutory requirements, namely that driver's license, and age is being verified, and that the sale is face to face, which is required under the law.

- Right. All I was asking it seemed like the agenda item was about adding parking stalls. But really, it's with the underlying reason.
- [Bungert] Right, it's adding parking stalls as part of their license premise.
- Got it, okay.
- [Bungert] In which they can conduct sales.
- Okay, thank you, I understand.
- Was there anybody else?
- [Lefebvre] Alder Stuer.
- Yes, go ahead. Alder Lefebvre.
- Lefebvre] Yes. I wish clarification because there's nowhere does it say that this is kind of like an end run around where we denied them to have drive through liquor. I really kind of upset with them. This should have been more clarified. This is I thought it was for groceries I didn't realize it was for the liquor and yeah. So I'm glad for the clarification 'cause I definitely will not approve that.
- Okay, thank you Alder Vander leest or Alder Galvin, do you have something to add on that?
- Yeah,I just. I appreciate Bungert and Mark you asking the question, 'cause that was my same concern, although I, Alder Lefebvre I don't think they were trying here. That's merely the wording or what they're asking for it's a proper way to word it. It's our responsibility to read through these application. So, again, I don't think festival was trying to pull one over. Thank you.
- All right, thanks. Alder Vander Leest do you have anything to add to that?
- Yes. Can you hear me mark?
- Yes I can.
- I would make a motion that we receive and place on file both two and three of E.
- Okay.
- That we're not gonna take any action on this. Just receive and place on file both two and three, 'cause they both are talking about the same specific grocery pickup. And I understand what they're, you know what the proposal is and everything but I think we can just receive and place on file and then you know, move forward.
- Okay.
- [Bungert] The appropriate motion would be to deny.

- If I would make a motion to deny.
- [Bungert] We would have to do that individually.
- Okay. I make a motion to deny then.
- Second.
- Okay. Any further discussion, all in favor?
- [Panelist] Aye.
- Thanks, that passes unanimously. Can we look at the next, do we have to discuss the next one in length as well. It's basically the same item--
- [Bungert] We can do the next one quick. And then I believe Officer Merves did call it we go back to item number three, so we can--
- Alder Vander Leest you wanna do that again?
- Yes, I'd make the motion to deny and for the East Mason one as well, for the grocery pick up.
- Second.
- Second by Stevens. Any other discussion all in favor?
- [Panelist] Aye.
- Okay, that passes as well unanimously. And when you're ready, Attorney Bungert, I'll get going back to number one.
- [Bungert] Okay, we are set for number one.
- All right. Let me read this again. All right, number one consideration with possible action on an appeal by Stephanie Lardnois at 1026 South Irwin Avenue regarding the denial of her permit to have more than two dogs at her residence. So Officer Merves is here as well. So how do you want to proceed with this sir?
- [Bungert] I just thought if I could just do a couple just housekeeping matters. We haven't had this kind of appeal before one of the committees so in an effort to maintain fairness and efficiency, I would recommend just setting some time limits for each party. I would do five minutes for the police department and then five minutes for the appellant and then an additional three minutes for each party for rebuttal. This permit is governed by our ordinance, section three dash 18. Under that ordinance, individuals are allowed to have two dogs at a residence, anything over that number they have to get an access animal permit. And that permit is applied for and reviewed by our humane officer, Officer Merves, and she looks at a number of factors in determining whether to grant this permit and these are the factors that the committee should be considering with respect to this appeal. Those factors are please bear with me number is type of animal most to be possessed. The

applicant's criminal record including any animal related police calls, prior history of the animals health of the animals, whether proper licenses and vaccinations have been obtained the condition of the applicants residence where the animals are to be kept the likelihood of a public or private nuisance that would be created any other factors determined to be relevant by the humane officer, if the committee does determine after today's proceedings that the relevant I'm sorry if the committee determines after today's proceedings that the applicant possesses the qualifications in this section, the Protection Policy Committee can make its recommendation to either reverse the decision or uphold the other denial and forward its recommendation to council.

- Okay, that's fine. The time limits and I have a stopwatch here as well, so I'm gonna work to do that better as well. I'm thinking in the past that we've had the citizen often. I'd almost like that Officer Merves, if she wouldn't mind. Speaking initial, like, well, that'd be all right?

- [Bungert] Yeah, that's fine.

- Okay, Officer Merves.

- Hey guys.

- Hi everybody.

- This is my second time logging into Zoom. I apologize for being late, I had to take a call here. We had gotten a call an animal related call for animal complaints, accumulation of animal waste. The number of dogs at the property, there's three dogs and there were other issues excessive barking. I brought Inspector Tim Neves with me and there was an issue where there was multiple vehicles parked on the street, multiple vehicles parked behind the residents. There were large rats across the yard. So there are ordinance issues as well accumulated trash broken windows. So when I did a property search, I discovered that it was a property owned by I believe Samson was the last name and it was the occupants were renting to own and so I was not able to make contact at that time with the resident. I left a notice in the door, explaining we had a two dog limit in the city. If they want to obtain a permit, they need to apply for one to be exempt from the city's two dog ordinance. Licenses were required, which is proof that the state required rabies vaccine, the dog feces that was in the backyard needed to get cleaned up, as well as inspection orders that needed to take place with inspections as far as tidying that up. One of the things that I had noticed was that there was a dog tie out that would come from like the rear entry area, and it was actually able to go on to the neighbor's property and the dogs were defecating on the neighbor's property and that was where some of the grass had also been just dug up from this large hedges driving right through and parking in the back yard. So when I spoke with the animal owner, Stephanie Lardnois, I kind of explained that, hey, you know, look there's things that we need to fix here in order for it to be okay. Now, we have not gotten any more complaints as far as the animals go. However, when I did send out the , I did get quite a few back from property owners and tenants within the area, that I could not safely and comfortably approve that knowing that if I allow that this was not going to create a nuisance in the neighborhood. I know Alderman Galvin, some of the constituents wanted to remain anonymous, and I advise them hey, feel free to voice your concern to the Alder person, if you don't feel comfortable contacting law enforcement and he could maybe relay some of your concerns to us so that One of the complaints that came through was the massive dog that was on there got loose from the property and was chasing someone down the sidewalk. And again, we haven't had any new complaint, but based on the number of letters received, I think that this needs to be addressed further.

- Okay, thank you Alder Galvin, did you wanna you're the Alder in the area.
- Yeah, thank you. And I would have to concur, basically with what Mallory has said, I've never met the people that live at the address in question. But on numerous violations ordinance violations from those residents. We've been in contact with the city inspector on this whose taken some action. I had a number of residents reach out to me and really their concerns to me. And basically it boiled down too because of all the ordinance violations that have been committed by the residents to this home. And some of the reaction that they have exhibited toward the neighbors were the ones that had turned them in. They are very concerned about allowing three dogs there, as we all know, as Alders, once we give them that right to have three dogs, it's very hard to withdraw that third dog there should the complaints and their action continue. So I would have to say that I'm gonna side with the neighbors at this tonight.
- Thank you. We've got Stephanie Lardnois here. And she'd like to speak, Stephanie, are you there? She's muted right now.
- Sorry, one moment.
- You know.
- [Bungert] Alders I'm sorry we have to do.
- [Bungert] I'm sorry. Can we pause for a second?
- Yes.
- [Bungert] We need to do a motion to open the floor.
- Yes, you're correct. We have a motion for this--
- You can open the floor.
- Alder Stevens and then second by Vander Leest all in favor?
- [Panelist] Aye.
- Stephanie please state your name and address for the record.
- Stephanie Lardnois address 1026 South Irwin Avenue Green Bay, Wisconsin 54301.
- Okay. Well, you have the floor so discuss the situation we've read a number of the letters and such it's your turn.
- Yes. Me and parents here are trying to obtain our permit. The third dog isn't our dog. It is my to be brother in law's dog. He's in the army. He's gonna be gone for three years. So we kind of took his dog is living in Michigan going to bed break up and they

- Hello, seems like she's breaking up.
- [Bungert] There maybe a little bit of a delay. You can give it a minute.
- Okay. If she can't get in. I don't so much the committee if we close the floor, I don't know, I'd like to hear from her first.
- [Bungert] It looks like her connection dropped.
- Okay, what do you suggest? To raise like a make a motion to hold this until she comes back, we could do that.
- [Bungert] We should close the floor and then we can hold until she returns.
- There's a motion to close the floor by Stephens. Do we have a second?
- Second.
- Second by Vander Leest all in favor?
- [Panelist] Aye.
- Okay. All right. Alder Stevens you wanna do that though, make a motion?
- Yeah, lets make a motion to hold this until she returns.
- Okay, do we have a second?
- Second that motion? Second by Vander Leest all in favor.
- [Steur, Stevens & Vander] Aye. All right. Do we need to move on to another item then?
- [Bungert] Yes, just one moment. All right. So we would be on item number four.
- Okay. All right consideration of possible action on a request by White Dog LLC at 201 South Broadway to amend their liquor license premises to include an outdoor staff.
- [Bungert] Yes, having my notes here, the fence actually meets all the requirements accordingly. staff has no objection.
- Police?
- [Lt. Mahoney] Police concur with law.
- Motion to approve Mark.
- Pardon.

