



MINUTES OF THE PROTECTION AND POLICY COMMITTEE

MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 2021, 5:30 PM
Virtual Meeting. Public may join via Zoom.

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

I. This item contains information and instructions on the Zoom virtual meeting.

B. ROLL CALL.

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

Also present: Deputy City Attorney Joanne Bungert, Lt. Steve Mahoney, Lt. Nate Allen, Chief of Staff Celestine Jeffereys, Chief Building Official Paul Van Calster, Alder Lynn Gerlach and Alder Barbara Dorff.

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest 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 December 7, 2020 Protection & Policy Committee Meeting.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve the minutes from the December 7, 2020 Protection & Policy Committee Meeting. Motion carried.

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

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Consideration with possible action on an application for an available "Class B" Combination license by Mangaire, LLC at 121 N. Adams St. with a licensed premise description as "Restaurant/kitchen/bar/4 bthrm/1 lqr stg rm/2 walk-in coolers/maint rm/fs dishwashing rm" (Currently licensed as Skaliwags High Cotton Club Limited).

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to approve an application for an available "Class B" Combination license by Mangaire, LLC at 121 N. Adams St. with a licensed premise description as "Restaurant/kitchen/bar/4 bthrm/1 lqr stg rm/2 walk-in coolers/maint rm/fs dishwashing rm" (Currently licensed as Skaliwags High Cotton Club Limited), with the approval of the proper authorities. Motion carried.

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

2. Consideration with possible action on a "Class A" Liquor and Class "A" Beer license at 2030 E. Mason St. with a licensed premises description as "behind the counter, shelves (in-store), back office storage.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to approve on an application for a "Class A" Liquor and Class "A" Beer license at 2030 E. Mason St. with a licensed premises description as "behind the counter, shelves (in-store), back office storage, with the approval of the proper authorities. Motion carried.

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

3. Consideration with possible action on an application for an available "Class B" Combination license by Cuquio Town Bar, LLC at 500 N. Baird St. with a license premises description as "sold behind the bar, coolers, basement, office" (currently licensed as Quilts and Beers, LLC).

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve an application for an available "Class B" Combination license by Cuquio Town Bar, LLC at 500 N. Baird St. with a license premises description as "sold behind the bar, coolers, basement, office" (currently licensed as Quilts and Beers, LLC), with the approval of the proper authorities. 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 B" Combination license by Jalisco Mexican Restaurant, LLC at 418 S. Military Ave. with a license premises description as "main dining room, back dining room, back area, storage at back office (license granted to Karaoke Mexican Restaurant, LLC for the 2020-2021 license year).

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

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

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, 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. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve an application for a "Class B" Combination license by Jalisco Mexican Restaurant, LLC at 418 S. Military Ave. with a license premises description as "main dining room, back dining room, back area, storage at back office (license granted to Karaoke Mexican Restaurant, LLC for the 2020-2021 license year), with the approval of the proper authorities. Motion carried.

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

5. A request by Ald. Scannell for consideration with possible action on an appeal by Paul Bachhuber for inspection fines on 202/208 S. Webster.

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. John VanderLeest, 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 rescind 13 citations and reduce the fines by \$650 for the inspection fines on 202/208 S. Webster. Motion carried.

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

6. Consideration with possible action on an appeal by Amanda Lee regarding the denial of her operator's license.

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, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve an appeal by Amanda Lee regarding the denial of her operator's license contingent on a letter of reference from the employer to be filed with the Clerk's office.

7. Consideration with possible action on a request by Ald. Dorff that staff research a change to Alder terms from two years to three years beginning with the 2022 election.

Moved by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to advance to full Council a request by Ald. Dorff that staff research a change to Alder terms from two years to three years beginning with the 2022 election. Motion carried.

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

8. Consideration with possible action on a resolution in support of City of Green Bay Employees.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve a resolution in support of City of Green Bay Employees. Motion carried.

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

F. INFORMATIONAL.

I. The Liquor Violation Report for January 11, 2021.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve The Liquor Violation Report for January 11, 2021. Motion carried.

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- [Woman] Now, recording.

- Okay.

- Perfect.

- All right.

- And we are all-

- All right. We are all set in Civic Clerk, so we can go ahead and open the meeting.

- Okay, very good. Well happy New Year everybody to all fellow Alders and citizens at large in Green Bay, and other areas, if you're here. Welcome to our Protection Policy Committee meeting for Jan 11, 2021. We'll do a roll call, Alder Steuer, I am here. Alder Lefebvre?

- Here.

- Alder Vander Leest?

- Here.

- Alder Stevens?

- Here.

- Everybody is here.

- All right, approval of the agenda.

- Good, do I have a motion?

- Motion approved.

- Approved by Alder Lefebvre, do we have a second?

- Second.

- Second by Alder Vander Leest. All in favor, please say I.

- I.

- I.

- All opposed, that passes unanimously.

- All right, and approval of the minutes.

- Motion to approve.

- Motion by Stevens, do I have a second?

- Second.

- Whichever .

- I'll flip a coin, right now it's Lefebvre's. Second all in favor, all in favor, please say I.

- I.

- I.

- I, all opposed, that passes unanimous.

- Okay, and we are on to regular business, Item Number One.

- Okay, regular business, Number One. Consideration with possible action on an application for an available Class B combination license by Mengorie LLC at 121 North Adams Street. With a license premise description as restaurant/kitchen/bar or bathroom. One liquor storage room, two walk in coolers, maintenance room, FFS washing, dish washing room. Currently licensed as Skaliwags High Cotton Club, limited staff.

- Staff is .

- Police?

- Police concur.

- Does anybody from committee have any questions? Otherwise, I'll entertain a motion.

- Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve.

- Motions by Stevens and seconded by Vander Leest. Is that all right?

- That's fine.

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

- I.

- I.

- All oppose, that passes unanimously. I would like to let the citizens know that our next City Council meeting will be January 19th. And that will be, you know, it'll go to final approval, anything on this committee, is advisory in a sense, but it will go to for final approval on the 19th if you have any questions.

- Mark, you wanna give them the time on the 19th?

- Six o'clock, six o'clock on the 19th. Another Zoom meeting.

- That's a Tuesday, Mark.

- Yes, that's Tuesday.

- Oh, we're changing it to a Tuesday, okay.

- Well, no, no, I'm talking, well Council is always usually on Tuesday.

- Oh, oh, you mean the council?

- Yes, did I mention that? I thought I did.

- Next, Protection and Policy, I apologize.

- I said council.

- Yeah, it's council.

- All right, ready for Number Two?

- All right, Item Number Two.

- Number Two, consideration with possible action on the Class A Liquor and Class A Beer license at 2030 East Mason Street, with a license premise description as behind the counter, shelves, in store, back office storage, staff.

- Staff has no objection. There is no license currently at this location. And it is not within 300 feet of a church or school.

- Okay. Police?

- Police concur with law.

- Okay, I would entertain a motion.

- Motion to approve.

- Can I ask?

- Yes, go ahead.

- Is there a map that shows where this is?

- Just so you know this location's pretty much right at, it's where Topper's pizza is, in that little strip mall over on Mason Street by Main, kind of right at that intersection. A long time ago, there used to be a Dairy Queen in there.

- Okay, okay.

- That's where this location is at.

- Okay, it's far from, there aren't, is there another bar? I don't think there's anything close, or is there one across the street?

- Bar or?

- Wally's Spot is nearby.

- No, that's down further.

- No, Wally's Spot's about, like there's a Walgreens, kind of kitty-corner. Then there's that Little Cesear's in that little strip mall right there-

- Oh, down further than what I thought, okay.

- Yeah.

- So it's pretty much right at the intersection of Main and Mason. One of the corners at Main and Mason.

- Okay do you feel that they have to, do they have to go around on that side street to get into that little strip mall?

- It depending, yes, they do. And depending on the hours or days, there are certain signs on when they can turn in there depending on the direction. But yes, they come in pretty much from the back way off August Street, or off Bater Street.

- So you don't think there'd be a problem with people trying to get in there off of Mason Street?

- No, not at all.

- Okay, okay, thank you.

- Okay, any other questions? Otherwise I'll entertain a motion.

- Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve.

- Motion by Stevens, seconded by Vander Leest. Any other discussion? All in favor please say I.

- I.

- I.

- I, all opposed, that passes unanimously.

- Can I say one thing, Mark? I approved it because there's not a lot around there. I wanna make sure that if something's new that we don't put in where there's a lot of concentrations of places that sell liquor.

- Right, I understand.

- Okay, thank you.

- Well, thank you for that.

- Okay, Attorney Bungert, are we ready?

- Yup, Item Number Three.

- Okay, Number Three, consideration with possible action on an application for an available Class B combination license by Cukeyo Ellen Barr, LLC at 500 North Baird Street with a license premised, description as sold behind the bar, coolers, basement office, currently licensed as Quills and Beers LLC, staff.

- Yes, so that has no objection. This in the old Main Street moratorium, but it's currently exemption. The current licensee no longer has control over the premises so the owner is applying for the license. And did provide a written statement confirming that the former tenant no longer has control, no longer has a valid lease. But it wasn't a surrender to the city, which is why it's being processed as an available license. So we're not adding anything, it's just transferring?

- Right, it's currently, yeah.

- Okay. All right, police?

- Police concur with law.

- Okay, motion to approve.

- Motion by Stevens, second by Lefebvre. All in favor, please say I.

