



MINUTES OF THE PROTECTION AND POLICY COMMITTEE

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

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

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

B. ROLL CALL.

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

Also present: Deputy City Attorney Joanne Bungert, Lt. Steve Mahoney, Lt. Nate Allen; Alder Gerlach, Alder Dorff, Alder Galvin, Alder Scannell, Director Mike Hronek,

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to Approve / Adopt / Accept.
Motion Passed.

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. The approval of the minutes from the June 21, 2021 Protection & Policy Committee Meeting.

Moved by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre, seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer to Approve / Adopt / Accept.
Motion Passed.

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

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

I. Consideration with possible action on a renewal application for a "Class B" Combination license by Strats, Inc. at 2850 Humboldt Rd (filed with the City Clerk's Office 6-15-2021).

(The Protection & Policy Committee has been granted final approving authority on liquor license applications, liquor license amendments and operators licenses from July 1, 2021 to July 31, 2021)

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to Open the Floor.

Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to Close the Floor.

Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to hold a renewal application for a "Class B" Combination license by Strats, Inc. at 2850 Humboldt Rd. until the September 13th Protection & Policy Committee meeting.

Motion Passed.

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

(The Protection & Policy Committee took final action on this item at the July 26, 2021 Protection & Policy Committee).

2. Consideration with possible action on a renewal liquor license application by Dawn Van Pay at 1610 Cass St. (filed with the Clerk's Office June 30, 2021).

(The Protection & Policy Committee has been granted final approving authority on liquor license applications, liquor license amendments and operators licenses from July 1, 2021 to July 31, 2021)

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer to approve a renewal liquor license application for a "Class B" Combination license by Dawn Van Pay at 1610 Cass St. (The Protection & Policy Committee took final action on this item at the July 26, 2021 Protection & Policy Committee).

Motion Passed.

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

3. Consideration with possible action on a request by Richard Craniums at 840 S. Broadway to temporarily extend their licensed premises to the outside parking lot on September 25 for CraniumFest.

Moved by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre, seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer to approve a request by Richard Craniums at 840 S. Broadway to temporarily extend their licensed premises to the outside parking lot on September 25 for CraniumFest, subject to complaint. Motion carried.

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

4. Consideration with possible action on the release of the 2020-2021 "Class B" Combination licenses to the pool of available licenses due to no action taken for the 2021-2022 license year.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve the release of the 2020-2021 "Class B" Combination licenses to the pool of available licenses due to no action take for the 2021-2022 license year.

Motion Passed.

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

5. Consideration with possible action on an available "Class B" Combination license by Appleton

Golf, LLC at 2255 Main St. with a license description as "10,000 square feet, open concept w u-shaped bar 5 golf simulators on left/rt w/ bathrooms, off, back storage."

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve an available "Class B" Combination license by Appleton Golf, LLC at 2255 Main St. with a license description as "10,000 square feet, open concept w u-shaped bar 5 golf simulators on left/rt w/ bathrooms, off, back storage, with the approval of the proper authorities."

Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to Motion to reconsider.

Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to approve an available "Class B" Combination license by Appleton Golf, LLC at 2255 Main St. with a license description as "10,000 square feet, open concept w u-shaped bar 5 golf simulators on left/rt w/ bathrooms, off, back storage, with the approval of the proper authorities."

Motion Passed.

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

6. Consideration with possible action on a request by I.T. Department to discontinue use of Green Bay Public Television Channel 4 in lieu of repairing malfunctioning equipment.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer to approve a request by I.T. Department to discontinue use of Green Bay Public Television Channel 4 in lieu of repairing malfunction equipment.

Motion Passed.

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

7. Consideration with possible action on a request by Ald. Lefebvre for an update on fireworks. Requesting that the Green Bay shorten the time permitted to sell fireworks to 2 days before the 4th of July and ends on the eve of the 4th of July.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer to refer to staff a request by Ald. Lefebvre for an update on fireworks. Requesting that the Green Bay shorten the time permitted to sell fireworks to 2 days before the 4th of July and ends on the eve of the 4th of July.

Motion Passed.

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

8. Consideration with possible action on a request by Ald. Scannell for the city to pass a nonpartisan redistricting resolution. Proposed resolution language on the 2nd page.

Moved by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre, seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer to approve a request by Ald. Scannell for the city to pass a notpartisan redistricting resolution.

Motion Passed.

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

9. A request by Ald. Brian Johnson, for consideration and possible action to modernize the ordinance and permit fees related to the operation of food trucks in the City of Green Bay including possible

partnership with the Brown County Health Department.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to refer to staff a request by Ald. Brian Johnson, for consideration and possible action to modernize the ordinance and permit fees related to the operation of food trucks in the City of Green Bay including possible partnership with the Brown County Health Department. Motion Passed.

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

10. Consideration with possible action on a request by Ald. Galvin to reexamine the municipal fine for possession of marijuana.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to refer to staff a request by Ald. Galvin to reexamine the municipal fine for possession of marijuana.

Motion Passed.

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

11. Consideration with possible action on a request by Ald. Brunette to consider a refund of inspection charges for 2593 Sumac Place.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. John VanderLeest to hold to the August 23rd meeting a request by Ald. Brunette to consider a refund of inspection charges for 2593 Sumac Place.

Motion Passed.

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

F. INFORMATIONAL.

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

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to Receive and Place on File The Liquor Violation Report for July 26, 2021.

Motion Passed.

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

2. Report on Homelessness, Green Bay Police Department.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer to Receive and Place on File the Report on Homelessness, Green Bay Police Department.

Motion Passed.

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

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. John VanderLeest, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to Adjourn.

Motion Passed.

