



MINUTES OF THE PROTECTION AND POLICY COMMITTEE

MONDAY, MAY 24, 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, Kathy Lefebvre, Excused: John VanderLeest

Also present: Deputy City Attorney Joanne Bungert, City Attorney Vanessa Chavez, Clerk Celestine Jeffreys, Lt. Nate Allen, Alder Gerlach, Alder Johnson and Alder Dorff

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to Approve.

Motion Passed.

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. The approval of minutes from the May 10, 2021 Protection & Policy Committee Meeting.

Moved by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to Approve.

Motion Passed.

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

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

I. For consideration with possible action a request from Alder Chris Wery, District 8, that the Green Bay Common Council be comprised of fifteen members and to implement with the current

(2020) census redistricting.

Moved by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to Motion to take up 1 and 2 together.

Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to Receive and Place on File a request by Alder Chris Wery, District 8, that the Green Bay Common Council be comprised of fifteen members and to implement with the current (2020) census redistricting and the request to discuss the 2020 Census as it relates to redistricting City Aldermanic Districts for 2022.

Motion Passed.

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

2. For consideration with possible action a request from Alder Chris Wery, District 8, to discuss the 2020 Census as it relates to redistricting City Aldermanic Districts for 2022. Include a timeline and process for study, proposals and implementation.

Item taken up and combined with item 2.

3. Consideration with possible action on a request by CH Bar, LLC at 301 S. Broadway to temporarily amend their liquor license June 5 to hold an outdoor event in their fenced-in area along the side of the building.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve a request by CH Bar, LLC at 301 S. Broadway to temporarily amend their liquor license June 5 to hold an outdoor event in their fenced-in area along the side of the building, subject to complaint.

Motion Passed.

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

4. Consideration with possible action on an appeal by Cynthia Nelson regarding an appeal of her operator's license.

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

Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve an appeal by Cynthia Nelson regarding the appeal of her operator's license.

Motion Passed.

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

5. Consideration with possible action on the 2021-2022 renewal liquor licenses.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve the 2021-2022 renewal

liquor licenses, with the approval of the proper authorities.

Motion Passed.

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

6. Consideration with possible action on an application for the 2021-2022 license year a "Class B" Combination license by Madrid Tapas and Wine Bar, LLC at 225 E. Walnut St. with a licensed premises description as "1st floor of 225 dining bar area, courtyard and alleyway" (Currently licensed as an individual Amanda Patterson).

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to waive the requirements for an outdoor premise with respect to fence height and imperviousness and to approve an application for the 2021-2022 license year a "Class B" Combination license by Madrid Tapas and Wine Bar, LLC at 225 E. Walnut St. with a licensed premises description as "1st floor of 225 dining bar area, courtyard and alleyway," with the approval of the proper authorities. (Currently licensed as an individual Amanda Patterson). Motion Passed.

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

7. Consideration with possible action on a "Class B" Combination license for Chefbop, LLC at 709 S. Broadway with a licensed premises of "two bar rooms, patio and storage room" (Currently licensed as Rockabilly's LLC).

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to waive the requirements for an outdoor premise with respect to fence height and imperviousness and to approve a "Class B" Combination license for Chefbop, LLC at 709 S. Broadway with a licensed premises of "two bar rooms, patio and storage room," with the approval of the proper authorities. (Currently licensed as Rockabilly's LLC).

Motion Passed.

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

8. Consideration with possible action on an application for a "Class B" Combination license for Basil I, LLC at 1423 S. Broadway with a license premises as "1-story bar/kitchen, ladies & mens restroom, small office, locked storage room, basement, outdoor bar, pool room (Currently licensed as Chanmina, LLC).

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to waive the requirements for an outdoor premise with respect to fence height and imperviousness and to approve an application for a "Class B" Combination license for Basil I, LLC at 1423 S. Broadway with a license premises as "1-story bar/kitchen, ladies & mens restroom, small office, locked storage room, basement, outdoor bar, pool room, with the approval of the proper authorities. (Currently licensed as Chanmina, LLC).

Motion Passed.

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

9. Consideration with possible action on a renewal application for a "Class B" Combination license for Basil I LLC at 1423 S Broadway, subject to the approval of the original application at the June 1 Common Council meeting.

Moved by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to approve a renewal application for

a "Class B" Combination

license for Basil I LLC at 1423 S Broadway, subject to the approval of the original application at the June 1 Common Council meeting.

Motion Passed.

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

10. For consideration and possible action on the creation of an ad-hoc committee to assess the feasibility and necessity of a unified municipal building to include city hall, police, fire and municipal court. The committee should be comprised of all relevant city department heads or their designees, Mayor's office, city council members, and community members at-large to fill expertise gaps. Items under consideration should include, but not limited to, site selection and property acquisition, cost analysis (including proposed expenditures in the 5-year capital improvement plan), disposition of existing real estate, departmental and facility requirements, and improved customer service experience (Alder Johnson, Dist.9)

Moved by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to approve the creation of an ad-hoc committee to assess the feasibility and necessity of a unified municipal building to include city hall, police, fire and municipal court and for the Committee to include appointees as selected by the Mayor with at least 2 city council members, a Mayors office representative, 4- 5 community members and appropriate City department heads and to report out to finance committee. Motion Passed.

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

11. Consideration with possible action on General Ordinance No. 04-21, adopting and enacting a new Green Bay Municipal Code.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to motion to take up 11, 12, 13 together.

Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve General Ordinance No. 04-21 (adopting and enacting a new Green Bay Municipal Code), General Ordinances 12-21 (an ordinance creating Chapter 10, Article XIX, Green Bay Municipal Code, relating to Video Service Provider Fees), and a resolution adopting the City of Green Bay Fee Schedule.

Motion Passed.

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

12. Consideration with possible action on General Ordinance No. 12-21, an ordinance creating Chapter 10, Article XIX, Green Bay Municipal Code, relating to Video Service Provider Fees.

Action on item taken with Item 11.

13. Consideration with possible action a resolution adopting the City of Green Bay Fee Schedule.

Action on item taken with Item 11.

14. Consideration with possible action on General Ordinance No. 13-21, creating Section 2-32, Green Bay Municipal Code, relating to Remote Attendance at Meetings.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve General Ordinance No. 13-21, creating Section 2-32, Green Bay Municipal Code, relating to Remote Attendance at Meetings. Yes- Craig Stevens, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, Abstain- None.

15. For consideration and possible action on the adoption of an updated Public Records Notice in accordance with Wis. Stat. § 19.34(1) to reflect current reproduction and copy costs as well as designated record custodians.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve the adoption of an updated Public Records Notice in accordance with Wis. Stat. § 19.34(1) to reflect current reproduction and copy costs as well as designated record custodians.

Motion Passed.

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

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Report on Homelessness, Green Bay Police Department

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to Receive and Place on File the Report on Homelessness, Green Bay Police Department. Motion Passed.

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

2. The Liquor violation report for May 24, 2021.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to Receive and Place on File the Liquor Violation Report for May 24, 2021.

Motion Passed.

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

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to Adjourn.

Motion Passed.

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

Minutes with Verbatim

- Hold on. I'm having difficulties adding the time and I don't know why. I'm just gonna set it manually. It happened to me last time so I'm gonna run this by IT after tonight's meeting 'cause I don't know if maybe it's just my laptop that's doing this.

- It's not just you. It's something that Shelby had sent an email out while you were gone on. So you're doing it just right. Just set it manually and it'll be fine.

- Perfect, okay. All right, it is set. All right, so we can move on to roll call.

- All right, first of all, welcome to Protection and Policy in the City of Green Bay for May 24th, 2021. We'll take roll call. Alder Steuer, I am here. Alder Lefebvre.

- Here.

- Alder Stevens.

- Here. VanderLeest is excused for family matters so we do have a quorum.
- Okay, one second. All right, on to approval of the agenda.
- Okay, approval of the agenda, I'd like a motion for that please.
- I'll make a motion. Oops, oh, second.
- All right motion by Steven, seconded by Lefebvre. All in favor, please say aye.
- [Multiple] Aye.
- Aye and all opposed? That passes unanimously.
- Okay, and now we are on to approval of the minutes.
- Okay, approval of the minutes-
- I'll move to approve.
- Second.
- Okay, we have a second. All in favor, please say aye.
- [Multiple] Aye.
- That passes unanimously.
- Yeah, all right. And then now on to regular item number one.
- All right, number one for consideration with possible action, a request from Alder Chris Wery, District Eight that the Green Bay Common Council be comprised of 15 members and to implement with the current 2020 Census redistricting. Okay, staff, I know that Celestine or Clerk Jeffreys was gonna do something on this as well.
- Yep, I think I'm going to defer to Clerk Jeffreys to go ahead and move forward with her presentation.
- Okay.
- Sure, thank you, Attorney Bunker and Chair Steuer. Actually, my item is number two. This first item, we could talk about redistricting with my item number two, but this first item really is not something that I have a purview on. So I just wanted to let you know that.
- Yes, go ahead.
- Can I make a motion that we put one and two together because number one depend on number two?
- Correct, yes. And apologies, I was reading number two as being number one. That is true. So any kind of changes that we do to the composition, solely is tied with the redistricting and the Census results. So yeah, it would make sense to take up items number one and two together.
- Okay, so we'll have the presentation then?

- Did we need a motion?
- Go ahead.
- Okay, I made the motion to combine one and two.
- Okay. Okay, all in favor, please say aye.
- [Multiple] Aye.
- None opposed, that passes unanimously.