- I.

- I.

- I, all opposed, that passes unanimously.

- Okay. And item Number Four, yeah.

- Number Four. Consideration with possible action on an application for a Class B combination license by Chulus School Mexican Restaurant LLC at 418 South Military Avenue with a license premise description as main dining room, back dining room, back area, storage shed, back office, license granted to Karaoke Mexican Restaurant LLC for the 2020, and 2021 licenser, staff.

- Yeah, so staff recommendation on this application is to deny based on safety and lawfulness concerns. Are related to multiple state violations of selling liquor without a license.

- Mm-hm.

- I do have some language for a motion if that is what the committee does want to pursue, simply because we have to specific on the record as to why we're denying. But I'm going to defer to Lieutenant Mahoney with more explantation as to our determination on this one.

- Okay, thank you. Go ahead, Lieutenant.

- Yes, late last year on specifically on September 23rd of 2020, the state department of revenue, they do, they're on a state level for alcohol compliance checks, they met with our department and went to this location, 'cause the owners were selling alcohol without a license. The owner that's applying for his license was cited by the Green Bay Police Department. As he was serving alcohol, he did sell to the agent from the State of Wisconsin. He sold alcohol to him and he was told that he needed to apply for a license. Then on

December 5th of 2020, that same agent from the Department of Revenue conducted a check as there was some unpaid taxes, and they believed they were still selling alcohol. The agent went to the restaurant, sighted signs for various beers. The agent placed a to-go order and the orderer asked the agent if he wanted a drink while waiting for food. The agent asked for a Coors Light. The owner paused a second, and said that he didn't have a liquor license, as he failed to apply for one on time, but then winked at the agent and poured him a drink. Then, he also then served him two strawberry margaritas. So based on that, and unpaid taxes, it seems like this owner has no concern for laws or ordinances. This was within two months. He obviously knew it was wrong, and I don't believe he would be following our liquor laws in the future if he was granted a license. So that's why we're recommending that he be, not be granted a license.

- Okay, I know, I noticed Leah Weycker, I believe she's here. I'd like to make a motion, or have a motion made to open the floor.

- Motion to open the floor.

- By Vander Leest, do we have a second?

- Second.

- Liken by Lefebvre, all in favor, please say I.

- I.

- I.

- I, all opposed? Leah, are you out there?

- [Leah] I am, Alder Steuer.

- Yes, we talked about this briefly a couple weeks ago. And I just wanted you to, you know, it's a business within the bid district there, and I just wanted you to kind of let us, the committee know your thoughts on all of this.

- [Leah] Yeah, thank you. And I also have Marvin and Maurice with me right now.

- Okay.

- [Celestine] Ms. Weycker, can you state your name and address for the committee, and then if other people who are with you are going to speak, please also state your names and addresses for the committee, thank you.

- [Leah] Sure, my name's Leah Weycker, L-E-A-H W-E-Y-C-K-E-R. With Military Avenue business district. I'll put it over to Marvin.

- [Marvin] My name's Marvin de la Rosa, my address is 833 South Jefferson Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin 50301. And I'm with Jalisco Mexican Restaurant Business. And I'm .

- [Maurice] My name's Maurice Guererra. Street, 50033.

- [Leah] Did you need spelling on that?

- Yeah, well, we could get that, if you wanna, I wanted you, well go ahead, I was gonna have you talk, Leah, initially. You know, as far as you've been working with these owners. I just wanted you to kind of share that with the committee.

- [Leah] Yeah, I have been working with them, Marvin, and the Karaoke Mexican Restaurant, since they moved in almost three years ago, I believe. It's a tough location, they've done very well in that location. They had some problems recently with the LLC partnership they were in. And that sort of sent things into a spiral with the licensing, the payment of bills, all those things. So they did the correct thing, in restructuring into a new LLC. And I believe they need to have this license back if they are going to continue in business. I'll expect to get a margarita with dinner and beer experiencing that happening today. And they applied for the license early in December, and it's gonna be like the end of January before they can even get a license which is really a long

time for us to wait on giving them a license, when it's such a critical part of their business. I can vouch for them, but they are an awesome business. People in the neighborhood like them. They had a really good clientele and the people that have been coming, expected to find liquor there. So it was very difficult and damaging to the business to make this transition. So I hope that you can vote favorably for them. And I will leave Marvin and Maurice speak to that too, if you have questions.

- Okay, committee, do you have any? I did talk to-

- I have a question.

- Go ahead, Alder Stevens.

- Well, you say that their restructuring in the their LLC, so who left the business?

- [Marvin] So the business, this is Marvin de la Rosa, and I'm speaking on behalf of Maurice also, who is the prime applicant for the liquor license. We'd like to address with regards that we've been restructured, we had a bad partnership with someone that was from out of state, also. And there was no commitment in regards to what we as a family, you know, for the district, and for the business. And unpaid amount of taxes, and also some things that were done that was not properly done, and we admitted to that. We wanted to restructure ourselves, as the business. But apparently, we couldn't do it with the agreement from the person who was holding the LLC. There was no commitment in his behalf in order to structure the business in a better way where we could directly make payments. We had to get in touch with him every time that we needed something to be done, because he was the sole property owner of the LLC. So now we wanted to restructure and reinvent ourselves, since we the one who sacrificed the time and the money that we had in our statements to continue the business and keep the business moving forward. But we have coming to, you know, an obstacle with the liquor license. And just in food alone, we not able to meet the numbers just to say alive. We personally, I haven't paid my rent, I haven't paid my bills at home. I don't know if I get an eviction any time soon, along with my wife and my kids, we have four kids. So there is a lot things at stake and at hand. And I understand that there has to be some trust in how we gonna rebuild ourself. And do it in a legal way, and a proper way in where we could prove you that's what we wanna do. We wanna move forward, but at the same time we wanna do it in a right way. We ask you to reconsider the decision that was made before. For that provisional license. We understand that there was a mistake done, but as a human being, we have other things that concern to our family. Like our bills, the restaurant bills, and trying to stay afloat. I think if we had legal be, beneficial to the business to keep moving forward. But at this time, to be honest, I don't know if we could stay at least another month, alive. I don't think the business has enough... In some food alone. Because we have clients that come in, but they leave once they know we don't have a liquor license. We're not here to commit any crime, we here to try and improve the district also, but in also to try and improve our business and be able to be proud of the society.

- Thank you.

- We just want an opportunity to be able to work. We wanna be able to work, and we wanna be able to prove you that we can continue on and do it in the right way. We just want that from your part.

- Okay, so is the taxes paid in full?

- [Marvin] The taxes on the previous, on this one, we are on the taxes already. On this one, on this LLC. The taxes for the other LLC, that leads to Kasalem and Cia, which is the previous LLC. The one that we have no commitment to the business in regards to moving it forward, he saw it as more of a personal gain rather than being a team member and say okay, you are the one who is sacrificing the time of being there.

- So this gentlemen's no longer associated with your business?

- [Marvin] No sir, this business is doing, is no longer in the business at all.

- Okay, thank you.

- That was a question I had, I was wondering that drinks were being given out as Lieutenant Mahoney said. Was this from this other person? Or were you aware of that situation?

- [Marvin] I did, I was aware of the situation. I presented to this person that we needed to move forward and be able to clarify those taxes, the statement. But the person had no commitment. He had no willing to fix that. I saw it in a way to try to destroy those, you know, by not being able to pay those, you know? But we keep moving forward, even though he wasn't even making the money to say that we was paying ourself a salary. Or making any to survival bits, you know? But we wanted to move forward because we have invested years in the business. The clientele in this community knew us, not him. So he was not involved in regards to, okay, let's get this clarified. It was more of a personal gain to him, rather than having us being able to grow with him.

- Okay.

- I have a question for Lieutenant.

- Yes?

- So the citations, who were the individuals cited? Your name?

- No, the individual that was cited is Maurice Heron Rivera Panita, I believe one of the other gentlemen that is still the current owner. It wasn't anyone from a past LLC. It was, I understand the whole tax thing, but our concern as the police department is someone that's currently there served alcohol without a license. It had nothing to do with an LLC and past taxes. It has to do with the people that were there now knew they didn't have the license. They intentionally sold it, and they even winked at the agent and make a gesture like, hey, don't tell anyone, and yet they still did it. That is our objection to it. I feel sorry that with all the restructuring, but their current owner was the one that received it back in September, and also received in in December. A couple months apart, in between September and December, no one came forward to apply for the license during that time. When they knew that they didn't have the license.

- May I speak?

- Yeah, the floor is still open. Who is this speaking?

