



MINUTES OF THE PROTECTION AND POLICY COMMITTEE

MONDAY, APRIL 26, 2021, 5:30 PM
Virtual Meeting. Public may join via Zoom.

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

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

B. ROLL CALL.

Present: Craig Stevens, Mark Steuer, John Vander Leest, Kathy Lefebvre

Also present: Deputy City Attorney Joanne Bungert, Lt. Steve Mahoney, Lt. Nate Allen, Assistant City Attorney Rachel Maes, Assistant Director of Community and Economic Development Cheryl Renier-Wigg, Housing & Zoning Enforcement Coordinator Bill Paape, Ald. Lynn Gerlach, Ald. Barbara Dorff, Ald. Bill Galvin

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve the agenda. Motion Passed.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, Abstain- None.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the April 12, 2021 Protection & Policy Committee Meeting.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to approve the minutes. Motion Passed.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, Abstain- None.

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. To revisit, with possible action, the January 2020 Ordinance dealing with the delivery of advertising materials, often wrapped in plastic, as an environmental nuisance and safety hazard. These materials are often distributed onto lawns and driveways of mostly residential units (submitted by Alder Mark Steuer), previously discussed at the March 22, 2021 meeting.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve the resolution requiring the City's Official Newspaper and its Subcontractors to comply with the City's Anti-Littering Ordinance.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, Abstain- None.

2. Consideration with possible action on a request by PH Hospitality Group, LLC (Pizza Hut) at 859 Lombardi Ave. for a change of agent.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to approve on a request by PH Hospitality Group, LLC (Pizza Hut) at 859 Lombardi Ave. for a change of agent.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, Abstain- None.

3. Consideration with possible action on a request by 304 North Adams Green Bay, LLC (Hotel Northland) at 304 N. Adams St. for a change of agent.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to approve a request by 304 North Adams Green Bay, LLC (Hotel Northland) at 304 N. Adams St. for a change of agent.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, Abstain- None.

4. Consideration with possible action on a request by Hyatt Corporation at 333 Main St. for a change of agent.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve a request by Hyatt Corporation at 333 Main St. for a change of agent.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, Abstain- None.

5. Consideration with possible action on a request by Magiare at 121 N. Adams to extend the issuance of their liquor license to June 2021 due to unexpected delays in renovations.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to approve a request by Magiare at 121 N. Adams St. to extend the issuance of their liquor license to June 2021 due to unexpected delays in renovations.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, Abstain- None.

6. Consideration with possible action on a request by Napalese Lounge at 1351 Cedar St. to extend their license premises to the parking area on August 21 for a one-day event.

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

Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to close the Floor.

Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve a request by Napalese Lounge at 1351 Cedar St. to extend their license premises to the parking area on Aug 21 for a one-day event, subject to complaint.

Motion Passed.

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

7. Consideration with possible action on a request by Pearly Gates at 3551 Finger Rd. to extend their license premises to the east parking lot on July 10, 2021 for the 16th Annual Outdoor Veterans Charity Fund Raiser.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to approve a request by Pearly Gates at 3551 Finger Rd. to extend their license premises to the east parking lot on July 10, 2021 for the 16th Annual Outdoor Veterans Charity Fund Raiser, subject to complaint.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, Abstain- None.

8. Consideration with possible on a renewal Class "B" Beer license for De Pere Dodgers Baseball Club, Inc. at 1450 E. Walnut St. with a license premises description as "Joannes Stadium."

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to approve a renewal Class "B" Beer license for De Pere Dodgers Baseball Club, Inc. at 1450 E. Walnut St. with a license premises description as "Joannes Stadium," with the approval of the proper authorities.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, Abstain- None.

9. Consideration with possible action on an application for a "Class B" Combination license by BSCTBC, LLC (The Job Site) at 1647 Cass St. with a licensed premises description as single room bar for selling & store, basement, 2 stall wmn room, 1 stall 2 urinal mens rm." (Currently licensed as KAGB, Inc).

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to approve an application for a "Class B" Combination license by BSCTBC, LLC (The Job Site) at 1647 Cass St. with a licensed premises description as single room bar for selling & store, basement, 2 stall wmn room, 1 stall 2 urinal mens rm," with the approval of the proper authorities (Currently licensed as KAGB, Inc).

Motion Passed.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, Abstain- None.

10. Consideration with possible action on an application for a "Class A" Liquor and Class "A" Beer at 1698 Main St. with a license premises description as "c-store" (Currently licensed as Main Street Mini Mart, LLC).

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to approve an application for a "Class A" Liquor and Class "A" Beer at 1698 Main St. with a license premises description as "c-store," with the approval of the proper authorities (Currently licensed as Main Street Mini Mart, LLC).

Motion Passed.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, Abstain- None.

11. Consideration with possible action on a request by Ald. Brunette to refund the re-inspection fees at 2468 West Point and for the city to appeal to the federal government to allow for the property owner's shed to remain, previously discussed at the April 27, 2020 and Aug 2020 Protection & Policy Committee meetings.

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

Motion Passed.

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

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

Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to deny the refund the re-inspection fees at 2468 West Point and to receive and place on file the request by Ald. Brunette for the city to appeal to the federal government to allow for the property owner's shed to remain, previously discussed at the April 27, 2020 and Aug 2020 Protection & Policy Committee meetings and for staff to proceed in accordance with standard operating procedures.

Motion Passed.

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

12. Consideration with possible action on a request by Ald. Chris Wery (District 8) by Brent Phare for the City of Green Bay to support the 2021/22 Wisconsin State Legislature, Bi-Partisan Senate Bill 243 & Assembly Bill 245, Lowering The Threshold From The Current One Hundred Percent (100%) Required For Wisconsin Service-Connected & Rated Disabled Military Veterans To Claim The Veterans And Surviving Spouses Property Tax Credit Under The Individual Income Tax System, to Seventy Percent (70%).

Moved by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to open the Floor.

Motion Passed.

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.

Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve a request by Ald. Chris Wery (District 8) by Brent Phare for the City of Green Bay to support the 2021/22 Wisconsin State Legislature, Bi-Partisan Senate Bill 243 & Assembly Bill 245, Lowering The Threshold From The Current One Hundred Percent (100%) Required For Wisconsin Service-Connected & Rated Disabled Military Veterans To Claim The Veterans And Surviving Spouses Property Tax Credit Under The Individual Income Tax System, to Seventy Percent (70%).

Motion Passed.

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

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. The Liquor Violation Report for April 26, 2021.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to receive and place on file the Liquor Violation Report for April 26, 2021.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, Abstain- None.

2. The Shelter Inappropriate/Chronic resources Report by the Police Department from April 1-April 19, 2021.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to receive and place on file The Shelter Inappropriate/Chronic resources Report by the Police Department from April 1-April 19, 2021.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, Abstain- None.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to adjourn at 7:05 p.m.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, Abstain- None.

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Catherine
- We'll start recording right now.
- I'm gonna have to, because I haven't done this. I got a cap here and it's not working.
- We gotta start. Welcome to Protection and Policy for April 26, 2021.
- I'm sorry. I am having difficulty starting. I'm just gonna type in the manual.
- So I'm thinking we're having a rough night Mark. No, I know I did just one of the things with the computer glitches and what have you.
- Yeah, it's a new, it's still version. It's not letting me set the current time which is the problem. I'm not sure if it's going to screw something up later but I'm trying to do it manually. Okay.
- We ready?
- Yeah, One second. Now it's waiting. Now we are ready. We can start. Thank you.
- Alright, no problem. Welcome to Protection and Policy for April 26, 2021. We'll have roll call, all the I am here Elder Vander Leest
- Here
- Elder Lefebre
- Here
- Elder Stevens
- Here All present and accounted for.
- One second.
- Okay.
- Oh my Lord.
- I'll make a motion to approve the agenda.
- I'll second it.