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

Minutes with Verbatim

- Post that in CivicClerk as well. So we can, one second.

- Can I tell John, there's that, there's that little like V on this, way on the side of the tablet, click there, and there's different options should come up. You want to try that, John?

- [John] I don't see it. So I guess I just have to get back to...

- You see it John, on the lower right corner, it says 86 degrees and sunny? Right next to it there's a arrow that points to the North.

- [John] Okay.

- You click--

- [John] I gotta get back onto the, back out of the other setting here.

- Oh, well, you click that on and then there's a little sound.

- I might have to rejoin--

- Mine makes a click.

- [John] I might have to rejoin the meeting. I'll see, once, here.

- On your tablet?

- I guess I'm okay.

- My tablet doesn't have that.

- Is it on the left-hand side or the right hand side for that volume?

- Right hand side. It's right in the middle, if you click that arrow, on the bottom, it's an upside down. It looks like a roof, a roof line.

- Okay.

- The line.

- I just hit it.

- Alder Stevens, we are recording. We can open up the meeting, because we're one minute past.

- All right, welcome, everybody. Welcome to the Protection and Policy Committee for Monday, July 26th, 2021 at 5:30 pm. We'll do a roll call. Alder Steuer?

- I am here.

- Alder Lefebvre?

- Here,
- Alder Vander Leest?
- Here.
- And Alder Stevens is here as well. I'll take a motion to approve the agenda?
- So moved.
- Motion to approve.
- Second.
- Okay. All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- And approval of the minutes?
- So moved.
- I'm sorry I'm sorry, Alder Stevens, if you could hold on one second.
- Yeah. Just give us a second.
- Just let me know if I'm moving too fast.
- Yes.
- Just inhale, exhale.
- There we go, sorry. My computer is just lagging a little bit. So that was a motion by Alder Steuer and second by Alder Lefebvre to approve the agenda.
- Yeah.
- Correct.
- All in favor and passed. All right. Now approval of the minutes.
- So moved.
- Alder Lefebvre, second? Is that Mark?
- I'll second.
- All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Is that John's?

- I found that volume, it's, mine is on the top. It's on the top of my tablet.

- You ready, John?

- But it's fine now, thank you.

- Yes, we are on to item number one.

- All right. We'll move on to regular business. But we have a little housekeeping we need to take care of. So regarding item number one and item number two, Common Council did give Protection and Policy a final approval for these two items. And the remaining of the items will be suggestions to Common Council for approval next week, is it the 3rd?

- Yes.

- Six o'clock. All right, so the first item of business is consideration of possible action on a renewal application for a "Class B" Combination License for Strats, Inc. at 2850 Humboldt Road. This was filed on June 15th. Staff?

- Yes, so staff's recommendation is to deny this renewal application as the establishment has not been in operation, nor it, actually, has it ever opened since it was initially granted in 2020. Just a little history on the item. The applicant applied for a license last year and they notified the Clerk's Office that they were not an operation, I believe due to COVID. And were not planning on going back into business when they filed their renewal application for the 2020-2021 year. So staff's recommendation at that time was to deny as they had indicated that they weren't going to be open. And so the committee actually did deny that renewal on July 13th, 2020. However, that meeting was the one where we had, I believe the fluoridation item on, and so that meeting, if you all recall was adjourned, and then we picked it back up again, a few days later and reconvened on July 16th. And in between those two meetings, the Clerk's Office was advised, and that was then provided to the committee that the applicant then had a change of opinion or a change of intention that they were going to open the business after all. So based on that, staff no longer had a basis upon which to recommend denial, as the applicant was stating on their application that they were going to open. So the basis to deny no longer existed. So then the committee then reconsidered its initial denial and then approved the renewal application. The applicant had never had the renewal license issued to them to this date as they had outstanding plumbing issues that were issues that were never addressed. And then they, fast forward to current time, they have submitted their renewal application for the '21-'22 year. On June 15th, two weeks before expiration, when they were, when they no longer have a license as of June 30th, 2021. The inspection order still hasn't been addressed. The business is still not an operation. Accordingly, the staff is recommending denial on the basis that the establishment is not currently operational, and with no plan to resume operations and therefore is in violation of Green Bay Municipal Code Section 4.7.

- Thank you, I'm assuming Police would concur?

- Yes, Police does concur.
- Thank you.
- Chair, Strats is here. I don't know if you want to hear from them at all before we discuss things?
- I'll make a--
- Can I just ask a question?
- Yes, Alder Lefebvre?
- What is their name? I don't see any name.
- Their business name?
- What do you mean?
- The business name is Strats. The name under which they're applying for the license is Strats, Incorporated. I don't know what the establishment name is.
- Okay.
- I would make a motion to open the floor, just to hear from that party.
- Second.
- Second.
- All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Hi.
- All right.
- Can you guys hear me?
- All right, I see Strats, so we opened the floor for you. So can you give us your name and your address please?
- Yes. Can you hear me okay?
- Yes.
- Mm hm.