- Thank you, this is Murray, I mean Marvin de la Rosa. The reason that, that took place in December. At the time that in the first incident where we were selling alcohol without a license, it was to the Karaoke LLC. At that time, we didn't have no knowledge, because of the fact that this person was the one on the LLC. It was the only person that allowed it renew the liquor license. So as I said before, this person saw it as a way of destruction. I don't renew the license, they basically done. So we didn't knew that he didn't renew the license at that time. At that time, the police department came in, the unpaid sale taxes. So at that time when they looked at the license, it was expired, it was not renewed. So basically we closed the restaurant from that day on, because we can't move forward and sell anymore. So we reinvented ourself, we came to a negotiation with him that we say, okay, if we are able to continue on, we could pay those taxes at the same time, being able to have a liquor license allows to do that. And on the incident that happened in December, we had already applied for the liquor license. What we didn't knew was that we could apply for a provisional license. I was not told, Maurice was not told, that there was an application for provisional license that he could apply for. And the reason why we came to find about that, is because Leah Weycker is the one who told us, being the president that I have contact, being the president of the military district, I have contact with her. And she advised me and say, this is the way that you could get a provisional license. Now when that application was in already, we was still waiting from the main application for the liquor license when that took place. Now we don't wanna do something illegal. Now understand that COVID hurted the business completely. I'm talking about sales of \$170 a day. You could barely pay two people with \$170, let alone the bills that this business has. So not to know due respect to law enforcement, or not to due respect to the City of Green Bay, we had to

do something in order for us to stay alive. You know, this was not done in the spite, of say, let's violate the laws. No, or let's violate the ordinance. No, sir. We in no way, our intentions was to violate the law, at all. What happened is that, like I say, my kids went without Christmas. No gift. You know, I got two paternal uncles that died of COVID-19. One on the 21st, one on the 25th. You know? And there was no money to bury them, okay? There was no money to say, okay, let's have a funeral. So understand, I have bills, personal, Maurice has bills, personals, too. So we don't have no response from the City of Green Bay in regards to, say okay, how's your business doing? Is your business able to maintain? Nothing. So we didn't get no help from no PP loan, we didn't get no help from no other agency that could of helped us and say, "Okay, "how can we work with you for you to stay alive?" Nothing like that happened. So I just want you to know that nothing that happened, came from us in the spite to violate any laws or ordinances, no sir. That would not come from our part. All we wanna do is to work, and do it legally, and for you to give us an opportunity. You could put us on probation and say, okay, we're gonna put you on probation from this time on, and see how you're doing, and we gonna keep checking, and you, if you could prove you that, that's what we wanna do. We wanna be able not only to be able to grow us a business, but be part of the community, and be able to be successful. At this time, that's what we ask from you.

- All right, okay. You spoke well on that. I wanted to get back to-

- [Leah] Can I verify, Mr. Steuer?

- Yeah, but I wanted to ask you, Leah, if you chime in on this.

- [Leah] The other owner that was part of that other LLC does not live in Green Bay, so he has never been a participant really in the restaurant, itself. Marvin and Maurice are the faces, and Marvin's wife, Margherita, are the faces of the business. That person that didn't pay the taxes, and that didn't renew the lease, or renew the liquor license, doesn't even live here.

- So the issues that you feel happened, happened because of the other owner, or the other people at the LLC?

- [Leah] Absolutely. He was the one that had control of renewing things. Marvin and Maurice did not have that control.

- Well, obviously there's a disconnect. There must have been a disconnect somewhere between-

- [Leah] Well it was a fight, it's part of the family. And they were intentionally trying to make these guys go down. Is the way I understand it to be.

- Okay.

- I yep, Lieutenant , when was the first citation issued?

- The first citation was issued back on September 23rd of 2000.

- 2000?

- Oh, I'm sorry, 2020.

- The second citation?

- The second citation was issued, let me see here, I'm going through my paperwork. I believe it was on December 7th of 2020.

- Okay, December 7th, okay.

- Yes.

- So I just heard that the gentleman that's no longer with this business, was not, hasn't even been in Green Bay. He's working from afar, it sounds like. So the citations that were issued in September and December were issued to the two current owners.

- Correct.

- [Leah] That is correct.

- Okay, and then they waited until December to file a new liquor license.

- Yes.

- Okay.

- September or December is, there's a lot of time there.

- [Leah] They shut the business down. The business was shut down.

- Could I ask when the business-

- [Leah] It reopened.

- Could I ask when the business opened back up? The gentlemen said he shut down. What day did he open back up?

- [Maurice] December 1st. We opened December 1st, and that's the time we have applied for the liquor license. On December 1st application, we sent the application to the City of Green Bay for a liquor license. We didn't have no knowledge in regards to the provisional license. Because we didn't have knowledge of it, we would apply for it. But we didn't have no knowledge. We came to know about the provisional license through Leah Weycker. And that was about-

- [Leah] I think it was later in December.

- [Maurice] It was later in December when she was able to give us that information that we could apply for a provisional license.

- Leah, I can ask you-

- When did the business close?

- [Leah] When did it close?

- [Maurice] The business closed September, right on the same day where we got the citation that the liquor license was not renewed. And we didn't have no knowledge of that. We were surprised that we didn't have no liquor license. So actually from that day on, we closed the business because of the fact that, we don't have no liquor license, the business was already hurt by COVID. So we say okay, we gonna have to restructure ourselves, in order to continue on, or this business is gonna have to close. And now, everything that went down to this business, this was a previous business in there, that nothing was successful. It meant that it wasn't able to keep the clientele going on. I'm sure that some of you are familiar with this location, and there were Mexican restaurants there before. There was a Chinese restaurant there before, and nothing was successful. We happy to take a liking to the community. The community liked us. You know, we seen, serve people. We are honest people. Just we made a mistake by selling liquor without a license in December, yes, we had been honest, yes we did. We admit to that. But you know, I think that the circumstances lead us to do something like that, and then we say, you know what? We're not selling to minors. This a restaurant that is more frequented by older people. I don't think there is a complaint in the City of Green Bay by the police department that could say that we sell to minors, or that we sell to people who are over drunk already, nothing like that. We try to watch for those, because we took classes to become bartenders in order to be able to sell liquor. Our main thing was that we didn't have no liquor license. We are completely hurt by not having it. Our sales dropped dramatically, I'd say 80% of our sales is dropped. Even with our clientele that knew us from before, for the reason that they come in to have a meal, to have a beer and go home, or go to work, or something. But the ability of not having that is hurting our business, I'd say 80%.

- Yeah, okay, let the committee chime in.

- So I'm just trying, I'll be honest, I'm torn on this. So I'm trying to figure out the timeframe on what everything has fallen suit, over the last few months. You dated the citation the first time. I don't know what the citation states, it's probably for selling liquor, you knew that already. But then you opened up December 1st, but you chose to sell a liquor license, and then you got citation on the 7th. So I'm assuming you were closed all those months ahead of time? I've never been there, so I couldn't tell you, so I'm taking your word that you've been closed. I'm torn because you already had one citation in September. But you chose to close down. And but then you chose to reopen, and unfortunately seven days later, you got nailed again. Which you already knew in September, that you weren't supposed to sell liquor without the liquor license, and you didn't have a liquor

license in your possession when you opened December 1st. So I'm very torn, I understand COVID, I understand the businesses are hurting in Green Bay, I totally do. But we still have rules and policies that we need to all follow.

- [Maurice] Yes, yes.

- So I'm torn, I truly am torn on this. So that's why I'm just trying to get a timeline to try and figure it out.

- Can I ask the gentleman one more question?

- Go ahead.

- When did you apply to get your tax registration number for your business?

- [Maurice] That was September.

- The reason that I'm saying this, the warrant that the Department of Revenue used, was they saw that you applied on November 1st to get a tax registration for your business. So at that point, once again, that's where the P.D., you were starting your business November 1st, not December 1st, so you were thinking about doing that. And then, never in November did you apply to get your liquor license, but you applied to get your tax registration. That's why the Department of Revenue sent you, got caught before, that's what triggered them to go spot check you again. So that's why, I feel bad for you, your family, and the business with COVID, but the P.D.'s opinion is you had ample opportunity to go get this license, and you knew about getting the license.

- [Leah] I have to question why they were not instructed that they could get a provisional license on December 1st. That would've solved everything.

- I could tell you the provisional license with the approval of inspection and the P.D., at that point, when I researched it, I would have not had granted a provisional license because they served alcohol without having a license to begin with.

- [Leah] And that would have been in the prior ownership of the business.

- The citation that was issued back in September was issued to the current owner, Maurice Hernanda Rivera Pantia. So I would have not authorized the granting of a provisional license. So they would not have been able to get one. The same is after he applied this time, he tried to get the provisional, and we declined to do that based on his past experience serving without the license.

- [Leah] I would request the city to look into the timeline of the application. I know if they applied in December, December 1st to reopen, applied to the liquor license, why was the inspection there was an inspector from the city that came last week. That's several weeks after the license application. Because it's Christmas, I understand. But this business needed to keep going, and now I believe there's also an electrician that is out, so there isn't even an inspector to inspect for electricity at this point, at the City of Green Bay. That is not the fault of the business.

- I'd like Alder Vander Leest, or Alder Lefebvre, do you have anything that you wanna speak on?

- I'd like to just make a comment.

- Go ahead, Alder Vander Leest.

- I read the information earlier in the day from Miss Weycker, as far as what went on. They weren't able to secure a loan. Like they had some loans, provisional loans for small businesses, and they weren't able to get that. I think there's been a lot of miscommunication as far as operating their business. And I think they made some mis-steps as far as not getting the liquor license in a quick manner and following up on it. And it sounds like they're making an effort to restructure and uh... at least give them a chance, another chance to move forward, as far as to keep their business going. I know that they have quite a few things against them, but I know that a lot of people don't know all the rules, they don't know all the requirements as far as city, and when you get into the tax part of it. And sometimes when you do apply for a tax license, as far as your sales tax and things, it's not done just overnight. Sometimes there's a waiting period there, as well. So I think that if they're willing to restructure and get things moving in the right direction as far as paying their taxes and getting this license and get everything approved, as far. I'd like to see them go forward with the business. I'd hate to see another empty spot in the Westgate Shopping Center, there. So I'd be willing to give 'em another go at it.

