



MINUTES OF THE PROTECTION AND POLICY COMMITTEE

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2020, 5:30 PM
Virtual Meeting. Public may join via Zoom.

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, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre

Also present: Deputy City Attorney Joanne Bungert, Lt. Steve Mahoney, City Attorney Vanessa Chavez, Assistant City Attorney Lindsay Mather, Ald. Barbara Dorff, Ald. Lynn Gerlach, Ald. Jesse Brunette, Ald. Brian Johnson, Ald. Chris Wery, Interim Director of Community and Economic Development Cheryl Renier-Wigg

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to approve. Motion carried.
Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, No- None, Abstain- None

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the September 14, 2020 Protection & Policy Committee Meeting.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to approve. Motion carried.
Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, No- None, Abstain- None

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Consideration with possible action on a change of agent for Skogen's Foodliner, Inc. at 2250 W. Mason.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve a change of agent for Skogen's Foodliner, Inc. at 2250 W. Mason. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, No- None, Abstain- None

2. Consideration with possible action on a request by Kittner's Pub at 129 S. Washington St. to amend the liquor license include an outdoor deck.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to hold until the next meeting a request by Kittner's Pub at 129 S. Washington St. to amend the liquor license include an outdoor deck. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, No- None, Abstain- None

3. Consideration with possible action on an application for a "Class B" Combination license by Bay Beer Bellys, LLC at 708 Bodart St. with a licensed premises description as "bar, bathrooms, cooler, backroom, closet" (Previously licensed as Bullseye 708, LLC).

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to approve an application for a "Class B" Combination license by Bay Beer Bellys, LLC at 708 Bodart St. with a licensed premises description as "bar, bathrooms, cooler, backroom, closet," with the approval of the proper authorities. (Previously licensed as Bullseye 708, LLC) Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, No- None, Abstain- None

4. Consideration with possible action on an application for a "Class A" Liquor and Class "A" Beer license by Neo Beverages at 1215 E. Mason St. with a licensed premises description as "behind the counter, shelves (instore), back office storage (Previously licensed as CCB Beverages, LLC).

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to approve an application for a "Class A" Liquor and Class "A" Beer license by Neo Beverages at 1215 E. Mason St. with a licensed premises description as "behind the counter, shelves (instore), back office storage, with the approval of proper authorities (Previously licensed as CCB Beverages, LLC). Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, No- None, Abstain- None

5. Consideration with possible action on an application for a "Class B" Combination License by CMT, LLC at 312 Cherry St. with a licensed premises description as "Bar, lounge style. Serving beer/liquor & wine-one open area w/ bar, two bathrooms & a storage area." (Currently licensed as C Street,

LLC).

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve an application for a "Class B" Combination License by CMT, LLC at 312 Cherry St. with a licensed premises description as "Bar, lounge style. Serving beer/liquor & wine-one open area w/ bar, two bathrooms & a storage area, with the approval of the proper authorities (Currently licensed as C Street, LLC). Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, No- None, Abstain- None

6. Consideration with possible action on an application for a "Class B" Combination license by Kokoro, LLC at 875 Lombardi Ave. with a licensed premises description as "Kitchen, behind the bar, basement, patio, restaurant." (Currently licensed as Sunny's Restaurant, Inc.).

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

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, No- None, Abstain- None

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

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve an application for a "Class B" Combination license by Kokoro, LLC, at 875 Lombardi Ave. with a licensed premises description as "Kitchen, behind the bar, the basement, restaurant, "and to exclude patio from the license description" with the approval of the proper authorities (Currently licensed as Sunny's Restaurant, Inc.)

7. Consideration with possible action on an appeal by Adrian Summers regarding the denial of his public vehicle operator's license.

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

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, No- None, Abstain- None

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, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve an appeal by Adrian Summers regarding the denial of his public vehicle operator's license.

8. Consideration with possible action on an appeal by Andrea Pleshek regarding the denial of her operator's license.

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, No- None, Abstain- None

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, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to approve an appeal by Andrea Pleshek regarding the denial of her operator's license. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, No- None, Abstain- None

9. Consideration with possible action on a communication from Alder Dorff to research and create an Equal Rights Ordinance for the City of Green Bay, previously discussed at the July 8, 2019, July 13, 2020, July 16, 2020, August 10, 2020, and September 3, 2020 Protection & Policy meetings.

Ald. Mark Steuer stepped away during item 9 but a quorum was maintained.

Ald. Mark Steuer returns at 6:18pm

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

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, No- None, Abstain- None

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

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, No- None, Abstain- None

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, No- None, Abstain- None

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, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest to receive and place. Motion fails for lack of second.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer to amend the ordinance and remove "receipt of rental assistance" from the ordinance.

Yes - Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, Craig Stevens; No- John VanderLeest Motion carries 3-1

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve as amended.

Yes - Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, Craig Stevens; No- John VanderLeest. Motion carried 3-1.

F. INFORMATIONAL.

I. The Liquor Violation Report for September 28, 2020.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to receive and place on file the liquor violation report for September 28, 2020. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, No- None, Abstain- None

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to adjourn at 8:32 p.m. Motion carried.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, No- None, Abstain- None

VERBATIM MINUTES

- And them too.

- Okay.

- [Celestine] We are recording.

- Okay. We can begin.

- All right. Welcome to Protection and Policy Committee Meeting for September 28th, 2020. Roll call. Alder Steuer, I'm here. Alder Stevens?

- Here.

- Alder Vander Leest?

- Here.

- Alder Lefebvre?

- [Kathy] Here.

- All present and accounted for.

- Okay.

- Are we ready?

- Approval of the Agenda.

- Okay.

- All right. Get .
- Motion to approve.
- I'll move the motion.
- Okay, by Lefebvre. Do we have a second?
- Second.
- By Stevens. Second by Stevens. All in favor, please say aye?
- [All] Aye.
- All opposed? That passes unanimously. Are we ready right away?
- Yes. Approval of the Minutes.
- Approval of the minutes. I'll entertain a motion?
- Motion to approve.
- By Vander Leest. Do we have a second?
- Second.
- Second.
- Second by Stevens. All in favor, please say aye?
- [All] Aye.
- All opposed? That passes unanimously.
- Okay, we are onto item--
- Whenever you're ready.
- Yes, item number one.
- Okay. Okay, Regular Business, number one. Consideration with possible action on a change of agent for Skogen's Foodliner, Inc., at 2250 West Mason. Staff?
- Staff has no objections.
- Police?
- The Police concur.

- Okay. I would entertain a motion?
- Motion to approve.
- [Kathy] I'll move, I'll second.
- Motion by--
- The system there, Mark.
- What's that?
- There was a blink in the system. What was that?
- I don't know. Hopefully not me.
- Okay.
- We have a motion by Stevens and a second by Lefebvre. All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- All opposed? That passes unanimously. And I'll wait for you, Joanne.
- Okay. All right. Item number two.
- Number two, consideration with possible action on a request by Kittner's Pub at 129 South Washington Street to amend the liquor license to include, including an outdoor deck. Staff?
- Yeah. So this licensee's site plan has been submitted to Planning, but Planning has indicated that because of the historical nature of the building, it needs a Certificate of Appropriateness that still needs to be issued before the site plans and the building plans can be all approved. Accordingly, staff would recommend holding this item until that COA is issued as it could, with the way that Planning staff indicated, it could derail the whole process if that certificate isn't issued. So we don't want to be in a situation where we're approving a licensed premise that isn't gonna be in existence.
- Well, is there any indication by the Kittner's Pub that this was time sensitive? Although it doesn't really matter, it would still need a COA.
- Not that I'm aware of, no.
- Okay. Is the Landmarks Commission aware of this?
- I'm not sure.
- I'm on the Commission. I'm just wondering?

- Stephanie Hummel is working on it. I'm not sure.
- Stephanie Hummel?
- Yes.
- Yes. She's working on it. So I believe she's the liaison to the Commission.
- Okay. Well I would entertain that from the Committee?
- Motion to hold until, till our next meeting.
- Well--
- Okay.
- Is that okay for the next meeting?
- Yeah, that should be fine. That should be fine.
- All right. Do we have a second?
- Second.
- By Vander Leest, seconded by Stevens.
- [All] Aye.
- All opposed? That have passes unanimously.
- All right.
- Number three?
- And Item number three, yes.
- Number three. Consideration with possible action on an application for a Class B Combination License by Bay Beer Bellys, LLC, at 708 Bodart Street, with a licensed premises description as bar, bathrooms, cooler, backroom, closet. Previously licensed as Bullseye 708, LLC. Staff?
- No objections.
- Police?
- The Police concur.

- I would entertain a motion?
- Motion to approve.
- Motion by Stevens. Do we have a second?
- Second.
- Second.
- Second by Vander Leest. Any other discussion? All in favor, please say aye?
- [All] Aye.
- That passes unanimously.
- Item number four.
- Number four. Consideration with possible action on an application for a Class A liquor and Class A Beer License by Neo Beverages at 1215 East Mason Street, with a licensed premises description as behind the counter, shelves in store, back office storage, previously licensed as CCB Beverages, LLC. Staff?
- Staff has no objections.
- Police?
- The Police concur.
- I would entertain a motion?
- Motion to approve.
- Motion by Stevens.
- Second.
- Second by Vander Leest. Any other discussion? All in favor, please say aye?
- [All] Aye.
- That passes unanimously.
- All right. Item number five.
- Number five. Consideration of application for a Class B Combination License by CMT, LLC, at 312 Cherry Street, with a licensed premise description as bar, lounge style, serving beer, liquor and wine, one open area with bar, two bathrooms, and a storage area. Currently

licensed as C Street, LLC. Staff?

- No objections.

- Police?

- The Police are working with the owners. They signed our stipulation agreement, so we have no objections either.

- Okay.

- Motion to approve.

- Okay, moved to approve by Stevens. Do we have a second?

- [Kathy] Second.

- Second by Lefebvre. Any other on any other discussion? All in favor, please say aye?

- [All] Aye.

- That passes unanimously.

- Okay, do I have to hang up then? That was for me.

- Well yeah, you're good. You're good to go. And I should mention that this is a recommendation to City Council, which will be, let me look here on my calendar.

- October 6.

- It looks like October 6th. Correct?

- Yep.

- October 6th at 6:00 PM. So you should have no problem, but there's always a possibility. So final approval comes on October 6th, at City Council.

- Is that like another meeting like this or?

- Yeah, it'll be a Zoom meeting at 6:00 PM. It's at City Council, and generally speaking, it goes fairly well. But there's always that slim slim possibility.

- That's cool. Thank you, guys.

- Okay. You're welcome.

- All right. Item number six.

- Number six. Consideration with possible action on an application combination license by Kokoro, LLC, at 875 Lombardi Avenue, with a licensed premise description as kitchen, behind the bar, basement, patio, restaurant. Currently licensed as Sunny's Restaurant, Inc. Staff?

- Yes. So, staff does not have any legal objection to the application. However, we would not recommend approval of the patio portion of the licensed premise, as it doesn't comply with the basic requirements of the ordinance. There is no fencing, just a rope barrier. I understand that the premise has been, was that section, that patio has been part of the licensed premise previously, and that's the state it was in when the licensee purchased it. So, I don't know what the prior approach was by the Committee and by the Council at that time. I know that we have been approaching these outdoor premises a little differently in the past couple of years, trying to make sure that everything is complying with the ordinance or getting a specific waiver. And any prior descriptions don't automatically carry over. There's no guarantee that if a portion of a premise is licensed and that business is sold, that that license transfers. The license doesn't transfer. It's a new application. So staff's recommendation would be to approve, but without that patio.

- Okay, Police?

- The Police concur with Law.

- Okay.

- Can I ask was the owner--

- Yes, go ahead.

- [Kathy] Was the owner contacted and told that the patio would have to be fenced in, in order to comply?

- Yes. Jamie did let her know. She wanted to proceed as, and she is on the Zoom call. I see her.

- Hi, I'm Virginia.

- Hold on.

- Hold on. One second, ma'am. So we can open up the floor for her. She did, she was told that, but she can speak for herself. So if we want to do a motion to open the floor, so she can speak.

- I entertain a motion to open the floor?

- I'll so move.

- Second.

- So moved by Lefebvre. Do we have a second?

- Second.

- Second by the Vander Leest. All in favor, please say aye?

- [All] Aye.

- The floor is now open. Virginia, just state your name and address for the record and you may proceed.

- Sure. Virginia Wilson. My address is 3733 Libal Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin, 54301.

- Okay.

- Excuse my ignorance, but if I were to put up a wall, like a six foot, I think it's supposed to be six feet up from the ground surrounding the outdoor patio, then it would be kosher, right? So as far as, I do expect to have outdoor service because that is ideal, especially considering how large the outdoor patio is. If I were to put a barrier. Approved, then, what do I do after that is done? Do I come back to you?

- I would think that, then, Attorney Bungert, you can maybe help me on this. But I would think that you would have to go to Inspection with your plan and have that okayed through them. And then they would contact you, the Attorney's Office, on that? So the Inspections Department is on the sixth floor at City Hall. And I think their number's 448-3300, if I'm not mistaken. That would probably be the route to go. And they can help you along with those rules and regulations, as far as what to do.

- Sure.

- That is correct. You can also contact Jamie, too, in the Clerk's Office, and she can point you in the right direction as far as who to speak with as far as getting the patio built, that would be compliant with the ordinance. And as far as today's agenda, to not hold up your license, we can approve your license premise without the patio. And then you would come back to add the patio once you have everything squared away.

- Sure. I don't expect to be open until November. So there won't be patio users.

- Not unless you're tough.

- What's that?

- Not unless you're really tough, to be outside. But anyway.

- Well I guess I come back to you when that time comes. Okay.

- Yeah, I think that makes sense. So, did we have a motion on this, or we just opened the floor, correct?

- We just opened the floor. We don't have a motion.
- Is there any other, any other comments from the public? Otherwise, Virginia, do you have anything else to add? Otherwise we'll move on.
- No, I don't. Thank you.
- Okay.
- Motion to close the floor.
- Okay, by Stevens to close the floor. Do we have a second?
- Second.
- Second.
- Second by Lefebvre. All in favor, please say aye?
- [All] Aye.
- All opposed? That passes unanimously. So I would entertain a motion then from the Committee?
- Motion to approve, excluding the patio.
- Okay, by Stevens. Do we have a second?
- Second.
- Second.
- That was a tie. I'll give it to Lefebvre. Seconded by Lefebvre. All in favor, please say aye?
- [All] Aye.
- That passes except for the patio. So, Virginia, you can work that all with, like I said, the Clerk's Office and I don't know if 448-3010, I think that would be one number to call. And then the Planning Office or Inspection would be 448-3300. So if you keep in touch with those two, they should be able to help you out.
- I appreciate it. Thank you.
- Okay, you're welcome. And again, this goes to City Council next week, but everything should look pretty good. So I just wanted to let you know that October 6th is the meeting and they will talk about that as well. So I don't foresee any problems, but there's always that slim, slim chance.

- Okay. All right. Thank you.

- You bet. Okay. Are we ready?

- Yep. Item number seven.

- Number seven. Consideration with possible action on an appeal by Adrian Summers regarding the denial of his public vehicle operator's license. Staff?

- Staff recommendation is to deny the appeal as the appellant is a convicted felon and habitual law offender for offenses that substantially relate. There is a memo detailing those offenses and convictions in your packet. And I defer to Police.

- Yeah, for some reason, I'm having a hard time bringing, I did see it before, but is there a way to, you don't want to put that on?