- Okay. The address of the business or the name of the business?
- No, your name and your address.
- Yep, my name is Troy Metzler, and it's 2420 Watson Circle, De Pere. And I'm also with Scott Metzler, who is the agent on there.
- At 2850 Humboldt Road.
- No, that's Strats.
- Oh, I'm sorry. 1424 Harbor Spring Circle.
- All right. Thank you. Committee, any questions?
- I guess initially, you heard what our Law Department said and we've looked at this issue before. And if you don't use the license for over a year, there's some issues with that. So we just want to hear from your standpoint, what happened here?
- Well, obviously with COVID last year, there was Smokey Ridge, there was a barbecue place. After the stay at home order was implemented, we decided that we had to close the business due to the nature of it, with smoking meats ahead so far in advance for, you gotta plan ahead and there was no ability to do that. So the concept did not work at that point in time. And then, fast forward through all of COVID, obviously it didn't make sense to open at that point. And then since then there has been, as you may or may not know, a pretty strong labor shortage. The building was put for sale, and that contract runs through September. And if it has not sold, we plan on reopening it at that point. So that's why we would want the liquor license with that. So there is a plan in place to do that. We have a front of house staff still working for back of house, and we would move forward at that point.
- I guess my question would be, even with COVID, the other businesses, we've had to deal with that accordingly, but I'm just wondering, and I'll maybe ask Attorney Bungert about that, if you have to wait that long, is there any stipulation at all in City Code, this is because of what happened last year with COVID and that, that you could put things on hold? Or is it business as usual?
- Well, I think we, I believe we had a similar issue at our prior meeting. Essentially, if the renewal license is approved now, we can't put in a stipulation that if they don't open, we can just take it back. We'd have to go through a revocation hearing to revoke the license on the basis that they're not operational, or they would need to get an extension. The other option is to essentially just hold the liquor license application, it's the renewal itself, until they are ready to open, because they still currently have a license and this is a renewal. They still have that interest in the license, and until a determination is made, it's not expired, or it's not, it doesn't go back into the pool of available licenses until a decision is made on the actual renewal application, since they've been filed before the license year expired. So that would be another option, is if they are still asking for additional time, that would be procedurally simpler versus approving the license, and then having to go through quite a significant procedural hearing and notice process, filing complaints and so forth, that would be required in order to revoke a license.

- Okay.
- I have a question.
- Yeah, go ahead. Or you do, you're the chair.
- I have a question for the owner.
- Yes.
- Troy, you say that you're in contract with this realtor until September.
- Mm hm.
- Are you planning on reopening right after that?
- Yes, if that contract expires, yes, we would, like I said, we're working towards that with some staff members that we, so we have a front of house person, we're looking for somebody back of house, so yes, there is a plan in place to reopen.
- If I recall correctly from last year, that was the same thing that was told to us last year, that you had someone that was gonna take it over. And of course it never happened.
- Yeah, and unfortunately with the volatile times and that, there's a lot of things that changed in the last year and a half, whether you put them in place to try to make that motion, keeping going or not. It's not a lack of trying in that area.
- Sure.
- So, I guess that's my counter to that.
- Okay. Thank you.
- I have my first question, Craig.
- Yeah, go ahead, Alder.
- What is the renewal fee? What is the amount of that? I'm asking this to the City Attorney. How much is the renewal fee to get it renewed? How much is that fee?
- Off-hand, I don't know, but I could look it up. If you give me a minute. You can continue on with your discussion while I try and find this.
- Alder Lefebvre?
- Yeah, okay. You presently has a liquor license, and sir, how long is that good for, do you know, the owner?

- Well, we're in the renewal process of this year's liquor license. So I guess, going back to the attorney, it's kind of in a limbo state right now, I believe that is where we're at.

- Okay. Then I'll have to ask the attorney when our, if you can wait, I know you're trying till September, but you're saying, I think, now we're saying that it has to be done now?

- Oh, we can actually hold this until September.

- Right.

- Mm hm.

- Yeah, I was gonna say, as long as he has a license, so he can still sell the property if he's looking to sell, wants to sell, 'cause the liquor license is there and that, if you hold it till September, he can renew at that time? That's a legal question.

- And she's still busy doing the other one.

- Look up the renewal fees. It's in our, it's a fee schedule that was just adopted. I'm just trying to--

- Attorney, I think there was another item on the agenda, further down, where it was like \$400.00, I thought. And then for the entire fee it was like 525.00. Now I would think that would be the same for every establishment.

- I think the item you're referring to, Alder Steuer, is for THC possession fine.

- Well, I don't know if it was that. Anyway, go ahead, I just--

- I believe it is somewhere around the \$600.00 mark.

- Yeah, somewhere in the ballpark.

- Do we have any more questions for the owner? If not, I'll entertain a motion to close the floor.

- Motion to close the floor.

- Second.

- All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- I'm sorry, that was a motion by, I was.

- To close the floor.

- Yeah, Steuer.

- Motion to close by Steuer, second by Alder Lefebvre.
- No, Vander Leest.
- Vander Leest.
- It's Vander Leest.
- No, Vander Leest. Okay, thank you.
- I would make a motion, Chair, if I could?
- Yeah, go ahead.
- I'd make a motion to hold this till September. And I don't know if there's a specific date that we need to hold until, if there's a date. It would be the meeting. It would be our meeting, maybe, in September.
- Well, let's do the second meeting in September.
- Yeah, which would be... P and P is on September 27th.
- Okay.
- That would make--
- As far as, yes, I believe it's on, I'm sorry. I'm doing multiple things at once. P and P in September, there are two. We have one on the 17th and one on the 27th.
- 17th's a Friday.
- Yeah. Would it be the 13th?
- Or the 13th, I'm sorry.
- 13th, okay.
- 13th and 27th. Yes, I think I was seeing the seven and was transposing.
- So Chair, would that be all right to hold it till the 13th, then, September 13th?
- That's fine by me.
- My motion.
- I'll second it.
- All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- So this is gonna, maybe we should, okay, we gotta make sure that this is gonna work out for everybody?

- So, are you asking the owner?