- Alder Vander Leest, I was gonna ask you, the owner or, mentioned something about probational type of thing. Is that something that you would consider?

- Sure, I would definitely consider that. And if they make a lot of miscues, the license can be pulled. There's a miscue, you know.

- I heard with Alder Vander Leest too, and I know Alder Stevens is a little torn on it. Alder Lefebvre, do you wanna chime in?

- Yeah, you're listening to all this, and you're trying to get it all in line, as I know Alder Stevens been trying to timeline. And I think some of it, what I have been hearing is that there was a lot of miscommunication and the former LLC was interfering with a lot of what's been going on. That they have been relying on them, and not realizing that some of this, the licenses, the license was not applied for, or it was, and denied. Yeah, I'm kind of torn on it, too. It's kind of hard. Yeah, you wanna keep businesses going, I know. You don't want a business to fail. Especially a family-owned business like this. That they wanna keep in the neighborhood. When you got the people from the Military Avenue Corridor supporting them, who feel that they have a good business, I do feel, yeah, it's hard, it's very hard to decide.

- Okay.

- I'm thinking about it.

- Right, well I appreciate that. Just one second, Alder Stevens. I was gonna say, Alder, or Leah Weyker, you know from Military Avenue. I've worked with her on many different structures and buildings, and businesses in the district. She's very proactive, she really fights for her businesses. And this is just another one of those things that she's fighting for. I think she realizes that a mistake was made. But I feel that, I think we can work with this, I really do. Alder Stevens?

- Did Paul Van Calster want to chime in? I know he turned on his video.

- Paul, do you wanna chime in, or do you wanna wait for our next item?

- No, I'll just chime in. We did do the inspection, so inspection isn't holding them up. We authorized the approval. The liquor's gonna be inspected, oh sorry, the electrical is gonna be inspected this week. So they're fine, they run a clean operation from the inspection point of view.

- All right-

- So my final... I do have a final comment.

- Yeah, go ahead.

- Well my final, I'm still torn on this, so but, my final comment is, when you operate a business, it comes down to the business owner.

- Yeah.

- [Craig] They need to be, find the correct people, business attorney, whoever it'll be that can point them in the right direction. There may have been miscommunications, or things not asked that should have been asked, but that does fall on the business owner.

- [Leah] Can I answer to that, Alder Steuer?

- [Mark] Yes.

- [Leah] In a different part of my life, I'm also a business owner of a Green Bay business. And have zero to say about that business. So because that owner is an LLC person, it's still, and they're all owners, technically, under an LLC. Many times the LLC people don't know what the other hand is doing. And I can personally vouch for that in another business.

- Well, had discussion on this, I think we should move forward. I would like someone to bring a motion forward. Alder Vander Leest?

- Alder Steuer, we need to close the floor.

- Oh, you're right, thank you.

- [John] Motion to close the floor.

- [Kathy] Second.

- All in favor?

- [Kathy] I.

- [John] I.

- I.

- Alder Steuer, that was Vander Leest who made the motion?

- [Mark] Yes.

- Second was?

- [Mark] Lefebvre.

- Who was the second?

- Lefebvre.

- [Joanne] And before we move on, I did just want to make one, I'm just recording this . I did just want to make one comment before the committee moves forward. I know somebody had mentioned that, I think it was Alder Vander Leest, that if subsequent violation occur, that the license can be revoked, and that is true. I just do want to remind the committee that is is very limited upon which the basis on which we can revoke a license is very limited. And quite time-consuming and intricate. So I just don't want the committee to be under a false impression that it's as easy as just taking away someone's license, it requires a complaint to be draft up by the Assistant City Attorney, and a hearing to be done, and there's appeal, appeal opportunities for the licensee. So it can take a good, several months to conclude. And it's usually not enough to proceed for revocation, just based on one or two violations, they usually have to be a history. So I just wanted to committee to be a little bit more aware as far as what that process is, when a license is granted, that it is, it is an involved process to revoke.

- [Mark] Okay. Alder Lefebvre, before we move on?

- Yeah, I think with, I'm sorry, I forgot her name, from Military-

- Leah Weycker.

- [Kathy] Leah, yeah. I think with her backing, I think, she's probably gonna be watching this and making sure that they follow through on things that they said that they're gonna do. And clean up the business, make sure everything's done legally. And run as a good business in the community.

- Would you like to make a motion to that effect? Would you like to make a motion, Alder Lefebvre?

- Oh John, do you wanna make the motion, and I'll second.

- I'll make the motion to give them another chance, and approve the application, and to move forward with their business.

- Okay, do we have a second?

- [Kathy] Second.

- Okay, any other discussion? All in favor, I will say I.

- I.

- [Kathy] I.

- [Mark] Alder Stevens? We got time.

- In reality, they broke the law.

- [Mark] You're right.

- Yeah.

- [Craig] They truly did. Maybe not understanding the law very well, which it seems like, but they broke it. And you know, I hope they got the correct people now that can coach them in this business, help them move forward. Yes, I think Green Bay to survive, I know it's very difficult right now, I have friends that are in their own business, and they're hurting, and I understand all that. But they did break the law, and that hopefully they understood that they broke this law. So, but I want the business to rise, so I will say let's move forward.

- Okay, I appreciate all the comments. All in favor, please say I.

- [Kathy] I.

- [John] I.

- I, that passes unanimously, and all right then, Leah and folks, this goes to Council on January 19th, Tuesday at 6 p.m. And so you may want to be there just in case somebody decides to poll to cite them. But normally, we hashed it up pretty well to Committee, and there were a lot of good comments by everybody and I appreciate all the dialogue. So we're hoping for the best, and Leah, we think that you will be very good at working with forward, so thank you.

- [Leah] Thank you, Alder.

- [Mark] Okay.

- All right, onto Item Number Five.

- Okay, Number Five, a request by Alder Scannell for consideration with possible action on an appeal by Paul Bachhuber for inspection five, on 202-208 South Wasker. I know that Paul is here.

- Alder Steuer, before we move forward, yeah, before we move forward, staff recommendation before I turn it over to Chief Building Official Van Calster. Staff determination at this point is to deny the appeal based on the appeal not being timely. Appeals for re-inspection fees are 30 days from the issuance of the fee. And there are several that are beyond the, way beyond the 30 day window. And accordingly, staff is recommending that it be denied based on that timeliness issue. In my understanding, though it, inspection staff recommendation is to proceed on a handful of those appeals, and pushing them within the window. But I'll defer to Chief Building Official Van Calster on which of those, they would be agreeable to proceed and review this evening.

- [Mark] Okay, thank you. Thank you, Attorney Bungert, Paul, what issue care to?

- [Paul B.] This is Paul Bachhuber, can you hear me?

- Oh no, I'm sorry, we don't open the floor yet, Paul, we'll get to you, don't worry.

- [Paul B.] Thank you.

- [Mark] Paul Van Calster from the Inspection Department.

- [Paul V.] The whole case started in May 22 of 2019. It's been going on for, since then. Paul then reached out to me on October 21st of 2020. And asked that everything be waived and disregarded because it was a foreclosure process and he wasn't in the loop. I asked him for a plan of how he was gonna to address the issues to try and clean it up as he was going through that. He said he had no plan, he wasn't gonna do anything until the new owner took over, and the new owner would address the issues. Looking back, like Joanne just said, the 30 day, all these are before the 30, but what I'm willing to do tonight, to show some agreement towards what Paul is asking, is I would waive 13 from when he called me on October 21st, and we talked for a good 35, 40 minutes about the issues, I waived those 13 for a total of 650 bucks. The rest are before he took any action.

- [Mark] What was that total, Paul? I mean the total before that. I got to bring-

- [Paul] I don't have that. It's been going on for two years, some of it went to the tax roll.

- [Kathy] I think wasn't it a thousand something? I don't have the exact.

- I'm having a hard time bringing it up right now.

- [Craig] It was 18 hundred.

- [Mark] Okay.

- [Paul] What, \$2,800.

- 28? Okay, well-

- Oh, 28, oh.

- And Paul Van Calster, you said you would bring it to what?

- [Paul V.] I'll take \$650 off.

- [Mark] Okay.

- [Paul V.] The thing to remember is, because Paul didn't wanna do anything to correct any of the issues for the benefit of the city, the neighbors, or the community. And we, Bill Tappie and myself tried talking to him on a couple of occasions, and he didn't care to take any approach relative to addressing the issues. It was just I'm gonna leave it set, and the owner can take it over.

- [Mark] Okay. I'd like to hear from Paul Bachhuber, unless committee, do you have any questions of Paul? Otherwise, we'll open up the floor.

- I'll move to open the floor.

- [Mark] Okay by Lefebvre, second by Stephens, or by Vander Leest? Second by Vander Leest, all in favor, please say I?

- [John] I.

- [Mark] I, okay, that passes unanimously, Mr. Bachhuber, if you care to, state your name and address for the record, and then-

- [Paul B.] Paul Bachhuber. 4955 Founder's Terrace in Holbart.

- [Mark] Okay, you heard what was stated by our inspection department. If you could talk to the committee and feel while, what should be waived, so go ahead.