- I wouldn't be able to screen share that, no.

- Yeah, I understand. I understand. Okay. Well, first of all, from Committee, have you had a chance to look at this at all? Do you have any questions?

- Is Mr. Summers, is he gonna be, Mark, is Mr. Summers gonna be speaking to us tonight? If he's here, I would entertain that thought.

- If you open the floor.

- Is Mr. Summers here today?

- Yes I am.

- All right. A motion to open the floor? By who, someone make that motion?

- [Kathy] I make the motion to open the floor.

- Motion to open the floor.

- By Lefebvre, seconded by Vander Leest. All in favor, please say aye?

- [All] Aye.

- All opposed? Okay. Mr. Summers, so you have the floor. Please state your name and address for the record, and then we'll move forward.

- My name is Adrian Summers. My address is 1813 9th Street, apartment 26, Green Bay, Wisconsin, 54304. I've been helping out in the public. I've been successfully off probation for about two and a half years now. I worked at Pizza Hut with no issues for a year, dealing with cash, food, Arby's, throughout my probation successful, like working with cash, food, and

customer service. I got rid of all the bad influences in my life. I can't praise that all of myself, I had help with my wonderful fiancé and my daughter now. And I'm actually expecting one in April. And I've been, I haven't done anything, like, honestly stupid, in a long time. I don't plan on going back to any of those ways, 'cause I'm not risking losing my family.

- Okay. And I apologize for this. One of the other Committee members will have to kind of look at the felony record. For some reason I can't bring that forward right now. I did look at it before, and it seemed fine with me. But if the Committee could chime in a little bit if they have any concerns? Any concerns at all from the Committee?

- [Kathy] Mr. Chairman?

- Yes. Go ahead.

- [Kathy] Yeah, I see the last time was 2018. It was a small, operating a vehicle without insurance. That is a small one. I like giving people second chances, as we did someone before. I just wonder if, yeah, I wonder on this one here. The theft is a bad one. But that's down five years ago. And he does have a family now. Do you, does anyone else feel that there's a problem, driving for Yellow Cab? I don't think I could really--

- I was gonna ask, with Alder Lefebvre, just to piggyback on what you're saying, I was gonna ask Mr. Summers, if he has any letters of recommendation at all or any letters from your parole? Anything that you worked with over time, that could help here?

- I sent in the completion of probation from my PO.

- Okay, all right. That's what I wanted to hear. Okay. Anybody else on Committee?

- Yes, Mark, I'd like to see this gentleman get a second chance. He lives in my district. And I do shop at Pizza Hut. They have good pizza. I would say let's give him a chance.

- Okay.

- Thank you.

- All right, then I would entertain a motion? Oh, first of all, let's, anybody else to speak? Otherwise I would entertain a motion to close the floor.

- Motion to close the floor.

- Does Annie, did you want to speak? Somebody was saying, somebody else wanted to speak? Anyway. Okay, motion to close the floor--

- [Julia] Yes, I do.

- Pardon? Go ahead?

- [Julia] My name is Julia Arnoldi. And I'm actually the manager at Yellow Cab.

- Okay, Julia, what's your address for the record please?

- [Julia] Sure, it's 511 Clover Lane, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

- Okay, go ahead.

- [Julia] I work at Yellow Cab. We're confident in hiring Adrian. We're live dispatched. We have a screen that shows exactly where the vehicles are at all times. We have up to 20 vehicles on at a time. We're equipped with radios, GPS, and dash cams. Our phone number and our cab number is written in eight inch letters on the cabs. So as you know, everybody's got a cell phone, so I'm pretty confident that nothing can happen. 90% of what we do is repetitive customers and contracted runs. So if anything were to go south at all, we would know about it right away.

- Right. Okay. Good. Thank you for your testimony.

- [Julia] You're welcome.

- All right, anybody else? Otherwise I would entertain a motion to close the floor.

- Mr. Chairman?

- Yeah, go ahead. Yes, go ahead.

- [Kathy] Yeah, I'm sorry, is it, I forgot, with the police, who's on the call again? I keep forgetting.

- Lieutenant Mahoney?

- [Kathy] Oh, Lieutenant Mahoney, if we grant this and there is anything that comes up, then he will definitely would lose that license, I would assume, if he's convicted on anything, right?

- His operator's license or the license that the City is granting him? Like his driver's license or his operator's license?

- [Kathy] His operator's license, which we are going to grant. If we do, if we pass this.

- I know, us, at the Police Department, we don't, when he's convicted, I don't know if that's through the Municipal Court. We don't want to handle that. I believe it would probably have to go back through Committee to seek to revoke the operator's license from him. It's not something that's automatic.

- Right.

- [Kathy] Okay. And it would be something that we would be notified, I would assume?

- Essentially, Alder Lefebvre, we wouldn't automatically be notified. If we did somehow find

out about it, we would be able to pursue revocation. However, I believe it's a yearly renewal, if I'm not mistaken. So at the time of the renewal process, if there has been a conviction for another offense between the approval on the renewal, then we would be able to deny the renewal.

- [Kathy] Okay. = But there isn't a mechanism in place that automatically revokes if there's an offense.

- [Kathy] Okay. But in a year's time. Okay. We would get, I would like to just mention to the gentlemen that be aware that this is, if we do grant this that we are, to live up to what you're saying, and that we would revoke that license if something comes up that's whatever. So, okay?

- Right.

- [Kathy] I just wanted to let him know that.

- All right, thank you, Alder Lefebvre.

- We do have a motion to close by Alder Stevens. We just need a second for that.

- We need a second.

- Second.

- Second.

- Second by Vander Leest. All in favor, please say aye?

- [All] Aye.

- All opposed? That passes unanimously. Committee, I can't say the word unanimously, Committee, I'll entertain a motion?

- I'd like to make a motion to give him a second chance.

- All right, Alder Vander Leest, a motion. And a second by--

- [Kathy] I'll second that. Any other discussion? All in favor, please say aye?

- [All] Aye.

- All opposed? That passes unanimously. Again, this goes to City Council on October 6th. So if you want to make double sure that it's, that's at 6:00 PM, same kind of Zoom meeting.

- Alright. Thank you, sir. Thank you, guys.

- You bet.

- [Kathy] Take care.
- All right.
- Item number eight.
- I changed my, okay, hold on a second. I'm sorry. Number eight. Consideration with possible action on an appeal by Andrea Pleshek regarding the denial of her operator's license. Staff?
- Staff's recommendation is to deny the appeal as the appellant is a habitual law offender for offenses that substantially relate.
- Okay.
- All of her convictions and offenses are listed as well in the denial memo.
- Okay. Police?
- Police concur with Law.
- Okay. All right. Well, I would entertain a motion to open the floor, 'cause I think Andrea is here.
- Motion to open the floor.
- I would make a motion.
- Okay, by Stevens to open the floor, seconded by Lefebvre. All in favor, please say aye?
- [All] Aye.
- All opposed? That passes unanimously. Annie does that how, is that you? Okay, you're muted right now.
- Yes, that's me.
- So just state your name and address for the record and then we will ask you questions.
- My name is Andrea Pleshek. My address is 3721 Flintville Road in Suamico, Wisconsin, 54313. I'm asking for reconsideration today to appeal. I mean, there's really nothing I can say. My record does speak for itself. And that's something that I've been dealing with and trying to get over. I've since had two beautiful little girls that I have full time. And I've gone to school for medical assisting, and I worked in that area for quite some time. And it's just that I like the atmosphere with customers and I enjoy doing. And it's something that I would like to continue to do.
- Okay. I did get several calls from your employer, Will, over at Keggers, and who is a very

successful businessman in town, and he vouches very highly for you. So I just wanted to mention that.

- Committee, do we--

- Thank you.

- Okay, Committee, do we have any questions right now?

- Can we get just the history on the offenses, Mark? The time period? I can't pull it up on my screen right now. Maybe as far as the--

- Joanne?

- Sure, the most recent was 2014, for disorderly conduct and obstructing an officer. 2013, operating while revoked. First, 2012, battery misdemeanor, disorderly conduct misdemeanor. No felonies, all misdemeanors. Just from 2007 through 2014 was her most recent.

- And might I add real quick?

- Hold on, Annie--

- I don't drink anymore. I'm sorry.

- Annie, I'm sorry. We closed the floor.

- Oh, sorry.

- I would make a motion to open the floor one more time.

- No.

- We didn't close it.

- The floor's still open.

- Okay.

- [Kathy] Yeah, the floor was still, yeah.

- Barb, I'm watching ya. You're shaking your head.

- It's okay, it's open.

- Okay, it's open. Thank you for that. Okay, go ahead, Annie.

- I wanted to let you guys know. I don't drink anymore. I work at a bar, but it's something I don't like doing anymore. Like I said, I have my two daughters and I just, I've really, back

from everything that I was doing. And I did have a drinking problem previously. But it's something that I just do not enjoy doing anymore. So I feel like I can make better choices and be more responsible in a way that I wasn't able.

- Okay. Alder Dorff?

- [Kathy] And Andrea? May I speak.

- Thank you, Chair.

- Let Alder Dorff, and then I'll get you.

- [Kathy] Oh, I'm sorry, go ahead.

- Okay. Annie, did you have any intervention, any treatment and counseling?

- Yes, I did have, I've had it in the past when I was a teenager. I went and struggled with that growing up. And I did have some rehabilitation, some outpatient rehabilitation. But really, it was just something that I did on my own, when I found out I was pregnant, it was something that I just did on my own. I decided that I was gonna put my life in a new direction. I moved out to Arizona to live with my mom so I could go to school. And I did the medical field for some time, but it was just really, really stressful, being a single mom and working 40 plus hours a week and having to get the kids, it was really difficult. So I kind of moved out of that. But I feel like I am in a positive direction with my life right now.

- Okay.

- And I see that that most of these things were quite a long time ago. Some of them as much as 13 years ago that are listed here. So, thank you. I'm not on the Committee, but I am on Council. So I will be voting on this on Tuesday.

- Sure.

- Thank you, Chair.

- Thank you, Barb. I see Will is here too. Will, I mentioned your name already.

- Yes. Thank you.

- I mentioned that you put in a very good word for Annie on two occasions. And I respect your business acumen as well. So I just wanted to let the Committee know that. So, pardon? Go ahead.

- Hi. My name is Will Liebergen, owner of Keggers, 231 North Broadway, Green Bay, Wisconsin. Bar for 13 years. I've actually only lobbied on behalf of one bartender in 13 years, ironically, but I was, as I do hire most people, I don't hire them based on their background. I believe I'm not supposed to even consider background into hiring someone. So when I heard she was denied, and then I looked further into her background I was actually kind of struck

because of her character at work so far. Annie reached out to me during the shutdown, asking if she could come back and work. Only one or two shifts prior to the shutdown. And she had reached out to me directly asking me if she could have some hours and hop back into our rotation once we opened. And she's been with me ever since, working as much as 40 hours some weeks, and I haven't had any incidents with her. In fact, I've had incidents where she has brought up more safe serving incidents than incidents that I thought I had to step in and intervene. So I was struck that it was, she had a background involving alcohol and using it inappropriately and then getting out of control with it. So I just, seeing her being in control of alcohol, and so that's why I'm here today, just to lobby on her behalf. And if we hold, it's tough to hold people, there's a big change in Annie's life, I think, with moving to Arizona, taking some medical classes, and also having two children. Just in someone's life that I really think should be considered.

- Right. Thank you for that, Will. Does anybody have any other questions for Annie or Will? Otherwise we can move on here. I'd entertain a motion?

- Motion to close the floor.

- Okay, motion to close the floor by Stevens. Do we have a second?

- Second.

- Second by Vander Leest.

- All in favor, please say aye?

- [All] Aye.

- All opposed? I'm gonna say some quickly, and then Alder Stevens, I'm gonna have to bow out. I gotta get on my other agenda item. So you'll take over after this. And I'll try to get back into the meeting if I can, I should be able to. Anyway, I feel strongly about this. I think, like I said, there are a number of misdemeanors here, and I think that Annie has turned her life around. So I feel comfortable with this. Committee, do you want to add anything to that?

- [Kathy] Mr. Chairman, I also believe that, it sounds like her employer has given a really good recommendation, and I was concerned about being around alcohol, once you're an alcoholic, even if it's years later, sometimes it's difficult, but I can see from her employer, he said that she can really handle it and she can notice if other people are having problems in the bar. So I think that's a good recommendation So I would vote yes to approve this.

- All right, well.

- Second.

- Thank you. By Lefebvre, seconded by Stevens. Any other discussion? All in favor, please say aye?

- [All] Aye.

- All opposed? That passes unanimously. Annie, good luck. Will, same with you and your group. And this will go to Council, again, on October 6th at 6:00 PM, just in case. But generally speaking it goes pretty well. But thank you for your testimony and good luck.

- Thank you.

- Thank you.

- Oh, Alder Dorff?

- I was just gonna ask, I see that your items are the last ones in the Plan agenda. Would you be able to stay? Or did you have them moved up?

- Well, I think it's the first item.

- I believe it's the second. Or his is the last two ones.

- I'm number one. I'm number one. I'm right off the bat.

- Well I hope you can come back.

- Well listen, I've been reading a lot on this, Barb, believe me. So I would like to weigh in on that when we can, but I think for now, I need to kind of, my neighborhood's calling me, so I need to kind of go there. So I'll check out for now. And hopefully I'll get back into the meeting.

- [Kathy] Okay, Mark.

- Thank you.

- Okay.

- Okay. Bye bye. Now, stop video.

- You ready, Joanne?

- Yes. Item number nine.

- Consideration with possible action on communication from Alder Dorff to research and create an equal rights ordinance for the City of Green Bay. Previously discussed at the July 8th, 2019, is that right, 2019?

- Yes.

- Okay.

- Yep.

- July 13th, 2020, July 16, 2020, August 10, 2020, and September 3rd, 2020, Protection and Policy meetings. Alder Dorff?

- Thank you. So the sixth time is the charm, that's what I'm thinking. And that this time we will move it forward to City Council. The way I'd like to see this go is perhaps to have Lindsay, Attorney Lindsay Mather, explain the memo and there are a number of people then that would like to talk and to testify. So after that memo gets explained, could we open the floor, Chair?

- Yes.

- Okay.

- Attorney?

- Thank you, Alder Dorff and Alder Stevens. Just to clarify, do you want me to go through the protected classes memo, the memo that I sent this afternoon about the constitutional issues or both?

- I think probably, if this is okay, Chair, I think probably both.

- Okay.

- Yes.

- I certainly can do that, and I'm happy to do that, I just wanted to make sure. Let's start with the protected classes memo. As requested at the previous Protection and Policy meeting, this is a comparison of the proposed ordinance to other, to state and federal law, to kind of highlight the similarities and differences between our proposed ordinance and those sources of law.

- Can we put that on the screen?

- Probably?

- Celestine?

- [Celestine] Yes, I can, I would make Lindsay, do you want to share that Lindsay?

- I think so. Yeah.

- [Celestine] Okay, I can--

- I think I know how to do that.

- [Celestine] Okay, you are a cohost.

- Okay. Now, oh, I see. What's happening. Oh, I see. I'm sorry guys. Oops, that's the wrong

one. Sorry, not, haven't had to do this in this context before. There we go. Why isn't it--

- [Celestine] There you go.

- There you go.

- There it is.

- Okay. You can see the memo, cause I can't--

- Can you make it bigger a little bigger? Can you make it bigger a little bit?

- Yes.

- Okay.