- As far as, Alder Lefebvre, as far as your other question, and I'm sorry, I'm still looking for the fees. The Law Department doesn't actually issue the permit. So I'm not, I don't have the fees off the top of my head. And I don't think we have anybody from the Clerk's Office here to answer the question. I believe it's in like the \$500.00 range. But again, I can't say for certain. As far as the legalities of holding, the way, because this is a renewal application, not a new application, and they did file a renewal on their previously issued or previously granted license, it doesn't go back into the pool of available licenses unless, because a renewal application was filed before the expiration of the prior year, it doesn't just revert to the available pool until council makes a decision on the license. So, because of that, we're able to hold it and it doesn't affect them detrimentally because they're not currently in operation, otherwise they'd have to be shut down, but they are already shut down, so it's not like we're, it's not, the business doesn't have to be shuttered during that time or going from open to closed, because they're already closed. So it is a feasible way of basically deferring the decision until they are ready.

- Okay.

- Thank you.

- I just want to make sure that it works out for the owner, and for the City, and everything is kosher.

- Yeah.

- Okay, thank you.

- Good luck to the owners.

- Thank you for your time.

- Thank you.

- Mm hm.

- Are you ready for that, to move on?

- One second. Yep, we are onto item number two.

- All right. Consideration with possible action on a renewal liquor license application for Dawn Van Pay at 1610 Cass Street, which was filed on June 30th, 2021. Staff?

- Law Department has no objections.

- Police Department?
- The Police concur.
- Okay, motion to approve.
- Do we have a second?
- Second.
- All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- All right. Item number...
- Three.
- Three, yeah.
- Consideration with possible action on a request by Richard Craniums at 840 South Broadway to temporarily extend their licensed premises to the outside parking lot on September 25th for CraniumFest. Staff?
- Law Department has no objection,
- Police?
- The Police have no objections. The owner's the head of the Tavern League. We've worked closely with him before on other events. We don't have any concerns or issues about security. We know that he'll make sure everyone follows the ordinances and laws and has a safe time there.
- Perfect. Thank you. I'll take a motion?
- So moved. So moved.
- I would make, okay, so moved, I'll second.
- All in favor?
- I'm sorry, who?
- Oh, Alder Lefebvre and then Alder Steuer.
- Okay. All right.
- Do we vote?

- Not yet.
- All in favor, aye.
- [All] Aye.
- All right, item number four.
- Consideration with possible action on the release of the 2020-2021 "Class B" Combination licenses to the pool of available licenses due to no action taken for the 2021-2022 license year. Staff, how many are we talking about?
- I believe there are four licenses going back into the pool.
- I'll take a motion to approve?
- Motion to approve.
- Second.
- All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- All right, item number five.
- Consideration with possible action on an available "Class B" Combination license by Appleton Golf, LLC, at 2255 Main Street, with a license description as 10,000 square foot, open concept with U-shaped bar, five golf simulators on left/right, with bathrooms off, must be office, and back storage. Staff?
- Staff has no objections.
- Police?
- The Police concur.
- Motion to approve.
- By Alder Steuer, seconded by Alder Lefebvre. All on favor?
- [All] Aye.
- I had a question, is this a new one or is?
- Yes, it's an available license.

- Where is the location again, too? It's on Main Street, I just wanna know.
- 2255 Main Street.
- It's the far, very far east side, past even the Main and Mason intersection. Almost close to the edge of the city limits.
- Just trying to picture it, that's all.
- What building are they going into?
- I believe it's that little strip mall, right next to Superior Liquor out there.
- Oh, so it's up on the hill?
- Yeah, it used to be the library, the Brown County Library had a branch in there. And I believe there's a fitness center in there now.
- Got it.
- I'd like to change my second, and I want to no vote.
- Okay, what we would need to do is we would need to do a motion to reconsider that, and then reconsider the vote, and then re-vote. But hold on one second. Alder Lefebvre, yes, you voted in the affirmative. Okay, so let me--
- It would be a motion to reconsider?
- Yeah, we would need a, I just need to switch back to the item, 'cause I was already on number five.
- Motion to reconsider.
- We need a motion to...
- Does Alder Lefebvre have to bring that forward?
- No, just any member who voted in the affirmative, that had the, whoever had a--
- So in the affirmative. Okay, well I'll make a motion to reconsider the vote.
- Second.
- Okay.
- All in favor?
- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Is just the vote or I'd seconded, actually? I didn't, I had my hand raised to ask a question, and I got in a second.

- That was a vote to reconsider the previous decision. And now we have another vote as if no vote had happened.

- Okay.

- If that makes sense?

- So we just had a motion, we just had a vote to reconsider the initial approval. And now we can move on and have another motion.

- I'll make a motion to approve.

- Do I have a second?

- Second.

- All in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- No.

- Three to one.

- All right. So that is an aye, I'll have to do a roll call vote. Alder Stevens is a yes. Alder Vander Leest is an aye. Alder Steuer is an aye. And Alder Lefebvre is a no. And then that passes on a vote of three to one, Alder Lefebvre voting no.

- Okay.

- Alder Gerlach, Chair?

- Alder Gerlach?

- May I just please ask a quick question? What does it mean an available license?

- That means that it's not a, that it isn't currently licensed, meaning it's coming from an available pool

from our pool of available licenses. So for example, when it says consideration with possible action on a class combination license, that means that premise is currently licensed. There is no mechanism by which you can transfer a liquor license from one owner to the next. It appears like you're selling the liquor license, but you're really not. You can sell the business, but ultimately the new owner of the business or the new tenant or whoever is taking over still has to apply and apply for the liquor license, go through the background checks, go through all the inspections. The license or the paper itself doesn't just get transferred over. But if an establishment is currently licensed, the way that our with that is that we don't put that license back into the pool, and then whoever is first come first serve, we allow that current licensee to surrender directly to the new licensee and the new licensee has to apply and go through all of the procedural requirements that is necessary of any new applicant.