- Well, I dunno if she's
- Okay, we're fine
- So that was a motion.
- A motion by Steven seconded by Lefebvre. All in favor, please say aye.
- Aye. All opposed that passes unanimously. And let me know when I can do approval of the minutes.
- Yep.
- Yes.
- One second.
- Double checking, Yes, okay.
- We're good. I'd like to have a motion for the approval of the minutes. Motion to approve
- Motion by Stevens. Second by Vander Leest Any other discussion? All in favor, please say aye.
- Aye. All opposed that passes unanimously.
- One second. Okay, and we are on to regular business.
- Regular business number one to revisit with possible Ash in the January, 2020 ordinance, dealing with the delivery of advertising materials often wrapped in plastic as an environmental nuisance and safety hazard. These materials are often distributed on the lawns and driveways and mostly residential units submitted by elder Mark Steuer previously discussed at the March 22nd, 2021 meeting. Attorney Bungert, do you want me to start? Do you start?
- It's up to you elder or can start. We do have assistant city attorney, Rachel Mayes on the line to discuss the resolution that's in the packet. Jack, what was this obviously?
- And I actually have an update on Chairman
- Go ahead, attorney Mayes. Thank you, go ahead.
- It sounded like you had an update.
- Well, okay. Well I just bought this assistant director and she mentioned that she could talk as well on this. So could you, yeah
- I am to say to this committee that I have con I have had contact with a human being at Garnett today with regards to the distribution of these papers. It took awhile and through different channels but I actually, I was able to talk to Matt who is the regional distribution manager for Garnett. He was unaware of how big of an issue this was. I think in green Bay and the challenges we've had. I know I have not spoken to him before. I don't think bill Pappy has either. We had tried to get through different people. So I think we've got the right person now. So I explained the situation to him with, you know where the papers are being thrown. The fact that people, when they call they don't they don't get taken off the list for delivery. And they've got some issues. He was not happy to hear that at all. He told me that he is there as far as that phone call for not having the papers delivered. That they're actually gonna add a reader box to that newspaper that they throw. That's

going to have local information on it. So if you, if you get that paper, you open it up. There's actually a contact name and phone number of someone you can call locally to say stop delivering this. If you want to stop delivering it. Which I think is good news. And then I also spoke to him about, you know the fact that we were always told that Garnett had contractors working for them and he's like, yep, that's, that's totally true. They're independent contractors, but we manage them. So I would be more than happy for you to sit down with you. And we can go over information that we need to share with those people, making the deliveries because he's, he knows, there are rules there are some rules in place with regards to where they can throw those papers. But he's not, he's not sure if like they're aware of that or if they're following it. So he said, certainly we could do a up on that. So he's totally willing to sit down with us, with Bill and I to go over that process and to make sure that the people delivering the papers which by the way I think are the same people that deliver the press Gazette deliver those supplemental papers as well. So to be aware that, of where they should be throwing them. And also they're probably not aware that they could be that they could be issued a citation. If, for example, we get their license plate and we call that in. They probably aren't aware of that fact either which they should know. I think that might be a motivator as well. So our plan is to set up a meeting with him this week or early next week to go over some of these issues and hopefully resolve this issue through the insight. So that's my update. That's what we're gonna be doing through our department.

- Whatever I have a question.

- Go ahead attorney. Spit it all

- Did reach out to him or did he reach out to us?

- I found him.

- Okay.

- I found, I, I call, I mean, I called a number of people and got transferred and I got the local person. So we haven't been able to reach that local person in the past. I think we've gotten some other people, maybe at different levels of Jeanette that haven't been able to help us with that.

- Thank you.

- He definitely wrote.

- What about the resolution that was put forward.

- We'll talk about that in a minute, John. We'll talk about that in a minute.

- Elder Lefebvre.

- I was gonna bring up, but hopefully now well the thing is too, if people don't want it but it's laying there and they're not looking at it then they're not gonna get that number. But I would think that if they had contacted them and said they do not want it. This is a legal question. Wouldn't they have the right to now. It has to be, I suppose, people aren't going to get a lawyer individually, but maybe get a bunch of people together and get a lawyer. And they could Sue because, and Garnett is responsible because it is their paper they put out. And if they don't get contacted that they do not want it and they continually are throwing it on their lawn or wherever. Wouldn't that legally bind them to some lawsuit? I guess that's for legal.

- It could be legal or inspection. You know, I think the citation possibly.

- One of the problems elder Lefebvre that that I mentioned to Matt was that I said people are calling the number that they find for Garnett to call to remove themselves and it doesn't work. And he said that that the

number that probably people are calling is the number that's like the general Garnett number. That's, you know, a lot, a lot of people are calling from all over the country. What he's gonna put in that paper as the local delivery number. So when you call somebody, it'll actually come to his like his section where they can enter that. They can enter that themselves. So I'm hoping that, 'cause that's the first place I had looked. Was in the paper to see if I could find a contact number anywhere. And I couldn't. So I'm hoping, at least that will help a little bit when people are getting them and opening them up. But we can certainly publish that number as well. He was willing to share information. He said that's something we could get that information out to people that this is the contact number locally if you want

- I think we're gonna have to do something like that because a lot of these papers are people are when they're going out to a campaign you're walking even in their driveways or laying in the sidewalks are all wet. They're in the road. You know people aren't even picking them up. just lay there. So yeah, we got to do something so people know.

- Right, I agree. Elder

- Well, I was curious as to if attorney Mayes had any kind of input on this. I had heard that she'd had been really looking at this and they have a solution.

- No, she did . I was going to say all through the elder Stevens and I did work on it and all the attorney Mayes as well. So attorney Mayes, are you there?

- Yep, I'm here. So the resolution that, the language that's in the draft that's in the packet for today's meeting. It had to come back to the committee because after law department got our hands on the draft copy there were some substantive changes. So at that point we couldn't just present it to the full council for a vote. It had to come back to committee. So that's where we're at right now. I think we've got a pretty polished final copy of a draft that makes it clear that the council is looking for an official newspaper. That's going to partner with us and comply with our anti-litter ordinance. The resolution gives some context for our current situation and why, why we're at this point, prompting the resolution. But I think that it goes beyond the initial intent from the the meeting back in March because this version identifies any newspaper that's selected as our official newspaper. It doesn't single anyone out. It just sets a clear expectation that going forward whoever's selected for our official newspaper is going to adhere to that anti-litter ordinance and Attorney Bungert and I did reach out to purchasing to make sure that in the RFP, for the official newspaper that adherence and compliance with the anti-litter ordinance is considered a material term of our contract that is set to renew I believe it's at the end of May. So between the resolution and the RFP there is a clear expectation and going forward if there is not compliance, we would have a material breach or a breach of a material term of the contract that we would be able to enforce. So I'm still hoping that we get voluntary compliance and it sounds like we're finally making some progress there but if there's not voluntary compliance, we do have another or a new enforcement mechanism that we haven't had in the past. That's kind of where we're at with the resolution and the RFP.

- Elder does that help? Well, thank you again, Rachel, for all your work on this side, I still think it's important that we look at this resolution that we've worked on for a while and use that in accordance with anything else we can do to move forward. For sake of transparency do you feel that we need to read this now? Or is that something that we can just

- Are you there, Rachel?

- Yeah, I'm I'm here.

- Is it necessary for us to read it? It's not that long. Just read it for the sake of clarity.