- Just like--

- Good, that's good.

- Okay. Sorry about that. So here are the protected classes in the proposed ordinance. And the ones that are highlighted are the ones that are not explicitly stated in state or federal law. The gender identity, gender expression, gender nonconformity, and transgender status, those were added to conform with the City's personnel policies, which were adopted by Council last year. And those are quoted down here. Those have those categories in there as well. Those were added last year. And so they've been added to the proposed language. And additionally, particularly the recent Supreme Court case, but there's other case law as well, supporting the idea that each of those. Category of sex, and therefore is already protected under federal and state law. I don't know if you want me to go too in depth with the differences between, I tried to just highlight what, for example, our ordinance is Section 50.04, and I compared it to the federal Fair Housing Act and then state law. The federal law states only race, color, religion, sex, familial status, or national origin. So everything that's in our ordinance that goes beyond those few categories is obviously not included in federal law. And then the ones that are specifically stated there, in the box below, are the ones that are not explicitly stated in state law with respect to housing. And I did it like this because the state protections for housing, public accommodations, and employment are all a little bit different. So I just wanted to make it as clear as I could, which classes were protected and which areas under state and federal law. But under the equal rights ordinance, the same classes are protected in all three categories. So I'll just scroll down here. So again, this is with respect to public accommodations. Federal law. Again. And these are all of the categories not specifically stated in state law. And again, these are the, this last one is employment law. And there are some categories in state employment law that are not included in the protected classes in our proposed ordinance. And I just noted below the slight difference between Military service in the state law and our past and present Military service, which is essentially the same, but it is technically worded differently. And all of the categories that are up here in our protected person definition fall within one of these other categories, except for the ones that I have highlighted, which, and I've already talked about, the gender related ones, those all fall under the sex category. So that's kind of a very quick overview of

that one. Any questions specific to that one from alders that I can answer? Or you want me to just jump into the next one?

- [John] I have a question for you, ma'am.

- Yes, sir.

- On this ordinance, is this kind of following what De Pere was trying to propose, that De Pere proposed there? Are you following that one? As far as, they did have a, there were some litigation, I think, brought against the City of De Pere in, how is this gonna do the test, as far as lawsuits that might come forward?

- Sure. That's actually a brilliant segue into the second memo.

- Let me just ask you this, ma'am. This is a very specially type of law. I've talked to some different attorneys, and the people that are actually involved with this type of law, it's a specialty law category. The County has, they've been, talked about this at the County level. And the County, what they want to do is that if people have any complaints, the County wants to assist them as far as directing them in the right spot, to the right agency, with either the state or the federal government. There can be some very expensive law fees, attorney fees, involved with this. So that's some of my concern there, that do we have the expertise to, we're having like a nine member committee that's gonna be involved here. The average person is not gonna grasp onto this type of litigation as far as lawsuits or whatever. And it's a specialty career field as far as when you look at human rights and housing ordinances and things like that. So that's my concern.

- Sure. Well, the second half of your question, I think we've discussed before, that the committee itself, the nine person committee, or I'm sorry, the equal rights commission, will not actually be handling complaints or assessing whether discrimination has occurred. So they won't need the kind of specialized training that you're referring to. With respect to your first question about, is this similar to De Pere's ordinance, and is our ordinance going to be vulnerable to the same types of challenges that De Pere faced? Yes, in structure, it is largely based on De Pere's ordinance, as well as some other ordinances from nearby municipalities. But the challenge that De Pere faced was specifically with respect to the definition of places of public accommodation or amusement, and De Pere did not specifically exclude religious organizations, associations, et cetera, from the definition of public places of accommodation or amusement. And our ordinance does explicitly exclude religious organizations and associations from that definition. So it's not subject to the, it's not vulnerable to the same challenge that De Pere ultimately faced. Some of the other, that was the first question that we discussed, or that was discussed in that memo. And as is noted on the memo, it is attorney-client privilege, so I'm not going to go through all of it in detail, but I do want to point out that, both Vanessa and I have reviewed this extensively. Both of us are familiar with constitutional law and have done a lot of research with respect to questions that have been raised by the alders. And if you have specific questions, I'm happy to answer them. But as far as expertise goes, we did put the work into this and we did research it to make sure it's constitutionally sound. And that's explained in more detail in that memo that I sent out this afternoon.

- Okay.

- [Kathy] I want to know, does it look like that the, all these, the housing, the public accommodations, employment, are those all pretty much covered under our City policies? Is there anything that's not in our City?

- Hang on one second. Sorry about that. Alder Steuer was in the waiting room.

- [Kathy] Oh, I'm sorry.

- No, no, not your fault. No, I just got distracted.

- [Celestine] I'm sorry, Lindsay, can you make me a host again? For some reason it made you the host and not the co-host, so can you just make me the host again?

- You bet.

- Thanks.

- No problem.

- Sorry about that.

- I'm back, but I'll .

- I'm sorry, Alder Lefebvre, your question was, do current City policies?

- [Kathy] Right right. Is there, right, the different ones you have here, the unemployment, the public accommodations, the housing, is there anything in our City policy for fair treatment? Is there anything that's not covered in these, these sections here, that's in our City policy?

- So the City, there is nothing in our current code with respect to non-discrimination in these three areas. And if I'm understanding correctly, the City's actual policies would just, really just be in the area of employment because they would apply to City employees. And so they wouldn't go into the areas of public accommodations and housing.

- [Kathy] And housing. Okay. That makes sense. Thank you.

- The Housing Authority would have its own policies and would be subject to HUD guidelines and all of those kinds of things. But again, that's not necessarily within current City policies.

- [Kathy] Okay. And the housing is pretty much covered, all of these, by state or federal law. And it seems like those are pretty much in our, in this ERO, right?

- That's correct. That's correct.

- [Kathy] Okay. Yeah. And employment, there might be a couple of things that are, I'm trying to think if there's anything different here. It looks like it's pretty much covered all of them by

either state or federal.

- Yes ma'am.

- [Kathy] Is there anything that we are putting in that is not?

- That's what we were talking about in that memo that I showed on my screen. I suppose you might not be able to see it since you're on the phone. But that was, the memo that I sent out a little over a week ago and that just, it highlighted the classes that are included, the protected classes that are included in our ordinance that are not included in state or federal law. And just to recap, those are receipt of rental assistance, gender identity, gender expression, gender nonconformity, and transgender status.

- [Kathy] Yeah. I think I got it here too. It came up. Okay.

- Okay.

- Thank you.

- That's all I have for now, Alder Dorff, unless there was something else you wanted me to speak to?

- Just, I really wanted the alders that had the questions, which is the reason we came back, the reason you wrote the memo, to ask their questions, to make sure that this is clarified for them. And I see we have other alders out there. And I'm hoping that if they have questions they will speak up at this point. You must have did a really great job explaining it.

- Thank you.

- Well, there's a few things that I was gonna bring up, but I can't, I'm gonna go to Chair Stevens. I'm gonna let you, you're handling at this point. I missed a few minutes of the meeting of this point. So I might repeat myself. I do have a letter from a citizen in Green Bay that I wanted to read into the record, if I could.

- It looks like there's a bunch of people that may want to speak on this. Should we open the floor?

- But it's okay. I would like Alder Steuer to go first.

- Okay, I just want to read this, and then if you want to open the floor for that, that's fine. This is from an Attorney Rob Miller--

- Yeah, my question would've been, do you want to do it now or after?

- Well, it does, whenever. I'll leave that up to you.

- You can do it now if you'd like.

- Okay. This is a letter from Attorney Rob Miller, 227 South Van Buren Street, Green Bay, 54301. And he just wrote, "The effects of the equal rights ordinance "says the equal rights ordinance will have the effect "of raising the application fees on rental properties "within Green Bay. "It may also have the effect of raising the rents "and lowering the value of rental real estate. "About half of the Section 8 recipients "are elderly and disabled. "They probably have no difficulty securing an apartment. "The other half of Section 8 recipients "pose greater problems. "If the landlord has to consider every Section 8 recipient "who applies, the probable result will be "an increase in the application fees, "so the landlord lessens the number of applicants. "The concerns here are that the Section recipient "probably has a lower credit rating "than the average applicant, "and also is not capable of paying for the damages "behind the security deposit. "The latter problem could be remedied "if the City of Green Bay would like to step up "and pay for the damages caused by Section 8 recipients "over and above their security deposit. "After all, if this is a small problem, "it should be spread across the population "of the City of Green Bay and not just borne by landlords. "The net result here is that the very population "that the City of Green Bay is trying to help "will be hurt by this enactment. "We learned that landlords now have to keep "the documentation of any Section 8 recipient's records "for at least a year. "Rents will rise to compensate the landlord "for this additional work. "In addition, landlords will face additional expenses "in litigation with the City of Green Bay "because of claims made against them under this act. "As a consequence of this legislation, the City of Green Bay "will be a less attractive place to build rental housing. "The increasing demand for housing will mean "a smaller supply, raising rents for everyone. "The net result of the equal rights ordinance "will be adverse for the very people "that it is designed to help." I mentioned that I would read this into the record, and I did, and that's all I have for now. So, thank you, Chair.

- All right, great. Should we take this moment maybe to open the floor, or Alder Gerlach?

- I would just like to ask if Attorney Mather would define Section 8 for us, please.

- So the, sorry, give me just one second here. The ordinance, actually the protected classes, actually, those who are receiving, it's receipt of rental assistance. So it includes the receipt of Section 8, it's commonly known as Section 8. It's a program from HUD, where HUD makes, actually enters into a contract with the landlord and provides money for the tenant's housing that way. But the definition in the ordinance is actually, it includes Section 8 but it's also, "or any other rental assistance "that is not considered household income." So it's not just Section 8, it's, whether it comes from the federal government or another source, it's just the receipt of rental assistance other than income.

- Thank you.

- So I have a question on that. So I understand Housing Section 8, ICS, and you have any other payment, is that an ongoing payment, or would that exclude a onetime payment? Attorney?

- I'm not sure I understand the question.

- So, Housing and ICS, the payment structure is longterm, month after month after month. But you made a comment about any other type of payment. There's programs out there

where it's a onetime payment that they need assistance with their rental payment. And it's a onetime deal, one month, it's done and over with. Is that excluded from that? Or is that included? 'Cause when you say Section 8, you're talking about month after month after month in which they're gonna receive that.

- It's written very broadly, so I believe it could include that, that type of situation. But I honestly don't know enough about it. But yes, my interpretation would be any household, any assistance toward rental, any money received toward rental assistance, which could include a onetime payment.

- That's the only question I have at the moment. Mark, did you have something?

- Yes. Thank you, Chair. Lindsay, I was reading through the document that you sent today. Sadly, I wish I would've had another day to look at it. But there you mention "That the proposed ERO "is neutral and generally applicable "to all places of public combination or amusement "as that term is defined in the ordinance." And I guess my question was, and maybe to Alder Dorff as well, is that looking at this entire ordinance, I think one of the questions was, are we trying to override, not override, but the fact is we have state and federal regulations on many of these things. Locally, it sounds like you're saying that if we do it locally, it'll just be another plaudit for the state and the federal government to have. And I'm just trying to get that in my mind, as far as, what the importance of doing it locally as opposed to having the state and federal government already deal with that. I just need some clarification that way, why locally, we need to do it?

- Chair?

- Now Alder Dorff's raising her hand.

- Alder Dorff?

- Thank you, Chair. So I think that the purpose is best stated in the first paragraph where it was written, "A vibrant, livable, successful, and productive city "is made possible by the talents, contributions, "and wellbeing of its diverse residents. "It is the policy of the City that the equal rights "of all those who live and work in the city "are ensured and that equal rights and equal opportunities "within the context of the larger commercial "and social fabric of the Green Bay community are promoted." So what I'm saying is, we're saying in Green Bay, "Yes, here we are. This is what we stand for. "This is who we welcome into our community. "This is who we value in our community." So it is just another emphasis on the things that we value, emphasizing what state and federal laws have in place, and even actually raising it to a little bit higher level.

- And like I said, Alder Dorff, if I'm not trying to disparage any of this, I just think that there will be questions that come forward, and we just need clarification on some of it. And I've tried to read the general ordinance is, what 16 pages, there's a lot in there. I think, what other communities in your research are, have done work to this degree? It sounds like Milwaukee, Madison, Racine, there's some other communities, I believe, that have something on the books, Appleton, I believe.

- De Pere.

- I just, that just have any kind of equal rights ordinance on their books?

- Yeah.

- Is that what you're asking?

- I suppose there's variations to that too, because we have housing, and you got, we kind of seem like we put a lot of it into this ordinance. It's not separated out.

- Most of the places that I looked at did have all three areas covered, housing, public accommodation, employment. But it really was, there are municipalities all over the state. This is not uncommon. It's actually, as Alder Dorff indicated from the very beginning of this, one of the reasons that it was brought forward in the City was because it was found to be an impediment to fair housing in the City to not have an ordinance like this. State law even, there's even a provision in state law where the intent portion of the statute specifically says that even though it's a state law, it doesn't absolve municipalities of their duty to enact similar legislation to protect access to fair housing and those kinds of things. It's not uncommon. It's actually viewed as a very positive thing to do at the local level because, among other things, like Alder Dorff said, it is making a statement as a community, but also, when there are local ordinances, there's a higher likelihood of the ordinances being enforced more fully. So even though these laws are in place at the state and federal level, when you enact an ordinance at the municipal level, you're more likely to get more, more people who are willing to say, "This is, "I haven't been treated fairly." And then we can eliminate more discrimination within the City than we could do if we left it just under the state law.

- Well, thank you, Lindsay. Alder Dorff, oh, I'm sorry. I just had another question. Alder Dorff, I've been getting calls from landlords and such around the community. And I think I just want to see if there's a way that this ordinance, the way it's worded, will ensure landlords that they won't lose any of their rights as landlords as well. And I don't know how to really word that. I might be skirting the issue a little bit. But like I said, whenever you put an ordinance or something into effect, there's always gonna be a cause and effect. It's gonna do one thing one way and one thing another way. And I'm just trying to understand that. Discrimination is terrible, and I understand that. I grew up in Milwaukee, so believe me, I have many stories of that. So I'm just trying to see if that, if there's some words of encouragement or something that you could give that we can give to landlords and say that, "You know what, we're not..." I don't know how you'd, like I said, I don't know if you know where I'm going with this. I'm just trying to get some--

- I do.

- Alder Stevens, you're involved in rentals, so maybe you could help me on that, go ahead.

- So, before we get to that comment, Lindsay, do we need to notify the public what we do? As our job?

- Sure. Yeah. I, Joanne, are you around?

- I am.

- Would it be appropriate to do now or just before the vote? As far as disclosures?

- The disclosures can come at any point. So if an alder does want to make a disclosure, then that can happen now or prior to the vote. Or you can do both as well.

- I asked the question now, so we might as well do it now. Many don't know that I do property management in the City of Green Bay. So I'm very passionate when it comes to Section 8 housing, and I know it very well. So I just need to disclose that, that I do do property management here in Green Bay.

- So, may I answer Alder Steuer's question with sort of an answer?

- If I--

- Go ahead.

- If I--

- Alder Dorff?

- Yeah? Are there any other alders on the Committee that own or manage rental properties that would need to make a similar disclosure to Alder Stevens?

- Alder Vander Leest. I am a property owner and I do rent properties. I'm on the commercial end of the business, not residential. But I do that. So, I'll mention that now.

- Thank you, Alder. Go ahead, Alder Dorff.