- Thank you. And so there's a limited pool?

- I'm sorry?

- There's a limited pool, then?

- Yes. Correct. There is a quota that's set by State Statutes and by the State, as to how many "Class B" licenses a municipality can have, and that quota is established, I believe by population.

- Okay, thank you.

- Thank you.

- Mm hm.

- Alder Lefebvre?

- Yeah. It went through really fast. And I wanted to qualify why I'm saying no. I don't believe there should be another liquor store there. I'm sorry. We have the gas station with the liquor in it.

- It's not a store.

- It's not a store.

- And we just approved another one. I just, I think that's not.

- Alder Lefebvre, to clarify, this isn't a store, it's a "Class B" Combination License. So it's a on-premise sale, so like a tavern or bar or a restaurant. So it's not for sale off-premise. So it's not operating like a store.

- Yeah, but still, it's more liquor there, I'm sorry. That's okay.

- Alder Steuer, did you have a question?

- I guess, just to reiterate maybe, Attorney Bungert, for some of the citizens out there. So basically just describe that again, it's beer and wine, no, or beer and liquor?

- Beer and liquor. So the "Class B" depends on where the quotes go, but essentially we call it a "Class B" Combination, which means for beer, or not necessarily beer, fermented malt beverages and intoxicating liquor.

- I can't hear you. You're breaking up, I didn't hear that.

- I'm sorry, so, a combination "Class B" is terminology that our municipality uses, but essentially it designates for intoxicating liquor and fermented malt beverages. And that is for on-premise sales only. So essentially anything that would be like a bar or tavern or a restaurant. "Class A", the way that I remember it, is "Class A" away. It's the sale of alcohol for off-premise consumption. So in the original container, in a bottle, that would be like a grocery store, a liquor store, or a convenience store, something like that.

- I had one other question I was gonna ask.

- I'd like to make a comment.

- Oh, can I just finish my one question? I just wanted to ask the police if there was any checking, they have a place like this, I think, in Appleton. But I just, problems that you had found, with the same type of establishment?

- I know we've had, in the Green Bay area, not necessarily inside the city limits, there are a couple of other indoor golf facilities. Pretty much they're run very professionally. A lot of them is during the winter so people could go swing their golf clubs. It's in essence, like say a bowling alley, where you go play golf for an hour and you have a couple of beers or drinks while you're there playing. So we have no issue with this. We don't believe it's gonna be a party central place or a bar that's gonna cause issues in the evenings, like some of the other places in Green Bay. It's essentially an athletic place that is gonna serve alcohol to their patrons as they're playing golf on the indoor screen.

- Okay. Thank you.

- All right.

- I've got one other question.

- No, Alder Vander Leest had a question.

- Oh, that's right, mm hm.

- I just want to mention that this is an entertainment venue, with the golf simulators. If you go on the west side, in the Packer District, they have one, it's a very nice facility. It's just a lot of fun. If you're into golf, it's a great venue to attend and I think that it's gonna be a big asset as far as on the east side as for, on the east side versus the, there's one on the west side. I think it's gonna be a real good establishment. So I support it 100%. Thank you.

- Last comment, Alder Lefebvre, before we move on.

- Yeah, the other question I have is, yeah, I do want to understand which building is that in? What

form of business was there?

- I'm not sure.

- It's, do you remember the east branch of the Brown County Library?

- Mm hm.

- It's essentially right where the Brown County Library Branch is, that exact spot in that building is where this golf simulator is gonna be.

- Okay. Okay. So they're taking over where they are because the library's moving to the next one? Building?

- Yeah, I believe so.

- Okay. Yeah, it's gonna be right next to them. Okay.

- All right. Thank you, Joanne, for the updates on the licenses. We'll move on now. You ready?

- One second. All right. We are on to... Computer is asleep. Okay, on to item number six.

- All right, thank you. Consideration with possible action on a request by IT Department to discontinue use of Green Bay Public Television Channel 4 in lieu of repairing malfunctioning equipment So, Joanne, did you want to start this off? Or do we want to go to Mike at IT?

- Yeah, we can go ahead and defer to Director Hronek.

- All right, Director? Give us the update.

- Okay, good evening. Everybody can hear me okay?

- Yes.

- Okay. We started our television station in 2014. So our current equipment, the encoder, which takes the current video that we create and has to convert it to a different video stream to put it on a television station, that has broken. We received that piece of equipment in 2014 from Time Warner Cable when we took over the station. So I don't really know how old that piece of equipment is, but I got a recent estimate from Charter Communications, who now own Time Warner Cable, and that was \$6,000.00 to replace that piece of equipment. Another item that broke previously to that, not really broke, but there's a filler content in between government meetings. And that is the Classics Arts Showcase channel. And that we receive a satellite reception from that channel, from that satellite, and put it on our TV. That satellite moved location. So we have basically been down for around four months from that content until we purchase a new satellite dish or stream in Classic Arts Showcase. We still haven't made that decision. The cost for getting a new dish could easily reach \$4,000.00 to \$5,000.00. So we're looking at \$10,000.00, possibly, of replacement parts for this. And since 2014, we've just done different things. We purchased CivicClerk. We have all our content in an easily accessible format on our city's website. And currently, when we do, the council meeting

is the only thing on, is the only content, on the Green Bay Public Television station. And that is seen six days after the fact of a council meeting. So, we spend a lot of time in CivicClerk. We'll never probably get rid of it. And it's kind of redundant for us to program two different video feeds. So my feeling is, we're sticking money into a losing purpose. And there is also a lot of other equipment associated with that TV station. We purchased a programming unit, so an electronics unit, and that is, all the equipment in that room where the TV station is located, runs 24/7, 365. So we really never know when something is gonna break next. We could be proactive and go and buy new program equipment, but that's gonna set us back \$8,000.00 or \$9,000.00 too. So that's what the original cost of that was seven years ago. Also, the position never really, or, this function never really came with any funding. We program a channel with existing staff. When that staff is on vacation or has other duties, we have to give the programming of the station to one of our programmer analysts, IT program analyst. They code for us. Not really his job duties. And I guess, we're really an IT department, not a TV station, and we put all the content on CivicClerk already, so I think it's kind of redundant. That's about it, I think, I think we can just redirect all our costs to a different effort.