- Motion to approve. Approve do we have a second?
- Second.
- Second by Stevens, any other discussion, all in favor?
- [Stevens And Vander Leest] Aye.
- I'll oppose, that passes. I'll wait for your Joanne's and I'll move on.
- [Bungert] It looks like Stephanie Lardnois is back on so we can move back to item number one just toggling through to set current.
- I don't have to reread anything I hope.
- [Bungert] No.
- Motion on the floor. Okay by Stephens, do you have a second?
- Second.
- Second by Lefebvre. I oppose all right. Stephanie, are you there?
- Yes, I am sorry, my phone got hot and went into emergency mode.
- Okay. All right, well, you got the floor again. And then you already stated your name and address for the record, so go ahead. So describe you know, the reason why you feel you should have three dogs.
- The third dog, his name is Mefault. He's been in and out of the shelter three or four times already. And the last owner who brought him back he had two gouges on this side. He's a big boy his name is Mefought for a reason. He's a brown lab master mix. So his bark is big, but he's a big baby. I've been working with him. And he's come very, very far and I would love to keep working with him. He's become a part of my family. My kids love him. He's always on the leash when we're outside. I read some of the complaints online we're, I guess someone saying we have two pit bulls and another large dog that makes children feel unsafe around us, which we don't have two pit bulls. We have a husky, he's overweight. And we have a one pit bull who is very tiny. I did come in contact with some neighbors, but I see now. We have one diagonally in front of us who has children so I didn't know her kids felt unsafe. And I'm like, well, I was wondering she said that her grandkids they're afraid of anything that jumps honestly and she said she doesn't care her more concern was the root of all homes. I can't wait to our other neighbor who shares the same property line in the backyard with us. His name is Aaron. Aaron Macross he lives at 65 Emily streets he said he did not have any objections with our dogs. Our dogs are never even in our yard. People were saying my dog charged him down. But there was never a complaint issued to us about any of that. So I didn't couldn't see how this happened when he's always on a leash. Another one I heard is if you have two dogs, they are free to not go outside of their yard. I'm just trying to think I talked to another neighbor. Her name is Audrey Schmidt, We also share a property line with her she through the letters like Aaron and Audrey they threw the letter away 'cause they didn't know who it was pertaining to and they honestly didn't care

and I forgot are direct neighbors probably meant a little more than other people around us who don't see us. I know there's been some complaints about things in the property on there was things left there from Jamie. We took care of it all. Every time we got the letter we made sure we were trying to get up to everything. The animal feces it was winter it was cold. Yeah, we kind of we slacked on that a little bit but if anyone comes to our yard any other day of the week there nothing in there. We've cleaned it up we've restocked all the wood. We've gotten rid of a bunch of things we obtained the storage unit, we've obtained all the license got all the records of vaccines, I have Mefought. If two of them one getting my license all the way back to 2015.

- One minute Stephanie, you have one minute left go ahead thank you.

- Thank you. He's a friendly not human aggressive. He just barks at thing from his past. But he's a good boy. If can trust him around my three children and mind you my oldest is four my youngest is a year. And they love him I love him like I said, this is a to me brother in law's dog who is in the army before this will pandemic, but his base got put on lockdown. He's in Colorado, he'll be transitioning to California and then after area, then he'll be going to Afghanistan.

- Okay, you're starting to break up Stephanie your time stop right now. You'll have a chance to come back one more time. Okay. All right. I was gonna ask the committee if they've read it.

- Mark you wanna close the floor?

- [Bungert] We need to close the floor.

- Motion to close the floor.

- By Vander Leest, Second? Who will have a second.

- Second.

- [Lefebvre] Second.

- Second by Stevens, all in favor?

- [Stevens & Vander Leest] Aye.

- I'll oppose, okay. I wanted to ask the committee if they've read any of the silver what their thoughts are. Anybody?

- Mark, I just make a comment.

- Go ahead, John. According to the officer that handles the dog control. She don't seem like she's in favor of another dog at that premise, nor does Alder Galvin, I don't know, Alder Galvin has been over to that area or not, would have to ask him if he's been there to see the, you know, the actual presence of what goes on. But it doesn't sound you know, as if our, community officer that's working with animal control is not in favor nor the Alderman Or there's quite a few different, you know, letters of not support for that. That's kind of the drift that we got so far. That you know, the staff and people are not in support about it.

- Right.

- That somebody else can weigh in and see how they feel about it.

- Alder Stevens or Alder Lefebvre.

- Was there letters of non support?

- Yeah, I didn't see anybody that really wanted this. There were a number of neighbors that wrote some letters, but I don't else in support of having three dogs here. I guess my question, go ahead John.

- [Lefebvre] I read one of the letters here, I wouldn't go by there they just classify the type of dogs as being aggressive doesn't mean that the dog is aggressive. Yeah, I mean, all dogs can be aggressive. It doesn't make any difference what breed there. But yeah, this is kind of a hard one in a way. There were things that happened according to her letters, I'm gonna have a hard one deciding on this one.

- Can I ask a question of officer Meves?

- Yes.

- Yes, Officer Meves you know, I, nobody's asked what the three dogs if they have to take one of the dogs off premise. I presume it goes back to the pond or what happens that you think deserve anything that you know of that will be the next step.

- We'll this points the concerns of the neighbors had? When we hand out those neighborhood letters, it says the address of where the animal request is so it does identify the address. And then I also put in parentheses in there, what types of dogs okay, so the people have the option to understand what's potentially gonna be living next door to them or in a surrounding area, so if a dog were to get loose, they can voice their concerns, is my concern with this permit in particular is that several guys don't feel comfortable with it. And my concern is the likelihood of a nuisance or fear. If the animal doesn't have to go, they could try to re home the animal says behind it sounds like this is a gentleman who owns the dog, who is either temporarily staying there and is deployed a placement this is going to be. I don't know if this long term or if this is temporary, and if he's able to provide that animal with a home, given his lifestyle at the moment.

- Okay. All right. Well, Alder Galvin.

- Thank you. And this is the problem when its neighbor versus neighbor neighbors don't like to be confrontational with each other or put themselves in a light where there could be possibly retribution that future. Was one neighbor that does not live near enough to have received a letter from Officer Maves that related to an incident that occurred when he was out walking his small dog where he felt he was attacked by the dogs or a dog house. And he was the dog actually made contact with him physically not with his dog, and he was very frightened by this but the dog just made contact with him and then the owners were able to get it and get it under control. But he was very concerned, he was on the sidewalk this dog did not come up to the petted actually it was protecting its cross property which is you know what some dogs do. The other residents that were part of this

letter campaign. Express their concerns to me and I don't know if they sent a letter in or not. But again, some of them expressed were because of the other ordinance violations in the past where the city was involved in ordering corrections. There were comments made to them by residents of this home, that they felt that these residents were the ones that complain that concern them greatly. And that's not the way you handle things if you're in violation of city ordinance, and the city orders you to make corrections, you had a via voice retribution or anything else, that your neighbors you take care of your problem. That's your problem that they care about. So again, that concerns me. And so I would have to say again, if you know even if we give them a six month window, they have this dog there or we give it to them again, I wanna emphasize how hard it is to take that away once we grant it. Once you open that Pandora's box, it's very difficult to close it. And so again, that's my concern. Having our heartstrings pulled here and we have concerned about that, you know and this guy is the owners servicemen he's been deployed My daughter has a dog right now for a serviceman that was the point so I mean, I understand how that works, but I can't in good conscience endorse having a third dog at this residence.

- Okay, thank you, Alder, I would like to have Stephanie's have one more chance at this so i would have a motion open the floor.

- Motion to open the floor.

- By Vander Leest second by Lefebvre, all in favor.

- [Panelist] Aye. Stephanie, you have the floor again. I guess you've heard some of the testimonies. So I guess one of the questions I would have to ask is, this doesn't work out is there an alternative for you know, for the dog I guess?

- We don't really have one everyone we know lives in rents in small like little one bedrooms that aren't even in this county or by us. We wouldn't know what to do we don't want him to go back to such an uncertain situation after he got brought back with two large incisions on his stomach. I wouldn't want to personally chance it because you can't tell he's a good boy and-- Every dog is he's seven years old. He's getting in his golden ears, I want him to have his forever like home where he can just relax, which she does, he's slowly coming more and more out of his comfort zone. He's been very timid and very afraid to begin with, and he's come a long way. He used to take food from my kids hands. He doesn't that no more he used to be uncertain about our dogs. They all sleep together in the same room all the time he loves to hang out with the kids. I know when I did my I set some pictures with him with my children to show he is a good boy. I sent a picture of our backyard which we are obviously as you've heard, He owns the property but come the end of this month like on the 27th the papers are being signed over to my fiance and it will become his house friends that we I put in the email and they've talked to officer Meves about I know she said it's kind of an iffy thing if you say you're gonna put one up and you don't but we plan them putting one up we not from Green Bay. I think that's a busy road I don't want my kids playing in it so we plan them putting up big giant privacy fence up but obviously with renting why would you put money into something you're only renting at the time just to make the property value go up more I guess.

- Okay. Well, you know, like I said, it's a hard situation because you know, we read the letters and we understand. It's never an easy situation, but we wanna do have the opportunity to speak to couple of clients on this. This will be a Anything else you wanna add before we close the floor?

- I just hope people aren't doing it just because we're younger couple new in the neighborhood, and I know reading like the complaints where it says two Pit bulls and they know there's some people afraid of just that animal breed in general in the neighborhood and I just don't know if they're doing it because of that 'cause it definitely feels personal. But we've tried to correct everything we don't really communicate with our neighbors but that being said, we are about to fully sign over on this house to closing the... We need to have a better relationship with our neighbors. versus just to hate living there for how many years because we had a loose I've number my family. This home my kids sorry, he's got a goal. My son sat with me for hour on the floor crying. We got our did not feel better. It's hard.

- I understand all right Stephanie we'll have to talk about it. So thank you for your testimony.

- And if there's any recommendations or I don't know, I guess the first time that this came from O'Connell county you can have three jobs before needing a permit and we didn't think anything of it to begin with. We would like to make the best of this and do everything that we need to do. If it is getting a privacy fence up with like, a month we don't care we wanna do what we can to keep him.

- I just wanna let you know that there's nothing personal with any of this, you know, we're looking at the ordinances that we do have and we're in a city location. So the and it's part of that, so there's a lot of factors that it's there's nothing personal here. So, anyway, right We'll, thank you for your testimony.

- Thank you.

- Okay, I would make a motion to close the floor. Someone make a motion for that.

- Motion to close the floor.

- Okay by Stevens, do we have a second?

- Second.

- Second.

- Second by Vander Leest, all in favor?

- [Panelist] Aye.

- I will oppose, oh, well, this, these are never easy. You know, I've been through a bunch of these and I think we all have we sat through these and it's tough. It's a tough thing. But, you know, I look at it from the standpoint of the ordinance that we do have in place. And that Officer Meves gave and the order that Alder Galvin, who, that's his district, so I lean pretty heavily on that. So I would tend to agree with Officer Meves and Alder Galvin than anybody else, any of the other Alders or committee.

- If we go ahead and deny it, what's the process? How long do they have to remove the dog actually can choose any dog? You don't have to have just, you know, the big dog could stay there. Right? as long as it's one or two. So there are different things to look at, What timeline is there to have to remove one of the dogs? And then where would it go? Would it go back to the ? And I think that

would be one place to that she should talk to the Humane Society and about finding a placement for that dog.

- Officer Meves could you chip in.

- Sorry, I'm just trying to turn on my speaker here. So the option I'm not sure of the timeframe. Normally I give people a month to get down to the number of animals or apply for a permit to be able to possess them. I do have, there's some information I'll have to find it about actually trying to place the dog. I don't know if this brother-in-law is planning to live there after he returned from deployment or training. I'm not sure where he's at, I know he's not stationed here in Wisconsin. So that being said, I don't know if they would qualify for like a military leave for the dog to go somewhere to stay with someone who's willing, sorry, my radios coming through here. If that would be an option, or if they can reach out to a breed specific rescue, that's also an option. The Wisconsin Humane Society is always an option as well. But I think if this gentleman is onto this dog, given his, you know, his deployment and everything else like that, he might be best to reach out to an organization that does care for people's pets when they are deployed.