- I'm gonna mention one other thing, ma'am. When Alder Steuer was talking, I kinda got cut out. Is there a reason that I didn't hear his words as he was speaking? In other words, my screen will just, it won't transmit any, I can see Mark, and it's like the screen is at a still, and no communication through my device.

- [Celestine] Yes, Alder? This is Celestine. That is your Wi-Fi connection that's doing that.

- That's the Wi-Fi? Okay. I'm sorry.

- [Celestine] Yes.

- I didn't know that.

- [Celestine] So sorry about that.

- No problem. Thank you.

- Alder Dorff?

- So a question that I was asked today was, "If a landlord has certain screening criteria, "as long as the screening criteria "does not include protected classes, "I believe that other screening criteria "can be implemented. "For example, like a credit score as a screening criteria." Am I correct on that, Attorney Mather?

- You are.

- Okay. So that would be a protection there that a landlord would have, as long as everyone is treated equally. And if there are screening requirements, they still can be in place, but it can't be a screening requirement that is, "This certain protected class may not live in my rental."

- Correct. And just to provide a more specific answer, in section 50.04, subsection 4, it talks about information that you are still allowed to collect that does not violate the ordinance. And the first one specifically talks about person's prior residence or familial, marital, financial, and business status. So it does still provide section, and the following as well, the ability to pay rent and other obligations when due, is also something that you can still take into account when you're analyzing somebody's application for housing. And so there are still, it's not completely removing all of those protections. Obviously, landlords, it's very important that you still be able to do those things. This is just saying you, like Alder Dorff said. "You can't just have a blanket ban "on any protected classes."

- Thank you. Anything else, Alder Dorff?

- No, I guess if there's no other alders that are gonna speak, maybe it's time to open the floor.

- Any other alders who would like to speak? If not, I'd entertain a motion to open the floor?

- Motion to open the floor.

- Second.

- Okay. How do I determine if someone wants to talk?

- [Celestine] So hi, Alder--

- Oh, all in favor. All in favor.

- [Celestine] Alder Stevens, I'll help you with that. This is Celestine Jeffries, I'm the Chief of Staff. So what you should do, if you would like to speak, and you are a member of the public, you can either raise your hand in Zoom, there's a feature to raise your hand. Or sometimes it's hard for me to see. I see Pastor Pahl, I see your hand, like literally figuratively, actually. You can also just unmute yourself and begin speaking. And then once you do that, I'll acknowledge you. And I will give you the three minute timer.

- We do still have to vote on--

- We have to vote.

- Oh, yes, sorry. I jumped the gun.

- No, that's fine. Just all in favor, for Alder Stevens, just all in favor.

- [All] Aye.

- All right, we are open, Celestine.

- [Celestine] Okay. Pastor Pahl, please unmute yourself, and state your name and address for the Committee.

- My name is Jon Pahl and I live at N10717 Lakeshore Road, Clintonville, Wisconsin, 54929. And I have a prepared statement for the group, if I could share it?

- [Celestine] Go right ahead.

- I'm Dr. Jon Pahl, Pastor at Union Congregational United Church of Christ, the longest continually worshipping Protestant congregation in the state of Wisconsin. It was a stop on the Underground Railroad. It was active in the women's suffrage movement. Founded the Green Bay Chapter of Habitat for Humanity and has a 20 year history of being open and affirming to individuals who identify as LGBTQ. Our congregation advocates for the American ideas of liberty and equal justice for all under the law. I speak this evening to commend the Council for proposing an equal rights ordinance for Green Bay, with clearly delineated, protected status individuals and groups, and I urge you to pass it. On this Eve of Yom Kippur, it is perhaps good to recall that when the United Nations passed its Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, it did so in the wake of the horrific persecution of Jews in Nazi Germany. Fortunately Green Bay's equal rights ordinance does not have such a tragic context, yet there is compelling evidence that hate crimes and acts of violence, targeting minorities and other vulnerable individuals, are on the rise in the United States, as documented by the Anti-Defamation League, the NAACP, Amnesty International, the Human Rights Campaign, and many other agencies. The ADL put it concisely in its recent mayor's compact to combat hate extremism and bigotry, and I quote, "We have seen an increase in hate violence "xenophobic rhetoric, and discriminatory actions "that target minorities." Such discrimination cannot be consistent with the warm hospitality and generosity that has made Green Bay a destination for so many. Instead, "the better angels of our nature," as Abraham Lincoln put it, whose picture hangs in Union Church, inspire us to become a more inclusive, pluralistic, tolerant, and exuberantly diverse city. The US First Amendment and a securing of religious freedom was intended preeminently to protect minorities, a heritage currently under threat from representatives of the majority, who claim privileged status as if aggrieved. Such a goal to protect, especially the most vulnerable among us, articulated well in this equal rights ordinance, is consistent with the deep ethic of love of neighbor at the heart of the world's historic religious traditions, including the Christianity practiced at Union Church. I'm glad as a historian of religions and a Christian pastor here in Green Bay to speak on behalf of this equal rights ordinance. And I encourage you to enact it, as a way to declare our

commitment as a city, robust pluralism that makes America great. Thank you for listening to me.

- [Celestine] Thank you, Pastor Pahl. Next I have Noah Reef. Noah Reef, please unmute yourself, and state your name and address for the Committee.

- Hi, my name is Noah Reef. I reside at 3502 Layden Drive in De Pere, Wisconsin. Although that is not in the City of Green Bay. I am very familiar with nondiscrimination ordinances, especially when there was discussion in De Pere several years ago. And I come to you today, not speaking as an expert on policy, not speaking as an expert on anything other than my own experiences, but I'm a trans-American and a trans-resident of the Brown County area. To say that it is very humbling to see that the City of Green Bay is thinking about taking this up, and is in the process of hopefully passing this, I cannot. Means, as someone who is trans and who often feels that the concerns of our community are not always met. And I'm just very pleased that the City Council and the Committee is taking this up. So to me, I went to college at St. Norbert and UWGB. I went to both schools. This community is home to me. I've been privileged to travel around the state, doing lots of work over the last several years. And to me, this part of the state is home. And to put it very bluntly, this kind of, this ordinance, this equal rights ordinance, that would not only signal to myself, but also to those among, those in the community who are less privileged than I to have employment, to be in a field where I am treated as valid and as a human is, it's truly, I have trouble putting into words how much it would mean to see this passed in the City of Green Bay that has really become my home. I am very aware that there have, I'm just very aware of how privileged I am to be trans, to be open about it, and to be a member of the community. It's a privilege that not many of us have that opportunity, unfortunately. And to me, this simple ordinance, and while there are questions to certainly be answered, there are obviously policy details and discussions that need to be had, and I know that you're having them, the passing of this ordinance goes a long way to recognizing the humanity, not just of our entire community, but of myself as well. It is a humbling thing to not, to know that you are not always seen as equal to others. And to know that this courtesy would be extended, not courtesy, but this right would be extended to myself and members of my community, is truly, it is not the end goal, but it is a big step in the right direction that we need to take. And as it's been outlined in previous, in the housing support that's come out, it is a barrier to making sure that the housing in Green Bay is equitable and just. So I just thank you. I urge you to vote yes for this. So thank you for your time.

- [Celestine] Thank you, Noah.

- Chair? Could I? I have a question.

- Okay, well, ask away.

- Could I ask Noah?

- Yes.

- Noah?

- Yes?

- Hi, Noah. Thank you for your testimony. I was reading a little bit about what happened in De Pere a couple of years ago, and you said you live in De Pere. And I was just trying to get a handle on it, and maybe you could kind of describe what happened, 'cause there was a lawsuit that was brought forward. And can you just describe briefly your experience in De Pere as good back or indifferent, as far as what happened there?

- So, that is a fairly long conversation. I'm sure--

- Yeah, I suppose. Well, what you can.

- I won't share the legal experience because that is not my area of expertise. I come to you as a member of the trans community, but to share, I will share what it meant to feel that the City of De Pere was standing up for, not only myself, but my community as well. I can say that it was a very contentious meeting. There were several, there were people who are very opposed to the enacting of this ordinance. But there were also a lot who were in favor. And I can say that I think it speaks very highly of the City of De Pere that they took this on with the acknowledgement that it could result in legal challenges, because the alders and those in power understood what it meant to, not just my community, but the community as a whole. I know that's not the exact legal analysis that you're looking for, and there are lawyers here who can have these actual conversations. But I want to center it on the humanity of this issue. And there are many of those in the community, and we, I know we started talking a little bit about it, but we talk about folks who would be most impacted. If you are a member of the trans community, especially trans person of color, you are more likely to be in a lower income situation than most. You are more likely to be in danger, physical danger, not just from community members, potentially, but also from institutions that are there to protect you, allegedly. This kind of ordinance goes a long way towards creating a safety net and showing to, not just like, again, not just the trans and the LGBTQ community, but marginalized communities, and of the community as a whole, that this is something that's very valuable and that we take everyone's experience and humanity very seriously. So again, I apologize, that's not the legal analysis.

- That's fine.

- But I just would like to bring it back to the human element here, and I. Just again, the City Council. Alder Dorff for bringing this up. It does mean a lot to our community. And thank you for your time.

- Thank you, Noah. That's all I needed. I wasn't expecting a whole legal description from you. But I thank you for your testimony. That's all.

- [Celestine] All right, next we have Cinnamon Harley. Cinnamon Harley, please unmute yourself and state your name and address for the Committee.

- [Cinnamon] Hi, I'm Cinnamon Harley. I live at 1198 Canterbury Road in Ashwaubenon. And I am a landlord. I have 23 units in Green Bay, or in Brown County, 22 of them are in Green Bay. And I'm here to speak about the ordinance. A little bit about me. I'm on the Board of

Directors of the Apartment Association of Northeast Wisconsin. I'm also a member of the Northeast Wisconsin Real Estate Investors Group. And I've also been serving on the Apartment Association COVID Task Force, or COVID-19 Task Force, that has been helping make sure that people aren't homeless throughout all of this and getting the information to landlords. And until last year, I had apartments in Marinette, and I worked with people who are in the Drug Court program and other people that are always in need of housing as well. The position of the Apartment Association is not to oppose the ordinance. And I also. But making these sections of the population protected classes are not gonna have the results that you're seeking. Landlords can and will get around this by changing their screening criteria, and it's just gonna make it a lot harder, and they're not gonna be violating it when they do that. So what I was proposing, when Brown County was facing this as well, is to try to meet with everyone and make things a lot better, working with the agencies, the local officials, landlords, and other groups, to try to come up with real solutions to help those that need affordable housing. And also, besides the ones that actually need it, but help those other ones who are temporarily in need find a way more permanent path to success. The people who need the rental assistance need more than just a label of a protected class. And to get the landlords involved we need to be able to, a way to minimize the risk in some way. And I've been working with Brown County Supervisors right now, the Brown County Housing and Homeless Coalition. I've started working with, we're trying to come up with a plan to make things better, as for these people, to make them more attractive as renters and to try to educate landlords as to other programs that can help to, in their assistance, to help these people as well, to make us have a better community. And that's pretty much what it boils down to. And the other thing that we're also trying to help is sometimes it's a transportation need. I looked at the SafeRide program, Brown County has the largest one there. There's a way that we can institute that to help these people to get jobs so it reduces their need for rental assistance. Not only is our local apartment association on board with the ordinance, the state organization, not only are they backing us, but they would like to try to take this statewide as well. We, as housing providers just, we're serious about finding real solutions to this. And that was just some of the things that we would like to work with you guys on.

- [Celestine] Thank you. Next we have a Melissa Cheslock. She's raised her hand. Ms. Cheslock, can you please unmute yourself and state your name and address for the Committee.

- Melissa Decker Cheslock, 2910 Bally Bunion Lane, Green Bay. I want to go back a little bit. I was born and raised in this town. I am 53 years old. And what really, I'm African-American, and what strikes the soul of me is that this is even still being discussed and argued about after having, this is the sixth time coming before the Committee. I will be honest and tell you that when we, my parents adopted me and then subsequently decided to leave Green Bay, I was ecstatic. I had had some of the most racist things happen to me, and it did involve me as a protected class. We had people who lived directly behind us, we lived at 1206 Richardine Court, who sent around a petition, telling my parents that they, who are white, did not want me living in their neighborhood because I would devalue the property. Now, if the landlords are more important than basic civil rights of individuals who should have been protected, based on the Civil Rights Act of 1964, that's sad. You want this to be considered a world class city. We have an NFL football team, and my understanding is that the team and the City would, at some point in time, like to have a Superbowl here. Well, if you want to be a city that welcomes people of all races, genders, sexual orientations, into their city and welcome

them, well, then you need to pass this ordinance. This is the only city in the NFL that does not have an ordinance like this. You can call it equal rights, civil rights, or human rights. And let's go back, not that long ago, when people here would not rent an apartment, a home, Bob Mann, if you remember Bob Mann, was the first Black football player for the Packers, and Coach Lombardi had to go and arrange accommodations at Hotel Northwood. So the fact that we're still here tells me that you are thinking in a very, very small way, and not thinking globally. You're not thinking about the international companies here that have minorities who work for them, who want to stay here, but are not included here. Yes, it's diverse, and it's much more diverse than when I was growing up. But what you're telling us is that you don't want to protect us and that you don't think we're relevant and that the cost to a landlord is more important. Thank you.

- [Celestine] Thank you very much. Is there, I don't see any other hands raised, meaning in, okay, Michael Vincent, Vinson, sorry, please unmute yourself and state your name and address for the Committee.

- Good evening. I am Michael Vinson. I live at 2731 Old Coach Road in Green Bay, near Edison Park, with my husband and two children. As the former Chairman of the Board of Fair Wisconsin, our state's leading LGBTQ advocacy organization, who has seen communities like ours across the state go through a similar process, and as the employee of a large international corporation, I'd like to lift up the impact this ordinance could have on our ability to attract and retain top diverse talent in this community. You may be. From the campaign, Municipal Equality Index, which rates communities on a number of dimensions, particularly non-discrimination policies and ordinances. And as it stands today, Green Bay ranked amongst the worst, not just in our state, but in the nation, where our peers, cities in our community, like Appleton's, are faring much better. The fact that we don't have an ordinance like that sends a real signal to talent that's thinking about moving to our community. We want to be seen as a community that is diverse and inclusive, where everyone belongs, where everyone can contribute, and enacting an ordinance like this would go a long way to making that so. Thank you.

- [Celestine] Thank you, Mr. Vinson. Anyone else who would like to speak, please either raise your hand in Zoom or unmute yourself and start speaking, and we will get going. Anyone else who would like to speak? You can also raise your hand, oh yes, Ms. Evans, just unmute yourself and state your name and address for the Committee.

- My name is Dusty Evans Cokos. My address is 2031 Dorset Drive, Green Bay, Wisconsin, 54311.

- [Celestine] Thank you.

- I wasn't actually planning to speak tonight. I was more kind of on just being here to support. But I just feel like my experiences as an advocate, as a school social worker that works in Brown County, and as a community member, I just feel this ordinance speaks volumes to create equity that I would want in my community. I believe it is a step in the right direction. I bring hope and I bring peace and I bring everything with me every day that I do to support my families and every student that I serve. I work at a high school. So sometimes I am somebody that leverages a place for some of my families. I am a person that helps,

sometimes, my teen moms find housing of their own. And I believe Green Bay is an amazing place to live. And I think that we need to embrace our diversity. I think that this ordinance will send a strong message to our community and will create a place where everyone feels comfortable, that they can live here and feel like they are heard and supported. That's my biggest takeaway, is that this ordinance is really important because we need to show grace and that everyone has a place in Green Bay. Thank you.