- I've got a question.

- Well, I have a question.

- Go ahead. Well, you're chair.

- So Director, so regarding Channel 4, do you have the information from Spectrum on how many people actually view that channel when it was working?

- No, I do not. And we'd never been able to get ahold of that kind of information.

- Have we asked for it?

- Yes, in the past we have.

- And another question. So this has been down since May 26th. Why did it take two months for us to hear about this?

- Well, we were awaiting on cost estimates, and it's really like, we haven't had many complaints about it. So we prioritize our work, and we're just getting to the estimate. We're always just considering why we're doing it anyways. And we haven't really fielded any complaints. And I'm not sure if the alders have fielded any complaints about the TV channel being down either?

- Just one.

- Yeah.

- Yeah.

- So, Alder Lefebvre, you had a question?

- Yeah, a couple of things. My husband would watch once in a while, and say, oh, there you are. Anyway. So that's one person sometimes. But I want to know, you had, there was an email said that

you were on YouTube. Would that be the video of it or what is it on YouTube?

- Whatever you see on YouTube is the same, what you see on the television station, except there's just, all the committee meetings are on YouTube and CivicClerk. They aren't on the TV station.

- Okay.

- Is there a reason why we're not on the TV for committee level?

- When we took over the TV station, we just assumed the same schedule as what Time Warner Cable previously had. So we just kept all the other content. We just basically took over running it for them. So now we got to get all these videos from other sources and put it on it. So we just took out a bunch of work and it's kind of unnecessary, I feel it is, it's totally your decision. I feel it's unnecessary because we display it in a different format that is much more usable than a television station or programming schedule. The world is--

- Alder Lefebvre?

- Okay. Yeah. I'd rather see us spend money on our security for our, against ransomware and different things. I'd rather spend on that, I think, 'cause I know we're probably going, that's something that is an ongoing thing that we to constantly be monitoring and looking at things that we have to do. So we're gonna maybe have to spend more money coming up in the, you know, there, just to make sure that everything that we have in the city is safe from these outside hackers and that. So I'd rather spend the money on that.

- Thank you.

- Chairman Stevens, I'd like to make a motion?

- One second, Alder Vander Leest. I see Randy wanted to talk too, or Alder Scannell, and Mark.

- Well, what do you want, can I go or no?

- Yeah, go ahead.

- All right. Thank you, Chair. I would ask, Craig, for us, one of the issues, and I understand that we're getting modernized and all that and the world is moving forward and that, but what about the citizenry who does not have a computer, older folks, widows, different folks that, you know, we're looking at transparency here, and I realize that these are all expenses that you might think, well, we're just spending money on that. And I was gonna ask a two part question. First of all, how do you deal with the people that don't have access to all of this technology? And then also, with this cost, these costs that you were talking about, where might that come from? Is that something that we'd have to budget for, of course, but anyway, those are my two main questions.

- As far as the cost goes, I would assume that it would have to come out of contingency funding. As far as alternate tech, I don't know how many people, there's always talk about cord cutting. What they do is cut the cable cord and they stream in the internet source. So I see more people going towards CivicClerk and YouTube to view our videos than to see them on our current television

station. Alternative methods, you can also, I don't want to say, I don't know the numbers, but many people probably have a smartphone where they can get video of our meetings from, instead of on our TV station. I think there's just multiple sources or multiple ways to get, you can go down to the coffee shop and start streaming a council meeting or a committee meeting.

- No, I have no doubt about that. But I think the question is is that there will be some people I think that will fall through the cracks on this a little bit. They don't have access to any of it. So I don't know, when do we as a city or as a society decide when we're just going this way and then everybody else has to get on board or not? So I'm just looking at the transparency into things. So if any other folks can help me on that, I'd appreciate it. Thank you.

- Mike, I want to piggyback off of that. So regarding to what Mark is saying, I would also be interested to know, Spectrum should be able to tell us how many households. in the Green Bay currently do not have internet service.

- Yeah.

- How do we go about getting that type of information?

- Spectrum should be able to tell us how many don't have internet service?

- They should.

- No no, the reverse. How many do.

- There's multiple sources of internet providers in the area, so they'd have to share numbers. I don't believe competition does that.

- I mean, television, not internet, I should say TV service. And internet, yeah, they should be able to tell us, even though there's different providers.

- Time Warner should be able to tell us how many customers they have?

- That are not using their data service.

- No, no. It would be the reverse.

- No, we would need to know how many people are not using the data service because the director keeps saying that we're using YouTube and we're using all these other outlets, well that's data service. We might have an older generation that doesn't have that service. So they're going to the TV to find our local government.

- No, no, no, Spectrum should be able to, like you said, you requested how many people were watching it, and Spectrum was not telling us. That's what we need to know. How many people in Green Bay were actually viewing Channel 4.

- Channel 4. Yeah.