- Okay, Alder Lefebvre is that suffice?

- [Lefebvre] Yeah, that's a good idea. Now, how, let's see now the deployed person has to reach out to I don't understand how you know where he goes to get that. Get the thing going. Sorry, I'm tired, I didn't sleep too tight. You're done that's not getting it across. Right.

- I have some materials that I won't be able to locate. I was just looking through my clipboard here. I don't have them, but I should have some in my office. It is for military members.

- Could you share that with Miss Lardnois I will appreciate that. Okay, anybody else otherwise I would entertain a motion.

- [Lefebvre] I'll make a motion that we deny the third dog at this premises with the condition that the gentleman who is deployed, that he reaches out to the military and finds placement for the dog until he is released from his deployment, does that make sense?

- Yes, I think so.

- While still there maybe it will just say something quick. Okay, so I just pulled up on my computer dogs on deployment and then also military foster program which is packed for animals that they have information on there. I can send that out to the requester.

- Okay, that would be good. Attorney Bungert does that sound good for the motion?

- [Bungert] The motion should really... The item isn't to either to issue the permit it's the appeal of the denial. So it would be a motion to deny the appeal with the recommendation that the owner of the animal reach out to who is currently deployed to reach out to available resources to rehome the animal.

- Okay.

- [Bungert] Alder Lefebvre is?
- [Lefebvre] My motion, thank you.
- Okay. Do we have a second?
- Second.
- Second by Steven some the other discussion? All in favor?
- [Panelist] Aye.
- That's unanimous.
- [Bungert] There's one moment to jot this down.
- We're waiting for you Attorney Bungert.
- [Bungert] Yes, one second. Just wanted to jot that down. Not a typical motion. Okay, so it looks like
- Number five.
- [Bungert] We're number five and yes Alder Steuer. I'm not sure if you did mention for all those who are listening, that everything we do here is just recommended.
- Yes this is a recommendation by this committee that will be going to City Council on May 19th at 6 p.m. You may enter that meeting and also request to be heard at that as well. Okay.
- [Bungert] All right. We are on to number five.
- Number five consideration with possible action on a request by Cotton Bowl Inc. At 1237 Main Street to amend his liquor license to include an outdoor patio on the west side of the building staff.
- [Bungert] Yes, so the proposed fence for this from us for the outdoor patio is to be five feet in height, but it will be impervious. Accordingly, we do need a waiver of the requirements with respect to the height because our ordinance requires 66 feet--
- What does it require?
- [Bungert] I'm showing you the example. Six feet and they're proposing five feet.
- Okay. So what's your request? What are you stating that you're against this?
- [Bungert] It's more of a policy consideration for the committee. My recommendation would be that if we want if the committee does want to approve this, we just need to recommend that the ordinance requirements related to height be waived. So an example motion would be to recommend that council waive the ordinance requirements related to height for an outdoor license premise and

to approve the proposed outdoor premise.

- Okay, all right police.

- [Lt. Mahoney] The police don't have an issue with this outdoor patio I know. All the ordinance but sunsets been granted for other places that we have no issue with this one, either.

- Okay. Well, we have the owner here. So I would entertain a motion to open the floor.

- Motion open the floor.

- By Vander Leest. Do we have a second?

- [Lefebvre] Second.

- Second by a Lefebvre. All in favor?

- [Panelist] Aye.

- Okay. The floor is now open and Mr. Gregg, you are if you'd like to speak to this, I guess I'd like to know. The fact that you have a five foot fence and you're looking at, you know, the city attorney was talking about a six foot fence, so I'd like to just hear your description about that. You're on mute right now.

- Can you hear me?

- Yes, State your name and address for the record thank you.

- My name is Darrell Greg. I live at 1550 Gillian road Green Bay, Wisconsin.

- Did you hear the question Mr. Gregg?

- Yeah, I don't know why the architect put that if you wanted six, we'll make it six it's not a big deal.

- So it isn't built hill?

- No.

- Okay.

- We'll make it six that's fine.

- I probably rather have it six feet. You know, you got staff in there, people will crawl on after you close, six feet fine.

- All right. I thought maybe there was an issue with that. Was there anything else you wanted to add to it? I know that you made a addition or you over the old store. Was around at the store right next door to your building?

- No.
- No, okay. I'm sorry, all right. Anything else you want to add otherwise we'll discuss?
- No, thanks. Thanks for listening.
- All right, I'd entertain a motion to close the floor.
- Motion to close the floor.
- By Vander Leest do we have a second?
- Second.
- Second by Stevens all in favor.
- [Panelist] Aye.
- All right.
- Mark, I did get a quick question for our City Attorney.
- Yes, go ahead.
- I think they're looking to revive this ordinance to begin with, as far as the heights of the requirements, and they haven't quite completed that is that correct?
- [Bungert] Yeah, we are still working. It's right now it's six feet. it's six feet and impervious.
- Moving forward do you think what is gonna be the height moving forward? Have you just discussed that further?
- [Bungert] I'm not entirely sure. I'm just from recollection I believe it's somewhere with around the forefoot range, what you would think of regular fencing maybe slightly higher. I know that staff is looking and having discussions with the inspections department to look at what building codes require for residences and our businesses. But it's just more in line with what typical construction kind of requires for businesses or commercial properties. Six feet is very rare to find. That's usually kind of more of a security fence or a privacy fence that someone is finding in a backyard on a private property from staffs perspective and from police department's perspective if I can speak for them if not, Lieutenant Mahoney can correct me. The most important part of the fencing is to just ensure that there is a delineation between licensed premise and unlicensed premise so that patrons know what is licensed and where they can have an alcoholic beverage in their hand and what area is not license, which also can indicate and be clear to law enforcement, whether somebody has an open container or is within a confined license permit. So long as that delineation, whether it be you know, a living fence shrubbery, additional fence some sort of other barrier that is, you know, within a height requirement that is not easily stepped over or stepped through that is what would be sufficient from staffs perspective, however, we have not yet determined what would be the best for that. So, and it's

also we want to bring it forward as part of an entire overhaul of chapter 33. Just for to be able to see the entire chapter and how it's going to function interrelate with one another. And so that's why that hasn't been brought on board but that's kind of a summary of what our perspective.

- Joanne thank you very much.

- Mark I make a motion to approve.

- [Lefebvre] I have a question.

- Hold on a second, go ahead, Catherine.

- Go ahead.

- [Lefebvre] Yes, I think because they just passed the Chester the sidewalk cafe definition any class B nor bar can put tables out on the sidewalk. The people can be sitting out in the open there's no confinement. There's no fencing. There's nothing so why are we putting regulations on the patios? I don't understand this because if you just opened up where they can just sit out in the open now and drink.

- Attorney Bungert.

- [Bungert] Yes. So Alder Lefebvre there is a difference between the sidewalk cafe ordinance and the outdoor premise requirements under Chapter 33. The sidewalk cafe ordinance applies to class B establishments that want to put tables and chairs in city right of way so a sidewalk. What this licensee is asking for is an outdoor premise or patio on their own private property.

- [Lefebvre] Right. I think then we should be looking at, you know, you're saying should it be six feet five feet you know, you're kind of four feet fencing to me I just don't understand that when you're just allowing open consumption on the sidewalks now. So you're right I know it's under private property. We have to have some regulations but--

- [Bungert] It is my understanding is for sidewalk cafe, when DPW is reviewing an application they are looking to see if there are some sort of barriers that are being put up so as validity is clear to both patrons to both police officers and to the licensee as well as to what is part of that sidewalk cafe and what is not.

- [Lefebvre] Okay, good because and then nothing too when they do have that sidewalk cafe permit, make the tables up but they cannot take over the whole sidewalk. Right?

- [Bungert] Correct.

- Kathy or Alder Lefebvre let's talk about that another time. I appreciate you're looking at this I guess one of the concerns or questions I have. Mr. Greg doesn't seem to have an issue with going from five feet to six or two seems to be very amenable. It's just that it seems like we're in the middle here as far as a timeframe. So it's kind of like he as the owner needs to know how to proceed.

- [Bungert] Currently the ordinance requires six feet. His application, I know he's had discussions

with Burke's office and said he was amenable going to six feet. However, all we can do is go based on what he's presenting as his application. And that is what committee is considering. And he provided five feet, which from staffs perspective, it satisfies what our concerns are as far as there is a sufficient delineation for the property. So it's clear as to what's licensed and what is not licensed premises. However, it still requires because of the way that the ordinance is currently structured, it does require a waiver of that height requirement in order for his proposed plan of a fence to be approved to understand that he may be amenable to offering it to six feet, but as his application states, five feet, the safer thing would be to just waive those requirements. So it's on the record that the requirements are waived if he chooses to move it to six feet, that is completely within his purview, and he can do that. However, at least we have the assurance that it's not gonna be any less than five feet.

- Okay, well, you know there's no timeframe as far as this ordinance who there as far as you know, when this might be amended, and also I don't want to hold him hostage. In this case, you know, I feel that he, needs to move forward with his business plan. So he's amenable to it, but it takes a while, you know, to relook at this ordinance.

- Mark I'd like to make a motion.

- Yes, go ahead.

- Alder Galvin?

- Yes, thank you. A couple of questions. The first one is for Attorney Bungert.

- [Bungert] Yes.

- How much longer is it going to be that we're working on this ordinance I have a request into your office from I'm gonna say safely because it's so long ago, but it's at least three years ago. And this item keeps coming before this committee and a lot of time on because I have reasons that I think the fences should be six foot I'm just wondering how much longer it's gonna be before we finally get something or we can make a decision and save people all the time and effort of asking for a variance.

- [Bungert] My understanding is staff is working on it. It is up high on the priority list. Unfortunately our staff has been we have a significant backlog with respect to ordinance revisions and there were some ordinance revisions that did post date your request Alder Galvin, but unfortunately due to the nature of the the issues with those ordinances, they had a higher priority and had to be dealt with sooner but staff is focused on it. We are working on it and hope to have it in front of the committee as soon as we can.

- All right. I was gone for part of the dissertation on this whole thing. Is there an ordinance limiting how high fences can be?