- [Celestine] Thank you, Ms. Evans. anyone else who would like to speak? Please mute yourself. I see Nancy Nusbaum. Ms. Nusbaum, please unmute yourself and state your name and address for the Committee.

- Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair and thank you to the Committee. My name is Nancy Nusbaum. My husband and I live at 3464 Peppergrass Drive. We have been residents here for a little over three years, and I know a lot of you might think of me in association with De Pere, but I have been a Green Bay native all the way from Jefferson School through graduation from Green Bay West High School, and now I have come back home. And just for the importance of this occasion, to put it in context, I had left public office in 2003, and I have never addressed a public committee of any kind since then. So that's 17 years, I calculated, and that's how important I think this issue is. So I thank you for giving me this time. And what motivates me and what excites me about the City of Green Bay, my hometown, standing up on this issue, and thank you, Alder Dorff, for bringing forward, is I'm speaking with the heart of a mom. I can speak about housing. I can speak about human services. I can speak about a lot of things that I've experienced. But, I prefer to speak about the fact that John and I have two children. We have a straight daughter and a gay son. And when you love your children equally, it's more painful than I can explain to you to see that society does not treat them equally. There's something that is so fundamentally wrong about the unequal treatment that people receive. When you see your hometown stand up and say, "We are going to fix this and make it right." That's a good enough reason to change a pattern of 17 years. So, thank you very much for doing this. I really am excited that you have chosen to join other cities in our state and other cities in the country. And I wholeheartedly wish to offer my support and encouragement that you go forward with this, because my son and every other person in this community who is addressed by this ordinance, is not a bracket, is not a category. They are human beings. They are loved by someone. They are loved by a mother. They are loved by a father. They are loved by a spouse or a sister or a brother. And this is the right thing to be doing. So thank you again. And thank you for giving me the time to weigh in on the subject. Thank you.

- [Celestine] Thank you, Ms. Nusbaum. Anyone else who would like to speak? You can either raise your hand in Zoom, or if your camera is on, I can see you, or you can just unmute yourself and start talking.

- [Greg] Hi, this is Greg Neal. I'm living at 3780 Dickinson Road in De Pere, Wisconsin.

- [Celestine] Okay, just one second, Mr. Neal. Alright, go right ahead. Thank you.

- [Greg] I too am a small landlord. I established my first duplex, I think, five years ago this month. So I listened to all of these people talking, and I agree with everybody. But I also want to point out, I think we're digressing a bit with the tenant landlord stuff. Unfortunately, in some

of the comments I felt that target on my back it hurt so much, 'cause I too provide affordable housing. And the level of regulation at the state, federal, HUD, Fair Housing, is already significant. I heard a statement in the Wisconsin Apartment Association the other day that they average landlord takes nine cents on every dollar of rent collected. I also was told that we pay on average across the nation 39 cents on every dollar collected in mortgages, which in my head, if that all fits into a simple mathematical algorithm, that puts what I pay in property tax about 20 cents on every dollar collected for rent. So I don't want to take away from anyone on this meeting, but I think we need to take the blanket coverage of the Section 8 or the ICS or all the other means of ways to help with housing out of this conversation. We should not blanket cover that as a protected class. And the reason is that group already covers the entirety. I can't believe that HUD or ICS or Section 8 would already be unfair in treating people, so to add more regulation into my industry is unnecessary. And frankly, I sit in the meetings we have weekly in the Wisconsin Apartment Association talking about COVID and how we can actually assist all of our tenants, and my heart goes out to how I'm impressed with my peers that care so much about other people. Now are all landlords like that? No, I'm sure they're not. But the ones that are, we need to have a fair shake at making the living too. And the burden of the ownership that we're talking about shifting here is heavy, especially on small landlords. There's all sorts of restrictions in ICS on your building and windows and on and on. But I want to thank everybody for allowing me to speak. I too was unprepared for this. I actually just got an email a couple hours ago that this was happening. So please take into mind that I think we're talking about two separate things here, and we should take one out. Thank you.

- [Celestine] Thank you so much. Is there anyone else who would like to speak? Please either unmute yourself and start speaking or raise your hand.

- [Eric] Hello.

- [Celestine] Oh yes, hi, Eric and Pam. Yes, hold on one second. Alrighty. Please go right ahead.

- [Eric] Yeah, my name is Eric Buergi. I live at 1212 Folkstone Drive, Green Bay, Wisconsin, 54313. I've been a landlord owner for about 20 years myself. And I have rented to a diversity of people. Genders, races, creeds. It hasn't mattered to me. I ask my tenants to follow two simple rules. One is take care of the place. And number two, pay the rent on time, as to the best of your ability. Now, again, the gentleman prior to me had mentioned to me that due to circumstances as of today my wife and I are working real heavily with our tenants to try and keep them in place. We've been pretty lucky at this point, we agree with that, but we're trying to keep everybody in place the best we can. I've done a lot of Section 8 housing in the past. I have stopped doing it. And it had nothing to do with race or creed or anything like that, but they're coming in with little to no money. And when they come in, I've had many experiences where they trash the place and also with drugs in the place and stuff. And so then they either get kicked out and then Section 8 drops you and goes running with their money, and I gotta sit and spend my time trying to evict them, and it takes, it could take up to two or three months depending on the situations. And also, and then now I have to forfeit my money to repair the unit and or take the losses from the expenses I paid because you can't get blood out of a turnip. So if they don't have any money, there's nothing I'm gonna go after. And I just don't want to be forced into renting to somebody that may be a little bit, I don't know how to

use a term, might damage my property and not be able to pay the bills and stuff and take care of things, that's all. I do have quite a bit of background checks on everybody. And I do the best I can. And it's not a perfect world, I get that. I've got bad tenants that are not on housing. Had those too. I think we've, those of us that are landlords have had those. I just would not rather be forced and not into doing that. I do have one on ICS now. Just to let you know that she was with me for five, six years prior to this, and she was a good tenant, and she needed some assistance, and we recommended to her actually to go get it. But we knew who she was and what type of person she was, and she took care of the place cleanly, and so we recommended to go do that, and we did everything we could at that point in time to help her and she did succeed getting it. So she's been on it for a couple of years now. That's all I've got to say.

- [Celestine] Thank you very much.

- [Eric] Thank you.

- [Kathy] Celestine?

- [Celestine] Yes, Alder Lefebvre?

- [Kathy] Or Chairman, can I ask him one question? I just wanted to know on the housing allowance, do you just get the payments for the rental per month? Or do you get an ahead deposit? Like when you normally rent to someone, you have to pay that deposit at the beginning and then you pay your rent.

- [Eric] It's been a while since I've done that, to be honest with you. Again, this is the tenant that I currently have has been with me a long time. So it was already been taken care of financially. But in the past, I believe ICS will help with the deposit. And then of course with the monthly rent after that, their portion of it. But it's in a monthly deposit of 800 bucks a month when they cause \$5,000 of the damage, it's a little bit of an issue.

- [Kathy] Okay. Okay. All right. Thank you.

- [Eric] Thank you.

- [Celestine] Is there anyone else who would like to speak? Please unmute yourself and state your name and address for the Committee.

- [Dan] Dan Coppens.

- [Celestine] Okay. Hold on one second, Mr. Coppens.

- [Dan] I just think that there's two situations that are being blanketed together here.

- [Celestine] Oh, excuse me, please state your name and address for the Committee.

- [Dan] Oh, Dan Coppens, 4520 Nicolet Drive, Green Bay.

- [Celestine] Thank you.

- [Dan] And I just want to take two seconds to say, I think the two situations that are blanketed together should be separated. I say we take the ICS, the Integrated Community Service, out of this motion and go forward with the second half. I think you have two situations, and you should address them separately. And that's all I wanted to say.

- [Celestine] Thank you, Mr. Coppens.

- [Dan] Thank you.

- [Celestine] Anyone else who would like to speak? Please unmute yourself and state your name and address for the Committee. Anyone else? Okay, Chair, I think we don't have anyone else who'd like to speak.

- Motion to close the floor.

- Second.

- You're muted, Craig.

- Okay. I'll make a motion to close the floor.

- Oh, no, we just did. I made the motion and I think Vander Leest seconded it.

- That's correct.

- All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Mark, would you like to take over now?

- I don't know. What's the protocol here? I kind of missed the beginning of this. But does anybody have a problem with me coming back?

- Not a problem at all.

- Okay.

- [Kathy] Mark, do you have the, that she put up on your screen? The memorandum and the...

- Yeah, I got, I think I have a copy of that. All right, well.

- [Kathy] That's what we had at the beginning and discussed some of that, what was on those two. No, did we even get to the second one? I think we just did the first one.

- Was that the equal rights ordinance questions answered, was that one of them?

- Yes.

- I just wanna check.

- [Kathy] Comparison of state and federal law.

- Okay.

- We primarily talked about the protected classes memo.

- Yep.

- Right. Okay, and, all right. I'll continue then. I think there's good testimony here from a number of folks. And when I read the letter from the attorney about the Section 8, I was reading, I wasn't taking a stand either way on this. I think anytime you have an issue of consequence, you're gonna have several sides. And I'm playing devil's advocate on some of this, but I'm definitely, I like very much of, the tenor of this. And I guess, just the questions that I had, Alder Dorff, and if you, like I said, I mentioned a couple of them. And Mr. Coppens kind of mentioned too, about the separation there. And I'm just wondering if the ordinance that you helped put together mirrored pretty much what the state or federal government has or what another community has? Is it a fairly close rendition of the ordinance that you're proposing? Is it a close rendition to another ordinance in another community or Wisconsin?

- When we discussed that earlier, Attorney Mather had said that there were many cities that had ordinances, some of them all within one, some of them in separate ones, but they all covered employment, public accommodation and, what am I missing, housing?

- Housing.

- Housing, yes, and housing. So we had a discussion about that. But it certainly doesn't hurt for you to ask questions again, Alder Steuer. I'm sure that it would be fine to answer some of those questions.

- I can answer that question a little more directly, if you don't mind, Alder Dorff?

- Sure.

- Sure.

- So as far as is, is there one ordinance that ours is largely based on? The answer is yes, it's largely based De Pere's, with the caveat that I made earlier, and I know Alder Steuer, you weren't here for this part of the discussion, but as we have talked about before, De Pere did lose a challenge to their ordinance because they did not provide an exclusion from the definition of a public place, place of public, oh, I can't even do it anymore. The public accommodations one.

- Okay.

- That their definition did not provide an exemption for religious organizations. And so we have included an exemption for religious organizations in our definition of public accommodations. And so while in large part it is structured very similarly to De Pere's, and a lot of the language matches, that is one very important difference, because it eliminates the likelihood of being challenged on that same provision that De Pere was challenged on.

- Okay. Well, I appreciate that. And I did miss that portion of it, and I think that was a big point. I commend Alder Dorff and others for taking that into account, because I think it's important that we try to cover our bases as well as possible. And I think, like I said, there was a lot of work put into this, so I thank you for your efforts, both attorneys and Alder Dorff and others. So I don't know if the Committee, anybody from the Committee have any other comments?

- I'd just like to make one comment, Mark?

- Yes. Go ahead, Alder.

- If this ordinance were to be challenged, where's the money coming from? Would our own attorneys handle the, in other words, if it was challenged? I'd like to know about that part of it. That would be for the City Attorney. Can you hear me, Mark?

- I hear you. I'm just waiting for--

- I don't know if Vanessa is--

- [Vanessa] I'm on now. Can you guys hear me?

- Yes.

- Yes.

- [Vanessa] So the, what will ultimately happen will depend the nature of any lawsuits that we get. If it is something that requires, are insured to take a position on it, then that is something that would happen with our insurers. And we do use outside counsel for those, but those do fall under and are considered regular litigation. If it is something that is not, then it is something potentially we could handle in-house, depending on other workload concerns of the time. We try to handle some of the larger cases--

- That answers some of my question there.

- In house.

- Are you on there yet, Mark?

- Yes, I am, Alder Vander Leest. Vanessa's talking.

- The Wi-Fi must be cutting out or whatever. During the discussions with some of the people that called in, they were looking more, I think, some of them were looking for separation from the human rights, from the housing, and the human rights part of it. I think that they got it rolled into all into one. Why didn't they have it, why didn't we have a human rights ordinance versus tying them both together? It seems like the discrimination that the people that we're talking about, this is plain out discrimination just because of your color. Personally, I have no discrimination against any color, race, creed, or religion or any of it. I don't have any of that in my blood, as far as discriminating against people. And some of the things that are more on human rights than on the housing part of it, I think that hasn't really been talked about. The human rights part of it where somebody is discriminated against because of their color or their sex or whatever, these are very serious issues. And they're trying to roll it into a housing. Not everybody that's discriminated is from the lower class of our economic chain. Discrimination comes at any level. I don't know if you can hear me, if I'm cutting out on this, this is not cutting out.

- No, we can hear you.

- But, I think that the discrimination part of it is totally wrong. People discriminate because of your color, your creed, or religious background. It doesn't matter what economic development, and as far as your economic situation, these are serious issues that, human rights is, I think, more serious than what we're talking about the housing. I think it should be totally separated for the human rights part of it. Our federal government and our state government, these are issues that, if we get complaints, how many complaints, are we dozens of these complaints that aren't being addressed? The state should be handling these complaints as far as discriminatory. And the federal government should be involved. Locally we're gonna come with a nine member, and they're not equipped to handle these kinds of situations. You talk about human rights discrimination, these are serious, serious agendas. And how are we gonna deal with them? I think that the federal and the state, I think they have the expertise that, if we're gonna try to put in a housing ordinance and a human rights ordinance, slap it into one ordinance, we're missing the boat. Human rights ordinances are very, very serious. And they hit all economic backgrounds.

- Okay.

- And so that's my thought on it. I think we're cutting it way short.

- Okay, Alder Vander Leest. Thank you. Alder Gerlach? Go ahead, you're,

- Thank you.

- Go ahead.

- Yeah. I'm unmuted now. Thank you. I just want to try to put to rest, first of all, I want to say thank you to everyone who spoke. I really, really enjoyed hearing from you. It was so important. And I'm so pleased with your participation. I want to try to put to rest, finally, the confusion about the commission that is established in this ordinance. It is not a judgment commission. It is not nine citizens who will sit together, like me, an ordinary person like me, with no legal background, and make a judgment about whether someone has been

discriminated against. The purpose of the commission as I read it is to be the eyes and ears of the Council, to be out there in the community and kind of taking the pulse of the community to see if things are going okay and to see where maybe the City Council needs to be aware that there's a little problem here or things are going now much better there. It would not be nine citizens sitting in judgment. That's the first thing I want to be really clear about. This is not in any way my resolution or anything like that, but I've read it numerous times and this keeps coming up. I'd also just like to say that, in gratitude to the people who spoke, I'm not a native of Green Bay, I'm a native of Appleton. And I married a Green Bay boy, and I ended up in Green Bay. And as many of you know, I was a Military wife, and I lived in seven States and I just came back to Green Bay two years ago to retire and live out the rest of my life here. And I came here because it just felt like home. And I have to admit, I came from a very large, very diverse city on the West Coast where I'd lived for 10 years. And when I came back to Green Bay, it just felt like it always used to feel when I was raising my kids here and when I was teaching here. And you know what, that's a positive thing and that's a negative thing. And one of the things that has just broken my heart, as I've come back to Green Bay, has been the closed feeling of a lot of people that they don't want anything to change and they don't want people who are considered other to now be here as part of Green Bay. I understand that because many of them, most of them, have lived here all their lives, and so they don't know what it's like in the rest of the world. And I had the opportunity to live all over the country and to find out what it's like, and to make, some of my best friends now live in India, and it's been a wonderful experience. I know it's hard and it takes time, but this is the first step in the right direction. And I will vote for this. I urge the Council to support this. I think it is the first step in the right direction. Remember, this is not a housing ordinance. This is covering discrimination, or putting out of the picture, discrimination against, in the areas of housing, employment, and amusement, and . So it's a broad thing, and it's a good step, and I hope that you will move forward with it. And I will support it when it comes to the Council. Thank you.