- [Celestine] Thank you. Lieutenant Allen, can you make me a co-host please so I can share my screen? Awesome, thank you. Okay, so I did email out this Census presentation as a PDF to the entire council this afternoon. Sorry for the plain, the plain Jane, Jane, who isn't always plain, but this white background, I didn't have the opportunity to make it fancy. So, but Census 2020, and Alder Lefebvre just so that you are, let's see, let me put this in presentation mode. Okay, and can everyone see that it's a full screen? Yes, okay, awesome. So, oh, sorry. There we go. So, just in terms of whether or not the population will support, will Green Bay have a population growth such that it would support 15 alders? I would say all indications are no, that we won't, if you just base it on population. In other words, if you just base it on the number of people who you currently serve. So the number of people in Green Bay, divided by the number of people you currently serve and that gives you approximately 12 council members. I don't see that Green Bay will have a big increase in population to justify 15, but then, of course, there are other political considerations as to whether or not the people in the council would want to have 15 members representing them instead of 12. So the request from Alder Wery was for timeline, process, implementation, and proposals. So just a little background, Census began with Census Day last April. All residents are counted once in place. And that's all residents, all human beings who were residing in the country. Infants, citizens, prisoners, permanent residents, people on visas, people in residential care facilities. And this was, this is where you are for that portion of the most part of 2020. So college students mostly live, you know, some commute but some do in fact live either on campus or in an apartment off campus. So those young people, for instance, would've been counted in their college addresses as opposed to their parents' homes addresses. So we did have some new methods in 2020 that were implemented that were some mobile-friendly questionnaires and some internet-based questionnaires. There were 10 questions for the Census. Some people confused the Census with the American So American Community Survey is a subset of the Census. Awhile ago there was the long form Census and the short form Census. And the short form was 10 questions, the long form was complicated, many, many more questions. And so the Census Bureau has decided not to ask those questions, the long form Census questions anymore. Instead they use the American Community Survey. And the American Community Survey asks, how many rooms do you have? Do you have electricity? Do you have the internet? Do you rent your own? So the American Community Survey is much more in-depth and it provides a lot of information that not only academics, demographers use but then also people who want to relocate businesses, people who want to school districts, universities. But for this Census 2020 it was 10 questions. Census questions are available in 12 languages. Now, of course we have a plague, a pandemic, and those Census results should've been delivered to the President by the end of last year. But because of the delays in tabulation and gathering, there was some delays in terms of sending it to the President. So I have a cool little graphic. So that as of the day that this information was released, which was in April, that was the population of the United States, 331,449,281. Obviously we've had some increases and decreases since then. Interestingly enough, the population grew only 7.4%, the second lowest growth rate in US history. Now there are lots of reasons for that, lots and lots of reasons. But that is what we have been handed and that is the number that we are going with. I'm happy to say that Wisconsin is not going to lose representation in Congress. Some other states have lost representation and only a couple have gained, but fortunately Wisconsin will not be losing our seven congressional representatives. So the Census is going to, the Bureau is going to deliver specific results to states in August. And these results are not really available to the public. They are available only in a way that people who are

authorized to deal with that information can then manipulate that information. So we will receive our, City of Green Bay will receive our statistics along with the rest of the state. Then by the end of September, the final redistricting data tool kit will be available to all states and the public. And unfortunately, because of the pandemic delays and just making sure the Census Bureau, they were making sure that they were getting it right, We only have a couple of months to actually create these new aldermanic districts. So the process, so staff will construct a variety of aldermanic maps for approval by council. This is what happened back in 2010. There are certain things that the staff considers and then when the council's looking at these maps, you all consider. And population proportion, one person, one vote, contiguousness and compactness. Now there's a great video from the league of municipalities, which they did at the end of last year, and I put the link there. What I sent to you this afternoon, that was a PDF so if you can't copy the link, just let me know and I'll send you the live link in an email. That's a great video, it's about an hour and it really explains how you construct a census map. So I did pull a few screenshots from there. So compactness, so you see the blue district on the left is compact, nice and neat. The brown district on the right is not compact. We are required to aim for compactness. Contiguity, so when you look at the brown district on the left, that is contiguous, it has some steps in it. But when you look at the blue district on the right, you see there are some pieces, kind of like it broke off, that is not allowed. And one person, one vote. So I won't go through this, you can read this on your own, but essentially you wanna make sure that your range, the difference between the largest and the smallest district is less than 10% and the calculation is explained there. So that's something else that we wanna do. This is probably something more at the state level than the city level but we do have our responsibilities to make sure that we have one person, one vote. So another thing about the process, so we don't have the software quite yet So I couldn't give you a live demonstration. But, and I think Alder Steuer will appreciate this, essentially what you see here are the 12 aldermanic districts. Alder Stevens' district is the one that is kind of close to the apex of those arrows and is kind of a tan color. You probably can't see my pointer. So that one is the district that is the least compact, quite frankly. So when we go for redrawing these districts, like I said, we're drawing them with the idea that they should be one person, one vote, we have a population proportionate, we have districts that are contiguous and districts that are compact. And there are various ways to draw these boundaries in this software. I had an opportunity to look at it last year and it's actually rather neat. And so then, like I said, we would have some options that council can choose from. One thing I do wanna mention is that in the last Census in 2010, the county had drawn their lines first. So I'm not sure if that's going to happen this time. Everything is a bit delayed, so unfortunately I don't have any understanding of what's going to happen regarding that. But we will find out and certainly report that to you. So we implement the maps and basically there are proposals that we will provide, then we choose and implement those maps. And ideally before Thanksgiving, because of course we have an aldermanic election potentially in February. And as you know, your papers are due at the beginning of January in 2022. So kind of quick there. Like I said, I'll stop sharing my screen, the league video is very good and open to questions from council. Yeah, Alder Lefebvre.

- Yes, how does the county affect our districts? 'Cause I know they did, I thought they pretty much, when the county does theirs we have to kind of match them.

- [Celestine] Yes, that's right. That's exactly what happened. So they, I don't know, 'cause I think the county population may have grown and so we may be in a situation like we are now where we actually have fewer county board representatives in the City of Green Bay and perhaps there are more county board representatives overall, that's what happened in 2010. So how it affects it is that we are then a little hamstrung in terms of how we draw districts if they draw theirs first. But not something that we can really head off at the pass.

- If we do ours first, can we actually do ours first?

- [Celestine] Joann, were you gonna say something?

- [Joann] No, no.

- [Celestine] Okay. So I'm not exactly sure if we can do ours first. I'm not 100% sure. I will need to get an answer to you on that.

- And then one other question. I know Alder Wery had asked about going to 15. If our, you said the county gained, but the city, did we lose or did we stay the same?

- [Celestine] No, no, no. We definitely gained population but most likely not enough to, it's really I'm just talking about a numbers issue, alder, so we did gain population only by about 1%. So that means if we were to keep the same size aldermanic districts, that means we wouldn't have 15 people. So we would then have to have smaller districts in terms of population in order to have 15 people. So I'm just saying that in terms of population, there isn't a population argument to go to 15, there'd be a political argument to go to 15.

- And it's probably right now will stay at 12. There's not enough to have-

- In terms of population.

- One on each side, right?

- Correct. Yes, in terms of population, it does not appear that there's enough population growth in the City of Green Bay to keep the aldermanic districts the same population size and then have 15.

- Okay.

- I was gonna, are you done, Alder Lefebvre?

- Yes, thank you.

- Okay, I had a question of you too, Clerk Jeffreys and whoever else may chime in. I know years ago Green Bay had 24 alders and a lot of times it was tied in with the county, as far as the same number. So if you were a county supervisor, you'd also be an alder. Well, that changed over time so I think one of the big indicators, like you mentioned, Clerk Jeffreys, was the fact that population has a lot to do with it. Our population has grown but very incrementally, not a lot, so I can understand why Paul might be working. I think Alder Wery brought up the fact and Alder Lefebvre mentioned it as well, that he was looking for 13 or possibly 15 to feel that the council would be able to vote and not worry about the mayor chiming in on that, although the mayor is part of the council. So that was just one of his takes and I think we can talk about that as time moves on. But we really can't do a whole lot now until we actually have the data. Correct?

- [Celestine] Correct, I would agree that the data is really important in order to make some of those decisions.

- I think the only thing you're saying though is an election in February, that would be a primary and then the general election would be in April. So by the time the maps are finished, there's not a whole lot of time, as you said.

- That's it, that is accurate. Yes, unfortunately.

- And it's wintertime too so that is what it is. It's always a tough time for campaigning and if you change your district, you don't have contact with those people. I've been on council since 2012 so I don't have to go through the whole Census thing but I know Alder Wery did and a few others did as well and they said it's quite a transition. So I'm looking and hoping, if at all possible, if the population hasn't gone up all that much to try to keep it as contiguous as we can with what we have. If there's some minor changes, so be it. Wholesale changes like happened in 2010, I don't think it's overly necessary to do that here, unless we decide to go with

13 or 15. But like I said, with the population being only going up maybe 1% over the last number of years, there really isn't a whole lot of need for it. That's my estimation.

- [Celestine] Thank you, alder. Any other questions.

- Alder Gerlach.

- I just wondered if historically are the aldermanic districts always redrawn after a Census? Is there always an adjustment?

- [Celestine] Yes. Yes, there's always that, I mean, you could choose. We do have some population growth, alder, and then we also have some density growth. So we have some new apartments and so you always wanna do take a look at where those lines are in terms of the number of people that we've decided that need to be represented by one alder. So yes, but we would take that opportunity to redraw the lines. And maybe that they're very similar to today.

- I know what you're saying is you always look at it. But my question is, does it always result in a change?

- [Celestine] Since I have been with the city, it has always resulted in a change, yes.

- Okay, thank you.

- Okay, Alder Lefebvre, you had another question? You're on mute.