- [Paul B.] Well there was a couple issues. I think this quick background. I represent Verve Credit Union. And this was a piece of property where the owner ended up in a coma, we foreclosed on the property, we took title of it in September. I had communication with Scott Nelson, with regards to what our intention was back in September. Shortly after, we were able to take title to it, we were able to find an offer to purchase on it, because it was occupied, it took us longer to , especially with COVID, we were no been able to evict the people that were onboard. And one of the conditions of the offer to purchase was that the property needed to have no tenants in place at the time. I had contacted Paul, like he said, in the first part of October. I'd also sent him emails on October 28th, and November 3rd without any response. He also did not respond to at least two voicemail messages. On November 11th, because of lack of response, I reached out to the Mayor's office, had communication with Celestine Jeffreys, who contacted the, Paul's department, and they said they would not do any reduction of any fees. I guess my first question is, why would they go out and inspect the property every day for a \$50 charge? It doesn't make any sense to me. And I did say that I was gonna wait for the buyer to fix it up, because I would not specifically know what the buyer's intention was to fix it up. For me to spend a lot of money in doing that, would not be very business-sense to me. It doesn't have any, if it was out there for six months, a year, I could understand that thought process. But we're talking about having it on the property for about seven weeks, before we were able to close on it. It would have been a lot quicker if it wasn't, if it hadn't been for COVID, and the inability to get the tenants out when we sold the property.

- I guess the-

- [Paul B.] In the month of September, there were an inspection almost every day for \$50 a day. In private industry, people wouldn't get away with that, and I'm not sure why the inspection department thinks that it's a motivator for people to go ahead and improve it by just throwing \$50 bills at 'em. I don't understand that. But when I first attempted to do this, I called up the inspection department, and they said that Paul Van Calster was the person to appeal it to. So I thought I would talk to Paul and get it done. And I talked to him, and the only response he gave to me is that the \$50 inspection fee was to be a motivator for people to fix the problem. To me, that doesn't make sense, but I'm not a governmental official, so I don't know specifically how you think about that. But there five inspections in July, 10 in August, 18 in September and six in October, which doesn't appear to me to have any practical sense at all other than billing the people that can pay it once Superb Credit you ran, was in the foreclosure process.

- [Mark] Well, I understand where you're coming from, Paul. I guess the question I had, you know Mr. Van Calster had mentioned he had contacted you a number of times, and you didn't get back to him.

- [Paul B.] I disagree with that.

- Okay.

- [Paul B.] I disagree with that comment. He never contacted me that I did not respond to him.

- Well Paul, okay, hold on a second. I'm gonna ask Paul Van Calster. Paul, when you, you know we've had a few situations like this over time, and I've seen it where you said there might be a minimum of one inspection a week. And sometimes it seems like there's three or four pending. I guess I just, I have kind of a hard time just understanding why there'd be multiple inspections. You said something to the effect that a minimum of at least once a week. Well, that's one thing. And as far as communication, there's telephone, there's email. Every situation's different, but I'm just wondering on this case, it sounds like you stated that you'd tried very hard to try and contact Mr. Bachhuber, and it seemed like, it was falling on deaf ears, or nobody was hearing this. So I don't know if you can just answer to that.

- [Paul V.] Sure, sure, it's reverse from that. Paul tried calling me and we talked that first day in October for like I said, 30, 40 minutes. Paul proceeded to, we gone over everything. We went over the fact that he's got a \$40,000 plus water bill. That he's got inspection fees, all this stuff because he had a business deal that went south, and now he's in the pickle where he's got these re-inspection fees that he wants waived. He then proceeded to do a recap email on Monday. We spoke on like Thursday or Friday, and he asked the same questions we just went over. I basically responded saying we talked about all this. And he asked me to waive the water, and I'm like, that's not me, that's the water department. So I have responded to Paul, but I don't continue to respond when it's the same questions, hoping for a different answer, if that makes sense.

- Well, it does. Committee, do you have any questions right now? The floor is still open, so we can, you can ask.

- [Paul B.] First may I make a couple of comments in regards to that, please.

- [Mark] Well hold on, Paul. Paul? Hold on, I'd like the committee to have the opportunity to ask you questions, if possible. Alder Lefebvre, do you have a question?

- [Kathy] Yeah, Paul Van Calster, you said that the first one was in May? And then it continued after that?

- [Paul V.] The first, the order was written in May 22nd of 2019, that's when this whole thing started.

- [Kathy] So who actually owned the property then?

- [Paul V.] The original owner-

- [Kathy] Redgold.

- [Paul V.] Not the credit union.

- [Kathy] No, Redgold owned the property.

- Hold on, Mr. Bachhuber.

- [Kathy] Okay, so those fees, are they part of this bill?

- [Paul V.] Some are and some aren't. Some already went to the tax roll, property tax roll. And they would have been paid by Paul's company, or however the foreclosure worked out. These new ones that he's referring to are the ones since that time, the 2020 ones.

- [Kathy] I would yeah, say he definitely is responsible for the ones after he took over. But wouldn't you go after the original owner for some of the other, the earlier inspection fees?

- [Paul V.] No, we never do, we always, it sticks with the property. This happens all the time when someone comes and buys the property. They have to do their due diligence and look and see if there's any outstanding issues on a property. When there is, they're accountable for 'em. I can't tell you how many times people have called and said, "Well, I didn't know." Well, you gotta do your due diligence and see if they're any, I mean, it's not just us that have things on the property tax that they're accountable for.

- [Kathy] Yeah, right.

- [Paul V.] We can't waive them out, just because people don't do it. Some go to the deal knowing it's there, and hoping they'll get it rescinded, or refunded, so they don't have to foot that bill.

- [Kathy] Yeah you know, this happened before with another property, where oh, what was it? Was it something with sanitary sewer? Remember, it was a big thing.

- [Paul Yep, over on Elm-

- [Kathy] And the thing is, I don't know, maybe we need to put out some press release or something, telling people, you know, I don't know how to help people to know what to do. A lot of people don't know what to do. And I guess they need some direction, I don't know.

- [Paul V.] That the truth be told, that's on the realtor, as they're working the deal to do a purchase. The realtor's the one that should do the background check and find out what they're getting into, or not getting into, that's what you're paying them for. In this case, it's different. It was a foreclosure. And Paul's stuck with a business deal that went south.

- [Kathy] Yeah, yeah.

- [Mark] Okay. Alder Vander Leest, do you have anything?

- I was gonna add, what kind of violations were these written up on? What were the violations? Some of them?

- [Paul V.] Give me a minute, and I'll pull it up and see.

- [Mark] Is there a way you could show the screen, Paul? I can't get that list up. Or not, if you can't, that's fine. For Celestine, is there a way?

- [Celestine] Yes, for Paul Van Calster to share a list. Joanne?

- That would be helpful.

- [Celestine] Was in the, was that in the council, I'm sorry, was in that in the committee packet?

- [Mark] It was, but for some reason.

- [Celestine] Okay, so Paul, I will make you a co-host, so that you can sure your screen, okay?

- [Paul V.] Okay.

- [Celestine] There you go.

- [Paul V.] I don't know if you guys could read all that.

- [Mark] Well, we could try .

- [Kathy] Blither.

- [Paul V.] A lot of external storage. There were issues with the building, itself, with the structure, foundation, exterior, roof. Peeling paint, maintenance. Weeds were huge. What spurred all this, was the police complaint that the water had been running forever, and they'd used a tremendous amount of water. Like thousands of dollars worth of water. When our inspectors went in there, they found one of the tenants that hadn't been paying rent forever, but this is not the city's issue. Hadn't been paying tenant, or hadn't been paying rent, the water spigot had been broke, and she just left it running, full speed, for months, and months, and months.

- [Kathy] Oh, .

- [Mark] So, I guess the question I had, and I know the floor is still open. But was, did Mr. Bachhuber own this property at that time? At the time that was going on?

- [Paul V.] No, that would have been the original owner.

- [Mark] The original owner.

- [Paul V.] Redgold Properties LLC or whatever.

- [Mark] Okay, well I see quite a bit there. Alder Vander Leest, was there something else?

- [John] I do them all, I do them all. Thank you.

- [Mark] Okay, all right. Well that's one of those situations, it's kind of between again, all the time, the floor is still open, so does anybody have any more questions so Paul, Mr. Bachhuber.

- I just have a statement that I think he's gonna have to, I don't know, get a lawyer and sue the former owner. Try to get some of his money back. Because some of this was not his, you know, was done before. But legally, you may, can't go after the, said it stays, this is what the ordinance is, it stays with the property, unfortunately.

- The reason we foreclosed on the property was that the owner doesn't have any money, and was not able to pay. So that's not an option to do. I guess one the questions that was raised by one of the Aldermen, was why would you have 18 inspections in the month of September? When there was only 21 business days in the whole month? You only missed three days. What's the purpose of all those inspections?

- Well, I know we brought that up, and I think you know, we have talked about this in the past. And it's, I can see the minimum at maybe once a week, type of thing. There might be extenuating circumstances with some of the issues that are really bad like a running faucet. You know, that's not good. I'm sad, dictates it. But generally speaking, I would think that a lot of times the inspection department would go in a minimum of once a week, so it's not overkill, but, inspection is offering to take off, whatever that amount was. I'd lean toward that. If anybody has any more questions of Mr. Bachhuber, or otherwise, we need to close the floor to discuss. Anybody else?

- Motion to close the floor, Mark.

- Okay, that's by Vander Leest, do we have a second?

- [Kathy] Second.

- Second by Lefebvre, all in favor, please say I.

- [John] I.