- Thank you, Alder Gerlach. Anybody else from the Committee or other alders? Anybody? Okay.

- Alder Lefebvre.

- Go ahead, Alder Lefebvre.

- [Kathy] Yes, I'm pretty well, I've either lived in Darke County or here in Green Bay. I have not had the opportunity to live in all other areas. And that might be a downfall for some of us, as Alder Gerlach has kinda mentioned. When you don't live in other areas, you don't get to understand other people, other cultures, how people think. And sometimes we do get too insulated. And sometimes it's hard. But I do believe, yes, we do need to move forward on this. This is so important. I feel it in my heart that these people, some that spoke, especially that woman of color, that was just heartbreaking that neighbors would actually do this to a child. Can you imagine how that affected her for the rest of her life? That's terrible. So I do believe that we need to do something like this. And Alder Vander Leest, this is all about discrimination, the whole thing. And I think this is something that's needed in all these areas. We have to be cognizant that we have people who are different than us living with us. They're not all gonna be the same as us. And they have different experiences. They have different lives. And we have to include them. Our Constitution says "life, liberty, "and the

pursuit of happiness." It's for everybody. Yes, I know the first president and our people in government, they did not include everybody, even though they said, "All men are created equal." They didn't include everybody. But we found out that this was wrong. It took us how many years to come to these conclusions, that everybody has a right to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness, as our Constitution says. And I do believe that we need to pass this. This is very important. And I thank everybody who worked on this, and everybody who had something to say. And I think, too, the rental people, the landlords, I think we do need to work with them and make sure that we're not making more problems for them, but we need to communicate back and forth. And I hope that they will contact us if there's anything that they really need to work on and we need to work together. That's all I got to say. Thank you.

- Yeah, thank you, Alder Lefebvre. I wanted to make a couple of statements. I, first of all, thanks for, thank you to everybody that did testify tonight, Cinnamon Harley, when she spoke, from the Apartment Association, I thought there was some leeway there because I know that they deal with many issues and such. But I thought she spoke well that she wanted to work together on something like this. And I think that with dialogue and communication, I think some very good things could happen. And Melissa, your testimony was great. I really appreciate that. I, myself, I can't help who I am. I am who I am. But I grew up in Milwaukee, and Milwaukee was a very segregated city. And as a child, as a 13 year old, I went to school on the nearest south side of Milwaukee. And we had riots in Milwaukee. We had martial law. We had a lot of damage. I also drove integration bus routes for a year and a half. So I met many, many families of color and other ethnicities, and I got to meet many, and we all have the same feelings. We want safety for our children. And we want goodness for our kids, for our families. We want to be healthy, and we want to be happy. That's just basic, basic common knowledge. I know that in the late sixties there was a housing ordinance that was set up in Green Bay. And that seems like it kind of fell by the wayside. I dunno, I haven't heard a whole lot about it. I have asked our legal department to kind of check into it. I know that in Milwaukee there was cases of redlining, where they would take maps and they would draw, so I'm very aware of that. I remember as a child, as a teenager, watching Selma, Alabama. So I saw John Lewis, personally, on television. So I saw that, and I just remember thinking, "This isn't right." So I think the questions that we asked tonight, it's not to say, we want it, we don't want it completely, but I think part of it is just to say, we just need to vet it out a little bit, because it is a big step. I know other communities have done it. But I think it's important that we at least talk about it and try to get all the opinions out there. And I think a lot of the folks have good intent and they have good hearts on either side of the fence. So we need to try to work together, communicate. And I think it's a good first step. So if there are no other comments, I would entertain, Alder Stevens?

- Thank you. And I'd like to thank everybody that spoke this evening too. Regarding this ordinance, I am 100% for this ordinance, except for the receipt of assistance, rental assistance. I feel like the government, the City of Green Bay, you are going to say, "Hey, landlords. "You need to look at every single person. "You will need to sign a contract with Section 8." And there's a lot of landlords that choose not to do that additional paperwork. You're setting it up where there's a potential that they may be forced to take that payment when they don't want to. So I think we do, it's two items that are put together. I think they need to be broken apart. And I think that the rental assistance needs to be looked at separately. And I think that's something that we could do. I don't think they should be grouped together under this ordinance.

- Could I ask Attorney Mather about that? Your thoughts on that?

- Sure. What specifically, about dividing them up?

- Yes.

- Well, yeah, I think that's--

- So if it's something that you don't want in the ordinance, and you want to take up at a later date, really all that you would need to do would be to take it out of the list of, or the definition of protected persons. And then basically just move to amend that it be removed from the ordinance and then pass the rest. Essentially the ordinance, content-wise, would stay as is because throughout the ordinance we just use the term protected persons. So it's really in that definition section, and that first section that states the purpose of the ordinance. That's really where it would need to come out, wherever it's listed in those areas. But the balance of the ordinance could still be passed without that, and if that's what the Committee chooses to do.

- Alder Dorff? Thank you, Attorney Mather. Alder Dorff?

- Yes, I'd like to have Director Renier-Wigg possibly respond to this question. When I started this, it was a housing ordinance, and I believe that one of the reasons that's in there was because of some of the requirements from HUD, where we didn't have this type of ordinance, and this was one of the areas of concern. And I also know that recently, the nonprofits in Green Bay, there's a number of them that have requested that Brown County stop discrimination based on homelessness and receipt of rental assistance. So that is something that I would really be opposed taking out. But I would like to ask Director Renier-Wigg if she believes that that is an important part of the ordinance?

- Thank you for the opportunity to speak on this. It was a lot of good testimony I heard from landlords. And I can tell you, the Apartment Association has been great to work with, with the City. We are very appreciative that there's a group of landlords that are willing to work with us on policy and change. The way that I, well let me back up. So our analysis to Impediments of Fair Housing, which is the study that we're required to do every five years in order for us to receive our entitlement block grant dollars, made a recommendation to the City of Green Bay that we should be passing a local fair housing ordinance. And they also further encouraged us that we should make discrimination based on the use of Section 8 vouchers as a rent supplement illegal. And I think the reason behind that is, and I can tell you, I've worked in housing for over 30 years with property management, with vouchers, all different types of housing. So I know that there are bad tenants out there, regardless of how they are paying their rent. So I'm gonna put that on the table. I'm not Pollyanna. I know that there are some tenants that trash units. But if I have in front of me two tenants that can both pay security deposit, can both pay rent, as a landlord I've screened them, they both have stellar backgrounds. I would have to say, why would you just carte blanche say, "No, this money is coming from this source. 'So therefore I'm not gonna rent to you.'" I think that's kind of my problem is that there aren't a lot of landlords that will rent to Section 8 tenants based on some of these misnomers that are out there, that all Section 8 tenants are bad or they're

dealing drugs or they're trashing units. Some of them do. There's 3,500 vouchers in Brown County. I highly doubt it's the majority of them, correct? And like I said, there's bad tenants out there across the board. But what you're really doing is you're discriminating against someone based on where they're getting their rental income from. So to me, I would not be in favor of pulling that out of this ordinance because I think that's an important element. People who need affordable housing need places to stay. And if they're good tenants and they're screened out and they have good backgrounds, you should not be able to discriminate against them. That's my opinion on it. The decision will be up to you, of course.

- And further, Chair, we already talked about the fact that you can have screening criteria beyond, that it just can't be that you can't deny a protected class the ability to rent, but you can keep your other screening criteria in place. So, I feel pretty passionate--

- Well--

- I have a question.

- Are you done, Alder Dorff? Hold on. Are you done, Alder Dorff?

- Yes. I'm done.

- Okay. Go ahead, Alder Stevens.

- Cheryl?

- Yep.

- So you're saying that because a landlord is not accepting that payment, you're saying that we're discriminating against that person. Well, in reality, we're not. We're choosing not to accept that federal payment. We're choosing not to go into that program.

- Yep. I hear that. But as a tenant that doesn't help--

- We're not discriminating against the person. We're choosing not to use that program.

- I see what you're saying, but as a city, as a whole, what you're doing is you're allowing landlords to say, "We're not going to allow you to use "this source of income to pay your rent." And it's not, and if you fully screened a tenant and they've got a great background, they're employed, they've got great references. You can just say, "I'm sorry. "No, I'm not going to run to you because "I don't want to fill up the lease or work in this program." But it doesn't take any rights away from you as a landlord. I think there's extra paperwork, but you can still evict, you can still screen. You can check your units to make sure your tenants are doing well.

- Correct.

- Right?

- Right.

- So you're kind of eliminating a bunch of people that need housing based on where they're getting their rental payments from.

- But that would it be the choice of the property owner, not accepting that payment. Right off the bat, they're saying, "No, we don't accept the program."

- Yep. They're not just saying, "We don't accept the program." And a lot of people understand that landlords don't accept it. So they move on to the next property that does.

- Mark, whenever you get a chance, I'd like to make a comment.

- I just think that--

- We've got a couple, hold on.

- I just think that--

- So that's why I say that--

- [Greg] They don't pay for all the rent either.

- Mr. Muehl, you gotta hold on. The floor is closed.

- And that is correct. ICS only pays a portion of it.

- Right, which is why--

- Only a portion. It could be half, it could be 20% of the income. It varies.

- Right.

- So that's why I'm saying that I support this, but I don't support the receipt part of it. I think there should be a lot more conversation with the community, with the landlords that are in the city, with City staff, there needs to be a lot more communication and a lot more dialogue, a committee maybe getting together, to see how we need to go forward with this, 'cause the rest of this ordinance is great. I 100% support it. But I don't the receipt part of it, because I feel like the landlord is being forced to accept that payment. And they're choosing not to at the moment.

- Okay. Are we good for now? We have a few hands up here. Thank you, Alder Stevens.

- That's my thought process on it.

- Alder Brunette?

- Yes, thank you.

- We'll get back to you. Go ahead, Alder Brunette.

- Thank you, Chairman Steuer. I agree with Alder Stevens, he raises a very good point. Because it's the right of a property owner to not involve themselves with a government agency. So it's not that a property owner is looking to discriminate against Section 8 housing, perhaps they just don't want to carry the administrative costs of dealing with ICS or any other government sourced funding. So that's, Director Renier-Wigg, do you see that? We're not, we are in a way forcing, by this ordinance, property owners to comply with a government program, which is their right not to deal with. As simple as that, and won't you agree with that?

- No, I don't actually, cause I'm looking at the--

- Ms. Renier-Wigg, if I could get your professional City of Green Bay position rather than your personal opinion, 'cause I think you're kind of juggling between the two.

- Well, Alder Brunette, I'm the Executive Director of the Green Bay Housing Authority. And as I've stated before, I've had decades of experience with Housing. In my professional opinion, I think we need more affordable housing units opened up to people who need them in the city. And I think that this is a way to have that happen. So that's my professional opinion with regards to that.

- Even if it means forcing a property owner to comply with a program that they are not required to comply with?

- Yes. 'Cause I think it, if you look at discrimination laws over the course of time, landlords have had to make changes to who they can rent to as protected classes are added onto the list.

- Currently by state and federal law they're not required to accept ICS or third party funding. True?

- I think that's true. I'm just saying that's probably coming down the pike. It's a recommendation from HUD. So I don't know if the federal laws are gonna change, but the recommendation came in our study that they're encouraging that to be added, along with the fair housing ordinance. This is a community decision. So in my professional opinion, as working with Housing, I would not be opposed to seeing this happen. So there's more units that are opened up.

- Right. So obviously you've been involved in this situation, this position, for quite some time. And the gentleman before spoke, and he indicated the cost of being a landlord. How much money goes to, say, property taxes, how much goes to direct to the landlord. And I think to the property owner, if I get that correct, that he only said 9% of rent goes towards profit to the property owner, is that correct? From what you recall?

- That might've been, I think I heard him say that. I don't know where those stats came from. But, yes, I think he said that, Alder Brunette.

- Yeah. I believe so.

- Is it, from your experience, Director Renier-Wigg, if landlords are now required to engage administrative work with ICS, if this ordinance passes and we cannot use that as a, a business, a property owner can no longer choose not to engage with ICS, a third party fund, or any other government source, that adds an administrative cost. And inevitably, what will happen to administrative costs is they'll pass that onto tenants, which means that rent will rise in the city. From your professional experience, do you see that that that could be a causation of this ordinance, unintended consequence?

- So it's my understanding that, well, I guess it depends if the landlord is, how the landlord's doing business, if the landlord's just taking cash and there's no lease signed or those types of things. But if you're gonna sign a year lease, you'd sign a year lease, you'd use the format that comes from ICS to do that. So you're gonna do that regardless. The check is coming to you, the tenant has to pay a portion and then the check automatically comes to you, I believe, for probably the lion's share of that rent. That's coming in. As a landlord, you have the ability to charge a fair market rent, which be a little higher than what you're actually getting right now in Green Bay, depending on what those fair market numbers are, which I think are a little bit higher. So the increase in that rent might give you the ability for any extra administrative costs. I know there's annual inspections that are done.

- Only 9% of rent collected, goes to the property, a very small amount, and I guess my point that I'm trying to make is right now, without this ordinance in effect, the landlord does have the opportunity to accept that funding. Many of them do. Thank God they do, because a lot of people need affordable housing in the city. But my point is that the unintended consequence that I could see of this is that rent will go up, and let me explain myself, I can respond. Right now a property owner, a small property owner, or a large property owner, it doesn't matter. They have rental units. And right now a landlord or property owner can rent to a tenant. That's it, that's the only two people involved in that transaction, right? So now if you, by the force of this ordinance are requiring that landlord to accept a housing voucher, right, wrong, indifferent, that, I'm not making a statement, I'm just asking the question. you could see how that including in serving and requiring, meeting expectations of a third party, that adds time to the landlord's day. They have to comply with paperwork. They gotta go through a certain number of things. You see though that that is an additional administrative burden, and if the landlord's only making 9% profit on rent received. And there was in issue who collect that voucher, again, not classifying people, but it's just the reality of what we're dealing with. They're gonna have to add money to rent, to collect administrative costs. 'Cause right now they don't have to deal with that. They can just go straight to the tenant. Now you have an outside party you have to satisfy, you see how that would add the expense to rent? In that how eventually that will increase rental costs for renters throughout the city?

- You know Alder, Alder Stevens, you said you have some Section 8 rentals at the beginning of the meeting.

- Yep.

- Did you find it overly cumbersome?

- I operate apartments, I used to have Section 8, yes. We got rid of it. We got rid of it years ago. We were like, "We're done." And we got rid of it. But the problem now too is, when you have a client that applies for Section 8 and they get approved, they have an X amount of dollars that they can work with, Cheryl, you know that. They might say, you need to go on find an apartment that \$700 or less a month. Well, when it comes to me, I have a \$900 apartment, but they want to come to me because my apartment's really nice. It's taken care of. They love the property. Well, they're only entitled to a \$700 apartment. Well, this ordinance is going to force me to accept their application and know, in reality, that Housing's not going to approve me because of my dollar amount.