- Yeah, If you, if you wanted to read it, you could. I mean, it's included in the packet it's publicly available. I guess that's, that's your call? I don't think that there's a, I mean, we're not it's not a first reading second reading type of a situation but
- But just for clarity sake, I would entertain one of the committee members to read it if they if they so choose.
- Mark, I don't know if elder still wants to speak. She had her hand up
- Oh, but I see you.
- I just wanted to say that I've read the resolution and the RFP. And I just feel like the problem is very, very close to solve now. I'd feel so much better about it. You know, I take great pride in my writing of resolutions and I have to admit this time I was way off base. It is so, so much better. I just wanted to make sure everybody understood that what Attorney Mayes was saying is that the contract will now say you and your employees and contractors must abide by our anti-littering ordinance. So we didn't have this in there before. Isn't that correct Attorney Mayes?
- That's correct.
- So, you know, I just think we have with the help of the legal department we've got this pretty much nailed down now. That's what I wanted to say.
- I agree. And again, thanks for your help on that too. Committee, anybody in the committee would like to read it otherwise we can move forward.
- I don't think we need to read it. But I do want to thank your attorneys for looking at the future contract.
- That's a great point.
- The languages in there. So I thank you very much.
- But I'll make a motion to approve that resolution.
- Second.
- Second.
- Motion by Steven. Second by Lefebvre. Any other discussion? All in favor, please say aye. Aye. All opposed that passes unanimously. Thanks again for all your effort and everybody that worked on it.
- One moment. And on to item number two.
- Item number two consideration with possible action on a request by PH hospitality group LLC pizza hut at H-59 Lombardy avenue for a change of agent, staff.
- No objection.
- Police. Police concur with law, no objection.
- Okay, I want to entertain a motion.
- Motion to

- Motion by Stevens. John, would you second that?
- Yes I did.
- Alright second by Vander Leest. All in favor, please say aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- All opposed that passes unanimously.
- Okay, onto item number
- Number three, consideration with possible action on a request by three Oh four North Adams green Bay, LLC. Hotel Northland at three Oh four North Adams street for a change of agent, staff.
- Law department has no objection
- And police?
- Police concur.
- Okay, I would entertain a motion.
- Motion
- Motion by Vander Leest. Do we have a seconder?
- Second.
- Second by Stevens. Any other discussion? All in favor please say aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- All opposed that passes unanimously.
- All right, item number four.
- Number four, consideration with possible astronaut on a request by Hyatt corporation at three 33 main street for a change of agent, staff.
- Law department has no objection.
- And police?
- Police concur.
- Okay, Motion?
- Motion

- Motion by Vander Leest.
- Second.
- Seconded by Lefebvre. Any other discussion? All in favor, please say aye. Aye. Aye.
- All opposed that passes unanimously.
- And item number five.
- Number five consideration with possible action on a request by Meguiar at one 21 North Adams to extend the issuance of their liquor license to June, 2021 due to unexpected delays and renovations staff.
- The applicant is asking for an extension in accordance with our operational requirements under our ordinances. Law department has no objections with that.
- Okay and police?
- Police concur as well.
- Motion to approve.
- Motion by Stevens. Do we have a second?
- Second.
- Second by Vander Leest And other discussion all in favor, please say aye.
- Aye.
- All opposed, I'm gonna
- All right, item number six.
- Number six. Consideration of possible action on a request by a Napoli's launch at 1351 theater street extend their license premises in the packing area on August 21st for a one day event.
- Law department has no objection. We did just want to clarify to the applicant that the approval in front of the committee is to just temporarily expand their license premise to include the parking area. In their paperwork they were referring to being able to have beverages in the right of way. And while that is an exception if allowed under our special event, exception, that approval is under a different mechanism and would only be allowed once their special events permit is approved. I'm not sure where they are in the approval process. I just wanted to just make that crystal clear to the applicant that all that's being approved tonight is just expanding to the park.
- Oh, until we basically, if we approve it tonight they still have to go through the hoops to make sure they get it done.
- Correct, yep. and be able to move from the parking lot here.
- Okay, great. Police.

- We have no objection with this. I do know one of our other lieutenants I believe is meeting with representatives from the Napoli's over the next couple of days to solidify our part of the special event permit.
- I was gonna to ask Oh yeah, go ahead. And then I'll ask later.
- Sure. Regarding this one day event is this the unveiling of their art display that they're having been under the law, you know?
- It sounds like it.
- I honestly don't know.
- It is okay, perfect.
- The mirror, the mirror is gonna be there as well.
- into that, I believe.
- Right. Well I guess I was gonna ask Attorney Mahoney if this, if Napoli's had anything else like this or is this kind of a unique situation?
- This was the first time that I've heard of them having an event. From my experience they've never asked for this waiver before. But we don't anticipate there being any issues since it is an unveiling and more of a public event not just outdoor beer garden.
- Right. Is anybody here from Napoli's that would like to speak?
- I could ask.
- Yes.
- Okay, hold on
- Make a motion
- I make a motion to open the floor.
- Second.
- Second by Lefebvre. All in favor, please say aye. Aye.
- All opposed. Okay, Martha, are you there?
- Yes, I am here. State your name and address for the record and then just kind of describe the event
- Martha five 21 Hilltop drive in Alloway. I'm a project coordinator working with the co-owners of the Napoli's lounge and with various community groups. This is tied in directly with the August 21st mural unveiling and door opening with the mayor involved. It is envisioned as a one-time event. The Napoli's has never done anything like this before. There have been some wonderful groups including old Maine, the art garage the boys and girls club, United arts, positive voice quite a few groups that are working together for this, this day.
- I was gonna ask Martha, is there any are there any concerns of large crowds gathering for this or not considering what's going on this in this last year?

- I think, well, first of all, the, in working with Rivera I've gone through the COVID protocols. And so at this point we're looking at about 250 people since it's never been done before. It's very difficult to estimate the number of people that will actually be there. But if necessary, we will have people at either ends of the street and counting. We also are looking at having four personal tables so that no more than four people together socially distanced, requiring masks having sanitation stations everything that's in place right now where won't be quite as stringent to set of guidelines by August 21st. But if there are so be it, we'll follow them.
- Well, great. I appreciate your agenda on that. Thank you. And elder Lefebvre, you have something.
- Well, I want to know where the, where it's located. I'm not sure it's not close to . That's Cedar street. Is it over by Wayne? It used to be Cedar. That's why it's motorway. It's over off of our crutch, right?
- It's the same street right down
- The other side of that in there.
- Back over there.
- Okay, Now I'm understanding where it is. Okay, thanks.
- So what I, I guess I, I, I did look at it but so Cedar street will be closed. A small portion of it.
- Two thirds of Cedar street is proposed to be closed. Closing at Baird, but then the next closure would be just before mid Tiara market. So that the food market Pete's still get into their parking lot.
- Well, the police said a little bit at this so I'm sure there'll be signs up and traffic flow elsewhere. I think that'll be good. Thank you again for your Elder Stevens.
- Yeah, thank you, Mark. I saw the four that were available. It should be very interesting on to rebuild.
- Great.
- But remember to invite all the elders of the city to come out as well.
- We'd like to have fun too once in a while.
- Absolutely.
- Then we extend that invitation in writing. Can we get a little closer?
- That's good. Thank you so much.
- Thank you for everything.
- Alright, we need to close the floor.
- We gonna close the floor. Okay, it's by Stevens. Do we have a second?
- Second.
- Second by Lefebvre All in favor, please say aye.