- Kathy I. I, okay, committee, go ahead, what are your thoughts? I've got a few. I feel that the city, I know it's a tough situation. You know, the inspectors go through quite a bit on this, as well. And my feeling is that they're making some offer to take some of the monies off. You know, the owner is liable, you know, you gotta let the buyer, the buyer needs to be aware. So many times we have cut some of the slack on some of these issues in the past. But I'm willing to look at what Mr. Van Calster stated and go with what his recommendation, if anybody else wants to talk about that, or make a motion, I would entertain that.

- I'll second that motion, Mark. I'll second that motion.

- All right.

- [Kathy] You have to make the motion.

- [Joanne] For the record, what was the amount?

- [Mark] Yeah, what was the amount?

- [Paul] The amount was to rescind 13 re-inspection fees for a total of \$650.

- Okay, so one of you make that motion, if you would.

- [Craig] I'll make a motion to rescind 13 inspection fees, totaling \$650.
- [Mark] Okay by Stevens.
- [Kathy] Second it.
- [Mark] Second by Lefebvre, all in favor, any other discussion? All in favor, please say I.
- [Kathy] I.
- [John] I.
- [Mark] I, all opposed, that passes. Mr. Bachhuber, this goes to City Council on January 19th at 6 p.m., you have a chance to bring that forward to the entire Council, if you wanna bring that forward, again.
- [Paul B.] What will that entail?
- [Mark] Well, we can, if you want the item polled so you that can discuss it at City Council, one of us could do that. You know, if you wanna do that.
- Or Alder Scannell, who brought it forward.
- [Mark] Alder Scannell, in fact, is Alder Scannell here? He's not here.
- [Celestine] No, Alder, he's not here.

- [Mark] Okay. All right, so that wouldn't entail you talking to your Alder, Alder Scannell, and having him do that for you, so that you could discuss it at Council. That's my suggestion.

- [Paul B.] Otherwise you think the 650 will be approved by the entire Council, is that what your recommendation is?

- Well, I mean, that's what we approved right now.

- [Paul B.] Okay.

- Okay?

- It's not what I was expecting, I was hoping for more, but I appreciate it, thank you.

- [Mark] All right, your welcome. Okay, Attorney Bungert, I'll wait for you.

- [Joanne] Yep, we are onto Number Six.

- [Mark] Number Six. Consideration with the possible action on an appeal by Amanda Lee, regarding the denial of her operator's license. So, staff?

- [Joanne] Yes, so staff's recommendation is to deny based on several offenses which relate to the license activity that indicates that the appellant is a habitual law offender, and therefore precluded from holding the license under state statutes. I believe the denial memo detailing the different convictions and offensives is in everyone's packet.

- [Mark] In case that's not brought forward, can you share that on the screen, or do we need to look at our packet.

- I can try and email that to everybody, but because of the confidential nature of the--

- [Mark] Right, I understand, okay. I did read it over briefly, but I don't have it in front of me right at this moment. Lieutenant?

- Police concur with law.

- [Mark] Okay. All right, well, I believe, let's see, Miss Lee is here. So I would entertain a motion to open the floor.

- Motion to open the floor.

- [Mark] By Vander Leest, do we have a second?

- [Kathy] Second.

- [Craig] Second.

- Second by Stevens, so all in favor, please say I.

- I.

- [Kathy] I.

- Okay, the floor is now open. Amanda Lee, if you would care to unmute and state your name and address for the committee, and then move forward, and we'll ask you questions, and you can speak as to why you feel you want this appeal to be appealed . For lack of words.

- [Amanda] Okay.

- Go ahead.

- [Amanda] Amanda Lee, 907 Wilson Ave., Green Bay, Wisconsin 54303.

- Okay, all right, you heard our city attorney, and also the police department. So, why do you feel that the committee should allow this to happen? So, go ahead.

- Yes, I did commit crimes. I am recently getting off of probation. I am just waiting for the paperwork to go through. I was not able to get the copies of that yet, so that I could send them to you guys, as you are aware of it. I'm trying to do the best that I can. I'm not committing any more crimes. I've learned my lesson. I'm just trying to make a better life for me and my children.

- Could you, do you have any letters or anything from employers, or anybody that can testify on your behalf?

- [Amanda] Yes, I did send in letters from social workers that I have worked with.

- Right, I did see that, yes, thank you.

- I did try to get my probation officer to also do that. She had stated that she was unable to do that.

- Okay.

- [Amanda] I could possibly get something from my employer, because my employer does not wanna loose me.
- And just for the record, where are you at right now?
- Upump, or slash, Sickel on Velp Avenue, it's a gas station.
- Okay, all right.
- Committee, do you have any questions of Miss Lee?
- [Kathy] I have one, Chairman. The last one was last year, 2019. Well actually, that's right 2021, 2019. What date on that? What month?
- I believe that was in October, I was in the process of being homeless with me and my children. And I was trying to get my stuff out of storage before I lost everything to go to Appleton to live with my aunt. And I had gotten pulled over because there was a chain on the trailer or something that was causing sparks.
- Here it says, due to alcohol. Were you drinking?
- No.
- No, Alder Lefebvre, it's an operating while revoked. And the revocation was due to alcohol.
- [Kathy] Okay. Oh, I see, okay.
- [Mark] Revocation.

- Okay, I understand it now.

- And that's a misdemeanor?

- [Joanne] Correct.

- [Amanda] Yes.

- She has no felony convictions, they all misdemeanors or forfeiture.

- [Mark] Right.

- [Kathy] Okay.

- And I am in the process of working on, slowly, getting my license, and trying to get back on my feet again.

- [Mark] Okay.

- Is it possible that this can be held up till we can get, that she can submit letters from her employer?
Employees? Employers?

- Well, there's always a possibility. My thought would be that, if we, depending on if we approve this or not tonight, that those letters could be forwarded at City Council?

- I believe the committee has, yes, the committee has approved on the contingency that the applicant submits letters from their employer.

- [Kathy] Okay, 'cause yeah, I would definitely like to see that, to make sure that, yeah, yeah. That they feel that she is actually learning from her mistakes, and wants to move on with her life.

- Well, I need, go ahead Alder Stevens.

- [Craig] If I'm looking right, the OWI was in 2016?

- Correct.

- [Joanne] Correct.

- And in 2017, you were stopped again for driving.

- [Amanda] Yeah, there, they had-

- [Craig] And again in 2019.

- The one after the 2016 was dropped because there was a situation that I was just trying to leave my house because it was very unsafe.

- [Craig] So, you took it upon yourself to drive?

- I had no way to get away from this person.

- Okay, my other question for you, there's many, many jobs that are available out in the city. Why are you choosing to go to the this employment for work when there's other opportunities out there that would not allow, that you could take, that you would not be coming in front of us for forgiveness.

- It's, like I said, I do have four children. This job is four blocks away from my house, so I do not have to drive. I walk to and from, everyday that I'm scheduled. And transportation, with not having my license, I'm not taking them chances anymore. I just wanna be able to do everything legit. And not have to worry about looking over my shoulder, or even trying to find a ride to get to and from work.

- [Mark] Okay, Alder Stevens, anything else? Otherwise .

- I'd like to give her another chance. It sounds to me like she's not driving to work. It's not far from her home. Sounds like she needs employment. I'd be willing to give her another chance. It's as simple as that.

- You can make a motion.

- [Craig] I do have a question.

- Go ahead, Alder.

- 2019, are the fines currently paid?

- [Amanda] I am going to going through a payment plan with that. Because of my OWI, I do have a pretty big fine out there. And then once I'm able to get on my feet a little bit more I'm trying to do it with my taxes. It's just, try to look for a vehicle and get the breathalyzer installed into the car, and pay all my fines with that.

- [Mark] Okay, And Alder Vander Leest, you were making the motion?

- [John] I'd make a motion to grant her request to get her license back.

- [Joanne] We do need to-

- [Mark] Oh yes, again, we need a motion to close the floor.

- [Joanne] We need to close the floor.

- Motion to close the floor.

- [Mark] The second?

- Second.

- [Mark] Second by Stevens, all in favor, please say I.

- [Kathy] I.

- [John] I.

- I, all opposed, that it passes unanimously. Okay, .

- I make a motion to grant her license, give her a chance to get her license back. It sounds like she's going on the right path, and maybe we can help her along that path, thank you.

- [Mark] Okay. Do we have a second?

- [Kathy] I'll second that with the contingents that we'll be reviewing a letter, or letters, from her employer.

- Okay, Alder Vander Leest, that's okay?

- [John] That's okay.

- All right, so-

- Alder Lefebvre, would you like that?

- [Mark] Oh she could, go ahead.

- Alder Lefebvre?

- As part of the motion?

- [Joanne] Yeah, that's fine, I just wanted to clarify that the applicant will be filing her letter with the clerk's office, and upon receipt, then her application of her appeal will be approved.

- [Kathy] Yes.

- Or her license will be issued.

- Okay.

- [Kathy] Yes.

- [Mark] Will that be done in time for Council? Will that be done in time?

- Well, the Council still has to approve this action. So if she does file it by the 19th, then she should be able to pick up her license on the 20th. The clerk's office would need to have that letter in either prior or on the day of Council in order to get it on the 20th. But, we still need that Council approval for the license to be awarded.

- [Mark] Okay, so Amanda, is Amanda aware of that? I know the floor is closed right now. But as long as she hears that. Work with the clerk's office.

- To get filed.