- Yeah, yeah, I was trying to think what Alder Gerlach was saying. If we added one more, that really wouldn't give a lot of, I mean, by the time we did it, wouldn't give people a lot of time to decide to run for that 13th district. 'Cause it is good, yeah, it's good to have an odd number, it's true. Because we have a lot of density in some areas, we maybe, I don't know how we would, there'd be a lot of shifting, I think by doing that. Probably where the apartments are, I'm thinking, if you had to, because there might be a lot like she said, density. A lot of people in one district in an area, you'd have to push some district up. You might have to go in two, three districts. So I think, yeah, it's gonna be really difficult, I think. So yeah, this is something we're really gonna have to look at and really think about.

- I think some of that will be in Central City though, too. You get a lot of density in the Central City and then along even university and some of the areas toward the university out there, Imperial Lanes, some of those areas. Anything where there's been new development over the last 10 years where you have density of population, that's where those changes will occur.

- Yeah, and that would be probably moving people, if we do, we'd be moving people, too many, I think alder districts might be involved. So it's really gonna really throw a wrench into the people who are in the district who are gonna run again. I mean, it's yeah, they're gonna have a lot of maybe new people, new areas.

- Right.

- Yeah, it's something we're really gonna have to think about.

- Okay, is there anything else? Alder Stevens, do you have anything?

- Kathy asked my questions.

- Okay. Well then I would suggest, probably receiving and placing this on file unless, you know, we have to get more data before we can really do something, unless somebody else has another idea.

- [Celestine] And then I will follow up with you to make sure that I answer Alder Lefebvre's question about the relationship to the county drawing lines.
- Okay.
- Mark, I don't know, is that alder, it just says, Chris. Is that Alder Wery?
- No.
- No, okay.
- I don't think, I don't know, she's not here today, I don't believe. Alder Wery, are you here Alder Wery? I don't think that's him.
- Okay.
- I do wanna mention that Alder Gelach and Alder Dorff are also present at this meeting. All right, I'll entertain a motion.
- To receive and place on file.
- Second.
- Okay. All right, any other discussion? All in favor, please say aye.
- [Multiple] Aye.
- All opposed. That passes unanimously. And this was for two and three, correct, Attorney Bunker?
- You're breaking up.
- [Celestine] Alder, it was for one and two, not two and three.
- Yeah. Did I say one and two? I thought I did. All right, are we ready for number three.
- [Joann] Yep, we are set for item number three.
- Okay, consideration with possible action on a request by CH Bar LLC at 301 South Broadway to temporarily amend their liquor license June 5th to hold an outdoor area along the side of the building. Staff.
- Not an apartment hazard.
- Police.
- [Man] We have no objections. They've done this and they're really good at having that outdoor van.
- How many years have they done this, lieutenant? Any idea?
- [Man] I believe it's been a couple of years they've done this now and there have been no issues.
- Okay. All right, I would entertain a motion.
- I'll make a motion.

- Motion to approve. Motion by Stevens to approve, seconded by Lefebvre. Any other discussion? All in favor, please say aye. [Multiple] Aye.

- Opposed? That passes unanimously.

- [Joann] All right, item-

- Number four. Number four, consideration with possible action on an appeal by Cynthia Nelson regarding an appeal of her operator's license. Staff.

- Yes, staff recommendation is to deny the appeal as the appellant is a convicted felon and a habitual offender for offenses that substantially relate to the licensed activity, and is therefore precluded under the state statutes. There should be a denial memo in your packet that goes over the applicable offenses that were considered in this decision.

- Okay, and police.

- Police concur as well.

- Okay. All right, well we have, I believe Ms. Nelson is here today so I would entertain a motion to open the floor.

- Make a motion.

- Motion to open the floor.

- Oops, second.

- Motion by Stevens, seconded by Lefebvre. All in favor, please say aye.

- [Multiple] Aye.

- All opposed? That passes unanimously. All right, the floor is now open. Ms. Nelson, if you care to speak, please give your name and address for the record and then we'll be asking you some questions. But I would like to just get a general comment from you as why you feel you need to have this appeal listened to. Go ahead.

- Hi, my name is Cynthia Nelson. My address is 1023 North Chestnut Avenue, Green Bay, Wisconsin 54303.

- Okay.

- The reason I appealed it is because same life that I have in the past. I had sent in some copies of some of the programs that I have completed. My last date of use of drugs was January 6th of 2018 and my last alcohol use was December of 2010, I think it was. It was much longer than the drug use. I went through the Jackie Nitschke Program and that's where my foundation started. I went through Libertas, intensive outpatient, and aftercare programs to keep seeing Mr. William Lavigne for awhile after that. My mom helped me buy a home so I have a home now just a few blocks away from the gas station where I would be working and need the beverage servers license for. I'm an active member of the recovery community and I'm also on the Mandolin 501 3 as a vice-president. I have good, solid foundation and roots here and I just would like for that to be considered, that I was able to change my life around and that I have a solid network of people.

- Okay. So Alder Stevens.

- Yeah, I have a question. For 2018, it seems like everything had stopped. So what life-changing measures happened in 2018 that made you stop going down this path that you previously did?

- I ended up getting arrested on January 6th and I was in Florence County jail and my probation officer had reached out to my counselor that I was seeing in Marinette, which was Bill Lavigne 'cause he traveled up there as well from Green Bay. And Bill, my probation officer, and the doctor had came up for a plan with me. And at first I was kind of opposed to it. I just wanted to sit my jail time and get out. And I had time to sit there and think and there had to be a different way of life. So I came down here to Green Bay, went through treatment. And then when I sober and everything, I was there for almost a year and then I went to the Jackie Nitschke two-person place and I just kind of started a life and this is what works for me and my mom helped me buy a house here and I'm just not going back to my hometown 'cause I don't know what would happen and I don't wanna find out. So all I could do is keep excelling from where I am. I'm moving up the pole.

- Okay, my next question, assuming there was fines and citations, has that all been paid?

- I am still paying on them. I pay on them every month. I have one completely paid off and I'm paying on the other ones and I pay it every month.

- Perfect, thank you.

- Okay, Alder Lefebvre.

- Cindy, in your letter you say you have a sponsor.

- Yes.

- Could they, I was wondering if we could make a condition that we get a letter from your sponsor?

- Okay, I do have one from her but it was like for the State of Michigan to try to get my driver's license back.

- Okay.

- I don't know if I could send that one in or if could, it's been done within the last three months.

- Alder Lefebvre, is anybody else on this Zoom that could talk in her favor?

- I don't know if there is.

- Yeah, is there anyone here?

- I don't think so.

- I did have a letter from, if I'm remembering the correct packet, I believe she had a letter from her employer.

- Right, The Attic.

- I actually read that.

- I didn't see that.

- Okay.

- That's from Bill Macier.

- Right, well any kind of letters that you have, that's always to your benefit while we're looking over this type of thing. As far as I'm concerned, I'm looking at the certificates you've got from Jackie Nitschke's Center and The Attic, you've also had a completion of a peer specialist as a peer specialist. Can you just explain that briefly?

- So a peer support specialist is somebody that has lived experience of substance abuse and or mental health problems. And I work with other people that are like me and I give them support and resources and somebody to talk to. And we work on their strengths rather than their weaknesses.

- They also mentioned that you had three felony convictions and Attorney Bunger, maybe you can help me on this. I found two, but was there, am I missing one somewhere?

- I'd have to get my papers, hold on.

- I can ask Attorney Bunger too. I just, for some reason-

- I was only able to find three or two, I'm sorry, that were included in the memo. I'm not sure if the police departments, when they did their had additional information that I wasn't able to see that was that third one.

- Lieutenant. Was there anything, Lieutenant Allen, that you could add to that?

- I went through the packet and everything's out of Florence or Cobb County and I think the only ones I saw, there was two.

- Yup.

- And they were drug-related.

- That's what I saw. Okay, well that that's 33% less so that does factor in, at least in my thought. Alder Lefebvre.

- Yes, so I wanted to ask, Cindy, did you see you work at The Attic?

- I sure do, for now.

- Okay, you did sound familiar, your voice. I do know Cindy from going to The Attic. So I was wondering too, can I vote on this or is this, it's not a, I just know her business-wise but-

- As long as you've stated for the record that you have or at least a familiarity with the appellant and so long as it doesn't impact your ability to be impartial and fair on the decision, then you don't have to abstain, but that's essentially a personal decision.

- For this but I will say at The Attic I know that she's a very good employee. She's always very friendly and she's very helpful and she does her job well. I would say that if she didn't, I don't think they would keep her on if there was any problems.

- Okay. Well, I'm glad you brought that forward. So Alder Stevens.

- I'd like to make a motion to close the floor.

- Okay. Is there a second?

- Second.
- Second, all in favor say aye.
- [Multiple] Aye.
- All opposed? Go ahead, Alder Stevens.
- Sure, so I would like to approve this. It looks like moving from Florence County has done wonders for her. And of course Alder Lefebvre talking about at The Attic, so I would like to approve this.
- Well, make that motion.
- And I'll second it.
- You make a motion and then seconded by LeFebvre. Any other discussion? All in favor, please say aye.
- [Multiple] Aye.
- All opposed? That passes unanimously. Cindy, this does go to City council. Let's see, that would be June 1st. So it goes for final approval next Tuesday at 6:00 and that'll be a Zoom meeting. Chances are, it'll be fine. There's always a slim, slim chance that somebody might pull it but I don't personally see that happening. But congratulations, I think you're on the right track and I think the certificates you brought forward and the letter from your employer, as well as the letter that Alder Lefebvre alluded to will really help. So we're looking forward you to being a positive force in our community. Thank you so much.
- Thank you guys so much.
- Okay, you take care.
- All right, thank you.
- All right, item number five.
- Number five, consideration with possible action on the 2021-2022 renewal liquor licenses. Staff.
- Law department has no objection.
- Okay, police.
- Oh, that's the wrong one.
- [Man] We concur with law.
- All right, any other discussion by our committee? Otherwise I would entertain a motion.
- Motion to approve.
- Motion by Stevens. Do I have a second?
- Second.