- [Bungert] That I'm not aware of as far as this ordinance, it says the requirement is it at a minimum, it has to be six, it does not provide a max however, I'm not entirely sure if there are max height requirements with respect to building code requirements or any kind of restrictions with respect to zoning or anything like that.

- All right. It is still my understanding that privacy fences between residential properties can be no higher than six feet. This ordinance was initially introduced because not only does it delineate between the bar property like you stated, but it was also there to prevent alcoholic beverages from being passed back and forth. If you're aware of the Cock and Bull Bar, where it's at, and this is I'm not saying anything against the Cock and Bull, but this is for example, this area is on the backside of the property adjacent to the park, a lot of individuals had been kicked out of the bar or were intoxicated not allowed into that establishment. They could easily be out in the back parking lot and have alcoholic beverages passed to them through over the fence if it's not built in a manner to prevent this and that's a lot of the reason why the ordinance was there in the first place. And again, you know, whatever the council decides the council decides, but I just wanna make that point there. That was the purpose of the fence otherwise we could paint the white line on the ground and say this is the property of the establishment. And this is where you can or cannot be. But I guess I'm feeling a lot of frustration with this ordinance I understand about triage. But I think three years is getting to be quite a long time. Keep taking an ordinance revision and putting it on the back shelf. And again, like I said, this becomes almost a monthly situation with BMP. And again, in Council where people are having to get these variances besides issues with alcohol enforcement. That's all I have to say on this.

- Thank you.

- Thank you. I was gonna ask Lieutenant Mahoney does the police have do they have any issues with this establishment with that, I didn't think there were Lieutenant Mahoney.

- [Lt. Mahoney] No, we haven't had any issues with Cock and Bull specifically. I do understand Alder Galvin's ideologies about yes one of our concerns is the passing of the alcoholic beverages. But with Cock and Bull the way this one is, if I'm remembering the back of the building, correct, it's even built up a bit off the ground. So that's why with this one, we don't have an issue with it.

- Okay, thank you. Committee, anybody else?

- I wanna make that motion Mark.

- Yes, just go ahead Alder.

- I make a motion that we approve what is requesting with the five foot. In other words, he's asking for the five foot fence and I feel that we don't hear any negative as far as the police or the city Attorney. So I feel that he's gonna follow the rules on this, you know, from just from hearing all the testimony and things and I understand you know, the city's working on getting this ordinance resolved and and i think they're going to get it resolved in hopefully, this should we can move on from this but that be my motion that we would grant the request.

- I'll second that.

- Okay, Vander Leest and seconded by Stevens.

- [Lefebvre] Can I ask a question?

- Yes, go ahead.

- [Lefebvre] Yes, Alder Lefebvre the question is then, you know, we give this variance here for five feet. And then we do keep the ordinance at six feet what happens to those who have it at five feet?

- Probably grandfathered wanted it.

- [Lefebvre] in right now. If we don't get this ordinance taken care of, and I will not support the five feet I think Alder Galvin is right, it should be six feet, 'cause do not want to allow people passing the alcohol outside of the business. Thank you.

- I just wanna make a quick comment.

- Go ahead.

- I think you know, we've rented quite a few of them in at different heights. And I think that the height restrictions I think they're trying to make it more aesthetic as far as how the appearance of the fences and as far as to liquor from one spot to the other people can put liquor in their coat, they can put it in their pulse, you know, if they're that bent on getting, you know, a drink, I think, you know, the establishment. You know, I don't think they're promoting it. I don't think that the establishments are promoting, you know, that they're gonna be passing liquor from one area to the other. I think it's more of a, you know, this is the rules, and I'm sure they're trying to follow the rules. And I don't think fansite really makes big, you know, a big difference as far as you know, I think that the people that wanna pass liquor, they're going to do it anyway. And I think the fence requirement, you know, it's nice to have a fence requirement for it and it gives the public where it can be and where they're to stay and I think that's all great, but as far as you know, one foot up or down, I don't think it makes it different. I think the more you know, the responsibility of the bar itself and the people that are there you know, I don't think like illegal activities.

- All right, thank you John. We have a motion and a second. And I'll just make one quick comment like I said, I don't wanna hold the owner hostage here on this issue because we're still dealing with the ordinance. I think when it becomes six feet if it comes to that point then I agree that we move ahead that way, but I don't feel he should be penalized in the situations. So that's my thought. So we have a motion and a second all in favor,

- [Panelist] Aye.

- All opposed, Kathy, you were opposed.

- [Lefebvre] No, I guess I'll approve it 'cause others have gotten it but with, I believe the owner will go to six feet. He said he'd rather do that anyway, so I will approve it.

- Okay, but he has the option to go to five feet. All right.

- [Lefebvre] Right.

- Well, all in favor. We already voted on that so that does pass.

- Thank you.

- Okay.
- You're Welcome.
- All right, Attorney Bungert when you're ready.
- [Bungert] We are on item number six.
- Okay. Consideration with possible action on a renewal Class B beer six month license for the third Dodgers baseball club Inc at 414 50.East Walnut Street.
- Staff.
- I have to step away.
- Okay, we're good with a quorum.
- [Bungert] We still have a quorum.
- All right.
- [Bungert] I will just note that Alder Stevens stepped away and quorum remains.
- Okay, I'll be right back though.
- [Bungert] Okay, thank you.
- [Lefebvre] All right. That be former Bulldogs?
- Bullfrogs.
- [Bungert] Okay, correct.
- [Lefebvre] So do the Dodgers now have a lease that stadium Yep, staff has no objections.
- Okay, police.
- [Lt. Mahoney] The police concur.
- All right, I'd entertain a motion.
- [Lefebvre] I will make a motion to approve.
- Okay, by Lefebvre, do we have a second?
- Second.
- Second by Vander Leest any other discussion? All in favor?

- [Panelist] Aye.
- All opposed? That passes, now I will wait for you Attorney Bungert.
- [Bungert] Yeah, item number seven.
- Number seven, consideration with possible action on exchange of agent for PH Hospitality Group LLC at 859 Burke staff.
- [Bungert] Staff has no objections.
- Police?
- [Lt. Mahoney] The police concur.
- Okay. I'd entertain a motion by Vander Leest. Do we have a second?
- Second by Lefebvre, all in favor?
- [Panelist] Aye.
- All opposed? That passes unanimously.
- [Bungert] All right, number eight.
- Number eight consideration with possible action on a renewal application for class B beer licensed by pH Hospitality Group LLC at 859 Lombardi Avenue pending the approval of the change of agent at the May 19. Common Council meeting staff.
- [Bungert] Law department has no objections.
- Police?
- [Lt. Mahoney] Police concur.
- Okay. I didn't entertain a motion.
- Motion to approve,
- By Vander Leest do we have a second?
- [Lefebvre] Second.
- Second by Lefebvre any other discussion all in favor say aye?
- [Panelist] Aye. All opposed? That passes unanimously. I will wait for you.

- [Bungert] Item number nine.
- Number nine, consideration with possible action on a charge of agent for Dino shell LLC at 1828 South Ashland Avenue staff.
- [Bungert] Law department has no objections,
- Police?
- [Lt. Mahoney] Police concur.
- I would entertain a motion.
- Motion to approve.
- so moved by Vander Lees, do we have a second Lefebvre?
- [Lefebvre] Yes.
- Okay. Are there any other discussion? All in favor please say aye. Aye?
- [Panelist] Aye.
- All opposed? That passes unanimously.
- [Bungert] Item number 10.
- Number 10. Consideration with possible action on a renewal application for a class A beer in class, A liquor license by Dino shell LLC at 1828 South Ashland Avenue pending the approval of the change of agent at the May 19 Common Council meeting.
- [Bungert] Law department has no objections,
- Police?
- [Lt. Mahoney] Police concur.
- Okay. I would entertain a motion.
- Motion to approve.
- Alder Vander Leest do we have a second?
- [Lefebvre] Second.
- Second by Lefebvre all in favor?
- [Panelist] Aye. All opposed? That passes unanimously.

- [Bungert] Item number 11.
- Number 11, consideration with possible action on a 2020-2021 renewal application for a class B combination license for 304 North Adams Green Bay LLC at 3304 North Adams street, staff?
- [Bungert] Law department has no objections.
- Pplice?
- [Lt. Mahoney] Police concur.
- I would entertain a motion.
- Motion to approve.
- Motion by i'll give it Lefebvre seconded by Vander Leest.
- [Lefebvre And Vander Leest] Aye.
- All right. Any other discussion all in favor?
- [Panelist] Aye. All opposed? That passes unanimously.
- [Bungert] Item number 12.
- Number 12, consideration with possible action on the 2020-2021 renewal application for class A liquor a class, B beer license for Walgreen company at 1995 Main Street with a change of agent staff.
- [Bungert] A lot of times has no objections.
- Police?
- [Lt. Mahoney] Police concur.
- I would entertain a motion.
- Motion to approve.
- By Vander Leest do we have a second?
- [Lefebvre] Second .
- By Lefebvre.
- They were say by say aye.
- [Panelist] Aye. All opposed that passes unanimously.

- [Bungert] Item number 13.
- 13 consideration with possible action on a 2020-2021 renewal application for a class A liquor and Class A beer license for LogMeln company at 1401. East Mason street with a change of agent, staff.
- [Bungert] Law department has no objections.
- Police?
- [Lt. Mahoney] Police concur. I would entertain a motion.
- motion to approve.
- No.
- [Lefebvre] No, we get someone different now.
- Well, Steven, so we have a second.
- Second.
- Second by Vander Leest.
- Thank you.
- All in favor say aye.
- [Panelist] Aye. All opposed that passes unanimously.
- [Bungert] One second.
- Okay.
- [Bungert] All right, item number 14.
- 14 consideration with possible action on the 2020-2021 renewal application for a class B combination license for Wisconsin Apple LLC at 24. With a change of agent and change in the description staff?
- [Bungert] Law department has no objections,
- Police?
- [Lt. Mahoney] Police concur.
- That would entertain a motion.