- [Amanda] Can you repeat that again, please? How I would go about doing that?

- You would just essentially file, the same person that you submitted all your paperwork to, for the PO, this evening, you would submit a copy of that letter of reference from your employer. So your approval tonight is contingent upon you providing that letter from your employer, and this recommendation is gonna go in front of Council on the 19th. So if Council approves, and you submit that letter, then you should be able to obtain your license on the 20th.

- [Amanda] Okay, thank you.

- [Mark] Okay.

- [Joanne] We still need to, we didn't vote yet.

- We didn't vote yet.

- We have a motion by Alder Vander Leest.

- [Mark] Right.

- [Kathy] Yep.

- Seconded by Lefebvre, all in favor, please say I.

- [Kathy] I.

- [[John] I.

- [Mark] All opposed?

- [Craig] Opposed.

- Okay, that passes three to one.

- Can I abstain? I would like to explain why I opposed.

- Opposed or abstained?

- [Joanne] Yep.

- [Mark] Go ahead.

- [Craig] Opposed, yeah, opposed. I oppose due to the fact that the citation is only a year old. And also, there was no letters of recommendation or people that came on her behalf.

- Well, there were a couple. There were a couple on the committee, and her letters. We did get some from a state, I think somebody from the state.

- Well not state, but the employer. None of that came through. And because that one citation is only a year old, you know, unfortunately, I do need to oppose that.

- [Mark] Okay. All right, so that passes three to one. So, Amanda, City Council is on January 19th, Tuesday at 6 p.m. I would suggest that you be at that meeting. And it'll go in front of the entire Council.

- [Amanda] Will it be virtual meeting again, then?

- Yes, it will.

- Just like this?

- [Mark] Just like this.

- Okay, will I get paperwork or anything in the mail saying how to connect? Cause I was having connection problems before.

- [Mark] Basically you go to the city, well, you could go to the city website. And they have meetings, it says Meetings on Agenda, and you can click that on, and it'll take you right to the City Council, then you click the top button, or the top line that says Zoom Meeting Instructions. And that'll walk you right through it. And there's a number, it'll give you a number that you need to type in to get into the meeting. If you have any questions, you should be fine.

- Okay.

- [Mark] Okay?

- All right, thank you very much.

- [Mark] Yep, your welcome, good luck. All right.

- All right, Item Number Seven.

- [Mark] Number Seven. Consideration with possible action on a request by Alder Doff, that staff research a change to Alder terms from two years to three years, beginning with the 2022 election. First off, Alder Doff, thank you for your extreme patience. I know you're used to some longer meetings, but we probably could have moved you up a little bit, but I don't know.

- I would have stayed, anyway. I enjoy watching.

- Yes, you would of. So we don't feel overly bad, but anyway.

- She really likes you, Mark.

- [Mark] A little bit, just a little bit. Okay, go ahead, Alder Doff.

- Thank you. Really before I would want staff to, spend a lot of time researching, I'm really looking to see if there's an appetite among City Council members to consider this. This is, been brought up, by other City Council members, I'm not the only person that's brought this up. Couple of things could be possible. One that, everyone would just simply go to three years, if we decide that that's the what we wanna pursue. Partly because you get on City Council, you're on a year, and then you're running again. And it takes away from really your ability to focus on the work. The other thing that could happen, is we could get like six council members to run, and then they would have a three year term, and the other six would have two, but then after that, they would have a three year term. With that would do, would kind of alternate terms so that there wouldn't be a risk of every council member being off at the same time. And that's what they do, for example, with school board. They have alternating terms. So, it's all kinds of possibilities. But I was really looking for some direction from this group to see if this is something that we, as a council, would like to just at least talk about and pursue. I know there are some timely timelines, timeline restrictions for this to be done by the 2022

election. We would have to decide fairly shortly. I know that there are a couple, two different ways it can be done via referendum, or it can be done by the sitting Council. But I don't know all of the legal ramifications of it. Before we have the staff research all of this, is there an interest?

- Well before I, let me just ask really quickly, Alder Doff, have you've checked with any other communities around Wisconsin, per se, that maybe have, I haven't done that, but have you looked at any other communities that have done this? In all like three year terms or four year terms, anything, at all?

- I don't know, Alder Stevens and I were working on it together. Alder Stevens, I don't know if you did that.

- I did not do that.

- [Mark] Okay, well I'm just wondering.

- [Craig] I did talk to Vanessa directly. But we chose to hold off until later in 2020.

- Well, let's have the discussion. Alder Lefebvre?

- Yes, yes, I thank Alder Doff and Stevens for, you know, talking about this, looking into it. I have this question. When I first started, why are all the Alders up for re-election on the same time? There's only 12 of us. It's conceivable, it could happen where you would have a huge turnover on the Council. And then you have new people who don't understand things that went before, and why we have different ordinances. And there was something, I can't remember that came up. I think, was it last year, or something. And someone on the Council was on there, like he says, wait a minute, I remember this happening before, and this is why we did it. And you need that. That's valuable information for all the new people that end up on. And I'm still learning, and this is my third year. Yeah, and so but, I think that's really important. People that have been there longer, and they got all this information that they can help, especially new people that come on. It's a big learning curve. And I did question a while back, why? Why are we all in the same? I'd like some alternating at least.

- I like that idea too, and Alder Doff, I don't know if you, or Alder Stevens, you know, just comment on that. How would you, in your mind's eye, what would you like to see as far as, how would you stagger that? Six on, six off, how would you do that?

- That would be, initially, if we chose to go alternating, and we also have to be aware now, that we have a term limit. So that's also gonna impact things. So it doesn't mean we can't do the math, and figure things out, and figure out how the elections might be staggered because of that, but we could, I would think we would have to do even and odd, maybe coin toss, very random, like okay, evens are going to go for two years in 2022, the odds will have three years. After that, everyone will have three years. And that way, it's staggered. It's just automatically staggered.

- Well that makes sense, that makes sense. Only because you don't wanna do just east side, west side. And all that.

- [Barb] No.

- [Craig] We couldn't.

- [Mark] I know, well I'm just saying.

- [Kathy] We have some people that, yeah-

- [Mark] I wouldn't want that.

- [Kathy] Let's not have this fight, he's the--

- [Mark] No, no, no fighting.

- [Barb] So that's one way. I mean, I'm only one person, Craig's only one person. There could be multiple ways. It also doesn't need to be. That's one reason why we're bringing it forward. But it's not saying that it has to be that way. The other reason is, the two-year terms, you're just turning over so quickly. Especially with the new people, don't even learn it, and you're running again. And three years seems reasonable to me.

- Right, me too, Alder Vander Leest?

- Mark?

- [Mark] No go ahead, Alder Vander Leest. I'm comfortable the way we're doing it with the two-year term. I think that, I can't see a change warranted, personally. I think it's just good government. If you wanna hold a job, you have to get out there and campaign. And if it's 24 months, that you're in for 24 months, I think that, it kind of helps out as far as keeping everything even. You know, with the constituents, if they like you, they'll put you back into office. And I think that the two year program has been in effective for quiet a few years. I don't really wanna see it change, personally. I think it's just good government.

- [Woman] Oh you beast.

- What we've been doing.

- [Kathy] And John, do you feel that all at one time have to run? Do you think that maybe staggering it, so that you got-

- I'm not in favor of changing as far as staggering. In other words, running, all of us running at the same time. I think it's just good principle. In other words, everybody knows what the term is, and what's involved. And some people might not wanna serve for three years. Some people wanna give it two years, and maybe they'll bow out, we don't know. But I'm just saying, I think the two year program that we got, it's pretty sound. In other words, if we get stuck with somebody that's not a good, for the city, in two years, they'll be gone.

- Alder Doff? Alder Doff?

- [Kathy] Really? We could impeach him.

- [Barb] What I'm hoping for to have the broader discussion at Council, that's what I'm hoping, just to get everyone to where, should we even pursue it? So yes, I appreciate the discussion here. I am hoping what we would maybe do is move it for discussion to Council. I don't know if that has to be, just approving discussion.

- [Mark] Right, I understand.

- [Barb] Not necessarily approving changing it. What's approved. Talking about changing it. That's what I'm looking for.

- Well I know that Alder Stevens, go ahead, Alder Stevens.

- Do we need to afford this to law departments, so we can get the complete understanding on what we can and cannot do? Joanne?

- Joanne?

- [Joanne] Yes, so this will require some research, because we don't know exactly off-hand, and it all kind of also depends on what the Council members are looking to see. Whether we want to have alternating, or to increase the terms, or to increase terms for certain alternating members. When does this go into effect? How it would interplay with the current term limits that we have? And then, whether this will require a charter ordinance amendment, or a general ordinance amendment. We haven't looked into this at this point because we were looking for more direction from the Alders. So I don't anticipate that we would have any answers, per se for the Council meeting for next week. As we still need a little bit more specificity as to what we are, what council, and what Alders are looking to have accomplish with it.

- Would you by chance have additional information from the next protection policy?

- We could, however.

- [Mark] Oh, Barb has a question.

- [Barb] The whole idea was not to have law do work, until we find out is Council interested? So the whole idea is not to have all the answers for Council. The idea is, is Council interested in the discussion. And if, through our discussion, we say, you know yeah, we'd like to move forward and get some more answers, then we will ask law.

- Then you would ask staff to get involved?

- [Barb] Yes. I don't wanna make work for them, if there isn't the appetite in Council to do it.