- Aye.
- All right.
- I make a motion to approve.
- I'll second it.
- By Stevens, seconded by Lefebvre. All in favor say aye.
- Aye
- All opposed good luck with that. Thank you. Thank you again.
- Mm.
- Oh, by the way, this does go to city council and, I should have mentioned that earlier on May 4th at 6:00p.m for final approval by the council. I don't see any problem with it, but there's always that slim, slim chance. So that's it.
- Thank you. Alright. Are we ready or
- One second. Item number seven.
- Number seven, consideration possible action. on a request by pearly Gates at 35 51 finger roll to extend their licensed premises to the East parking lot on July, 2021 for the 16th annual outdoor veterans, charity fundraiser.
- Law department just wanted to clarify again a couple of things to the applicant. They were requesting for a noise variance on that request does have to go directly to the chief of police under our ordinance to get that variance for the band. The a little longer our ordinance requirements. In addition, they're also asking for some free closers that again isn't something that's within the purview of the committee that he needs to be a request that needs to be directed to the department of public works. I'm not sure if it's going to rise to the level of a special event. However they inquire with staff there'll be directed appropriately. That's it and I will
- Alright, police.
- Yes, they've had this event numerous times in the past. We've never had any issues. Yes, there are quite a few people that attend but their security is always top notch. You know, certainly there's quite a bit of traffic that I know in the past, they've worked with us to help drive all the motorcyclists that are out there, but we've never had complaints from neighbors or anyone about the event. We have no objection to this event.
- I know that they've done it for a few years and all their doors that center district, alright. But in your district I believe I'm just asking really Gates. I think Humboldt
- I believe it might be all their Corpus Dax.
- That's what I was thinking.
- And I don't think it's mine.
- I've got to look at my maps. I'm usually pretty good at that.

- Oh, well you're the map person.
- I'll rub it in.
- Motion to approve.
- Motion by Vander Leest. Do we have a second?
- Second. Second by Stevens. Any other discussion? All in favor, please say aye.
- Aye. All opposed. That passes unanimously.
- Item number eight.
- Number Eight, duration possible on possible action on a renewal class B beer license for the pier Dodgers baseball club, Inc. at 1450 East Walnut street with a licensed description of joint stadium staff.
- No objection.
- Okay, police?
- Police please concur.
- Well they're an integral part of our entertainment in the summer until they'd been here, you know baseball it's been going on a long time is so that's a good thing. Any other discussion or I would entertain a motion.
- Motion to approve
- By Stevens and then seconded by Vander Leest. Any other discussion follow please say aye.
- Aye. All opposed that passes unanimously.
- Alright, item number nine.
- Is it nine or 10. Well there's no
- Nine.
- Okay but I'll read it accordingly. Consideration with possible action on the application for a class B combination licensed by B S C T B C, LLC. The job site is 1647 caste street with a licensed premises description as single room bar for selling in store. Basement to stall while the UMN room one stall to urinal men's room currently licensed those K H G B staff.
- Law department has no objection.
- Police.
- The police concur.
- We need a motion.
- Motion

- Motion by Vander Leest before we jump in on that.
- No, I just had a, add a comment on it. They talk about the urinals. That's a men's room, whereas the women's room. They don't mention anything about that.
- There are two stall woman rooms.
- Oh, okay. Then it just said two-stall and urinals.
- I saw the initials. I apologize for not knowing that. I should have. All right. Was the second by Lefebvre? By Stevens.
- You made the motion, right? And then I can second it.
- Vander Leest moved the motion. Seconded by Stevens. Okay, any other discussion? All in favor, please say aye.
- Aye. All opposed passes unanimously.
- Just to clarify that was elder Vander Leest who moved and elder Steven Correct, okay.
- Yeah, that's right.
- Alright. Item number 10.
- Number 10. Consideration of possible action and an application for a class A liquor and class A beer should say license, I suppose at 6098 main street with a license premise description as CS four currently licensed as main street, many Mardel LC staff.
- Yes, Law department has no objection.
- Police.
- Police concur.
- I entertain a motion.
- Motion
- Motion by Stevens. Seconded by Vander Leest. Correct?
- Correct.
- All in favor please say aye.
- Aye.
- All opposed.
- Okay, and on to item number 11.
- 11, and simulation with possible action on our request by elder Burnette point and for the city to appeal to the federal government to allow for the property owners shed to remain. Previously discussed at the April

27th, 2020 and August, 2020 protection policy committee meetings. Before we even continue on this, I wanted to find out is there anybody from the public to speak to this?

- I talked to all their older Burnett. He was driving back from a conference and you know, I'd think elder Stevens if you remember, we put, we we asked for some more information on this and this was quite a while ago, six months ago, maybe.

- Oh yeah.

- We'll spend a long time. So is the property owner here? Well that's what I asked to see his seizure. The Mr. is not here.

- And then like six months and Bill refresh our memory.

- Yeah, that'd be great.

- Thanks. So this actually started back in 2018 with a permit where the, the owner Mr. Dudeck to go to through our office our Spanx inspection office to put up a shed. The shed, as you recall, was put in the wrong role location. It was put out in, in the floodway. So he wanted to put it it was supposed to go on the left side of the property. He put it on the other side of his property. So that's kinda why I were in the spot that ran. We've been working with them for for the last several years. Some enforcement action was taken. Elder Burnett became involved in April of last year. Through this committee would have been kind of extending by several, I believe 90 day extensions to try to allow the owner to contact chemo and the federal government to work on some type of a document for us. And to date, we haven't received that. So his options are kind of getting limited as far as what he can do because it's been going on for, for quite a while. And we'll need to proceed with some type of action to get a resolution one way or another here soon. So any of the fees, what is that like?

- I'm sorry I'll receive.

- And you broke up.

- What was that?

- Did he make any payments on the fees that are assessed?

- He made all of them. All of the fees have been paid. He was assessed a total of 30 a re-inspection fees over the over the last several years. The last two years starting in 2019 and 2019 he received 22 fees 2020 he had eight fees. As soon as the older brother became involved and we were going through this process. We haven't feed anymore since that, up until today's date.

- I have a comment then I have another question. So yeah, go ahead. If I recall correctly, this property owner has not been in front of this committee as of yet.

- Six months ago he might've spoke. No, I don't think he was here.

- What would the next step be to get this corrected?

- There we go. Can you hear me okay?

- Yes.

- Go ahead.

- We have a couple different elder Stevens We could continue a reading that they'll contact us at a resolution of the shed, to the appropriate location. We could issue citations Either of those options One of our last options would be the issue or raise or remove order.

- I'll be muted.

- Please do all.

- The Randall is

- Here we go. I think we lost him. We might have her self esteem. All of us.

- I muted elder Vander Leest. When he wants to talk, I'll unmute him.

- All right, thank you. So I don't know what part you're heard but really the last option. If we continue re-inspection fees we could issue citations try to get voluntary compliance for him to either remove the shed or or move it to the appropriate location. If he's not amendable to either one of those what we would have to do is issue a raise or remove where the city we would. We would come in and give them a timeline to either he moves it to the appropriate location disassembles it, or we would have to disassemble it.

- So you said this has been going on since 2018?

- Correct, July of 2018 is when the permit was taken out for almost three years.

- So my question for you would be, what step would you like to take now?

- I, I'm, I'm more of, I'd like to try to give the gentleman the opportunity to, you know, voluntarily comply. I don't like tearing down anybody's structure that they built because that's, you know, I mean that's going to be there's financial ramifications involved in that. I'd rather try to workout something where he voluntarily moves it or removes it himself, then go that route. So I would, you know, buy that's our whole premise of why we issue our enforcement. It's not to penalize people. It's to try to get voluntary compliance. So I would like to take that route and exhaust all those possibilities either through our office and then the law department, before we would do that.

- Well, my rec are all there.

- Well, hold on.

- I have a question. Bill, I assume you went out and looked at the situation. If he moved it, how far would he have to move it?