- [Lefebvre] How long do-- I got Alder Lefebvre, do we have a second?
- Second.
- Second, by Vander Leest any other discussion? All in favor say aye.
- {Panelist] Aye.
- All opposed? That passes unanimously.
- [Bungert] And item number 15.
- 15, Consideration with possible action on a 2020-2021 renewal application for a class B combination license for South Bay Marine Center in 101 Bay Beach Road with a change of agent and change in description to buildings as indicated in the attached map consisting of the office and storage areas, pool area grassy area, surrounding patio. McDonald, Marina staff.
- [Bungert] The law department has no objections.
- Police?
- [Lt. Mahoney] Police concur.
- Okay. I would entertain a motion.
- Motion to approve.
- Motion to approve by Stevens. Do we have a second?
- [Lefebvre] Second.
- Second by Lefebvre any other discussion? All in favor?
- [Panelist] Aye. All opposed? That passes unanimously.
- [Bungert] All right, item number 16.
- 16, consideration with possible action on a renewal application for the 2020-2021 license here for tenant, LLC at 2475 West Mason street staff.
- [Bungert] Yes. So staffs recommendation at this point, based on information we've received is to not renew this application as it's known not the business is not operational not necessarily due to COVID-19 but was not operational prior to the COVID-19 shutdown. And the licensee indicated to the clerk that they do not intend to reopen once the COVID-19 restrictions are lifted. However they would like to obtain the license in order to be able to transfer via sale. Unfortunately, our ordinances require that businesses be operational and only have a 60 day window during which they cannot be operational, or otherwise be subject to revocation of their license. Accordingly, our recommendation would be to deny as it appears, the business was not operational prior to the

shutdown, and there's an indication that they're not intending to reopen, and could therefore just be sitting vacant and shuttered. I do believe the licensee is present so I would that the floor be open.

- I will do that I just have one quick question. Is there would they have to reapply for a license which might be let's just say that is cited that they'd like to get there down the road? They would have to reapply?

- [Bungert] Correct, yes.

- Okay.

- [Bungert] They would have to apply for unavailable license while there is no mechanism by which a license can be transferred from business to business. What we do allow, as far as our administration of licenses goes is when a current licensee who is currently operational is seeking to sell a business. We allow that licensee to surrender and to the new business owner or the new licensee, and that licensee is applying for that specific available licence, however, typically there is a transfer mechanism, but it only applies in the event of a death, I believe. So there is no mechanism where you can just transfer a license, it does have to go through the whole application and review. There is no guarantee when you are purchasing a restaurant or a bar that's licensed that you're going to get that liquor license as it's still subject to review and approval by the governing body.

- Attorney Bungert if this would have been if the place would have been open beforehand, they would have the fact that it was not open and all the pandemic has moved on.

- [Bungert] I believe the licensee did indicate to the chief of staff in back in December that they were closed at that time, that they were hoping to reopen. And we're working with whatever information we do have that is why staff did want to hear from the licensee not just if we're around or to confirm.

- Okay, thank you.

- [Lefebvre] I have a question. Go ahead Alderman Lefebvre.

- [Lefebvre] Yes, this is for Attorney Bungert. If someone is considering buying the property, how do they go about getting some kind of insurance that they can get a liquor license?

- [Bungert] There is no it's unfortunately, it's a risk of the business. There is no opportunity under the law to be able to transfer a liquor license as part of a real estate transaction. That is a separate part of the business. And it is incumbent on receiving approval from the governing body for that new business owner for that license to be approved for him or her.

- [Lefebvre] Okay.

- Okay.

- [Lefebvre] Thank you.

- All right.

- [Jeffreys] Attorney Bungert?

- [Bungert] Yes.

- [Jeffreys] Yes, Celestine Jeffreys, Chief of Staff. Just to be clear, when I heard the owner of tenant say that he was not open. That was at the mayor's beautification awards celebration. I attended so just to be clear, that was back in early December.

- Okay.

- [Bungert] Thank you. All right, Alder Galvin.

- Thank you just for a little historical issue on this thing. There was a time many years ago where people that owned an establishment and had a issued license would sell the establishment to a new buyer with the license attached even though like Attorney Bungert said, That's not supposed to happen. And there were some incidents and where it was found out later on that the owner had actually charged more because the license was transferred with the business in that there's only so many licenses is within the city of Green Bay. And if people hang on to those licenses, it prevents other people from opening up establishments. And so what happens in some of these cases is someone's business closed down, like there's one on the Near East side of town, where the owner opens his business about once every six months, just enough to keep the license active, so we can hang on to it, so if you ever can't... he's attempting to sell his business for several years now. And he hangs on to that license because it makes it easier for him to sell that business if there's a license attached to it. And as you know, there's licenses are at a premium most of the time in pretty big. So what's happened now is, with so many people vying for these licenses, I can certainly understand why someone who owns a business like that would wanna try and maintain the license with it to you know, ensure that the sale would be able to go through. Thank you.

- All right. Well, I'd like to hear from Mr. Campbell. So I'd entertain a motion open the floor.

- Motion to open the floor.

- Second.

- Second by Stevens all in favor?

- [Panelist] Aye.

- All opposed? All right, Mr. Campbell. Can you hear us?

- Yeah, thank you. I will save as much time of yours as possible.

- First of all, state your name and address for the record.

- Certainly, Jason Campbell at 3585 Blackberry lane in Mason Street. The city clerk's office, the inspection office, and all of those individuals that are perfectly aware of the process I've been through in the last two years. So we acquired a 40 year plus property that had a great deal of history here in

town, right so people are very much aware of the Blarney Stone and Nana stay and then busters for another 20 years after that. We the beautification award was brought up by Miss Jeffreys here moments ago. Yes, we did, we were awarded that by the community which we're far appreciative of, is a testament to how much effort we put into rehabilitate that 40 plus year property and turn it into something special yet again for goal. With that said, I've been completely lately, having shut down at that time I even had been, you know, clear to the clerk that we were for sale, and we still are to this day. But now COVID has added a certain amount of complexity to the situation, as we're all very aware in our own regard for different reasons. As a property owner and a business. I would like to maintain the license for twofold number one, yes, for you know, the opportunity to sell the property with a license. But I'm perfectly aware by all individuals that have stated that it's not a guarantee of a transfer. That's not the point. But the second is, now I own a property that is a restaurant specific in the middle of COVID, where I just got off the phone with the restaurant association for Wisconsin. They're not even expecting 50% of the amount of restaurants to reopen after the end of this because of the, you know, the issues that they're going through in terms of financials. And I may be sitting on this for some time and so I've got a mortgage, more to the point I have a loan through the city, which we had done it part of the forgive me I didn't get lunch and I'm short on burn calories here. But long story short, I mean, we're pretty indebted and I think it would be a wise business move to perhaps reopen when this community is ready to do so. We had closed as a staffing issue. We were not able to maintain front of the house I had asked a toxic person to leave and as it turns out, as toxic as they were they asked the rest of the front of house to go with them. It was a lovely experience. And at that point, we found it better to at the time. Welcome for closure to regroup and figure out what we were going to do. The partnership didn't last through that, and I am the owner of both the property and the LLC. I have a single question and I guess ultimately, I would like to offer a little bit of defense so it's a question for Attorney Bungert. It was stated in the clerk's email that I am in violation of an ordinance to maintain the license if we're not operating which section is that?

- [Bungert] That is section 33.06. opposite or on issued licenses, a license which has been granted but not issued or issued, but not in continuous use in a manner indicating an ongoing business for a period in excess of 60 days is presumed invalid. And shall be subject to revocation unless otherwise Authorized by the common council.

- Right it was the last five words that I was gonna state so unless otherwise authorized by the Council so the council does have authorization to allow this to be extended even though we are not operating. I would like the opportunity to retain it with the idea that it is a possibility for me to reopen as a wise business move because without the cash flow of both it open or the opportunity to sell it because nobody is gonna be looking for a property in the near time future with 50% of the restaurants shutting down. I'd like to have that and then furthermore, in Section 3307, if this were to be taken away, I would need to have some grounds for it to be pulled in subsection of three and we have obeyed everything that has ever been asked of us. There's never been a visit by the city of Green Bay police. We have done everything in all regards where it was a classy operation. And we've maintained code in the building we had it inspected for the renewal we've done everything in every regard. We've played nice, so to speak. And so with that being said, I would greatly appreciate another extension for this one year renewal at least number one, allow me to open if I chose to and react to the, you know, the lightning of the COVID shutdown, excuse me, or number two, you know, give me that year to sell real estate if that is but if I can't sell it, then perhaps it would be best to reopen. And I know this is it's kind of a chicken egg or chasing my own tail. But I think both of those are valid. If the city of Green, the police department could speak if they've ever reason, you know, I think many individuals here have visited the restaurant or at least I hope so you know, this

was a it was a fine place. And we're never in any vital.

- You'll have an opportunity to speak one more time.

- Entertain a motion to close the floor.

- Second.

- Okay, but who authorized that?

- Vander Leest.

- Vander Leest do we have a second?

- Second.

- Second by Stevens? All in favor? Aye, all opposed. I see Alder the Brunette here that's your district.

- Thank you, Chairman. Thanks for allowing me to speak. I don't technically know if it's my district or Alder Vander Leest.

- Actually, they're pretty close.

- Yeah, it's right on the border. Now, about a year ago I did talk to Mr. Campbell. And he expressed some concerns at that time getting a liquor license and it was resolved and very unfortunate sad to see that business model there didn't work out. But I think we as a council should grant the gentleman, you know, his wishes to renew the liquor license I think he gave two very compelling reasons to do it. And if he can make a go of it, the fact that half according to what he said many businesses are going to be failing. But unfortunately, I don't think we need to put another burden or barrier for an existing business, although it's not currently open. We put another barrier up for them to not work out. I don't think it's appropriate. One thing to keep in mind too, is that particular parcel of land, I just looked it up now the property tax that parcel of land generates for the taxpayer in this community is nearly \$14,000. So if we as a city can extend the ability for him to keep that why is the two purposes he stated very clearly, I don't think there's anything wrong with that. I think is looking out for the business community and trying to make things a little easier for them as we transition to a post COVID way of life. So that would be my recommendation he is correct. Businesses is beautiful the way that the work was done, the improvements made, the types of meals and services that business provided were great for the area, great for the neighborhood. And we're not doing anything out of the ordinary. That has been bar though, you know, 10 it wasn't technically fully bar, but it did serve alcohol, that is not out of the ordinary what that neighborhood had seen for years. So I would be in favor of allowing the liquor license to continue for another year.

- Thank you Alder Brunette, committee anybody?

- I'd like to make a motion on that Alder Vander Leest I'd make a motion that we grant him another year to renew his license to give him he possibility to reopen bar and restaurant due to the situation that we're facing right now with the COVID-19. And I definitely would support it 100% thank you.