- But why, I guess I would not see it working that way. If they don't qualify for the apartment because they can't afford it, they would not apply for the \$900 apartment.

- But people do. They will try to work the system. They'll try to work the system. So there's a lot that still needs to be talked about when it comes to assistance from payments.

- Probably the best people, so, I'm talking to you from the Housing Authority, we run public housing in the city.

- Right, we know that.

- That's what I do. I used to be the executive director of the Brown County Housing Authority. That's the person you really should have at the table, are the people that are running the programs that can talk to you about the nuances of the programs. If they need to make changes to the program, make changes to the program to help landlords work better within the program. I can't speak to you to the details of the program because we don't operate that program right at that level.

- We don't operate housing--

- I'd be happy to--

- We have to follow their guidelines.

- Right right. I'm talking to you just on a big picture. I'm just trying to provide, I'm trying to find a way to provide more units for people who need them in the City of Green Bay. If you choose to take this out, that's your prerogative as the Council, I'm just telling you, that's my opinion. I'd like to see that move forward.

- Alder Lefebvre? Oh, I'm sorry.

- I also understand what Alder Brunette is talking about. If this goes through, rental rates will increase throughout the city. And I think that's not one thing that we want. But in reality, I think it's gonna happen because rent rates have been increasing every single year in the city. They're going up more and more.

- They're increasing because we don't have enough units. That's a whole other discussion

that's coming later. But we need more units, period, across the whole city.

- Right. Alder Lefebvre, hold on, Alder Lefebvre, did you want to say something?

- [Kathy] Yes, I did. If we take this out, where are those people gonna go? You say we have a shortage of housing right now, and we have people who need this assistance. We've probably got a lot of people who are gonna need this assistance because of the pandemic. A lot of people lost their jobs. And some of the people weren't even getting the unemployment, they're still waiting for it. These people are gonna be in desperate need. They're right now probably renting and be kicked out. They're gonna need some assistance. We're gonna have a lot of people, I think, that are gonna be needing this assistance. And the landlord has the right to refuse them if they do not meet, there's certain requirements that they have to meet. And I want to mention something, they said 9%, they make? These landlords, this is an investment, okay. He said, well, 9%. That's an investment. Do you know when you invest your money, even in the stock market, 9% is pretty darn good. The rate, don't look at 9% as being really--

- It's what feeds me. It's not an investment until I eat.

- Mr. Muehl, if you want to speak, Mr. Muehl--

- [Greg] Well, there's a lot of misinformation going on out here, I'm sorry I interrupted.

- Yes.

- Mute him.

- Mr. Muehl, do you want to speak again? If so, we'll have to open the floor. Do you want to speak again, Mr. Muehl?

- [Greg] Yes, please.

- Okay, well just give me a minute and we will get to you, okay? I'll open the floor again. But just hold your comments until I open the floor.

- [Greg] Okay. Thank you.

- All right, Alder Gerlach?

- Just a quick little question, please. I don't know anything about housing. If, let's say, Alder Stevens has apartments for rent and the lowest priced one is \$900, and the person who is receiving assistance is getting only \$700 a month. If we pass this, will he be breaking the law by not lowering the rent and accepting a person at \$700 a month? Or is it okay for him to say, "I'm sorry, I don't have any \$700 units. "You'll have to go elsewhere." I just don't know?

- Director Wigg?

- I think that's a legal question for this ordinance enforcement. I would think no, because it'd

be like, what if the unit was 1,500 a month and you only had, I would say no, but that's, I guess I'd want the Law Department to comment on that for enforcement.

- Hold on, Vanessa or Lindsay, go ahead, either one of you, I'm sorry.

- [Vanessa] There's nothing that would require a landlord or other person to accept less rent for their unit. It literally just means if there are two equal participants or two equal applicants, those have to be treated equally.

- And remember too that--

- Just, I want to make sure I understood what you said. So you said if there are two equal applicants, meaning each able to pay the same amount, then you cannot discriminate if one is getting their money from federal assistance and the other one isn't. But if the apartment costs \$900 and this one has the \$900, from any source, and this one just can't afford it, you're not discriminating by saying, "I'm sorry. "We don't have any apartments at your price range." Is that right?

- [Vanessa] That is correct.

- Can I ask one other question on top of that? So if you had someone who has assistance, but can pay for the apartment and the other person who just can pay up front, and the landlord makes their choice, is the landlord under a problem here if they decide, "Well, I'm gonna rent to this particular person." And the other person might say, "Well, you're discriminating against me." I guess I just want to make sure that the landlord has the ability, if it's equal on both sides there that both parties can rent, that the choice they make will be done equitably, and they won't have retribution coming? Cheryl, could you, or our Law Department?

- Again, I leave that to enforcement. Get the Law Department.

- I can weigh in on that one. So again, the ordinance still allows for consideration of other factors beyond just the protected classes, right? So you can still consider ability to pay, et cetera. So if you have two people that one person gets \$700, it's a \$900 apartment, one person gets \$700 in rental assistance, but they can pay the other \$200 a month somehow. And one person can just pay \$900 right away. If the only reason that you give it to the person who can pay the \$900 is because they don't get money for rental assistance, then that is discrimination under the ordinance. But if there are other reasons, if it's based on background checks, et cetera, then it's, but assuming all things equal, if that's the sole deciding, just as it would be the sole deciding factor if one were a man and one were a woman.

- Okay, thank you for that. Alder Brunette, were you gonna say something else?

- Yeah. Chairman Steuer. I know you want to open the floor. I actually need to go, but I just wanted to add a few final thoughts to this. I think there are many, many parts of the ordinance that are good and that I can agree with. I think we could focus on equality, trying to make it a better living environment for groups that maybe have been overlooked through our history. But I also still have concerns about how sweeping the ordinance is. It gives a lot of

power to the municipal government, power that we have never had, and in my opinion, should not have over the people. We are adding many protected classes, over and above what the state and federal law identify, and we are talking about one right now, it's rental assistance funding. That's just one of the protected classes that are being added. Keep in mind there are many more. So right now we're hearing from landlords and property owners with concerns. All those other protected classes, it is likely that similar questions are out there throughout the community. It's hard to pass something and then after the fact go, "Oh my gosh, we did not think of that." And I do think one of the effects of passing the ordinance as is, is that the unintended consequences are rent will go up. Now, we don't want to believe that, or we want to think that this ordinance would dare do that, whether purpose or not, but that is what I see as a consequence of this. We need to really consider that to the point where maybe we should separate things out and pass this in piecemeal, that really allows more intense thought. The other thing too, and I, many of you on the Council probably received the email, this is attorney client privilege information we received from the Law Department in regards to the legal ramifications or possible legal defenses. That was sent to us client, confidential client attorney confidential, which means that I don't really feel comfortable in open session discussing or even mentioning any of that. So I guess the question of the city attorney is, when this goes to the full City Council, can we, can the legal issues surrounding this be discussed in closed session?

- [Vanessa] So for the record, anytime anything comes from the Law Department, it is considered, that is providing legal advice, it is considered attorney client privilege. It's that Council can ultimately, or Committee can ultimately choose, to waive that and discuss it in open session. We would never do that. And we would never provide advice that would be provided to the general counsel or to the general public. That's just not what our department is capable of doing, that's not what we do. So when we provide you with legal advice, everything that we provide to you is considered attorney client privilege. And it is ultimately up to the Committee or the Council as to whether or not those are items that they want to discuss in public. We don't have pending litigation against this, so there's no basis for us to go into closed session. Those are just considerations for you to be aware of as far as, items to be aware of when it comes to asking for legal advice on stuff.

- Okay, thank you, Attorney Chavez. I really appreciate that. I think it answered a lot of the questions that I had outside of the meeting that we had corresponded about. I haven't had a chance to read it a few times, but I read it once and plan on reading it again. My focus is also, I want the City to avoid any unnecessary lawsuits. And when you push or when you vote on something like this, that you have City government powers and duties that it had never had, inevitably what will happen is people are going to be alarmed if they feel that it infringes on their rights and their abilities to live their lives without municipal government intrusion. So I do think that... I think that we need to be aware that there have been a lot of federal cases that have come out, one recently in Kentucky. And I think that what I'll do is I'll forward that to Attorney Chavez for review, prior to the full City Council. So those are my only comments. Thank you, Chairman Steuer.

- Okay. I'll just, I'll make one comment, and I'll open the, make a motion or open the floor. Were you here, Alder Brunette, in the beginning when, and I missed a little of it too, when Attorney Mather was talking about the situation that happened in De Pere. That there was a lawsuit and there were, there was a clause that was brought up by--

- I was there.

- It was brought up by several churches and that, they brought in a lawsuit against De Pere because of it. And it sounds like this, our ordinance here, has taken that into account and tried to incorporate that in a little stronger sense. So I don't know if you had a feeling offhand, if you feel that the De Pere ordinance that caused the lawsuit has been at least taken care of a little bit better in Green Bay, at least with the wording?

- I was here. I'm not an attorney.

- Well, that's just, well, that's, I suppose that's your opinion.

- No no no, there have been cases that have happened recently, as recently as August, that I think that we should consider as the Council. I don't want the Council, I don't want the City, to take on additional lawsuits unnecessarily. So I'd rather ask the questions now than have it pass and then, "Oh, I wish we would've talked about this. "I wish we would have brought this up." Those are my intentions.

- Well, the fact is that we're gonna be, we're voting on this as a Committee, but it will go to the full Council. So it will be discussed, so regardless of what the vote is here tonight.

- Okay, thank you.

- So anyway, I would like to open, have the floor opened. Thank you, Alder Brunette. A motion to open the floor, one of the Committee members?

- [John] Motion to open the floor.

- By Vander Leest, do we have a second?

- Second.

- Second by Stevens. All in favor, please say aye?

- [All] Aye.

- All opposed? That passes. Mr. Muehl--

- [Celestine] Actually, Alder Steuer, Cinnamon Harley has had her hand up for quite some time.

- Oh, she has, I can't see here.

- [Celestine] Yeah, she has her hand up, the blue hand.

- Well, I'll let you handle this end of it. Okay?

- Okay, thank you, Alder.

- Go ahead.

- [Celestine] So first we'll have Cinnamon Harley, and then we'll have Mr. Muehl, And Alder Chris Wery also has his hand up. I don't know if he wants to speak. But first we'll have Cinnamon Harley. Ms. Harley, please unmute yourself and state your, you don't have to state your name and address for the Committee again.

- [Cinnamon] Hi, what Mr. Muehl is talking about is a breakdown of every dollar of rent that's brought in. It was a study done by the National Apartment Association. And what they say is that 14 cents of every dollar goes toward financing towards schools and everything like that, with property taxes. 27 cents of every dollar goes towards payroll expenses, including regular maintenance, employees, stuff like that. 39 cents of every dollar goes towards your mortgage. 10 cents of every dollar goes toward your capital expenditures, like replacing roofs, your big ticket items. And you get nine cents of every dollar that the property owner gets to keep. Not 9%, it's only nine cents. That's what they're talking about.

- That's 10%

- Okay.

- [Cinnamon] And if you guys would like, we can email that to you, 'cause that's--

- That would be good. I would like that. Thank you.

- [Cinnamon] You're welcome. And as far as like what, I think it was Cheryl or maybe Alder Stevens said something about getting on the committee. I would, myself personally, be more than happy to do that, because there's a way we can make this a win win situation for everybody. So with that--

- Well, I was going to ask you, are you done, Ms. Harley?

- [Cinnamon] Yeah, I was done.

- I was just gonna ask you a question.

- [Cinnamon] Sure.

- You made some very good comments early on in the testimony, and it sounds like you want to work with the City and such in the various committees. Do you feel that this ordinance, have you had a chance to read this ordinance?

- [Cinnamon] Yeah.

- What is your take on the ordinance? Can I put you to the fire a little bit, as far as your feelings on it, or do you feel?

- [Cinnamon] Myself, personally, as a landlord, I only care if you have money. I don't even care, if you're purple, if you have antennas coming out of your nose. I could care less. I want money to pay your rent. That's it. I recently purchased some property in December and with that, an existing tenant had Housing, so I finally have an experience with Housing. It's not even been a year, so it's very little. But in reading all the stuff I get from them, I have buildings that won't qualify for Housing, due to some of the existing repairs that I'm in the process of doing or ones that need to be done that I just don't got money coming out of my nose to do it right now. So when sometimes landlords say they won't take it, it's because my buildings aren't gonna qualify. And I know there's certain repairs, when they come in, they give you a deadline. There's no feasible way I can get them done in that deadline. So that's gonna put me in a financial situation. That's why I would rather, obviously I'm working on fixing them, but when you have people that can make the same amount of money and everything, why is that person on Housing? If the money you're talking about the same, paying the same amount of rent, is coming from housing that's different. And sometimes when you have everyone who's tied, you go with your gut. It's not being that your discrimination against the program or whatever. I just personally have never taken it 'cause of my buildings. But this lady I have, I did renew her lease, 'cause she's just a lovely lady. But I mean, as far as all that other stuff, I personally don't discriminate against them. I have friends that are, they're all different races, creeds, nationalities, sex, gender, what they identify, I don't care. I don't disagree with it, and that's why.

- Okay.

- [Cinnamon] I do see a need for that. But I, for the housing, I think there's a different way to do it.

- So you're saying CPAH?

- [Cinnamon] Yes, and I've been trying to get on the housing committee with the mayor, but this whole COVID thing has kind of like kiboshed some of that. So I'm trying to reach out to him to get back onto the committee, because he wants some of the Apartment Association there. But yeah, there's, I've been working with, Supervisor Borchardt right now is trying to get all the pieces together to help make everyone's life a lot better, There is a need and there's a way that, as landlords and as a community, can help, not just give them a temporary fix, but a permanent fix.

- Okay. So one other question. You were talking about the nine cent profit that most apartment owners have. Are you, without getting too personal, is that, what is considered a good number? I suppose the more the merrier of course, but is there a certain workable number that works for you?

- [Cinnamon] As far as profit?

- Well, you said nine cents in profit.

- [Cinnamon] I still work a job. I get no money from my business, and I have 23 units, because I've working on improving all my businesses, all my units, all my buildings, 'cause that increases my value of my buildings as well. So I've been a landlord for seven years, and

I get nothing.

- Well, you still have to pay taxes on the properties too, so I don't know.

- Yep.

- That's a whole other story. Okay, thank you. I appreciate that. Go ahead, Celestine.

- [Celestine] Thank you, Alder. Mr. Muehl, please unmute yourself.