- It's basically to the other side of his property. The flood there's a, he's got a small he's got a small area right behind his house to the left. If you're facing his property to the left of his, of his property there's a small area that is not in the floodway. That was the area in which he was approved to put it. I'd have to pull up the exact width of his lot but it's basically on the opposite side. The issue is, there's several trees that are involved. And now because of the size of the structure I believe, it's they're resistant to do that because they may have to cut down or remove some trees now in order to do that. So those are really decisions that he's gonna have to make, to figure out. He's gonna have to wait what he wants to do, you know.

- Another question then. You said it's in the flood plain. Can he, can he Jack it up? It just can't, it can't be there at all.

- Can't be there. So that's the whole premise we're in the resolution. It's really it's. This is my opinion. But it's really not in our, in the cities. The city can request that of FEMA. because we actually do the opposite. I mean, we're they're instructing us as the federal government as a city to remove things from the floodway. So we really can't, you know, request the opposite of them when it would kind of put all of our other work in compromised, if that makes sense. So really the request from us is it's kind of puts us in a bad spot where we really can't fulfill that.

- So you're really saying he either has to move it or take it down

- Or he would need to get a documentation from FEMA that would provide that to us. And we've had, in my opinion I think we've given them a long time to be able to do that. And it just hasn't happened.

- Yeah. I, I think with the how long it's been him trying to get that document I have a feeling that FEMA's not going to give it to him.

- Okay, all their doors. I'm gonna get off. Hold on there. I'm just going to ask one quick question with the, with this being set up like this. There's really no option for him. It's in the floodway, with something else I was gonna ask I'm gonna go to elder . Elder go ahead.

- Thank you chair.

- When I was, why would elder Burnett be asking the city This is what it says, number 11, asking the city to appeal to the federal government, to allow for the proper this all that's really what's under discussion here is whether as a city, we're going to answer for Bill Pappy. You just gave, which was a good answer that that would negate all the work that we're currently doing. Where we're supposed to be removing things. Because this isn't this is a little bit of a confusing agenda item asking the city to do something we normally wouldn't do. And then asking the city to refund the inspection fee. is it two different things two separate things that are happening.

- I took it that way. Two separate things.

- I don't know why he did either.

- The fact is I think the fact is that elder Burnett has talked to this gentleman numerous times. There might be some personal things going on. He can bend some things. Hello, somebody would call him out there. Either somebody say something.

- Yes, there is someone who I think wants to speak. So this Mr. , if you would just wait for the chair.

- Oh, you're too loud.

- Okay, I like to hear from the public, if need be at all unless elder you have something to say before we open the floor

- A suggestion, because you know, here we go again this is stuff that started way before I was on the council. And I just can't imagine. I think I heard Mr. Pappy say that all together. There've been like 50 inspection fees?

- 30.

- Well one year and 22 in another year. Isn't that what I heard?

- 22 and eight.

- Oh, 22 and eight. See, I'm not good at math. So 30. Why? Is this typical? Do you do this for people? You just keep giving them fines and say, you know is that typical or is this is there something special about this case?

- You want me to answer? Yeah, go ahead. And in elder A couple of years ago we had a policy change. And what we found is that if we instead of issuing citations, which we could do a lot in overburdening, our law department, what we found is that if we take the re-inspection fee route or goal is to generate communications. So a lot of times what happens is that the communication breaks down where we sent orders. We've been trying to work with, with people and for whatever reason that the communication stops. So what we found is if we issue re-inspection fees usually around the two to three week mark people will say, Hey, this is problem. Isn't going away. And we have to have a conversation then. And we try to work on a resolution. The goal isn't to punish them per se it's to try to work towards compliance and resolution. We have a group of there's a I don't know the exact number maybe anywhere from 40 to 60 total total complaints at a time where that fall into this category where they are generating, you know re-inspection fees on a, on a more regular basis. Because for whatever reason, we hit a dead end and they re we refute that we don't get voluntary compliance or kind of dug into their situation communication breaks down, and we don't have a resolution. So it is, has been more common lately.

- Not about how many people or homeowners or property are in a situation where they've had 30 inspection fees. It's been going on for two or three years.

- Well, we get a boat, 33,500 complaints a year. And I would say about on average maybe 50 of those 3,500 complaints would maybe fall into that category in any given time. Some fall off. Typically the majority of them in about a two week time period we'll get some type of resolution and something will happen but it's usually anywhere from that number kind of fluctuates as new cases are coming on.

- It just seems an awful lot of staff time.

- I think we're getting off topic.

- We are?

- Yeah, we are so Bobby I'd like to let's get over to Mr. Fon for quantitative speak. So I need emotional from the floor. So I have a second, we'll say. All right, all in favor please say aye.

- Aye.

- All opposed. Mr. did you want to say something? State your name and address for the record. Unmute yourself.

- line one, it first started, then it went off and then said that I was off taken off by the host. I just got back on line open the gates yet.

- You're not for this item. You're you're okay. You're you've been passed.

- Thank you very much after this meeting.

- Okay, never mind. You might've been a neighbors, something. Nevermind.

- Thank you.

- In fact, we have a second to close the floor.

- Do we have a second?

- Second.
- Second by Vander Leest. All in favor, please say aye.
- Aye.
- All opposed. All right, let's
- Can I just add to all their relaxed comment was that this one's a little different because it got to this committee and was held. Normally we would have followed through with the standard inspection process. But I think that this has been on hold since is it April of 20, but I think the first hit. So that's why it's kind of been in limbo as long as no re-inspection fees have been issued since that time. So there's zero fees out at this point and we stopped and we held it now and we stopped issuing. We really stopped doing anything on it.
- Now, was that something with the committee or was it something with administration or them might've taken that long to get back on the agenda? I don't know. I mean, we all did, but it just never came back. So I don't know if there's something.
- If I recall correctly, we held it. So Jesse could speak with the property owner.
- Right. And I talked to Jesse today. He says, whatever the committee decides move forward. Know it sounds like he's like maybe he's run out of options as well. That's just the feeling I'm getting from him. Committee do we have any So I haven't gone all the little favorite strand quickly.
- I was just gonna make a motion that we move on. Let's see how do we wanna state that? Attorney Bungert, how should we state this motion?
- It should be received and placed in file.
- Okay Just receive in place some file.
- Wouldn't it be to deny the refund?
- I don't, the refund isn't an, this isn't an appeal for the for the re-inspection fees.
- Okay. Then regarding that second part. So we receive in place some file, but can we add to it where we can instruct inspections to move forward with the next phase? Of moving out, getting that building moved.
- Okay, I understand what you're saying. Yeah. So it would be a two-part. So if the committee wants to deny the refund it would be a denial of, of that request and then the item is to appeal. So if that's not the direction of the committee than it would be to receive and place on file. And then what other whatever other direction the committee has that it does that address.
- Yeah, that makes sense.
- I think the denial of the refund or the moneys
- So then some fly West saw I'd like to go there.
- I personally feel that we need to move to the next step.
- So that would be part of my motion then that we direct staff to go to the next step.