- Okay, we have a motion, Alder Lefebvre did you wanna say something first?
- [Lefebvre] No, I guess I'll go with it otherwise, I was gonna say maybe we could do it six months, but I'll go ahead with the year.
- Okay. So you second that?
- [Lefebvre] Yes.
- Yes. We have a motion and a second. Any other discussions say aye?
- [Panelist] Aye.
- That passes, anybody opposed? That passes unanimously.
- [Bungert] So that was a motion to approve the renewal application?
- Yes. Correct. Mr. Campbell, good luck.
- I appreciate your time, all of you be well.
- Okay.
- [Bungert] Okay, one moment. Item number 17.
- Okay, number 17 consideration with possible action on the various liquor and or beer licenses, renewal applications for the 2020-2021 license here with changes in their license description from the 2019-2020 license here, see at their staff.
- [Bungert] Law department has no objections.
- Police?
- [Lt. Mahoney] Police concur.
- Okay. There's quite a few there. So I'm glad you looked at them all. Do we have a motion?
- Motion to approve. Motion to approve by Stevens, do we have a second?
- Second.
- Second by Vander Leest. Any other discussion all in favor say aye.
- [Panelist] Aye. All opposed? That passes unanimously.
- Mark, I just have a quick question for the city attorney.
- [Bungert] Yes.

- Go ahead.
- On these applications, this is where we reduce a fee down to \$50 is that correct?
- [Bungert] Depending on the type of license that reduction applied to class B licenses and those went down to the statutory minimums.
- And that was the \$50 is that correct?
- [Bungert] For the class B liquor correct.
- Okay. That was Class B liquor would include like a regular buyers.
- [Bungert] There's two for bar, they would apply. They would have a class B beer and a Class B liquor. The class B beer, I believe went down to zero, and the class B liquor went down to 50.
- Okay, that answers my question. Thank you very much.
- [Bungert] You're welcome.
- All right. Okay, let me know when you're ready.
- [Bungert] Yes, item number 18.
- 18, consideration with possible action on the renewal applications for various liquor and or beer licenses for the 2020-2021 license here. See attached staff.
- [Bungert] Law department has no objections.
- Police?
- [Lt. Mahoney] Police concur.
- Okay. I would entertain a motion.
- Motion to approve.
- Motion by Stevens. Do we have a second?
- [Lefebvre] Second.
- Second by Lefebvre any other discussion? All in favor say aye.
- [Panelist] Aye. All opposed? That passes unanimously.
- [Bungert] All right, item number 19.

- 19, the request by Alder Brunette for consideration with possible action on Green Bay Common Council to begin meeting a minimum of twice a month effective June 2020. There are too many crucial or critical issues requiring attention and action to meet once a month. We answer to the public and more regular meetings are necessary and convenient for the public previously discussed at the April 27 Protection and Policy Committee meeting. Alder Brunette is here I will Alder Brunette.

- Yes, thank you, Chairman. My statement speaks for itself if you recall the last meeting. City Attorney Chavez was to look at clarification on if that was a decision made by the mayor or by the Council. I would ask the City Attorney's office if they could give some clarification if we could just change that through action council or if it needs to be done through action of the mayor's office.

- [Bungert] Yes, so City Attorney, Chavez is on the line. So I will defer this item to her.

- Okay.

- [Chavez] Hello Alders, well, I'll look into this. And under our ordinance, section 2.01. It states that our regular meetings are held on the first and third Tuesday of each month, and that one of the regular monthly meetings of the council may be canceled, or the council may be canceled or rescheduled each month upon 15 days written notice by the mayor to the clerk for good cause or upon one day notice and so with the calendar having been established at the beginning of the year. And so essentially what I'm saying is that the calendars already been established the methods the team, period, 15 day period even for not having good cause and so the calendar requirements have been met with those to be canceled. There is nothing in our ordinances meetings back on, except for special meetings. And again, those are at the call of the mayor, with permission of the council president or in absence by the council vice president. And so at this point, my recommendation would be, to submit this to the mayor for his consideration.

- Alder Brunette.

- Yeah, I would, I think, based on the issues that we deal with as a council and the fact that constituents property owners taxpayers come to us and have very little pressing issues are important to their life and their livelihoods. I think it wouldn't be appropriate for the council to begin meeting again, twice a month and keep that regular schedule. I voted along with it. I believe Alder Dorff for a couple of years ago, you made the recommendation that we go down to one meeting per month in the summer months. I voted for it. I don't feel comfortable meeting one time a month for many of the months out of the year. I think there are at least four or five where we're only gonna be meeting one time per month. So I understand what Attorney Chavez said but short of asking the mayor I think any action of the council to reestablish meetings, twice a month, effective June 2020. If that was a motion of the council, I think that would be appropriate. Again, it's not any division or frustration with the mayor's office, but we do report to the public and the public should have access to the city through regular meetings of their city council. So I would just like to reverse that and ask the committee to recommend reestablishing twice per month meetings and moving forward from there. Thank you.

- I'm sorry Alder Dorff go ahead, Vanessa, then I'll get to Alder Dorff.

- [Chavez] Thank you Alder Steuer. Just to just to clarify under current ordinances, there is no mechanism for the council to establish the date that is something that would need to be sent to the

mayor's office.

- Are you okay with that Alder Brunette?

- I read some, I did a little research, of course, I'm not an attorney, but I did a little research and I thought per state statute that we had a little more flexibility to set the meetings from the council level, but I'd have to look into it a little more, of course.

- Okay, Alder Dorff.

- What we're dealing with right now is the fact that we have an ordinance which establishes it establishes when we have our meetings, and then allows the mayor to cancel them, which has been done.

- Okay. I'd like to hear from Alder Dorff and then we'll get to the committee Alder Dorff.

- Thank you. So yes, when I made the motion a few years ago was to continue to have one meeting a month over the summer, which had been a precedent for quite a while. And then, you know, I looked at this well, of course, in June, we already have two meetings scheduled. If you look at July, and then the week of the fourth, it would be difficult to get any committee meetings in between the meetings. Sure how much we would have to do. If there was one or two topics then the mayor could call an emergency meeting as he's already done, but the same happens when you look at September with the Labor Day week now maybe this year, it's a little different with COVID. But it's difficult to get those in between committee meetings in because there's the vacation weekend, those two vacation weekends in there. And sometimes it's hard for people to be around. Now I see we have already established a precedent, for example, with Alder Wari where he was able to call in from Tennessee, you know, perhaps in the future if someone were on council were to be gone, or a member of the city staff were to be on vacation in future normal years, you know, maybe there would be more potential to have that person call in while they were, you know, on their vacation, but we really been July in September, would be too difficult months to have those extra meetings. So that brings us down to one month August 'cause we have two meetings in June two in October. Two in November and two in December. They're ready on the schedule. So we're really late about August, unless we can somehow figure out how to squeeze in a whole bunch more committee meetings in July and September. Thank you.

- I'd like to make a point that, you know, I think with thank you Alder Dorff what Alder Brunette brings up, though, I think it's a good point too. And I think, especially, you know, with these Zoom meetings, that we've had some very long, long meetings, and I don't know if it's just the because of, you know, the pandemic and what but, you know, some of the meetings have been very, very long. And it seems to me that if we could split that up a little bit more and have shorter meetings somewhat, you know, with agenda items, being able to split the two meetings, rather than one I would be all in favor of that type of thing. Go ahead Alder Dorff.

- But we've had two meetings a month. So how would it make the meeting more shorter.

- I was looking at it August you know, I agree. You know, I think, well, of course in December we've got Christmas too.

- But we have it this first and 15th. And just the way that it was week spa, it works out pretty well.

- Yeah.

- It does.

- Does anybody else? Okay. I appreciate your comments, anybody else? Any other Alders or committee, like the chairman Alder Stevens,

- Regarding our meetings being long the last couple meetings due to the fact because of the election.

- Okay.

- That's why we've been having longer meetings.

- Well, of course. All right. Well point, good point. Go ahead Alder Vander Leest.

- I feel that, you know, there's an ordinance in effect already as far as the schedule of the meetings. I think that we've gotta follow the ordinance for right now. As far as you know, the meetings being long so means that just the way they run. And as far as, you know, if we don't have a meeting, you know, twice every month, it gives the people a little bit of break from the staff and the people that are attending as far as the Alders. I think we've done a pretty good job. You know, I don't have any I know that, you know, last year they took, you know, the city workers took off on Friday afternoon. And I think that was received pretty well as you know, as far as you know, giving them a little bit of break, so they get a little longer weekend. But I think as far as how the meetings are scheduled, I think we're doing okay, you know, I don't have real problem with what's going on right now. And, you know, I understand, you know, there's a lot of things on our plates, but that's just the nature of it right now. And I think we've done a good job overall. I don't have a lot of complaints from my constituents that we're, you know, not getting the job done. So, I guess I'm comfortable what we're doing right now. Thank you,

- I agree with John

- Okay, Alder Lefebvre do you have anything to add to that? Alder Lefebvre?

- [Lefebvre] I think right now the schedule is probably okay, because it's already been set. We went to a couple months where we only had one meeting where we could have had two, I can see in the winter months, you know, doing too, and I can see in the summer, a reason I voted for the summer one that we had last year, is because of a lot of people are on vacation. It's a little different in the summer months, what we do, and then we also change the hours at the City Hall. You know, we had the Friday, close. So it was a different situation then. But I think we're already almost not quite half through already with the year and I think the way things are set right now. I think this discussion that we could send to the mayor. I can see that stating that we should look at next year having two meetings all the months except I would consider June July and August just to once once a month but this is something I think that we can discuss with the mayor and we're already pretty much set in a year that I don't think right now that we should change things the way that

- You know, we can always have an emergency meeting as well then all they can always be called.

Okay, anything else Alder Brunette you've spoken twice, so I don't know if there's anything else you wanna add. Otherwise, I'm gonna have this go back to committee.

- That's fine.

- Okay.

- I think they spoke once but--

- Okay. I entertain a motion then if anybody would like to bring that forward.

- Motion to receive in place and files that correct. Well, that Attorney Bungert I mean, in order to have the mayor take a look at this, whether it be the appropriate

- [Bungert] For the mayor to take a look at it. I believe City Attorney Chavez mentioned it would be a motion to refer to the mayor's office for consideration.

- Okay, I'm referred to the mayor's office.

- Okay. By Stevens do we have a second. Second by Lefebvre any another discussion? All in favor?

- [Panelist] Aye.

- Aye, Alder Brunette?

- No, that's fine. I had a comment, but you've already voted so that's fine.

- Okay. We could work out that way. Okay. And All in favor.

- [Panelist] Aye. Opposed? That passes unanimously. All right.

- [Bungert] All right, item number 20.

- Okay, number 20 hold on a second. Let me get that, excuse me 20 okay, we have a request by Alder Brunette to the protection Policy Committee for consideration with possible action on allowing the public to address the city council on non agenda items that each full Common Council meeting. For example, this could be to allow up to three or no more than five minutes per speaker Alder Brunette.