- Yeah.
- That would be the question.
- That's what we have to press for, to find out. Right? Right, Director?
- That would be nice if you could get it. Alder Dorff was trying to talk too.
- Yeah, hold on.
- I think Alder Scannell was first.
- Yep, Scannell's first.
- Sorry.
- Go for it, Alder.
- Am I on now?
- Yeah.
- Okay. Just a couple of things. One, first, Director, Mike Hronek, the YouTube channel streams live, as well as video, correct or no?
- Correct.
- Right, so they can, and as far as the TV, the only, that's not over the air. So there's probably people who don't have cable, who, as far as transparency goes, are still out because it's not over the air, they have to have cable. They have to have Spectrum.
- That's right.
- So I don't know how far, I mean, what do we do about those people's ability? And I think the number that is watching live on Comcast TV through cable is probably pretty minimal. And I would hope that they could find other sources, just like anybody who doesn't have cable is obviously gonna have to try and find another source. And what was the last thing I was gonna say? I guess it wouldn't hurt to try and get that information from Spectrum, if they'd give it to us. I mean, they may not keep track of it or they may not, for whatever reason decide it's prudent business-wise, to give out that information. But I guess it maybe wouldn't hurt to try and ask them. But, for my money, I'm thinking it's a pretty small number, I think in that, we don't worry about those who don't have cable. Why should we worry about those few who are watching Spectrum, watching it, when there's so many other venues they can get it from? So that's my two cents.
- Alder Dorff.
- Thank you. Director Hronek, did you say it doesn't even air until six days after our meeting?

- Correct.

- Did I hear you say that?

- Our Council meetings are on Tuesday. And we could change that schedule, but, I just, we always just kept the schedule, the current schedule.

- Right, well, that's the current schedule. That's what people are used to. There's TV news. There's the newspaper. There are cell phones where people can look online if they want to find out what's going on, but six days after, it's too late to do much input. Knowing what our contingency fund is, would be very opposed to voting for money from the contingency fund to fund this. I don't think that we possibly can reach everyone, but if people, the person really wanted to know what was going on, there would be a way they could find out. There definitely would be a way they could find out what was going on with city government, such as calling their alder. So I am very much against continuing this TV station. And maybe let Appleton do it for awhile. Thank you.

- I'd like to make that motion, Mr. Stevens?

- Oh, I have a question. Hold on, Alder Gerlach. Director, my question for you is, we had this service for the Channel 4. It feels like we've been under-utilizing it. Is that correct?

- We changed with time, where we utilize the internet and streaming, not the TV station.

- Okay.

- We're duplicating an effort, and we're going toward a modern viewing of video. But it's just a decision we made. You could call it under utilized because we're not putting on committee meetings and all that kinds of, yeah, so I see where you're going.

- Okay, Alder Gerlach?

- Director Hronek, I thought I heard you say something that didn't make any sense to me, and I just, I must've heard it wrong. I thought I heard you say that neither any of the committee meetings nor the council meetings are on Channel 4? Did you say that?

- Council meetings are on Channel 4.

- But not the committee meetings? And the council meetings are six days later?

- Yes.

- Okay. Thank you.

- And then, do you, by chance, know how many other cities are using this type of service in Wisconsin currently?

- I could probably get that number. We used to program Brown County, Appleton, a couple of other stations. And I don't know if everybody recalls, probably some weren't here. Maybe five years ago,

we had to start complying to ADA requirements, which meant that, if we were gonna broadcast live, if we were gonna live stream this meeting, in the change in the COVID world, we would have to have 99% compliant closed captioning. And there's not a service, there's not an automated service, that kind of meets that 99%. So we take all our meetings and give the video to a transcription service called Rev.com and they hand-type all our closed captioning. So when you see closed captioning on CivicClerk, that is from Rev.com. So, I don't know when we go back to normality, but I don't think we'll be live streaming, because then we don't meet our requirements.

- Alder Lefebvre? Oh, you're muted.

- That's exactly why Brown County has not done it, because they said that apparently the cost and everything, it was just not worth it, doing the Brown County board meetings.

- Yeah, they're not the only municipality who backed out when we made that decision.

- When you had to do the ADA? Yeah.

- Yes, mm hm.

- Mm hm.

- Is there any other questions or comments?

- I'd like to make that motion, Craig.

- I'll second it.

- Well, wait, what's your motion?

- My motion is that we follow our Director Hronek's lead on this and that we discontinue the use of Green Bay Public television station number 4, in lieu of repairs and all the rest, that we're gonna take his recommendation. And I support his scenario of it, and that we discontinue it. So that's my motion.

- Before we get that second, Joanne, do you have a comment?

- Do I?

- I don't have any other comments, no.

- Yeah.

- No, I just wanted to chime in that that's just going to be a motion to approve the request.

- My motion, to approve the request of Director Hronek.

- Yes.

- Yes.

- I will second that, with the hopes that transparency will be attained, in all ways, as we move forward. So I will second that.

- Thank you

- Okay, so all in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- I will be a no.

- Correct. So Alder Stevens is a no. Alder Vander Leest is an aye. Alder Steuer is aye. Alder Lefebvre, aye. That passes three to one, with Alder Stevens voting no. Okay, so noted.

- Ready?

- All right. Yep, on to item number seven.

- Consideration with possible action on a request by Alder Lefebvre for an update on fireworks, requesting that Green Bay shorten the time permitted to sell fireworks to two days before the 4th of July and ends on the eve of the 4th of July. Staff, or Alder Lefebvre, who wants to start?