- You brought this forward, Alder Doff, so we're wide open. I mean, we're talking about everything here. And I think, some are against, I think some are open to the possibility.

- [Kathy] No.

- With that being said, we just refer it to, I don't know what kind of vote we need to take on this just to allow it to go to Council. You know, if it's a three to one, it doesn't matter. It can be polled at Council anyway, so-

- So is that why, so we just want it polled?

- Well no, I wouldn't, I'm looking at what Alder Doff said. And I think it has legitimacy, at least to be able to be listened at Council. So you know, my feeling would be to just bring it forward. You know, yes or no, or two to two tie, whatever. Just vote on it, and at Council. And then Council will help to direct, to say, "Okay, well we need more research done on this."

- But in reality, that's probably-

- [Barb] Is this committee or poll?

- what's gonna happen.

- Yeah, it'll happen, I think anyhow, so.

- [Barb] Well, it might not.

- [Mark] Or it might not. I don't know, so.

- I don't know.

- I guess, well-

- We can't just say forward to the Council to discuss it. Would it have to be a committee of the whole request?

- No, so we would-

- [Kathy] But how would do it?

- Council or, right. Committee can just basically vote to move this item without recommendation for discussion by Council, if we-

- [Kathy] We can, okay.

- [Joanne] Committees have done so, and they didn't feel comfortable, or ready, or for whatever reason to make an ultimate decision or recommendation. So it's essentially just advancing the item without. So it's a motion to advance the item without recommendation to the full Council.

- [Kathy] See, I'm learning, see I'm learning something new again .

- [Craig] So then that's-

- Okay, hold it! One at a time here. Alder Stevens?

- Don't take this the wrong way, we're gonna forward this to Council without a recommendation. At Council, it's gonna be polled, which we know it will be polled. And then it's gonna become into a discussion, and really we're doing committee work at Common Council, which is always brought up that we shouldn't be doing gritty work at Common Council.

- [Mark] But you know what? We've done that before, we have done that. So it's not, that's fine.

- But we shouldn't be doing that.

- Well, we shouldn't, but you know what? I mean, we've done that in the past. And nine out of 10 times, it's nice to do it at committee, but I think this is one of those times where we could have everybody weigh in.

- Right, but if we're looking for a yes or no from Common Council to move forward, then that's what it should be, a yes or no answer with no discussion, right? I don't know. Barb?

- [John] I'll take Mark's recommendation that we just forward to the City Council for discussion. That's simple as that. We're not making any judgements one way or the other, we're forwarding it to City Council, that's it.

- Okay, hold on a second. Alder Doff, one more time, and then we'll move that forward.

- You know, I would agree that motion could be, a yes motion to forward to City Council for discussion. You're not voting on whether to take an action on it, you're just, so it isn't like with no recommendation. It's saying yeah, the committee's interested enough in this that we wanna have some discussion. So I just don't wanna make work for the staff, if there is not an interest in this.

- Right, that makes sense.

- And I don't know if there is, till we talk about it.

- So, Attorney Bungert, do you? I thought you had a good motion. Is that the one that sounded pretty good to the committee? Just to move it that way?

- [Joanne] I believe so, it was just a motion to refer this request by Alder Doff for further discussion and consideration by the full Council.

- [Kathy] Okay, I'll make that motion.

- [Mark] Alder Lefebvre will make that-

- Taking that without recommendation language out.

- [Mark] All right. Alder Lefebvre, you made that motion, then?

- Yeah.

- [Mark] Do we have a second? Alder Vander Leest? Was that, do you wanna do that?

- [John] Yeah, that's fine.

- Okay Alder Vander Leest . All those in favor, please say I.

- [Kathy] I.

- [John] I.

- [Mark] All opposed, that passes unanimously. That was pretty simple. You know? Thanks for bringing it up. Yeah, we tried, that's all we can do. Well, we'll be fine, we'll be all fine. All right, we're getting down to the favorite part of my, of the meeting.

- Yes, number, almost, Number Eight.

- [Mark] Oh, Number Eight, oh boy.

- There's one last, yes. The last general-

- [Mark] Oh, we're getting there, I didn't quite say we were there yet. Consideration with possible action on a resolution in support of City of Green Bay employees. I know Alder Stevens, you were bringing this forward. I don't know if you wanna comment on it right away. And what's your thought?

- [Craig] Well, there's a typo that we need to fix.

- Oh, really? Okay.

- [Kathy] What is it?

- [Craig] Oh, where is it?

- [Joanne] In the resolution itself?

- [Craig] Yeah.

- Okay.

- Landfounder.

- [Joanne] We can address that.

- [Mark] That's just a clerical, but anyway.

- [Joanne] Right, we can fix that.

- [Mark] Yeah.

- Prior to Council.

- Oh Barb, do you know where it's at? My computer's froze.

- Barb, you're?

- [Barb] I got that, I knew I was needed, okay. All right, so I do know where it is. So go down to the third whereas. And then go to the fourth, fifth, oh, there is, it's like, it's the increased rate of pavement resurfacing. So, boy it's a lot of bullet points down.

- Yeah, you got a lot of bullets.

- [Barb] One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, 10, 11. Bullet point 11, under the third whereas. I'll wait till you get there.

- Okay, one, two, three. One, two, three. The implementation of the office?

- [Joanne] The third whereas.

- [Barb] No, the next one. The increased rate of pavement resurfacing, and reconstruction by 20% over 2019, instead of, of 2019.

- Okay.

- [Barb] Over 2019, and by 40% over the past 10 years. So changing of to over, with the pavement resurfacing and reconstruction item.

- Okay, that was the only one that we needed?

- [Barb] That was it.

- Okay.

- [Barb] Yes.

- [Joanne] Okay.

- [Mark] All right. I know Alder Stevens, you put a lot of time into this. So, describe briefly.

- I started the project. You know my thought process was that I wanted to recognize staff members for the City of Green Bay. In all, I did go the the Ethics Committee, you know, they gave their blessing, but you know, with possible issues, you know on that.

- Right, right.

- It was the most easiest, simplest way was to draft a letter and a resolution. So that's why we have the resolution in front of us for discussion, because then all this will to appreciate our city employees. And to show as a Common Council, hopefully as a whole, that we appreciate everything that you do for us.

- In the same light, because of the pandemic, things were really tightened up a little bit, so to speak. So there was more of a challenge, a little bit, to do your job.

- [Craig] Right, right.

- [Mark] Okay? I first bless you, I have no problem with that. I'm sure that somebody might find a point or two. But I don't know, I feel pretty good with it. Committee? Anybody else?

- [John] Motion to approve.

- [Kathy] Second.

- [Mark] That was motion by Stevens. Stevens?

- [Kathy] Not Vander Leest.

- [Mark] I'm losing my hearing now, too. Well by Vander Leest, second by Lefebvre. Any other discussion? All in favor, please say I.

- I.

- [Kathy] I.

- [John] I.

- [Mark] Good work on that, Alder Stevens, I appreciate it, and Alder Doff, too.

- [Kathy] Thank you.

- [Barb] And Alder Gerlach did a-

- [Mark] Where is she?

- [Kathy] Alder Gerlach, of course, yeah.

- Where is she?

- She's very good at-

- [Barb] She's at Plan, she had to go to Plan. But I will tell her that you said thank you.

- Please tell her on our behalf, thanks. Okay, now are we getting to the favorite part?

- Yeah, we are on the liquor violation report.

- [Mark] Okay, let me, oh gee, for some reason I don't have my agenda up here. Just, can you read it for me, Joanne?

- Sure.

- [Mark] Go ahead.

- That is, the liquor violation report for January 11th, 2021.

- Lieutenant? This is your moment.

- Yeah, I wait for it every time. Before I do that, I just wanted to introduce, we are restructuring over here at the P.D. Lieutenant Nate Allen, who's sitting in with me. He is gonna also be a community police lieutenant. He'll be covering the west side, I'll be covering the east side. So at future meetings, you'll see one, if not both of us, at these meetings.

- Okay.

- [Kathy] Okay, thank you.

- And, we'll be emailing all the Alders with information like emails and phone numbers, and that. So that you guys are aware, so if there's an issue on the west side, you could speak to me directly.

- Right, thank you, thank you for that, thanks. Good to see you, Nate.

- [Nate] Yep.

- [Mark] You look good, you look good back there.

- In terms of the liquor violations, the good news is we do not have any violations for this timeframe.

- What a beautiful thing. That is, that's fantastic.
- [John] Motion to receive and place on file.
- By Vander Leest.
- [Kathy] Second.
- Second by Lefebvre. Any other discussion? All in favor, please say I.
- I.
- [Craig] I.
- [Mark] Thank you, all. Happy New Year, and all that good stuff.
- Thanks, Mark.
- [Mark] Thanks for all your work.
- Mr. Stevens, thanks. Kathy, all the best, okay, have a healthy New Year.
- We need a-

- [John] Don't get COVID.

- [Joanne] We do need to adjourn.

- [Mark] Oh, we don't want to, we don't want to.

- [Kathy] We don't want to.

- [Craig] Motion to adjourn.

- [Mark] Okay, motion by Stevens, seconded by Lefebvre. Any other discussion? All in favor, please say I.

- I.

- [Kathy] I, I.

- [Mark] Now we can all-

- [Kathy] Everyone take care and have a healthy, safe 2021. And let's hope for a vaccine soon for us old folks! They'll do it.