- Thank you, Chairman. It was a comment I received from a member of the public commented on something I threw out there on Facebook and they asked to consider this. This was something that the county board did when I was a member of that body. I don't know how long they did it. And I don't know if they still do it. But basically, at the beginning of a full county board meeting, they would open up the floor to hear from anyone who would like to address the entire body. And, you know, every meeting hit or miss, you know, one or two people might say something, but it was very rare for that to happen. But I always liked it personally because it was an opportunity for the public to address their, their government, you know, their elected representatives as a whole on any issue that they would like to and sometimes good ideas came of that sometimes some of the speakers were

way off course on tangents, and the chairman of the board had to, you know, bring it in a little bit. I personally liked it, if we put some restrictions on it, you know, on and kept it, you know, tight to a minute range, I think it's worth looking into. So those are my comments.

- Okay, Attorney Chavez.

- [Lefebvre] Alder Lefebvre I have some information on that the county board yes, did that. And it Yes, and I did approve. I believe that was a great thing that they did that. But now with the the way we're running our meetings, We're on Cisco WebEx we do not do that now. We had the Wisconsin county associations to weigh in on it and they recommend that we not do it, because then it makes the meeting so long. When you're on these types of programs that we're doing. So they will I'm sure when we go back to but we're not doing it right now.

- Okay. Well go ahead, Alder Vander Leest.

- Generally speaking, they don't act on anything that the person from the poll, they don't act on anything, you know, during that meeting it is strictly not acted upon. Just so you understand that's how we do it at the county. You know, they get the information. And that's what it's just information that's given. It's nothing is acted upon at that when they come forward.

- Alder vander leest, is there a timeframe that they have instead of setting--

- Three to five minutes, no more than five minutes. That's what it's about.

- Is it a separate agenda item or is it depend on what's going on.

- It will to be comments from the public. They would address it as comments from the public.

- [Lefebvre] It's on the agenda, yes.

- Okay. I think that's how it work thank you.

- All right. Attorney Chavez, did you want I thought I saw your phone on?

- [Chavez] Yes, sir. So I think it would be important if this is a route that the council would like to go that the Stewart's purchase staff has purpose of drafting some rules that would be established. The reason being is that if the council goes this way, what we're essentially doing is creating a designated public forum during council meetings. And so we need to have some clear parameters as to what the public can do and also what the council can do. And some of the Alders have alluded to the purpose of this is specifically just to let people talk for an usually a designated period of time. We can't control anything they say outside of maybe speaking, with profane attacks, or making libelous statements, so anything goes, they can comment and just basically criticize what people are wearing and we have to let them talk because they're in a designated public forum. And so the limitations that we impose on them that are based on a specific topic, don't necessarily apply. Like they can talk about anything, not just I think it's on the agenda. And then, as one of the elders stated, that council cannot participate in any of the discussion. It's literally just an opportunity for the public to talk in their public forum. And they'll be able to engage in any kind of questions or debate 'cause we would not be a specific item on the agenda. It would just fall under something like comments from the

public and if I didn't count or any action needed to be taken on a follow up, then it would be actually put it on to the agenda as a new agenda item. So it would be something that the council is interested in pursuing. It is definitely something that can be done. Whether or not it has been the continued practice depends on who you talk. And a lot of attorneys discouraged it, a lot of city attorneys discourage the practice because it does create a public forum, which allows people to come and talk about anything that they want during the council meeting. And the only thing we can do is really restrict time, place and manner. So usually that means like giving a timeframe and just sticking to it. But at the same time, it's also a really welcome a welcome practice from many legislators perspectives, because it does allow people to come in with their opinions in front of the Council. So it's entirely up to council voters to our recommendation would just be that if it is something the council pursues before it is adopted, it'd be sent to staff for us to put together those ground rules that has to be followed both by the public and the council's with its clarity.

- Okay. Alder Brunette does that sound like something that was okay?

- Yeah. I Like it just in reference in four years, I was on the county board that I recall, there was only one situation where someone was a little out of line. And the chairman of the time, let that person speak and it really wasn't much of an issue. I will also say that the if I recall the Green Bay school district that allows this a few years ago, there was a teacher, if I recall from Washington Middle School that spoke and she really laid before the school board to the point that the school board then decided to act on some issues that been going on at Washington Middle School, I think it is a good avenue for the public to address the full Council, share ideas, share concerns, and then you know, I do think it's appropriate to refer to staff from a legal standpoint. And hey, if they push forward something and recommendation and we act on it, there's no harm in trying this for a year and reevaluating at that time. So I think that Attorney Chavez, his point of referring to staff i think is appropriate and a good idea at this point.

- Alder Gerlach.

- Thank you I press my button, but I don't think that you can see it. So I think this is ill advised I would recommend against it. I think that there are two reasons one is that you have a committee system whereby specific concerns can be addressed in the committee that is specifically set up to address that kind of concern. And the other reason is that the common council meetings are very open and public, and they are streamed on YouTube. I know that there are some Facebook pages that stream them live. And I think that it could be an invitation to people to grandstand and to waste a lot of time of the Council and the staff and people who've come there for the the agenda that was posted. I think it opens a can of worms. If you didn't have committees who address specific things? But I would stick with the system that you have I would recommend against this

- Alder Dorff go ahead.

- Yeah, I would also recommend against it citizens have a very clear path right now to bring things before council. First of all, if there's a concern, they call one of their Alders, lots of times we can help alleviate that concern by putting them in touch with the right person, the right department, figuring things out for them immediately. Then if that doesn't necessarily work, then maybe the Alder has to put in a communication and it goes to a committee and then we do our committee work and we talked through things. And then of course, anything from committee can also be talked about on the floor. So I would definitely be against this only because there's an alternate way that has worked very

well for people to bring things forward to city council. Thank you. All right. Okay. Go ahead Alder Lefebvre.

- [Lefebvre] I kind of would think it would be a good thing for the county. I was glad that some people came forward because I was not aware of that. And sometimes they don't always get to their supervisor right away. And the meeting is there and they will express it. Sometimes it's easier to tell everyone you'll bring it out more. And then what happens is one of the supervisors will then make a communication later on, on the item that was brought forward. I think it's a good way for the public to inform all of us what's going on. And I'm not gonna say there's Alders who don't do their job, but sometimes you might have an Alder who's not doing exactly what they should be doing. And I think it's a good thing for the public to be able to come and speak. I don't think we should be afraid of them. I just think it'd be a good idea. I love it that the county does this. And it's an actual agenda item. We do it before we open up the rest of the meeting. Thank you.

- Okay. All right. Committee I would entertain a motion then.

- I make a motion that we send it to the to the staff to do in other words, just as far as how it should be worded, if we're gonna go forward with it, I'd say that the staff should be the first to be involved as far as if we're gonna, you know, give the public a chance to speak at our meetings. I'd recommend we refer to staff, for more communication more work. That'd be my motion, I'd support the motion.

- Okay. Do we have a second? Well, will second it.

- [Bungert] Okay. Can I mention one other thing too?

- Okay then quickly.

- I got one of those that you had a brain fart go ahead.

- I'm sorry go ahead.

- All right. We got a motion and we have a second. All in favor of the motion say aye.

- [Panelist] Aye. All opposed? What are the nays? Who said nay?

- Nobody.

- So I thought somebody said?

- [Lefebvre] One thing I was gonna quick say was that I don't think we're gonna have an issue with a lot of people coming forward. It's a little different maybe than the county but with the city, people are going to contact Alder. So I don't think we're gonna have a lot of people coming forward. Thank you.

- Okay. All right. All in favor we'll said aye so that passes. Okay. Attorney Bungert when you're ready?

- [Bungert] Yes, item number 21.

- Okay, a request by Alder Weary to the Protection Policy Committee excuse me, I just lost him here for a second 21 which states request obtaining bids quotes from consultants for an external election review of processes. In administration of the April 7 2020 election preference should be given to attorneys with election law experience, current or former municipal clerks or inspector general positions. I got a text from Alder Weary he's at work right now. And this is what he's stated to me says "I am in favor of my request. "Please discuss and move to Council." So that's his request. So I don't know if committee or Alders if anybody would like to chime in on this anybody?

- I would say that we refer to the city council and let the city council decide if they wanna, you know, try to get the bids in motion or if they don't, that the city council would be the ruling factor if they if they wanna go forward with getting bids and, you know, the courts and things that he's requesting to be in my motion to refer to city council and you know, get it as an agenda item on City Council, and then see if we want to go that route.

- Hold on Alder Lefebvre Alder Dorff.

- Did we do this already? It seemed like at the last meeting, we talked about it and people didn't wanna spend \$40,000. And people didn't wanna spend the money. I thought we did this already. How many times do we take a kick at the same cat? I'm just curious.

- I guess I'm wondering about that as well. And I don't know if somebody wants--

- Attorney Chavez wants to talk.

- Well, yeah Venessa Chavez.

- [Chavez] I wasn't gonna weigh in on whether or not it's something that should be in front of them. I would say that when this item is decided, should be votes from the staff levels should be identified, whether it be myself or potentially be HR Director.

- Can we make a motion to receive and place on file?

- [Bungert] Yes, that would be a proper

- That's my motion.

- Do we have a second?

- Kathy Lefebvre second.

- Kathy Lefebvre. All right, I've got a few more comments before we vote.

- This the reason by this is going to council.

- Right hold on. Alder Brunette.

- I believe Alder Gerlach had her hand up first.

- All right, Alder Gerlach.

- Thank you. Alder Brunette. Yes, I would urge you not to do this, I would urge you not to commit any funds to do this. We have established a committee to look at what went wrong, and what should be done in the future to make it right. I think we need to put all our risk so making it right, we have less than six months to make this right. It isn't necessary to hang anyone. It is necessary to figure out what went wrong and make it right. We don't have to point fingers and target someone and make someone pay the price. And then we certainly don't need to use sitting money to do that I would urge you not to do this. I would like to see it ended. We have a committee to look at this. Thank you.