- Second by Lefebvre. Any other discussion? All in favor, please say aye.
- Aye.
- Aye, all opposed? Vote passes unanimously.
- Celestine.
- Yes, alder.
- All of a sudden my protection policy, I don't have, all of a sudden, my screen went blank and my protection policy, I don't have today's. All of a sudden it's gone, I can't get in it.
- You might have to go back to city clerk where you open it.
- [Celestine] Yes, I would suggest exiting out of that and then coming back in.
- Okay, all right.
- [Celestine] And you can always get on via the web too. You can see the Rosie board portal. You'll see all your confidential documents but you'll have some other documents.
- Okay, item number six.
- Number six, consideration with possible action on an application for the 2021-2022 license year. A class B combination license by Madrid Tapas and Wine Bar, LLC at 225 East Walnut Street, with a licensed premises description as first floor of 225 dining bar area, courtyard, and alleyway. Currently licensed as an individual, Amanda P. Patterson. Staff.
- Yes, staff has no objections, however, we do wanna note that the outdoor courtyard doesn't meet the fencing requirements of our outdoor premise ordinance. So a recommendation would be a motion to waive the assignments for an outdoor premise with respect to said height and imperviousness and to approve as presented.
- Okay, police.
- [Man] We have no objections on it.
- Okay, well, I know for a fact that that's a unique little setup in the back there and I've been over there occasionally to see it. And that's kind of an integral part of that establishment. And I think over time, they've done a good job with that. So I'd entertain a motion.
- Motion to approve.
- Second .
- You guys are close today. Alder Stevens, seconded by Lefebvre. For all in favor, please say, aye.
- [Multiple] Aye.
- All opposed? That passes unanimously. I don't know if Amanda is here, but congratulations, Amanda and keep up the good work.

- All right, item number seven.

- Number seven, consideration with possible action on a class B combination license for Chef Bob, Sorry about that, LLC at 709 South Broadway with a licensed premises of two bar rooms, patio, and storage room. Currently licensed as Rock-A-Billy's LLC. Staff.

- Yes, so they had just for the 2020-2021 year, the renewal will be coming in the next meeting. They just didn't meet the deadline for the 15-day period to get both. It is on a Broadway moratorium, however, it's taking over a currently licensed location, so it meets an exception. This one is also going to require a waiver of the requirements. They do have a fence and a delineation, like the clear delineation of boundaries, but it's just not impervious or six feet so we need the waiver and approval for this one as well.

- Okay, I was gonna ask real quickly, Attorney Burger, is that something that might need to be looked at by the establishment moving forward?

- By the establishment, I don't think they get that waiver. We are as staff and as a city, as part of our revamp of and revision to chapter 33, we are gonna be addressing the requirements for an outdoor premise, as they don't seem to be fitting very well with functionality for a licensed establishment and these outdoor premises, which now are becoming even more popular with Green Bay. So that is gonna be addressed. But for the time being, in order to be in compliance with our ordinance, we just wanna make sure that we're dotting our I's and crossing our T's and getting in the records that these establishments are having a waiver of the requirements and are able to move forward as presented.

- So as we move forward with this, then we might have to maybe re-look at this going down the line. I mean, with the pandemic and all and people are doing more outdoor events, you know we have to look at-

- No, once it's approved, it's good to move forward with.

- Okay. All right, police.

- [Man] Yeah, we have no objections and concur with law.

- Okay.

- I'll make a motion to approve with the waiver.

- Okay, by Stevens.

- Second.

- Do we have a second. Second by Lefebvre. Any other discussion? All in favor, please say, aye.

- [Multiple] Aye.

- That passes unanimously. Now again, this goes to city council on June 1st, everything that we've approved tonight, for final approval by city council.

- All right, number-

- Seven?

- Eight.

- Eight.
- Yeah, eight.
- Okay, here we go. Consideration with possible action on an application for a class B combination license for Basil One, LLC at 1423 South Broadway with a licensed premises as one-story bar, kitchen, ladies and men's restroom, small office, locked storage room, basement, outdoor bar, pool room. Currently licensed as Chimina, LLC. Staff.
- Yes, law department has no objection. This is also just to note, it's in the Broadway moratorium that meets an exception, as it's taking over a currently licensed bar space. And this will also require a waiver of the outdoor premise requirements. Again, they do have a fence and it's sufficient for delineating the borders of the premise, it's just not impervious or six feet in height. I believe it appears to be about five feet.
- Okay, police.
- [Man] Police have no objection. We concur with law.
- All right.
- Motion to approve with the waiver.
- Okay, by Stevens.
- Second.
- Seconded by Lefebvre. Any other discussion? All in favor, please say, aye.
- [Multiple] Aye. All opposed? That passes unanimously.
- I have a question with the waiver. We've done this previously. Do we continue doing this every year?
- If for the renewal, yes, just to ensure there isn't any kind of change. But what happens if you renew and you have no changes from your premise description from the year prior, we don't actually have to do a waiver every time. It just gets renewed based on whatever was approved originally, if that makes sense.
- Okay, thank you.
- May I ask, I was wondering if we should look at the ordinance where it says six feet. Maybe we should have a, say it has to be six feet to five or four feet. Just something in there and it depends, it'll have to be worded something like maybe the six feet is warrantied where the location is or something like that. We might have to look at that because we are doing a lot of waivers on this.
- Yeah, right, that is something that we're finding and staff is working, law department is working with inspections particularly, just so that federal law being consistently applied between businesses and residences and things like that. So that is something we are looking at. It's on the to do list.
- And we have another agenda item too talking about the municipal code. Is that any of that dealt with in that, with the changes?
- Not really no. Our city attorneys have a-
- All right. Okay, just thought I'd ask.

- Okay, yep. We voted, didn't we, on that?
- Yes, we're all set with number eight. We are on to item number nine.
- I think we just did nine, didn't we?
- No, so nine is the renewal application.
- Oh, okay, there we go.
- The 2020-2021 year and then they're just applying for their renewal right away.
- All right, thank you. Consideration with possible action on a renewal application for a class B combination license for Basil One, LLC at 1423 South Broadway, subject to the approval of the original application of the June 1st county council meetings. Staff.
- Staff has no objections.
- Police.
- No objections.
- Make a motion .
- All right, Alder Lefebvre.
- Second.
- Seconded by Stevens. Any other discussion? All in favor, please say aye.
- [Multiple] Aye.
- Aye, no opposed, that passes unanimously.
- All right, item number 10.
- Number 10, for consideration and possible action on the creation of an ad hoc committee to assess the feasibility and necessity of a unified municipal building to include city hall, police, fire and municipal court. The committee should be comprised of all relevant city department heads or their designees, mayor's office, city council members, and community members at-large to fill expertise gaps. Items under consideration should include, but not limited to, site collection and property acquisition, cost analysis, including proposed expenditures in the five-year capital improvement plan, disposition of existing real estate, departmental and facility requirements, and improved customer service experience. Alder Johnson brought that forward and Alder Johnson, you are there so the floor is yours.
- Thank you, Alder Steuer. Sorry, that was a mouthful there for you to read.
- That sure was. I got an almost-
- But I was trying to be very transparent with what it is that I'm trying to achieve. So essentially what I'm asking of the committee is to support the creation of an ad hoc committee, as stated in the motion, to explore the pros and cons, if you will, of a unified municipal services building. What really prompted this is two things. One

is the work that was done almost five years ago now around the needs of a public safety building, police department headquarters. And of course, as we all know that there was some work that was put into that. A consultant was hired for, I don't know, 30, \$40,000. We had a report and then nothing's really been done on that issue since. The secondary part of this conversation is really what I saw in my work with the finance committee. And in our five-year capital improvement plan, renovations being proposed to the police department and more substantially to city hall, total approximately \$10.4 million over the next five years. That is a big chunk of money in renovations. And when you see that type of investment, recognizing that there are other major capital improvements needed within our community, particularly to facilities, I just think it's a good time to pull together the right stakeholders to have a long-term conversation about that police building and whether or not city hall could potentially be combined with it. There are some general thoughts they have that could be contributed at the committee level, in terms of what that development would look like. But whenever you're talking again about \$10 million of investment that could potentially serve as a down payment on a new facility, I just think it's worthwhile perhaps to have a committee come together with the various stakeholders, areas of expertise, including finance, including community and economic development, because they can obviously help with site selection and in putting together real estate transaction deals that might need to happen. Obviously police and fire are really critical to that conversation, someone from the mayor's office. I also suggested a couple of alders. I think of it very similarly to the elections ad hoc committee, which I thought did some really great work and was very functional because there was a good cross-section of representation on there. And then I would also encourage us to consider a couple of ad hoc or excuse me at-large community members who have background and expertise in these types of projects. So that is my request before the committee.

- Alder Lefebvre.

- You wanna keep this downtown so where, I really have a problem with this. How are you gonna find a big enough, there is no building, I don't think, that's gonna be big enough for all of this to combine it. And city hall is itself, you could expand out to the parking lot but then where's the parking. I find this is gonna, I think it's gonna be a problem. You can have an ad hoc committee but where are they gonna find a big enough space to combine all these offices, all this together? I think that's gonna be our problem because downtown, there aren't open areas or old buildings that can be converted anymore because other businesses have moved in some of these buildings. So I don't know. I mean, if they can come up with something viable, yeah, I'd definitely look at it, but I find, yeah, I just have questions on the size that this would have to be.