- That's one part. We're also gonna deny the refund, correct?
- Yes.
- Motion.
- Okay.
- Do we need two motions?
- We can do only one, can we? Attorney Bungert?
- We can do it all under one.
- Okay.
- So there would be a motion to deny the refund and then to direct staff to take the next step.
- Right. So we have a motion to that effect. I would say that's good.
- Sorry, I just want to jump in Attorney Bungert I just got a procedural question for you. Often times, what happens with these is if when this committee takes an action if we go back to doing re-inspection fees that re-inspection fee and put this back on the agenda because if I understand it, what that does is they can make an appeal to that particular feature to this committee, right?
- I can make a comment on that.
- Are you following what I'm, what, I'm what I'm asking? Joel, you can jump in.
- If you're maybe thinking we're done with inspections we need to do the inspection fees. We need to move on to the next phase of this.
- Does that include inspection fees still or no?
- You know what? I think you guys are getting wrapped up in the details of how inspections gonna follow up. Really what you wanna do is you wanna say, you know we're going to deny the refunding of the re-inspection fees. We're gonna receive and place on file the appeal to the federal government. And we're gonna direct staff to proceed under normal SOP.
- Perfect.
- All right, there we are. That's my motion.
- Do I have a second with Steven? So any other discussion all in favor, please say, aye.
- Aye.
- All opposed that passes unanimously.
- I know that's why we have excellent people working on our staff.
- That's team effort.

- Good.

- Can I make one comment to

- Go ahead. You're on a roll. I stopped that because that question that you brought is very, it's very in-depth and this meeting wasn't a part of to do with that. I asked you to reach out to bill and he will tell you everything that goes on, regarding inspections.

- All right. Let me know and can move on

- One second. Just trying to capture the last motion. Item number 12.

- Number 12 consideration with possible action on a request by elder Chris district eight by Brent Fair for the city of green Bay to support the 2021 22 Wisconsin state legislature. Bi-partisan Senate bill two 43 and assembly bill two 45 lowering the threshold from the . 100% required for Wisconsin service connected and rated disabled the military veterans who claimed the veterans and surviving spouses, property tax credit under the individual income tax system to 70%. I know we have somebody here to speak to that effect and all that. All their worries said he's very much in favor of moving forward with this. He said he spoke to the mayor about it. The mayor seemed to be in line with it as well. So I entertain to open the floor so we could have Mr. Fair speak.

- I move to open the floor

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

- Aye.

- All opposed Mr. Fair, state your name and address for the record and a little bit.

- Sure. My name is Brent Fair. I live at two zero six Cleveland street green Bay, Wisconsin, five four three zero three. I am a veteran and I found out about this proposed legislation roughly a month ago. And I've been trying to raise awareness and gather support for this legislation down in Madison. And I've been doing that a number of different ways, talking with my state legislators and talking with the city legislators and County legislators as well. And I am asking you for support on this. I think it is a, a really good change to current law. And I would definitely answer any questions anybody has at this time.

- Maddie? Does anybody have anything to say?

- If you could just give us a brief if you could just give us a brief informational session so that the public can hear it as well what you're trying to accomplish?

- Yeah, sure. So currently, if you are a service connected disabled veteran in the state of Wisconsin and you get compensated by the department of veterans affairs at a hundred percent you and you are a homeowner, you qualify for a program through the state of Wisconsin to get a hundred percent of your property tax that you pay back on your Wisconsin income tax return. So you, you claim this credit and you go to your County veterans service office and they would do a worksheet for you. Get the information confirmed by the U S department of veterans affairs and send that along with your annual income tax return. Then the state of Wisconsin credits you back for the money you paid in property taxes on your primary residence to include land up to one acre. So it doesn't, if you owned multiple homes, it would not it would not cover multiple homes. And it only covers up to one acre. What this legislation does is lower that threshold of being a hundred percent disabled, 70% disabled. So, and, and then it's graduated as well. So a person who's 70% disabled wouldn't get a hundred percent tax back. They would get a prorated 70%. Is that?

- Go ahead.
- Yeah. Is that the threshold see information in the what you're trying to accomplish.
- Thank you.
- Okay.
- Brent is a 70% kinda the limit lower than that, or?
- Oh goodness, yes. It goes down to 10%.
- 10%, okay. All right. Is this a bipartisan type of bill that's gone through? Or what, what is your take on that?
- It sure is bipartisan and it is, it's legislation like this has been proposed. It's it's, it's gone gone to committee a few times and this time it's come out as bi-partisan and there, I believe like 25 co-signers on the bill, if that's the right language.
- Sure, well, that's, that's a good number.
- And it's fresh. It was, it was early April then it was read for the first time.
- Well, that's great. John, I know you're, you're a veteran. I mean, what's your take on all of this? It sounds pretty good to me.
- I think that they're trying to help the people that really need assistance that aren't able to that was just tax credit. I think it would be fine. Pray wheelchair bound and what have you can get income. And I know that the amount of money that it might receive might not be sufficient to sustain their, you know all the, the costs of the medical and what have you. That'd be my take on that.
- Great. Thanks. Over to elder Lefebvre
- Yes, I wonder why it took so long for something like this because you know it's not just here in Wisconsin and this bill here you hear about so many things with the veterans how so many have fallen through the cracks and they're not being taken care of. And I think that's a shame that we should be looking out for our veterans. So this is a really, I'm really glad that we got a number it's it's bipartisan and we got a number of them finally coming forward and doing something. Like John said, it's not, you know nearly maybe as much as much as it could be but it's something that helps. And I definitely will support this.
- Elder Stevens.
- I looked at it over I'm supportive of this. So what's our next step? Refer to staff?
- Attorney Bungert.
- This can actually go up for approval. The resolution. I'm not sure if they're committee approve that then the item would be approved and then a resolution draft when we put together.
- Then I will make a motion to approve.
- I'll second that.

- Seconded by Lefebvre. Fair do you have something else?
- Just there, there was a resolution draft that was sent along with the request. And I, you know, I don't know where, where that ends up. But there was a resolution draft.
- so I did look over it briefly. I found it to be very straightforward and good. And I don't know if the committee wants to take a second I'm looking at it, but it wasn't our
- Right, if the committee approved that language as is, then the committee is essentially approving the resolution that can be formulated into resolution format and then placed under resolution item, agenda.
- Then Mark, we can ask Mr. Fair if there's anything more otherwise we have to close the floor.
- Right, anything else Mr. Fair?
- I just wanna thank you all for your time and letting me speak to this. Thanks for listening.
- Well, we appreciate your, your efforts on this as well. And we, we, we thank you for that. We need a motion to close the floor.
- Motion to close the floor.
- By Vander Leest second by?
- Second
- By Lefebvre all in favor, please say aye.
- Aye.
- All opposed. So Steve, Elder Stevens you made a motion?
- Motion to approve.
- Right? And that was seconded by?
- Me
- Lefebvre. Any other discussion? All in favor, please say aye.
- Aye.
- All opposed this goes to council on Tuesday. I don't see any problems with them. Thank you. Thanks everybody for their effort on this. All right. We're getting toward the end here. My favorite part.
- Nope, clarification.
- Go ahead. Did we miss one did peer Dodgers baseball club?
- No.
- No, we've ordered

- That was misnumbered.
- Got it. Moving right along here .
- And I like baseball, but yeah, we, we did it.
- We are on to item Informational ,
- Informational. Lieutenant Mahoney. Are you there or Lieutenant Allen?
- We don't have any violations for this month.
- That's a beautiful thing.
- I can get onto the shelter appropriate.
- Do we have a second by Vander Leest and second by Lefebvre, all in favor, please say aye.
- Aye.
- All opposed. All right, item number two. The shelter inappropriate chronic resource report by the police department from April 1st, April 19th, 2021. Go ahead Lieutenant.
- I don't know how much background you guys have on this. Do you have any questions before I start this?
- There was some information that was brought into it, and we did look it over a little bit. Maybe just give it a cursory as far as you know some of the things that police worked on with us.
- We were approached by elder Galvin and he's wanting us to track maybe a top 10 list of our most chronic almost maybe alcohol abusers that we have and see if we can find out what they're engage maybe the County or someone else to hopefully find shelter or housing for these individuals. It's currently, we have six people that we have I guess marked as chronic users of our resources and are a couple of them have been deemed shelter inappropriate and as far as that means is that they have all been through St John's But when they go there they're they either won't follow the rules. They don't get along with other people. And they just, they cause more issues with the other residents that are following the rules and they've been kicked out or no trespass or have been banned from shelter for the year. As far as we won't give out names or either sexes but we'll just we just number them one through six. And I can give you a little brief summary of what we have.
- Okay.
- I don't know if you have the sheet that shows the dollar value that they may have incurred.
- We do. Do you have a chance to share that to the screen or not?
- I don't, like I can hold it up. That's about the best.
- No, I have to get to we'll go ahead and just you can describe it and I'll try it. It wasn't a pack itself.
- All right, so the first one no real, real history on her. She, we have some mental health issues on number one and she was placed on EM one. One, one at Brown County. One has a history of misuse of services, violent behavior. And she's been no trespass from St John's. So she's not a good fit to be sheltered. Number two.
- We have questions. Can we do absolutely