- Okay, Alder Brunette. Alder Brunette did you wanna--

- If I could, I don't wanna speak for Alder Weary, but I think it is different than what we have discussed in the past. At the full city council meeting, the quote from our city attorney was up to \$4. And that the council, you know, agreed that that was a rather high amount. And so I believe Alder Weary was looking at all their alternatives outside of an attorney. And as I stated at the last city council meeting, there are other options. The City of Milwaukee has a Inspector General, I believe there's a possibility having a county clerk not affiliated with the city or Brown County Clerk to do it. A review of our election and I believe that there is no harm in getting a price estimate. Because if the council and I agree \$40,000 seems like you know, not a good use of taxpayer dollars. But if we could look at having an independent set of eyes look at our election, the administration of our election, we owe at least another look to the folks who did not have an opportunity to vote or waiting in line. So it is different, it's not the same. I suspect Alder Stevens is correct. We will have some have a discussion there but I'm against receiving I'm placing a file I believe that the city should look at some opportunities to do a thorough review outside of City Hall at a cost that's much less than 40,000. There are possibilities out there. I don't believe for a second that our only options are spending \$40,000 or dueling entirely inside of City Hall. There are other options available tonight. I think we need to explore that as a council. Thank you, that's all.

- Alder Galvin.

- Thank you chair. My understanding of what took place at committee in council meetings the election is that the majority of the council members believe the answer of what's wrong and who's responsible, or what happened during the vote has already been answered. And it even though Alder Brunett thinks it was only because of the thousand dollars, that we balked that wasn't my impression, my impression was add those answers those questions answered, and that there is no desire to have any kind of an investigation done, to even have staff spend time again, trying to get quotes from different people. And all the time that goes into that. And then they to have this taken up again. And our council meeting, again, we talked about time, how many times again and Alder Galvin asked us How many times are certain council members gonna be going at this thing? Before they, you know, I mean it's like they're looking for any little loophole, any little angle they can to try and get their will on this to what happened during an election. And we just keep beating this thing over and over again, I don't know if the attempt assists to keep it in the public eye to try and convince people to do diligence or if they have some kind of a hidden agenda here, and I'm not sure what it is because I'm not hearing a sufficient explanation as to this, that I haven't already heard before in other meetings. And it's, it's getting old really quick. We have processes in place now to make sure we do better in

August and beyond. And I think that's where we need to be putting our efforts. Thank you.

- Okay There was a motion made correct.

- [Bungert] Alder Steuer to clarify there was a motion made by Alder Vander Leest to refer this to staff. City Attorney Chavez did clarify that it needed to be specified to what staff however a second was not called. That motion needs to be there. And then there was a secondary motion made to receive and place on file but Alder Vander Leest motion needs to be either seconded or it will fail for lack of second and then we can take action on Alder Stevens motion.

- Was there a second? On the first motion.

- No.

- [Bungert] All right. So that motion fails for lack of a second.

- So, then we have a--

- [Bungert] Yes. So, now we have a motion to receive and place on file by Alder Stevens seconded by Alder Lefebvre. And then is the motion that can be voted on at this time.

- Okay. All in favor?

- [Panelist] Aye.

- Can I make a comment about that new committee?

- Sure, go ahead.

- Well, the ad hoc committee on elections their first meeting date is Thursday at 5pm.

- Okay.

- This Thursday the 14th.

- I wanna make the comment to I, you know, I've gone back and forth with this issue too. And I, you know, I think it's been difficult but I feel like it's time to move on to a little bit. I'm thinking the ad hoc committee would be a good route to go for this so I will vote to receive and place on file on this as well.

- [Bungert] Can you give me the time for that meeting again?

- Sure, it's five o'clock on Thursday.

- Okay, so we have a vote, you know.

- [Bungert] So just to clarify, the motion is to refer to the ad hoc committee. Okay. Attorney Chavez recommendation was to refer this to staff either to the City Attorney or the HR Director or to

another staff member. The committee felt--

- [Chavez] Just to clarify, to be the, if it gets referred to staff to be conducted, we need to specify which staff is gonna be doing it.

- It's being put on file received and placed to file.

- [Chavez] That's right then right. Correct.

- [Bungert] There were a lot of motions on this item. So the first motion to refer to staff failed for lack of second now we have a motion to receive and place on file. And the vote took place and that was approved.

- But what was the vote on it three to one?

- [Bungert] It was anonymous there was a roll call. Yeah, I didn't hear any nays.

- We didn't ask for any nays.

- Is there a nay.

- Be one nay.

- One nay, okay.

- [Bungert] Okay, one moment. So can we do a roll call vote then so Alder Stevens?

- Yes.

- Alder Vander Leest?

- Nay.

- Alder Steuer?

- Yes.

- Alder Lefebvre?

- Yes. All right that motion to receive and place on file passes three to one with Alder Vander Leest voting no.

- Okay, let me know when you're ready.

- [Bungert] Yep, one second. All right item Number 22.

- 22 consideration with possible action on a request by Alder John Vander Leest to the protection of policy committee to request to review the policies and procedures for curbside voting for the

remaining two elections and how to communicate curbside voting information to all voters and co workers in Green Bay. Alder Vander Leest.

- Thank you.

- I have to leave.

- You got to leave.

- Okay.

- I'd like to refer that to the nine member committee. That's, you know, gonna be discussing the election and moving forward with our August election as well. In our November election, I'd like to, you know, make sure that the nine member committee that they take it up and they find a good solution as far as how they handle the curbside voting, that a person that comes that's handicapped, that doesn't have anybody with them, and they're just in the car that you know, that there'd be somebody there to greet them as far as so that they can, you know, get their vote to get their ballot to them, that they don't have to wait for a long period of time. And I'm sure that committees they're gonna look at that 'cause I know at the last election. The curbside voting was not addressed properly. So I referred to the committee and I'm taking full confidence in the committee that's, you know, gonna handle the voting and our clerk and I know they wanna do the right thing. And that's all I'm asking, you know, just at the curbside voting be addressed and that they get a good plan. That's all I'm looking for. I got a question.

- Okay. Go ahead, Alder Lefebvre.

- [Lefebvre] Yes. I believe to the curbside voting should definitely be looked at I wonder if they should check with Milwaukee 'cause they did the before the election. I know they did curbside absentee ballot voting and I think they did it during the elections too they could check with Milwaukee and maybe some other communities how they handled it. 'Cause I think we can do that and we can make an improvement on it. I think it's a very good idea.

- Kris Teske go ahead.

- Thanks you. I just wanna clarify people are getting curbside voting and drive thru voting mixed up. I do have documentation for our meeting on Thursday the difference. We always have curbside voting during open voting. Kim and I have gone up many times to the parking lot and have assisted people. The curbside voting that was done on April 7, is the same that it's been done the 15 years that I've been there. But, you know, driving through voting is totally different. And I just wanna state you know, just keep that in mind so that on Thursday when you're listening, you'll see the difference.

- Okay.

- Unless you want me to get into it now.

- Anybody have questions?

- [Bungert] No, I think that'd be good for the committee, to go through.

- I guess here's a question I have, and I know Alder Dorff if you had made a communication or pulled it at council as far as this committee, the makeup of the committee, and I know that at one time names were mentioned. So I'm wondering where that set and I don't know if that's Attorney Chavez that we need to talk to her or what is the makeup of the committee for the ad hoc committee? Discipline established? I mean the names of the people.

- [Chavez] Yeah, that is the mayor's office who's doing the determination of who gets appointed? I don't know the exact people.

- Okay. So that should be should be common knowledge very shortly.

- Well, I know but so Celestine Jeffreys was kind of the one that sent the email out. And if she's still on here, maybe she could speak.

- [Jeffreys] Yeah, so the committee is comprised of nine people currently we have Clerk Teske, Alder Weary, myself Kim Wayne will be the meeting manager and then we have five members from the community Susan Smith Attorney Susan Smith, Professor Allison Sanger. H. James Smith from Kobo, which is an organization that helps people vote. Karen Sly and Terry Racine who Kris correct me. I think those they are both chief inspectors. One was at East and one was at West is that correct Kris?

- That's correct.

- [Jeffreys] And that the agenda is published.

- Okay, good that's all I needed wanted clarification. All right. So are we at on this item. somebody refresh me, I'm sorry.

- My motion was referred to the committee as far as the handicapped borders that were done. How the voting gets done for a handicapped person that drives up to the polls that the committee, you know, you know, go ahead with it requires the committee. Thank you that being my motion.

- Is there a second?

- [Lefebvre] I'll second it.

- Okay, a second by Alder Lefebvre any other discussion? All in favor?

- [Panelist] Aye. All opposed? Okay, that passes. Let me know when you're ready.

- [Bungert] Yes, item number 23.

- Okay.

- 23 hold on a second here. 23 consideration with possible action on a request by Alder Bill Galvin to the protection of policy committee that plans be made and implemented by July 20th to avert any future problems within person vote and absentee voting. This is to include training of staff and volunteers, obtain necessary equipment, establish secondary voting sites and then the other

resources needed Alder Galvin.

- Thank you chair, and I would be okay with a recommendation that has just be passed on to the committee that's gonna be meeting shortly on this. At the time I put this in, there was nothing in place. That wasn't guaranteed it was even gonna happen. But I think that for the purposes of planning, training and budgeting, we need to have a solid plan in place by July 20th so that it can be implemented for the August election and if it needs any changes after that, for the November election, so I just wanted to make sure we were following a process with some timelines to make sure that things move along. And they don't languish. And then we end up with another situation in August. So if someone wants to make a recommendation to, you know, receive and place on file or just push this timeline forward to the committee, that'd be meeting I'm happy with either one.

- Okay.

- I'll make a motion to move with the ad hoc.

- Okay, do we have a second?

- Second.

- Second by? Okay. Motion a Second by vander Leest all in favor?

- [Panelist] Aye. For opposed? That passes unanimously.

- [Lefebvre] Can I make a quick comment on that?

- Sure.

- [Lefebvre] I believe this should definitely very good comments by Alder Galvin on this, and I didn't get a chance to email Kris Teske, but I do believe like establishing secondary voting sites. I think we should have definitely really pushed that having said we only had it at the bus people and ours for weren't very good, I think was one to four. And you could only have five people at a time so it really limited. So I think if we can maybe set something like that up. I will also hopefully I'll attend the ad hoc committee and I'll bring that up there too.

- [Bungert] Okay.

- [Lefebvre] Thank you.

- All right, thank you. Okay, Attorney Bungert are we ready?

- [Bungert] We are on the liquor violation report.

- All right. The liquor violation report for May 11 2020 Lieutenant.

- [Lt. Mahoney] we have no violations during this time.

- Well, very good.

- Motion to receive and place on file.
- Okay by Stevens do we have a second?
- Second by Lefebvre all in favor?
- [Panelist] Aye. All opposed? How about a motion to adjourn anybody?
- Motion to adjourn. By Vander Leest. Do we have a second?
- [Lefebvre] Second.
- Second by Lefebvre, all in favor?
- [Panelist] Yay.
- I'm done, anybody else.
- Thank you, was a good meeting. Good meeting. Thank you.