- Yeah, they think it's premature to answer that question, Alder Lefebvre. Now that said, I'll tell you, I think the easy answer is the existing site of the police department. But I think that that is one thing that I would expect the committee to explore. And so, as I stated, and I was very intentional about this in the communication, was partially to include the necessity of this. It may not be necessary. This committee could go through the amount of work that it needs to go through and determine that, you know what, this isn't the way to go. But I think if we're gonna spend \$10 million of taxpayer money on renovating city hall, we oughta at least give every alternative a look to ensure that we're prudently investing that money.

- Alder Gerlach.

- Thank you. I would just like to thank Alder Johnson for this. I think that this is a very smart move. I think Alder Johnson knows, I believe very much in foresight and planning ahead. And even if this never comes to pass, the smart thing is to be thinking about it and looking into it now. I think he's got a good idea, a good understanding of what needs to be done. I think he's the right person to be bringing this forward. I will support this at council. I don't know where he's gonna put it or the committee is going to put it or if we're going to need it. But I really, really believe in looking into these things before the roof comes crashing in and you have to do something quickly. So thank you and I would hope that the committee would support this.

- I think the timing is very good on this too. I think Alder Johnson bringing this forward is good, considering that we have the five-year capital improvement program that's out there now. We really haven't had that tool

in the past. Now we have something that we can at least look at over a period of time and try to incorporate some of these other things into it. And again, this is a plan, per se, an ad hoc committee and plans to come to fruition sometimes and sometimes they don't. But I think you've gotta look, as Alder Gerlach said, you have to look forward and try to come up with some solutions. I always was looking at some of the older buildings in the downtown area and re-purposing those, if possible. I know that last report that came out a few years ago kind of talked about that a little bit. We didn't really go very far with it but I think the straw maybe that broke the camel's back on this is the \$10 million that we're talking about upgrading city hall. And that building is 66-years-old. It's not the oldest building on earth but it's had its issues with infrastructure. I worked there 25 years and I can attest to that. So I think, I don't know if the committee has anything else to say, but I really feel that bringing this forward is a good thing. Alder Johnson, I was just gonna ask, are you looking for the committee to help choose some of these folks? Or are you looking to, do you have some names in mind? What's your thought process as far as that goes? Because I think the committee is willing to work with you on this.

- Thanks for asking the question. I'll just start there. I would envision that this would function very similarly to what the elections ad hoc committee did. And it would be my recommendation that the mayor simply appoint the individuals to the committee that make the most sense. That to me is the role of the executive branch. And I have no doubt the mayor can come up with some qualified people that can help move that forward.

- That's fine with me. Alder Lefebvre.

- So then you would want a motion to, let's see what it would be, have the mayor establish an ad hoc committee?

- The motion would be to approve to establish the ad hoc committee, members to be appointed at the there. And then one other recommendation that I would chime in with and lead with, ad hoc committee should report out to finance as elections did because of the fiscal impact that it would have. It would most reasonably could be reporting to finance and then finance to council.

- Okay.

- Attorney Bunker, I have a question for Brian?

- Go ahead, Alder Stevens.

- You have city council members. How many members are you thinking about from city council?

- Yeah, and I was actually gonna just ask that question of Attorney Bunker. Can this committee specify the composition of that committee?

- Yes, they can specify in any way, yeah.

- So Alder Stevens, I think, I mean to me, two members of city council seemed to work well for the ad hoc elections committee. And for something of this scope I personally think two would be sufficient. Where you're gonna get, where the greater area of expertise is probably going to come I think is from impacted city department directors as well as community members who really have their arms around these types of topics.

- Alder Stevens, do you have some ideas? I do, I have a couple.

- I do, yeah I would like to be one of those members and I think Ryan Johnson should be one for sure.

- So I was thinking of Alder Gerlach as well.

- I also feel like we should have more community members than city council members because this is becoming part of the community. More community members need to be involved to make this type of decision.

- My thought would be okay, some names are brought forward. I don't know if we have to really specifically mention the names, cause there's a few other alders that are not on this call who might like to get involved. So my feeling would be that if we get this to the mayor, the mayor could reach out and find all the people that he would like to see on this committee.

- suggest some members, find out which members would like to sit on this and do a lottery and then the name that's picked, that's the person that's gonna be on it. You know, then the mayor doesn't have to decide which council members.

- Should we do, should in a motion that we should set the amount of, the number in the motion?

- That can be done. So at this point, in my notes, I have with at least two. So if you wanna increase that, you can always, if there's less interest than there are slots, the way that the motion is situated. And obviously it can get amended on the floor at council, it will allow at least a certain amount. So you can set a limit and a minimum or whatever.

- For a minimum of two and then no more than three.

- Yeah, go ahead. Shouldn't we determine how many members we would like to sit as a whole?

- I would suggest a minimum of two and no more than three.

- No, no, no. I meant citizens, departments, the mayor,

- I see.

- representative. Are we doing nine, 12, five ?

- I would say an odd number seems to work in your vote.

- Nine, any suggestions?

- Yeah, Alder Gerlach, I mean, she's got an idea.

- I'd suggest you ask Alder Johnson what he has in mind.

- Alder Johnson, what do you have in mind?

- I mean, you can obviously over-complicate an initiative out of the chute and I think it's important to recognize that this is really more of an exploratory committee. And at some point, if and when something becomes sticky or tangible coming out of this, it really changes the composition of what you're doing. But I think for this initial process, to me, two alders seems to be sufficient, maybe four to five members of the public who really, again, recognize, understand the complexities of putting together something this complex and appropriate department heads. And I would personally be comfortable with deferring to the mayor on appropriate. But I would urge and think that appropriate would be parks department and city hall. I would think public works, for obvious reasons. I would think community and economic development because, as I alluded to, site selection, development agreements, and all of that stuff. And then police and fire. I've gotten some input from municipal court already. If you wanna include them, it probably wouldn't hurt to have them at the table, if you're gonna contemplate having that included. I would defer to law. I don't know if it would be necessary at this stage in the game, but maybe, I mean, someone's gotta be represented there. And of course,

someone from the mayor's office. So I mean already, you start adding those numbers up and you're starting to get a big group.

- Brian, wouldn't say the mayor's office, police, and fire, wouldn't they be considered part of staff members and they would be associated to it but don't sit on that board?

- Well, I don't know that there's any really binding decision authority that you're granting to this group anyway. This is really about just having the right brains at the table to really kind of flesh out the concept and whether or not it makes sense for the taxpayers of Green Bay. So a part of that conversation as well, which was written into my communication, was acknowledging and recognizing that whenever you're talking about the construction of a new facility, it's the opportunity for us to streamline the way that we interact with the rank. If you talk to anybody right now, if you go to city hall, the way that it's laid out, no fault of anyone's, it's very cumbersome to someone who visits city hall. You go there and you're like, oh you gotta go to six for that, fourth for that, and second for that. And we just chase people all over. And I've seen other committees or excuse me, other communities, they've done a really good job. There's one community, in particular, where they built a new city hall to streamline a better user experience for the residents in their community and it did wonders for them. And so I think to have the right representatives at city hall, to be able to talk us through that process and understand that's certainly there's always incentive discussion to be had, but there's also the user experience discussion that needs to be had as well.

- I 100% agree with you, yes.

- And I would also point out guys, when we passed the directive to do this five-year capital improvement plan, this is exactly what we were, this is one of the outcomes, the side effects you're looking to achieve. It's when you can see things five years out and you can start to recognize opportunities to make different types of investments. So that's partly, it's because of the capital improvement plan, I think that the council is afforded the vision to recognize that there might be a different path that makes more sense for us when it comes to facility management.

- Makes sense. All right-

- okay, so now the motion.

- Yeah.

- Okay, let's work through this motion.

- I think we all agree that this is a good thing. So we just have to just come up with the right motion.

- I'm sorry, alder. At this point what we have is to include appointees, as selected by the mayor, with at least two city council members, a mayor's office representative, four to five community members, and appropriate city departments to report out to the finance committee.

- Does that sound good, Alder Johnson?

- Yeah, and I think I might've missed it before but I think finance is really important at the table, like probably the most important to have at the table.

- Well, that's part of the departments that were mentioned, right?

- Yeah and to Attorney Bunker's point, if this reports out to finance, I would imagine that finance would be the staff appointed to the ad hoc committee. Would that seem to make sense?

- That would make sense, yes.
- Okay.
- And you're gonna have somebody from Parks and DPW, so I think that's understood as you brought forward. So I think that'll all come forward. Is that motion good enough? You feel good?
- Yeah, that's the motion.
- Okay, you bring that forward. Do we have a second?
- Second.
- Second by Stevens. Any other discussion? All in favor, please say aye.
- [Multiple] Aye.
- Aye, that passes unanimously. Thank you, Alder Johnson.
- All right, item number 11.
- Number 11, consideration with possible action on general ordinance number 4-21, adopting and enacting a new Green Bay municipal code. Quite a lengthy thing, I tried to read every word. Took awhile. Staff.
- I think, alder, I would actually recommend that we take up items.
- Do you want to take it .
- 11, 12, and 13 together.
- 12 and 13?
- 11, 12, and 13.
- Okay, somebody bring a motion to that effect.
- Motion to bring 'em forward together.
- Second.
- 12 and 13. Seconded by Lefebvre. Any other discussion? All in favor, please say aye.
- [Multiple] Aye.
- Aye, all opposed. Okay. Do I need to read each one of those individually, Attorney Bunker?
- Uh, no. I think it's-
- Understood. Okay, so I read 11, so 12 and 13 will follow suit. Okay, were you saying something to the effect that we're gonna split hairs and go area by area or I was looking at general questions, just general like fees. How much have they increased over time? And things on that order and maybe some of the players that were involved in all this. I know the law department was as well, but I would think that each of the departments that are involved in this would have representation and they would have brought things forward as well. And I

know this has been going on for awhile so I know, Attorney Chavez, you're there as well. I'd like to know how long the process has taken from beginning to end 'cause I know this has been going on for awhile?