- Just interrupt me at any time if you have questions.
- You stated that subject number one has mental issues. Has she been referred to Brown County mental health?
- She had gone on a EM one.
- And what does EM one mean?
- For emergency medical detention where she had gone to crisis presented as suicidal. And it was deemed that they placed that individual on, at Brown claimed mental health for an evaluation.
- And where is this individual currently?
- Current now, I am not sure. I have not seen this person over at St. John's and I haven't physically had any interactions with her and spoken with her. There is a group of regulars that is that St. John's park. And I interact with them probably two times a week to get names and see who's there and who's left.
- Oh, I'm sorry, go ahead.
- We currently do not know where she's currently at.
- Can you report back to us for three weeks if she comes back up on the radar?
- Yeah, we have alerts set up.
- Maybe she left the city.
- So we have alerts set up in our if this person does pop up, our prime analyst ladies will track any contacts we have with her and maybe track down a location where this person ended up.
- Okay. In the recent, since that the, the EM one.
- I have another question but I'll wait until the end.
- Lieutenant, I was gonna ask quickly as new, have six people here is a normal number, as far as some of the things that have gone on over time or
- Yeah, we just, we just started this. So I'm anticipating that this list will grow and then some people will leave. There is number three, she has now been housed.
- Alright that's a good point that it's a new program per se but just too many of course, but you know the something.
- So number two and three of their regulars at St. John's park, like I said, number three is now been housed. There are some, there are some a lot of mental health issues with this one but is currently how is number two? He's I would say maybe in her fifties but she she is eligible for any housing she wants there's, you know, she's very . Most people does not want to go into the shelter for fear of her own safety. So they have outreach persons who are working with that and trying to maybe ease or fears of going into shelter and getting her help. But there's no alcohol drugs anything like that on board with, with number two.

- Alright, like the fact that elder Stevens said that he liked this report at all. Can we keep those, keep us in touch, you know?

- And it gives you just, instead of looking at the first form with the dollar amount you have some context of the people that we're dealing with instead of just know, Hey, this person incurred those kind of costs, you know.

- Sure.

- So I'll direct you to four and six. Those are, would be our two real chronic alcohol abusers that we currently are tracking. Neither of which are shelter appropriate. Six can go to a shelter but that person needs to blow zeros and, and have no alcohol on board and is allowed to go back to shelter. But that doesn't seem like that's going to happen. And number four just does not get along with anyone when he's in a group of people. And he usually sleeps over by Mason street bridge to the South of St. John's park. And really, it was just kind of by himself. When he does drink, it usually ends in some type of police contact, whether it's just being creating a disturbance by himself, just being loud out on the sidewalk or the street, or, you know getting into some type of argument or fight with another person out there.

- Elder Galvin is trying to get in just as someone could let him in.

- I didn't see him.

- I can stay on later with them and go, we'll keep going until the Galvin.

- He needs someone to let him.

- I just let him in , I did. Thank you.

- Thank you.

- So out of these six have we issued any type of citations or anything?

- Yeah, there's been a number C number four and six having current citations. And they're just the basics is open intox or DCS for disturbances. Number six was picked up on a couple of warranty had and it was taken out the jail at one point.

- Are these affective at all these citations? 'Cause I think some of them probably couldn't pay them anyhow?

- All those citations most likely will end up in

- Okay.

- So I do have another question. I don't know if you can answer this. Maybe it may be law department. So if these individuals have housing issues within the community and the police department has cited them but it's been determined that they do not reside in the city of green Bay. Can we send them back to their hometown? I don't know if can answer that?

- I don't know if we'd get them a bus ticket to go back there. But you know, I don't think we can hold their hand and get them on the bus and send them home.

- There would be no mechanism that we can force someone to return to their home town. At least not

- Even though citations may not be paid in full to the city?

- Essentially the, the mechanism by which like if someone can not pay a citation result is basically jail time.
- The last one I got as number five he's been a regular over. I think, I have not seen any alcohol or drug issues with this person. There is some definite mental health issues on board with this one. And I haven't seen him in about a week and a half now but there was a citing of him this weekend by a newcomer. You walk past the building and that was it. But he doesn't
- alternative Lieutenant Allen without saying any names. Is this the individual that newcomer has been having issues with?
- Well, there's a few of them that they've been having issues with. So this is probably gonna be one of them. But he, you know, he's, he does start fires to stay warm. Some of them are in inappropriate places and parking lots. There's a couple of trees down, few found set those on fire to, to, and he has been cited for those things and no trespass in a few different parks. As far as alcohol drug abuse with this one we haven't found any evidence of it. And it's just mostly mental health.
- Lieutenant Allen there Galvin. I know you're in now. I know you you've requested this, you know for our committee to take a look at have you had a chance to look at this and what are your feelings about it? And we're gonna have Lieutenant Allen report back to us probably each meeting just to let us know where we're at with this.
- Right, and I I've had some conversations with commander Wark on this report. I'm gonna be getting a hold of him because I was able to answer some of my questions. But the thing I'm also looking for with this report is these individuals that we identify
- No, he just froze.
- He froze.
- Well, I, I'll make a comment when Bill gets back.
- So regarding this report I know, I thought the report was to be generated because of the program that St. John's is now starting in the park for May first.
- And hiked about two miles up these back.
- Bill, you're gonna, you want to start again a little bit.
- Elder Galvin, your camera's all frozen.
- I'm having some, some wifi issues here. Anyway, this group of individuals were, were finding out that they could circumvent the police watching for them downtown, by hiking out to me. And Amanda walked to a liquor store there where they were not recognized. And so I, I'm just hoping that the, the PD can some kind of some way flag their names so that any contact they have with police or fire, you know, in the city that we can get you know, updates on the impact they're having on the city at large.
- Does for Lieutenant.
- You know, on attached to this current report. And number six probably used up the most resources. That was a medical call where he was drinking and he fell down fire rescue and we were up there. And you also had that's when he had the warrants he was picked up on those also.