- [Greg] Thank you. First of all, I just want to give some accolades to Cinnamon. I don't know that we've ever met directly, but I promise you, she would be a good person to work with on that committee, just from the indirect interactions I've had with her through the different associations. With that I'd like to lead into at one point. First of all, is it, I just experience bias. I do this for a living. You can't assume that landlords all do this on the side for extra money. This is what feeds me, that nine cents. So no, it's not an investment. How Cinnamon does 23 units and holds a job and is involved in all this baffles me. Good job, Cinnamon. So you gotta understand not everybody's just has extra money and buys properties to rent to people. Some of us do it for a job. So please understand that. The other thing is it's become very clear to me through this meeting, that a lot of misinformation about housing given to you by the 30 year expert. I won't get into, we should really have an ICS person on that committee as well, which is what they used to call Section 8, they call ICS now. So first of all, it's just the name. So please understand how it works before you make any decisions on this part of what we're talking about. The rest of it, I think we're all in agreement, yes. We all want to be equally treated. But don't force a government program down my throat. Shame on you for just doing that. It's unnecessary. I listened to all of these associates, I listen to all these different association meetings, all they talk about is how to keep their tenants happy and in their places. We don't all conspire against tenants. That's a misnomer, and I'm tired of it. I'm a professional, I'm a professional property manager who produces quality housing at an affordable rate to people that pass my background. If I choose not to take the government housing because that adds onerous costs, and frankly, it's the time. I do all my own repairs, as many as I can for that nine cents too. It's not necessary to be in what we're even talking about. Listen to us talking about housing. This is in the wrong bill or whatever this is. And with that, I'm just gonna close it. I do appreciate everyone listening to me. I think all the hearts are in the right place. I just think we do need to separate this out. Start a committee, get the facts. Again, you're listening to somebody with 30 years of experiences. I can pick three things out that weren't right. I'm not gonna say true, I'm just gonna say were not accurate. So I'm running out of time. So I'll leave it there. Thank you.

- Well, thank you again, Mr. Muehl, for your comments. Celestine, anybody else?

- [Celestine] Yes, Alder. Actually Alder Wery has his hand up. And he, of course, doesn't have to speak now during open session, just to let you know. I don't think there's anybody else.

- If Alder Wery wants to speak now. Otherwise he can wait.

- I got a quick word.

- [Celestine] Okay. Yes, Eric, I'm sorry, I can't see your last name. So Eric and Pam, please go ahead and speak.

- [Eric] Yeah, I just want to expound a little bit upon that and I want to do, I feel bad for Ms. Cheslock there that she had to go through that. I think it's totally disgusting, my personal self. And I hope that it never goes, has that happen to her family going forward ever again. However, I do support what the other gentlemen and last two people have talked about, is separating it. I would be all in support of not segregating and stuff like that, but taking the money out of it separately. But again, I would support the, the racism part of it and stuff like that, I would definitely do that. That wouldn't be an issue for me at all whatsoever. So that's all I really have to say.

- [Celestine] Thank you very much.

- [Eric] Thank you.

- [Celestine] Is there anybody else from the public who would like to speak now? You can unmute yourself and start talking or raise your hand.

- [Jeremy] I would, just for a minute or two.

- [Celestine] Okay. Thank you, Mr. Lemere. Just give me one second. Go ahead, Mr. Lemere. State your name and address for the Committee.

- [Jeremy] Yep. Jeremy Lemere, 2648 Whitegate Trail, De Pere, Wisconsin, 54115. I have a number of properties in Green Bay. And like many of the others, over the previous two years, I've plowed probably \$150,000 in those properties in Green Bay, roughly a 10% addition to the tax base for those properties. I would really like to stress the fact that, to Cinnamon's point, there are a substantial number of assets in Green Bay that are challenged to meet many of these obligations. And I've been fortunate enough to be able to stretch out the improvements over the previous two years. And the tenant base is improving significantly as a result of that. Where those other individuals are going, whether they were part ICS, one could argue either way. But I believe that making the program a must is gonna be some serious challenges for many small property owners. And I would rather see us identify a solution that gets us moving up the curve to get the affordable housing for these individuals. It's rather a small tenant base, or the small apartment owners, small duplex owners, and the small single family owners to be able to handle this situation which keeps being pushed via the HUD assessment on us, while the HUD program doesn't do anything in and of itself in order to actually provide a solution, other than to create the onerous requirements for the individuals. I really challenge, with somebody asking and demanding for these things to be put into place, when they're not, from a national level, providing the solutions themselves. If they came to us and they said, "Green Bay has a substantial shortage of housing. "We're looking for somebody to take 20 acres "and put affordable housing, dispersed, "in whatever configuration, many different options." It's spread right now across the county in some reasonable ways. But there are no current executable plans for that, except for to place it, as a burden, on the individual landlords throughout, in this case, Green Bay, as Brown County doesn't appear to be moving forward with that. And I give you back the rest of the time.

Thank you.

- Thank you.

- [Celestine] Thank you, Mr. Lemere. Is there anyone else who would like to speak from the public? Please unmute yourself and state your name and address for the Committee. Anyone else?

- Is that it?

- [Celestine] Yes, I think so. And just to remind the public, that once the Committee closes the floor, members of the public are not permitted to speak. Thank you.

- Thank you, Celestine. Someone bring a motion forward to close the floor?

- Motion to close the floor.

- Motion to close the floor.

- By Vander Leest, do we have a second?

- Second.

- Stevens, okay, second by Stevens. Okay. All in favor, please say aye?

- [All] Aye.

- All opposed? That passes unanimously. The floor is now closed. Alder Wery, you wanted to speak?

- [Chris] Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Can you hear me okay?

- Yes.

- [Chris] All right. Thanks. I just wanted, in researching this particular topic, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is Dr. Ben Carson. And he, in 2018 started a task force to study why landlords weren't taking Section 8 and to how to improve it. His goal was to entice, not force. He's never, from what I could find, ever talked about forcing landlords, but instead of working together to find out how they can resolve the problems that are being faced by landlords. And I think the task force is wrapped up, and they're starting to put out different initiatives and ideas. And so I think this is happening naturally. And I don't think we need to force it. So I'd be in favor, really, of separating it. And I think it needs more discussion. If the head of Urban Housing and Urban Development doesn't want to force it, certainly why are we doing that? They're trying to figure out how to fix it, not just force it. So that's my two cents. Thanks.

- Okay. Thanks, Alder Wery. Alder Dorff?

- I would just have one thing to ask the Committee. Moving it onto Council, whether it's an up vote or down vote, whether there's, it passes or doesn't pass, I'd really like you to move it on intact. And then let Council ask for amendments. I just think, by doing that, we'll have a broader and richer discussion. We'll have more input from everyone from Council, and I think it's gonna need to get discussed at Council anyway. So I would just ask you to move it, with or without a recommendation, intact to Council. Thank you.

- I appreciate that Alder Dorff. I think, I was trying to think of the separations and such, but it's a good point. Committee, do you have any, if you don't have any problems with that, what do you think of Alder Dorff's position on that? I personally think it would be a good way to go. Let the Council talk about it.

- I'd like to make a comment, Mark?

- Alder Vander Leest, yes, go ahead.

- I feel that the issues that we're trying to address here, they definitely need separation, and I don't think we should just move it ahead to the City Council at this time. I think there's much more needed discussion that should take place. Just from the comments that we've heard tonight. We're talking about enacting laws here, in the City of Green Bay, and it sounds like the City wants to micromanage, micromanage the housing industry. I think that there's a lot more discussion that needs to be done as far as moving forward. We're not there yet, my personal opinion, we're not there yet. And as far as the human rights part of it, and then the housing part of it, those definitely should be separated. These are serious accusations, when people are discriminated against, for any reason, I don't endorse any type of discrimination. And I feel that the City of Green Bay, we're not there yet as far as passing any ordinance. This is just gonna be slammed in, and we're not getting the right answers. We need much more discussion before we move it forward.

- Okay.

- I can't support it at this time. There's not enough meat to it right now. Thank you.

- Okay. Thank you, Alder Vander Leest.

- Alder Lefebvre?

- Alder Dorff? Just give me a second. Alder Dorff, you said you want to bring this forward. It's a bit of a roll of the dice in a sense that if you bring it forward that way, it's up to you, but--

- I will bring this to Council no matter what happens tonight.

- Okay.

- I will pull it. It's been here six times. That is enough. We need to talk about it at Council. At Council, maybe they'll choose to take that part out, about Section 8. okay. I want everybody to be there in the room though. I don't want it just to be the Committee saying, "Let's take this out and take this out." This is the way I would like it to be presented to Council. And then

Council can bring forward amendments. I expect there to be amendments.

- Okay, well I just needed to hear it again. All right. Alder Brunette?

- Well, if you follow that recommendation, you're doing work of the Committee at the floor of the City Council. Whatever--

- Oh wow! Yeah, sorry. Excuse me.

- Well that's--

- Point of order, Alder Dorff.

- Let's keep it--

- Apologize for not, apologize Alder Brunette, I apologize.

- Yeah, let's just keep it professional.

- Here's my point, though. Don't as a Committee vote to forward as is if you have issues with how it was presented as is. 'Cause otherwise it indicates to the community and everyone in the public that the Committee supports the ordinance as presented. And you see just what two members of the Council, that I see who are on the Committee, you disagree with it. So don't pass something as is that you don't agree with. I don't think that that's a good recommendation. Now, I agree, Committee is a recommendation. So the full Council's gonna address this and discuss it. And I'm fine with that. We've done committee work on the floor of the City Council a lot. I've participated in it. But I think that this Committee has the authority and the discretion to perhaps send back to staff for more information or whatever it is. But don't pass something as is if you don't agree with it. I don't know if that's good advice. That's all.

- All right.

- Thank you.

- Duly noted. Alder Dorff?

- That's not what I asked for. I didn't ask you to pass it. I asked it to be moved with no recommendation, if that's the way the Committee votes on it. I didn't say pass it. I just would like it to come to the floor. I said with no, just pass it on to Council. I didn't say pass the ordinance. I don't think the votes are on this Committee to pass the ordinance the way it is. I could be wrong. But I'd like it to move to Council.

- Both sides seem to makes sense on this. Committee members, anybody else? Alder Stevens?

- Sure. I do want to thank Alder Dorff for bringing all this information forward. I think we are in the right direction. But I do feel that we do need to split it, 'cause I do support the majority of

this, except for the Section 8 part of it. There needs to be a lot more discussion on that. And maybe pulling them as separate and make them two separate ordinances may be the way to go. But as it stands right now, I can't support this.

- Will somebody on the Committee bring forward--

- [Kathy] Alder Lefebvre?

- Alder Lefebvre, go ahead.

- [Kathy] Yes, I agree with Alder Dorff that, yeah, it's not gonna, it's gonna be maybe two to two or one to three, a vote. I think the way it's going right now. So I think, I don't know is that a motion, that we don't have any recommendation. We just pass it on to the City Council?

- I make a motion to receive and place on file.

- We have a motion. Do we have a second?

- [Kathy] Second? Does that, wait a minute, does that bring it forward, like we were talking?

- We have to vote on it.

- No, okay.

- No no, Alder Lefebvre, it would table the motion--

- Just to table, the motion?

- Or table the ordinance--

- We need much more work done on it, Mark, and--

- You would be receiving and placing on file. That wouldn't be, it would be disposing of it.

- Yes, we don't want to do that.

- [Kathy] Yeah, that wouldn't be right. Yeah. I withdraw my second.

- Okay. That dies for lack of a second.

- Well, Mark, I just want to make one quick comment.

- Go ahead.

- I think that receiving in place on file would give them some more time to bring up the real issues here, not just jam something through to City Council. I don't think it's correct. Receive and place on file would be good, they got more work to do on this, what they're talking about here. They need separation and they need a lot more information to the public.

- Okay.
- Receive and place on file will give them more time to get the job done. Thank you.
- All right. Attorney Bungert? You heard that again. If we?
- Right. If the ultimate goal is to get more information, then a motion to hold for that additional information to be brought forth would be the more appropriate motion. The effect of this motion is to essentially file the item away. And then there would have to be another, and City Attorney Chavez can chime in if I'm off at this point, but there would have to be another motion to bring the item back. You're essentially permanently filing it away. That's the effect of a receive and place on file. If the goal is to continue work on it and for more information to be brought forward, then a motion to hold would be more appropriate, with directions to staff as to what to bring forward.
- Okay. I thought I'd question to follow that. Alder Stevens?
- So I think the majority of us are in favor of the majority of this. Could we exclude that Section 8 for further discussion? Then move the rest of it forward?
- You can make any amendment to change the language and then approve as amended. I believe the language, and I'll defer to Attorney Mather, is if the language isn't Section 8 specifically, I believe the issue is removing persons that receive rental assistance as a protected class within the fair housing portion of the ordinance. And so the amendment would be to remove that language. And then the second motion would be to approve as amended.
- Okay. So I make the motion to remove the Section 8--
- [John] I still have a motion on the floor. To receive and place on file.
- No.
- There was no second.
- Alder Vander Leest, it died, for lack of a second.
- [John] Okay. Thank you.
- Okay. Go ahead, Alder Stevens?
- I would make a motion to remove the Section 8 from the ordinance.
- Just to be clear, it's receipt of rental assistance.
- [Craig] Yes, sorry, receipt of, yes.
- So the motion would be to amend and remove receipt of rental assistance as a protected

class from the ordinance?

- Right.

- Okay.

- But I still think we should have a separate thing where we discuss that portion of it, so it's a separate ordinance.

- Okay. That was my question, before, we can discuss this further. I guess my question, before we get a second. How time sensitive is this? I know we've gone, Alder Dorff, you said we've done this six times. I understand it's come back a few times. But I feel that just to get this information out. There was a lot of testimony from landlords and such. Some of it was very good. And I think that we owe them at least that, so I will second Alder Stevens on that. Okay, Alder Dorff, last time.

- Yeah. I think it's, I'm fine with that. I'm fine with that. If the rest of it's, if you feeling like you're supporting the rest of it, I'm fine with that then. I will bring further discussion about that then back to Council at a different time.

- That's appropriate. I thank you for that. All right, so we have a second, do we, any other discussion?

- [Kathy] I will vote yes, with Alder Dorff's blessing. I will vote yes.

- Well, Alder Stevens made the motion. So I second Alder Steven's motion.

- [Kathy] We had a second, didn't we?

- I seconded his motion. So do we have any other discussion? Otherwise I would entertain a vote. All in favor, please say aye?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed?

- It'll be nay for me, Mark. Because I think there has to be much, much more work done on this, on this ordinance.

- Well, I think there will be. I think there will be, Alder Vander Leest. There will be.

- I'm a nay on that one. Thank you.

- [Mark] Okay.

- All right, I have Alder Stevens, Alder Steuer, Alder Lefebvre voting as aye, Alder Vander Leest voting as no. And that passes three to one, on the amendment.

- Yes. Now do we need another vote?
- Yes, now a motion to approve as amended.
- Alder Stevens, do you want to go with that?
- Motion to approve as amended.
- [Mark] I will second that.
- [Kathy] Second.
- Okay, seconded by Lefebvre. All in favor, please say aye?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- [Mark] Opposed?
- [John] Nay.
- Okay, Alder Vander Leest, nay. Okay. Three to one. Attorney Bungert, anything else there?
- Nope. That would be it for New Business. Are we good to move on to the next item? I certainly would like that.
- Okay. Next item is the Liquor Violation Report.
- My favorite part of the meeting. Is Lieutenant still out there?
- Yep. I'm still here.
- [Mark] Oh man, I'm proud of you.
- We have no violations during this time.
- [Mark] You are the best.
- [Craig] Motion to receive and place on file.
- Second.
- Second.
- We have a motion by Stevens, seconded by Vander Leest. All in favor, please say aye?

- [All] Aye.
- All opposed? That passes unanimously.
- And we are on adjournment
- No, we want to stay for awhile.
- [John] Motion to adjourn.
- Motion to adjourn by Vander Leest.
- [Kathy] Want to stay for awhile. Seconded by Lefebvre.
- All in favor, please say aye?
- [All] Aye.
- Thank you for all your testimony.
- [John] Thanks a lot, everybody. I enjoyed the meeting here. A lot of good discussion. And we got a lot more to do on this subject. Thank you.
- Stay democratic. All right. Thank you all.