- So we originally talked about this in 2017 and the codification is finally to the point where you guys get to adopt it. And this has been a very eye-opening process for us because it was able to enable us to have the entire code review to identify where there are issues. So with that, we've identified a number of ordinances that ultimately need to be brought back to the council for revisions. But that's not what we're doing today. What we're doing today is literally just bringing the code back up to clients with existing standards and re-codifying it to make it much easier for the community to not only review but also to search and make it more user-friendly. So now we have in the email that I sent you guys providing the original documents, one of the things we identified was before we had things pertaining to animals split up in numerous code sections. Now they are going to be entered into one code section. So you have dog licenses, you have dangerous dogs, you have anything pertaining to keeping animals will all be in one section, regardless of whether or not it's pertaining to something else. The licensing of animals will fall under one section, same thing with business licenses. So this will ultimately make it easier for people to find what they're looking for. And then it makes it a much more searchable, user-friendly format. It also finally allows us to have a completely updated code on the website. What we've had in between when we started this and now is a, we got the, the code digitized, turned into a format that was searchable. But then as we were doing the re-codification, we couldn't add the amendments without incurring unnecessary expenses. So the amendments were showing up on the website but they weren't showing up as part of the text so we had to actually go look at the amendments. So you could find it, it was on the website, but you weren't seeing it when you would just do your search. So now all of that work we're going to have these cleaned up. From here on out, it will be updated, I think, on a monthly basis. So if there are amendments to that, they will show up in what's called the word bank. And so it will link to those only until it's actually re-codified. And I think I said, that's happening every month so that we keep up with the amendments that are coming through from council. So the reason I asked all three of these things come at once is because one of the things we brought forward was pulling all of those fees out of the ordinances and putting them into your resolution. The resolution, the intent with that is to bring it for the council to review with the budget, to set the fees. So what we have done right now is pulled everything else. We used existing fees and then we also contacted the departments and asked them if the fees were or if the numbers have changed forever. And so what is presented to you is a recommendations thus far from staff. You'll note that there are a number of them that are zero. The reason being that we don't close out the licenses or permits or something could be that it has been taken over as the county does, but it still shows up in our ordinances. So again, those are things that we will ultimately be asking to revise. But at this point, because we were trying to keep it intact and just get you guys something that you could adopt, we didn't tackle those. So we just made them clean. So the fee schedule-

- What pages are those on again? 'Cause it's such a long document and I'm trying to call-

- It's a separate resolution.

- Did you wanna show the screen at all and talk about some of that? That might help.

- Sure, let me pull it up.

- I'm trying to dig stuff out too, but it's-

- Yeah.

- It's a long one. Kathy's gonna read it tonight.

- I've read some of it. I did already.

- I am not able to screen share.

- Oh, you're not. Okay, can you tell me what pages those are on again? I'm just trying to-
- Chairman?
- Yes, go ahead.
- The page is 1043.
- Okay, way down.
- And if you actually go to item 13, it's separated out.
- Correct.
- And you guys received a separate version of it today. There was one revision that was noted that needed to be corrected. And so that item, it was a PowerPoint once. So that is the one item that just, that's why there was a revision that you guys were presented today.
- Well, I went to a 1043. There was like literally a spreadsheet, several spreadsheets with all the, and I'm just trying to find that again. It's not 1043. Maybe it's toward the bottom. Oh, here we go, 1177, more down in that neck of the woods.
- It was a very long posting.
- Yeah, it was the fee schedule, it looks like it starts on 1176. So anyway, I know it's several pages long. So I'm just looking at that generally and without comparing apples and oranges or apples and apples, you know, to the old, former fee schedule, was there a general trend? Generally speaking, you would think that fees would go up some percentage. I don't know if numerous ones of these have stayed the same. Has anything gone down or is it all, is everything gone up in your estimation, Attorney Chavez?
- Right now for the most part it's staying consistent with what's already been done. There are a few that have gone up. I believe that the police department is able to speak to those ones that are going up. For example, the alarm user permit fee is going up by \$5 for a residential and nonresidential is going to 40. That's going up from, that one's going up \$10. Then there's a false alarm, third and subsequent false hold up alarms is going up \$50. They've done stuff so that false alarms is going up \$50.
- So it's going from 75 to 125?
- So if you are looking at 10-741, the alarm user permit fee, the first one is going from 15 to 20.
- Thank you.
- The second one was for 30 days- I looked at the wrong thing.
- And then 10-742, the 300 is going to 350. The 300 is going to 350 on each one of those and then there's a 175 that's going to 225 on two of those. So those are the types of revisions that are-
- Is there a way, and I know I don't wanna cause a lot more work on this but, is there a way to let counsel know, where some of those increases have incurred? If like you said it's not wholesale, is there a way to let us know what those increases have been? I mean, I know do we have to sit there and try to dig it all out, looking at this.

- We can tell you. I can actually tell you. So in addition to those ones, there's a fireworks fee. That one's going up \$100.

- Right, well, like I said, we have all this verbal, you're talking to us verbally. Is there a way that we can get some kind of a document or a spreadsheet or something just stating, okay, we've had 30 increases, dah, dah, dah. \$5 here, \$10 there, is that inventing too much work?

- Nope, we already have that for the most part. That's kind of what I'm looking at. Those are the only revisions to what is currently existing.

- And that would be fine, even if they're just so that we know that we don't have to look through all of all these pages and really kind of dig that out. I noticed that there's a lot of them that are zero with the bar, tavern licenses and such. Is that partly because of the pandemic? I know that we waived a lot of these things. Can you explain that a little bit?

- Most of these are because they are governed, they're no longer governed by the city. So there a couple of counties and what not, those are all governed by the county. Some of them are governed by the state. So there's are ones that we're ultimately looking to pull out. We just, as I said, we were trying to get you this as quickly as possible so those Right.

- Well, first of all, thank you for all the work. I mean, it's amazing. I mean, we're trying to streamline things as much as possible and I, many times we're trying to understand it ourselves and then trying to tell our citizens as well. So I thank you and your department and whoever else was involved in this for all the work that they did on this.

- Any other questions?

- Go ahead, Alder Stevens.

- So before we get to questions, can I just tell you the reason we're taking the other one, the video licensing fees?

- Oh, sure.

- The reason we have taken up three of these at one time, the video, cable, it's what used to be the cable franchise fees. The cable franchise fee is no longer allowed. I'm sorry, it's no longer something that we're able to govern. We just aren't able to grant franchises. So in order to bring that up to code, we just had to strike the whole thing. But in order for us to still get our 1%, because now it's governed by the state and then the state gives us our cut. In order for us to get our full percentage, we have to actually have something in place saying that we want this. So just to make sure that we weren't creating a gap, that's why we are doing this at the same time. And it's literally just taking out what's obsolete and keeping what's still intact.

- Okay, all right. Alder Stevens, you had a question?

- Yeah, I may not have caught it. Why do we have an increase on these fees?

- They were recommended by the department.

- The department?

- Yeah, it's just a sample of them. These are all numbers that came from the department. So we compiled them and then we asked the departments to verify the numbers and then if there were increases, those were coming from them.

- All right. So I'm just looking at the false alarms for alarm systems. So that came from the police department?
- Correct?
- So is this possible to get something by council on Tuesday or not?
- Yes.
- If that could be a part of the packet, it would help, I think for all of us to at least have that information.
- Sure.
- Thank you. Committee, anything else? Or police, I was gonna ask police as far as your input on this too. Obviously there are some increases here and I don't know if, lieutenant, you can talk to any of that?
- As far as the alarm one, I know we do go on quite a few false alarms, and I think that that was part of the increase for the amount of man hours we go into. We do go to alarms, mostly false alarms, not the legit ones.
- So I have a question.
- Go ahead.
- So Lieutenant Allen, do you know approximately how many false alarms we do a year?
- I don't have that on me really available but I can get that and I can forward that to you.
- Because it looks like, I don't know, I'm looking at one here, 50 bucks for the second, third 75, then the fourth on it goes to 125 to 225. So they're also taxpayers so I'm kind of interested why there's a \$50 increase almost a \$125 increase.
- Yeah, I'm not sure what the reason is but I know there are some businesses that hopefully that they can call their alarm company and get some of that equipment fixed.
- So if that's the case wouldn't they be more of a nuisance property then?
- I don't know if that would be a nuisance property for a mechanical issue. It's not really creating a nuisance to the public. Not so much a nuisance to us. We'll still respond to it. But a lot of times when we do go to alarm calls, we'll talk to the owner and make suggestions that, yeah, it looks like this piece of equipment might be not functioning properly. Or you go into some of these businesses that have placards hanging from the ceiling, especially in the summer and the winter when you got the air conditioning and the heat blowing around in there, sometimes it moves those things enough to trigger an alarm. So we're real good about going to these businesses and then pointing out that, hey, this or that may be the thing that's triggering your alarm. So, you know, suggest that we move it here or there. I don't think there's, I don't think there's been too many that we've had to go down that road with.
- Well, thanks for clarifying.
- Yeah.
- So some of this is just to kind of cover some of the costs, man hours, so to speak, of going out there. Otherwise it comes out of your budget. That's my thought. Anyway, committee, anything else for the police or that I, like I said, I'm very thankful that this has been brought forward. It's been a long time coming. Attorney

Chavez, can you just let me know? I suppose each department had their input in it, as much as possible. So I don't know if there was some committee of sorts or if you just would appeal to inspection or police, whoever it may be, to have them give their input to you to continue.

- I'm sorry, do you mean on the fee schedule?