- So Bill or saying that many times you know, some of these things happen in the central city but when they go outside of the central city it's hard to keep track of these folks.
- I know for the, like the liquor store who sent out that no serve list and everyone they have a picture of those people on that. So although all those establishment should have that.
- Sure, that's fine. All right.
- I just wanna make one comment.
- Go ahead elder Vander Leest.
- I think the Green Bay police department is doing a fine job as far as monitoring these type of individuals and dealing with them. And I think that, you know, they're making progress. So I appreciate that.
- Okay, thank you.
- I have a question, comment.
- Elder Stevens.
- So regarding St. John's and the program they're doing in the park. Wasn't this supposed to be more geared towards that? So we can keep clarification.
- I think this report is those people who are resistant to shelter, who are resistant to be engaged in that program and what, you know, what how do we get them engaged or how do we deal with them and get them how to get them to a place where they can, you know, be involved with the shelters and St John's and hopefully work themselves. through that program and then out into the public like in their own job and how, whatever it is and just how to let's identify the top, how many we have and see if there's a way through either us or the the outreach team or the County or whoever whatever the resources are that are out there to get people engaged and and not have them sleeping outside.
- That was it, elder Stevens and I think I know what you're driving at there. You're kind of like you'd like to see something as far as the the program that's going on at the park and maybe some kind of report on something like that.
- Yeah, correct me, correct me if I'm mistaken but I thought this is what this type of report was supposed to be.
- No, I think, I think what elder Galvin brought up was this, this exact issue. I think if we wanted to get that other type of report we might have to, I'm not sure putting in a communication or, or get something else from the You know, it's a part, it's the city park. So I might have to go to that committee as well. But this is just about the problem. Problems that elder Galvin brought forward for the committee and Lieutenant Allen's putting this stuff together. But I know where you're coming from all this.
- Can I have a question for Lieutenant Allen? So regarding these individuals and you're doing this outreach is St. John's involved with you during this outreach? or is it the going by themselves?
- So when I got my list of to St. John's and then I, I got some background on what their history was with them and why they're not in shelter or what what they know of them. And every person on here was offered to stay at St. John's at one point in time. You know, two of them, well three of them actually four actually don't, two qualify because they don't get along with people when they're in there. I have two other ones who just, they don't they're fearful of being in a shelter and fearful of being assaulted or whatnot. They don't have any

drug or alcohol issues. And then I think you have number four, again, three, two and then one has created so many problems at St. John's or new community shelter that they're just they're not appropriate for shelter. They just can't, they can't function when they're in there.

- So, correct me if I'm wrong in my thinking. So if, and when you come in contact with a new individual it sounds like you would contact St. John's to see if they've done any outreach with this individual.

- Yeah, so next, next month I'll have probably, you know who knows, maybe I'll have six more names. And a couple of these people that we currently are talking about will fall off the list. So there'll be a running tally. So we'll never go back to, you know, two or three the next ones are going to be seven, eight, nine. And when I get those names, I'll go back to St. John's Hey, what's your contact been with these people? I can reach out to the Micah center see what contact they've had and what history they have with these people. You know, usually when I come in contact with them over at St. John's that's the first time I've ever met some of these people. but they do have a history in the community with services, and I can get more of a background on them to understand, you know, what's their background what's their history where they've been where they're going.

- Well, if you're doing that, and you would share that during our these meetings, I would be comfortable with that.

- Okay.

- You're doing what I'm trying to get at.

- Yeah, I, you know, I get the names and I meet some of these people over there but I don't know any history on them. Some of them will talk to you. Some of them are, they just, they just fear new people and it takes a week to a month to kind of get their trust and they'll come and talk to you. And it, you know, and I'll do my best at that, but it's a lot easier to go to the St. John's and the Micah center new shelter and see what kind of history they may have.

- on a roller.

- I know one more than elder Lafebvre.

- Well, thank you.

- I understand mental health. And I understand all of that, but we do have a lot of businesses down in that area, downtown. Are we also keeping track of property damage?

- Yeah, we're if we get a police call police generated a call or any type of criminal damage that's related to that. Yeah, we will have if we just get a general criminal damage of property and we don't have a suspect? I can't really count that 'cause I don't know who was responsible for that. But if we do, yeah, we'll, we'll add that.

- Okay, that'd be perfect. Last thing we want is our businesses to start leaving the area. It gets packed.

- Elder Stevens, are you finished?

- I am finished. Thank you.

- You are on a roll tonight. I don't know what you ate, but I need some of that. Elder Lefebvre.

- Yes. I do believe that the program that St. John's is doing in the park I believe there was supposed to be a report on that. I can't remember if that was at the end or if it was every month. But I thought that was part of what we passed at the council on that, I thought.

- Well, it went through committee initially. So we'll, we'll double check on that altogether. Do you remember anything on that?

- I'm sorry, I didn't, I didn't share the exact question.

- It Initially went through parks committee with the program, with the

- I'm just asking if there's like a report or something that

- Yes, remember Elder asked to have a report in July? And we passed. There was a part of it that was amended to that.

- Yes. Thank you. Thank you elder That's what I was gonna question. I thought for sure there was something about a report. So wanting to report on that. He was mentioning about that program. So there is going to be one.

- Okay, elder Vander Leest

- The program is just getting started and they're gonna kind of collect the data and then they're gonna get backed up back to the council on how things are going, you know, with the new program. Cause last year, evidently it was a disaster program. They didn't have much going on and it was chaos. And now they're trying to, you know be more selective on what they're doing and and more follow-ups I think as the program gets going they're gonna give us that feedback. Thank you.

- All right, anybody else.

- Is elder Galvin gone? I don't see him. I wanted to ask him what the purpose what his purpose was in asking for this report. If he's gone, I can't ask him.

- Lieutenant Allen, did he share any of that with you?

- We had a meeting with elder Galvin. I think we're same page about how we engage these high barrier resistant to shelter person. I mean, to see, well, how large that group really is. I don't think we have an idea of like how many people right now we have six but one fell off because that person is now in shelter or has housing. So we want to see, you know are any of these people 365 days out of the year? Are they not wanting to be in shelter? And if they're not, what, who who can we engage your community? Can the County or any of these other places to be more engaged or how they can engage these people better than we can. I mean, it's hard to force somebody into something that they don't want and for whatever reasons they have. I know it's hard to believe that somebody might not want to be housed or sheltered but yes, unfortunately there are people like that. And we have a few of those people currently that stay at St. John's park on the regular.

- Elder does that help? A lot of discussion there. Elder Lefebvre and then

- I would just go say too, I think it's because issue onset on these people but the majority of it sounds like it's mental and that's the problem that we've been trying to face is to be able to put people into a mental institution where they would be housed and hopefully taken care of, but it was abused. And then they just said, no, you can't do that. You can only do it temporarily. And that's why we're in the situation. We're trying to help these people but you can't commit them long term with this commitment, long-term think, but we can't do. I think we're pretty much our hands are tied on that armor.

- Well, that might be another discussion. For this, you know elder Galvin brought this forward and this is the first kick at it. You know, we had a chance to look at it. I think there's some good things to it. Here is a work in progress. And like elder Vander Leest said, you know we're moving forward and know it's better than what we had last year. So if we need to, if we need to tweak it in the future we will look at it.

- And I think what's good that Lieutenant Allen said that one person actually is now in the housing, which is good. It's a start.

- Right. Even place on file.

- Right, let's do that. Lieutenant Allen, with these numbers one through six. Did you say other, because we're not mentioning names so like seven through 12 would be, each number would be a separate number.

- Yeah, the next one you'll have you may have some from this original list but going forward, it will be seven, eight, nine, 10.

- All right, we have a motion Vander Leest to receive a place to file. Do we have a second?

- Second.

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

- Aye.

- That passes unanimously. Thanks for all your help on that Lieutenant Allen.

- Yeah, no problem.

- All right. Anything else? Okay, go ahead Attorney Bungert?

- Yep, We are on adjournment.

- Who wants to adjourn?

- Mark, can I quick say something before we adjourn? cut us off right away. I need to call you. Cause I don't know if you have been on vacation or if you've got my number. You got my number?

- Yeah.

- My temporary number?

- Yeah, we all got your temporary number. Just call you at home.

- Yes, I need to talk to you about something else.

- All right, fine. Okay, let's, let's adjourn. Somebody.

- Adjourn.

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

- Aye.

- Thank you everybody. Boy, everybody was alert more alive today.
- Thanks a lot for helping me with the phone.