- Well, not so much the fees schedule. I'm just saying the departments that all weighed in on this. I would think of any of the departments that are involved at all in this would go out to their people and talk about improvements and that and you would work along with them to recodify, if you will.

- The recodification was really more of an issue of reorganization and creating user-friendliness. And then doing a legal review of things that are obsolete. So in the process we've identified a number of things that we're working with the departments on moving forward. And everybody's been instrumental, so when we've told them that we're planning on making revisions, figuring out where the cutoff is gonna be as far as bringing ordinances so we don't have any conflicting numbers coming out of the recodification, and then also identifying the timeline for things. And then there were a couple of things with BPW that we felt were important to bring forward before we got the recodification in place. So this is not supposed to be necessarily a substantive change, those will still be coming to you. This really just makes the code easier for the public to understand and gets rid of all those inconsistencies, all those references to statutes that don't exist anymore. Gets out any references to other parts of the code that have been amended. It really just cleans up our code and gets it into a nice spot for us to be able to work from here on out.

- Okay. All right, committee, do you have any other questions? Otherwise-

- Motion to approve.

- Okay. Sounds like a deal, motion to approve. Do I have a second?

- Second.

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

- [Multiple] Aye. Again, Attorney Chavez, just maybe something just to kind of let council know where some of the changes were. And even if it's entered in this document here, it would be nice just to even have a paragraph stating, okay we worked on this over a two-year period, three year period and maybe just a couple of bullet points as far as what the advantages were to doing this. And I know some of it is common sense, that we all follow that. But sometimes we need a little guidance. So is that something that you would consider as well?

- I already sent you guys the fee schedule with the markups so you guys can see what changes are being made. I'm happy to add any additional information. We're just really excited to have this one finally done.

- Yes, that's a big job. Thank you.

- Yeah, thank you very much for all your work. So, all right. Thank you again so we can move forward when we're ready.

- All right, item number 14.

- 14, consideration with possible action on general ordinance number 13-21, creating section 2-32, Green Bay Municipal Code relating to remote attendance at meetings. Staff.

- This one's me again. So we have been operating under our emergency orders and then under the pandemic conditions to be attending remotely. Now that the pandemic conditions are easing up such that we are able to gather in public spaces, at least to a limited degree, in order to continue to have virtual attendance, the city needs to have an ordinance in place allowing for that. So this is what is being presented to you all. I will say that in order to stay compliant, we really should adopt this on a first reading. Actually, that's true for the recodification as well but I can deal with that at council. But this should be adopted on a first reading if we intend to continue doing this for the summer meetings.

- And this is at any city building or just City Hall?

- This allows for employees, council, committee members, members of the public, anybody to attend council meetings virtually. So it basically allows us to continue doing these Zoom meetings in addition to doing the onsite. So anytime we're gonna do hybrid, anytime there's not gonna be somebody physically in the building, if we wanna do have the live feeds or the Zoom meetings, this is what we need to have in place to do it. What we do have under the ordinance right now is a sunset provision for December 31st of this year. I don't know if the council is ready to entertain going through this process completely, so this gives us an opportunity to address it. Otherwise you guys can always take it out and adopt it as a permanent solution.

- Yeah, go ahead, Alder Stevens.

- So Attorney Chavez, question for you. I know there was talk previously about doing remote and some of us being out of state and some in-state. Did you by chance look at that? Is this ordinance or this, what we're planning on doing, does that allow us to say be in Michigan and call in to be a voting member or do we need to be physically in Wisconsin?

- I have not had a chance to look at that but generally the idea is that you have to be present in order to discharge your duties. But that idea of present has changed. In the time of when the framers were creating all these different rules, you couldn't conduct business from a town two hours away when the only way to interact is by courier mail or, there was, there weren't the means available to us. So I think that now that we're moving to a virtual environment, there's definitely an argument for it to be said that as long as you're able to provide representation that's definitely an option. But it is one thing that we do need to look at. But either way, like if you guys want to be able to attend from home, this is the only way that we can continue to do it.

- I just wanna make sure that we're okay if we're in Arizona or Illinois or Michigan and we're calling in.

- My wife and I chimed in from New Mexico so that's something that we need to really figure that out. Alder Stevens, Alder Lefebvre, do you have anything?

- Yeah, I think, that something maybe should be put in here that right, 'cause then somebody could decide, oh, I'm gonna take the next three, four months and I'm gonna go on vacation somewhere and I'm not even gonna be in the district. I think there has to be some rule, like Alder Steuer, one time he was gone-

- One time, just once.

- Right, that he was allowed to do that. It has to be, you can't be doing this month after month because then you're not here really taking care of your district. So I think there's gotta be some kind of wording in there. I think the law department maybe can look into that and see how can you word that? Where I know say I have brother in North Carolina. Say something happened to him, he was in the hospital, and he dies, I would want to go to his funeral because council is usually two times a month or so it could be possible I'd be down there but there might be something that I really need to be at the council meeting, some vote or something that I would really want to be. Now that would be an exception, I would think. That that could be part of the rule because those are unavoidable. Those aren't, when people do vacations, I don't know if that can be put in

there. I know at the county we talked about this too, and they just, they would not. They said, we're all gonna be in person. We're not gonna do anymore Zoom or whatever which one we do. It's gonna have to be in person and they're not gonna make any exceptions for anything. So I think there's sometimes there has to be some exceptions made. And we do have the ability with the Zoom now, it works and it seems to work fine. But we don't want people abusing it.

- Alder Lefebvre, I think Attorney Chavez has some homework to do for us. But I think that we should move forward with what we currently have in front of us. But I think Attorney Chavez should figure out the state line, if it's good.

- What I would recommend at this point then is to adopt it with the sunset provision because then the opportunity for somebody to abuse it goes way down because it's only through the end of the year, that's only six months. And that's really the extent of the pandemic, so you guys have an opportunity to see whether or not there are, now that the restrictions are being lifted and now that people are able to travel more, whether or not it is something that is useful or if it's becoming a problem. So I think that that's an appropriate middle ground until we're able to really decide what you guys want to do.

- Can that sunset clause can be amended? I mean, if there's something comes up in October, that changes things, we can look at it then, correct?

- Correct.

- All right. I'll make the motion. I would suggest to move forward. Alder Gerlach.

- I was just wondering, I don't know. Does it make sense to have a sunset or does it make sense to pass it without a sunset date and just require that it be re-examined at a certain time? I mean, when I read that there it sunsets at the end of this year, I thought it might still have something to do with COVID. So I don't understand the difference.

- So once something is adopted until it's brought up again. So the council could ultimately say that they wanna have it revisited but it's on the books. There is no, you would have to essentially act to amend it or appeal it. Whereas with the sunset provision, it has a built-in expiration date, which means that it has to be dealt with before then.

- So the purpose of having a sunset clause is to not let it, in other words, it seems to me like you're saying this should probably not be our policy going forward.

- The reason we added a sunset clause is because this is new for the city. We don't really know how it's gonna work. And so rather than committing the city to this on a permanent basis, it's really like, okay, let's see if we just need it to get us through until the restrictions are all the way gone, until COVID is completely under control, or if it is something that the city ultimately wants to adopt.

- Okay, thanks.

- Alder Lefebvre.

- And the city itself paid for the Zoom, right? Does that go to the end of the year, the contract?

- I believe that's a question for Clerk Jeffreys. But I do know you can either pay on an annual basis or a monthly basis.

- [Celestine] Yes, thank you, Attorney Chavez. The account, there are several accounts in City Hall. The one that has the ability to have 500 participants, that is the account that I had created and we paid for that through the end of the year, the calendar year.

- All right, I think the fact that we can possibly change the sunset clause moving forward as things change is a good thing. So I have no problem with it. Committee, do you wanna bring anything forward?

- I'm happy with the way it is.

- Okay, do you wanna bring that forward as a motion?

- Motion to approve?

- Okay, by Steuer.

- Second.

- Seconded by Lefebvre. Any other discussion? All in favor, please say aye.

- [Multiple] Aye. All opposed. Okay, thank you for the work on that as well.

- All right, item number 15.

- Okay, number 15, for consideration and possible action public records notice in accordance with Wisconsin State Statute 19.34 subset one to reflect current reproduction and copy costs as well as designated record custodians. Staff.

- Yeah, so as we were having, the staff was having discussions with respect to updating the fee schedule, there is a separate fee schedule and notice that is required under open records laws under our statute. And that requires an authority or the City of Green Bay, as the records custodian, to identify who the persons are that to whom records request should be submitted to, what the process is for submitting a records request, how you go about doing so, and what those expected or estimated fees would be for copies, for a flash drive, for color copies, for example. And that has not been updated for several years. And in addition, in the last year or so, the Wisconsin Attorney General's Office for Open Government did put out a general guidance as far as what are appropriate and how reproduction costs are supposed to be calculated, which put our old fees out of line with the principle under law. So according to this, we recalculated those fees and actual costs of staff time with respect to obtaining ink and paper, with respect to paper costs and ink costs, and then the actual digital medium costs, such as flash drives. So taking all that, we're presenting the new fees for approval, and then that notice has to be adopted by council. So in front of the committee this evening.

- How much, oh, hold on a second, there are figures. How much did they go up?

- It went down about by 15 cents.

- Oh, it went down, interesting.

- Correct. So the reason is because the additional factors that we were utilizing previously, such as staff time and actually making the copies, the attorney general has opined that that is not permissible under open records law. So that time and those figures had to be taken out of the calculation. Current law provides that we can only charge for direct costs of creation of the copy itself, which is the paper, the ink, and any staff time associated in purchasing the paper and the ink and paying the bills and things like that. But nothing with respect to reviewing, collecting the documents, putting the files back, making the copies. Those were all factored into the staff time portion and so that had to be taken out too.

- Is that a detriment, do you feel to our departments, as far as costs? We have no choice, I understand, but is that gonna be a burden of sorts?
- What I can tell you is that our budget, what we anticipate in revenues from records request is minimal because we really aren't able to charge very much when it comes to records anyways. So our number is gonna go down substantially but we're talking about, I think we've collected maybe \$500 for copy fees over the last, even in our biggest year, we're maybe hitting \$500.
- So it's not a tremendous amount.
- It didn't generate a lot of revenue.
- Okay.
- And part of the reason it went down is because our costs, in general, have gone down. So the purchasing department has new contracts for paper that have dropped the amount that we are paying by \$17 per case of paper, so that went down. The copy costs, in general, have gone down just because of the successes with our purchasing department in getting the right vendors for the city. So as a result, the costs that we've passed on have also gone down.
- Okay.
- And then the last thing is we're only allowed to charge the rate of the lowest skilled employee able to do this. So we had to use the rate of the lowest paid employee in our department in calculating our rate, whereas before when this was generated, we had employees who'd been here for career length and so their rate was just much higher than it is.
- Okay, all right, well, good. Alder Lefebvre.
- I'm sorry, I'm not too tech savvy. The USB digital flash drive, it's 2.47. Now, does that include the document or do they have to pay per page on the document? Do we have it on that?
- No, because that is basically providing the record or the document in digital form so we're not charging any copy costs. It's essentially just paying for the flash drive itself.
- Okay, all right, thanks.
- All right, anybody else on the committee? Alder Stevens, we're good?
- I'm good, thank you.
- All right, all right, so we're just gonna, you're looking for approval on this.
- Yes, just a straight approval.
- Motion to approve.
- Second.
- Motion by Steven, seconded by Lefebvre. Any other discussion? All in favor, please say, aye.
- [Multiple] Aye.

- That passes unanimously.
- All right, we are into informational and the liquor violation report. Or no, I'm sorry, the homelessness report.
- Homelessness. Is that the lieutenant?
- Yes.
- Okay, lieutenant, go ahead.
- All right, how much background you guys have on this? Did you get any answers to questions from the last time we talked about this?
- No, I mean, personally, I feel that, you've got a little bit of a handle on it. You're looking at numbers of calls and the total number of folks and the monies and things like that, so it's pretty straightforward. I don't know if somebody has, I know that Alder Galvin had kind of pushed on this a little bit. So, just the fact that we're reporting out is good. Information is always a good thing so we appreciate that. Committee, do you have any specific questions at all?
- I have a question and a comment here.
- Yeah, go ahead.
- So it says onsite resources, fire, ER, or jail and it says yes or no.
- What was that?
- It says onsite resources, fire, ER, and jail. And the responses are yes and no. Shouldn't it be either if had a fire or if they need an ER, or if they went to jail?
- The records, rather the crime analyst lady that's tracking these, she made that a separate category. If any of those three were touched, it was a yes, it just wasn't specific to which one it was.
- I'm reading the description on top. It says I should be tracking that. And also if it's public or private or if it happened in a park property. That's not on this list.
- For the addresses of where this stuff happened?
- Yeah.
- Yeah, so we asked that to Alder Galvin last week to see how he exactly he wanted this tracking sheet. And after sitting down with him, I will tell you the 17 we have on here is gonna drop down to maybe a handful. All we're really trying to track are the unsheltered homeless to see if we can better serve them or get the colony on board to better help and get them engaged in it. I guess that's Galvin's angle on trying to find out where the issues are with the unsheltered and how we service them better.
- Are we keeping track of if it's public or private property?
- I would have to go through each call. Each person is assigned a case number or report number. I mean, I can go, we can go back through and get if it was on private or not. Some of these are obviously private, 'cause some of these people were no trespassers on these properties. So they could have been no trespassers from a

park and those things. So, but a lot of these are welfare checks, very few disturbances, or like a suspicious person, somebody acting out of the ordinary, and we went and did a welfare check on 'em.

- Okay. You're excitable.

- Okay . I see on number six here, he's had 23 contacts or calls and it's all alcohol. So is that one of our resistant ones that just does not want to go to the programs?

- So number six, yeah, he is very well known to us. He is a chronic alcoholic. He was found today, we talked to him, and it was supposed to be this evening that New Cap was gonna take that person in and do an intake to see what his needs are and see what type of housing they could get him or shelter they could get him. He is eligible to go to any shelter he wants, the only catch is he has to be able to PVT zeros, which isn't probably gonna happen. He hasn't gotten to that point to where he wants to stop drinking and move on with life. So that's one of the people that we're looking at and some of the services in a group of people that Paul Handle, myself, and then Mike Barabu from St. John's, we're putting together a street outreach team to go out and address these issues with these people and make contacts and make relationships and get them comfortable with us and then the system and the service providers to get them on that right track.

- So those costs that are there, lieutenant, are they split up between the city and the county? Or is there some kind of a delineation there?

- No, they're just our costs.

- Your costs, the city.

- So if you go to number six, you look at him, he's racked up about \$2500 so far. And that's just what it has cost us to deal with him off and on through this year so far.

- Okay, that's all I see. That's April 1st to April 19th. It's only for those nine, 10 days, that's it?

- Yeah, I don't know if that's the running total for that.

- Yeah, I would like to know that, 'cause that seems pretty expensive just for those 19 days, but what do I know?

- Well, I can tell you that-

- So-

- Yeah, that kind of-

- If you, if you could just email the committee that, if you've got that information, I'd appreciate it. And then next month, when we reply out, we'll just wanna know if it's a cumulative or a period of the year or just the time period that was shown.

- I wanna see when I talked to him last week but I'll clarify that that's a running total for the year.

- Okay, that would make sense.

- Yeah, the calls that you see on there are just since the last report but the dollar amount should be a running total, if I remember correctly, our conversation. But I'll clarify that-

- Alder Galvin. Okay, Alder Galvin, who I know has been involved with this, has he looked at this? I suppose if anything, at council this will come forward. But has he added anything to it as far as does he feel like the city is doing a good job on this? Or what's your take with that, with Alder Galvin?

- So I know he had suggested some type of alternative to maybe dealing with these people, but his idea we have, number six, is about your only candidate for that option. And I talked to him at length about the street outreach program, along with the mayor, and I believe that I think they're on board with that, which is a more cost-effective, and more trying to solve the issue than just trying to push that issue into a building until it dies off, you know?

- Right, well, it's nice to at least have a handle on looking at the number of folks that we're dealing with and being able to look at maybe one or two you need to work with. And if nothing else, I would think that's helping just handle the situation a little bit better than maybe before. That's just my thought.

- Yeah, it's a process. Some of these people have some pretty high barriers but we're doing our best to get the counselors out there, the AODA people, even the new community clinics coming out and meeting with these people, breaking down their barriers, getting them more comfortable with us. Some of these people need to be on meds so we're working through that. So it's a process, but we gotta go out and find 'em and talk to 'em and get them the right services.

- I know that the county is coming forward with some things on homelessness. And I would think that they're working with the city as well but it looks like they're really looking at trying to solve this issue as much as they can. So it seems like there's a concerted effort in the community and also they're looking at maybe having some of these different organizations that work with homelessness to maybe put down those silos and work together. So it seems like that there's some efforts that way. And I know, years ago we were looking for a resource center, but at least now it seems like everybody is kind of working together on this. So I think this is a good factor for that. So we appreciate your efforts.

- Yeah, no problem.

- Anything else, Alder Lefebvre?

- On that issue of the homeless, yeah, the coalition is really working. They got a lot of different people coming in and really tackling this. I didn't get a chance to go on the last meeting, just been too busy, but I went to the one of them and it was very interesting to see all the different groups and backgrounds of people working on this issue. I think that, yeah, everyone's coming together and finally realizing, we've got to do something or it's just not gonna get better.

- Right, it's a good thing. Alder Stevens, who had something else?

- Yeah, for the lieutenant. So I see that someone put a value to this at \$1.16 per minute. What's the breakdown on that? How'd they come up with a \$1.16?

- I think that's where they just average out the the patrol officer's salary. So what the average pay is for a patrol officer who would respond to any one of these people. And that's just kind of what they worked it out, what Melissa assigned it as. That's what it costs per minute. They may only be with this person for five minutes, so how do you calculate that? It's not per hour. It's per the time we spend with them.

- I just wanna know if it was salary or if they're putting equipment costs in there. If you drive a vehicle over there, you're spending a couple ounces of gas.

- Yeah, I think, think they're just going off of the police officer's salary.

- All right, sounds good. Thank you.
- I'll make a motion to receive and place in file.
- Second.
- Sorry, any other discussion?
- All in favor, please say aye.
- [Multiple] Aye.
- All opposed? That passes, again, thanks lieutenant for you and your employees for working on this. Thank you.
- Yep.
- All right. Now to the favorite part of the meeting.
- Yes, we have all, I'm sorry. Yeah, go ahead lieutenant.
- We have no liquor law violations reported for this.
- Place and file.
- That's pretty good.
- Okay, second, any other discussion? All in favor, please say aye.
- [Multiple] Aye. All opposed? That passes unanimously. Thank you again, lieutenant. Keep up the good work.
- Yup.
- Alright.
- All right, on to adjournment.
- So we have to adjourn.
- Alder Lefebvre, seconded by Steven. You guys are jumping on that one. All right, all in favor, please say aye. [Multiple] Aye, good discussion. Thanks for all the input from everybody. Thank you.
- Not a bad meeting. I thought it was gonna be a lot longer. Thanks , it was moving along.
- You weren't betting on that, I hope. But anyway, no, I think it's been while. All right, good night. Good night, all.
- Good night. Have a good night?
- Good night.