- Yes, I think a lot of alders probably got all kinds of calls, constantly calls. People are, well this year I heard them in May, people shooting off fireworks. It becomes where there are a lot of elderly people, there are people with dogs, and they've been calling me and saying, you know, this is really, the dogs, especially, the pets, really suffer from this. And they go too far. And unfortunately, how to say this, I know the police will stop some of these kids and they'll just tell them not to do it and they leave. And then they end up going somewhere else and shooting them off. There's no teeth to our ordinance, that there's a fine if you're shooting off fireworks. I forgot what the amount is, it's a hefty amount. But there's nothing, there's no consequences for people illegally shooting these off. And so I'm making this request to try to calm it down where they can only buy it for the short period of time, which is appropriate, it's supposed to be for the 4th of July. Not for months ahead or months after. So that's my request, because I've had a lot of people contacting me. I don't know if Randy, if you had people? Alder Gerlach, Alder Dorff? Okay, Randy wants to speak.

- Alder Scannell.

- Yeah. I don't know if that there are many people selling fireworks within the city limits. Most of the firework establishments I know are not within the city limits. So I don't know that this will practically do anything, except for if there is anybody selling within the limits, it would pretty much end their business. They won't be able to, no one's gonna be able to do it. So if you want to just drive the business outside the city, I don't think that does anything as far as people shooting them off. If people want to buy fireworks, they'll go, they don't have to go that far to be able to buy them. And so I appreciate the effort, but I see this as kind of a futile one. I'm not sure what can be done about this. I know every year it's an issue. This year I think it's been even crazier. I don't know if coming out of COVID had anything to do with that? People are just really letting things snap or what. But it is an

issue every year. But I think past years it certainly hasn't been like it was this year. And I don't know if that's gonna be true next year or whatever, but anyway, I would think, if we're gonna do something, let's try and figure out something that would be effective. I just don't see this as being, I think it's a notable effort, but I don't see it as being practical in any way to solve the problem.

- Thank you. Alder Steuer?

- Thank you, Chair. I'm gonna piggyback on what Alder Scannell said. I'm in touch with Representative Sheldon's Office about this. I've had phone calls, like a lot of the alders have had as well. And kind of the unusual thing in Wisconsin is that you can sell fireworks, but you're not supposed to utilize them. It's kind of like the head shop. You can sell the paraphernalia, but you can't use it. So it's kind of a, it really comes down to a state issue. And in Minnesota, you can't sell them. Here you can. So I've. Representative Sheldon's office, and she is doing research on it right now. And I'm hoping that there's some steam that can be built up with this and brought to the State of Wisconsin so that they can deal with it there. Locally we can't do a whole lot. Like Alder Scannell said, they sell these outside of the city limits, so we have no jurisdiction over them. So it is what it is. So if you want to change this, you're gonna have to change it I think at the state level. And I'm starting that now. And I think some of the other alders that would like to piggyback on this, I think that we should move forward and try to work together as a unit, if we decide to go that route. So that's my point.

- All right, Alder Lefebvre?

- There is one that's right on the corner of University and Elizabeth. He sells all kinds of stuff. And that's the real big complaint in my district, that he was selling a lot. People were using it. And my, I dunno, maybe I got crazies in my district, I don't know, that really loves shooting off fireworks. This has been going on years in mine. I'm surprised they haven't burned down buildings with how much they shoot off. And some of this, I mean, it's not just little stuff. It sounds like dynamite they're shooting off. Even in here, at Bay Beach, after hours. I had to go over there and yell at that person to stop it. It was almost 12 o'clock and he's still shooting it off. So that's the problem that we're trying to solve. Yeah, the state would be good, but I dunno if we're gonna get any traction there, with the state. But I do know one on University, he sells, and he sets up two weeks, three weeks before the 4th, and people are just, they're stupid, they're spending their money on this stuff. I mean, it's not cheap. I think they should spend it on their families instead, but you know, we could have an ordinance for us. It would help to control some. And I'm sure there are some other stands around that maybe you aren't aware of, but it would kind of help a little bit here, but, yeah, I think it is, it's kind of a, I dunno, it's kind of a weird law that you can sell something that's illegal to actually use. And yeah, it would have to change at the state, but I don't know if that will happen. Maybe I can bring it up to the Brown County board, a county ordinance, I don't know.

- Okay, so Alder Lefebvre, I have a question though, what do you mean update on fireworks? You're looking for staff to give you an update on something?

- Well, no update, well update the ordinance, 'cause there is, they can sell it. There is nothing in the ordinance that they can't sell it. So I'm just trying to change, I should say change the ordinance, maybe, or add to the ordinance.

- All right.

- Sorry.

- So hold on, Joanne, do you want to chime in on this? Yet?

- I'm trying to think if I have anything to put in that would be separate or different from what everybody else mentioned. I was just briefly reviewing the statutes, and like Alder Steuer mentioned, regulated by the state, it just basically defers to the city or municipalities to sell the permit. But that's the extent of it. So if it sounds like Representative Sheldon is looking into doing some changes, then ultimately it would come down from the state level and give us a little bit more direction on how to best deal with it.

- Okay.

- Alder Galvin, Alder Galvin was, he might have more.

- Before Galvin we have Alder Dorff.

- Thank you, Alder Stevens. So I had only gotten one concern about this from a constituent, and his concern was about, is crack down on the ones, the stands, selling illegal fireworks. And again, I know that there are just two kinds of fireworks that you can set off, the snakes, and I forget the other kind, but--

- Sparklers.

- Sparklers?

- Sparklers.

- Okay. But I don't know that there, I mean, are there. Works or are the fire, it's just okay to sell any fireworks? But maybe Alder Galvin knows that and police, or actually, we actually have other police here.

- Ask if anybody else knows.

- Oh, okay.

- So--

- Alder Galvin?

- All right, so anything that flies in the air or goes bang is illegal. So you're gonna have snakes, sparklers, fountains, smoke bombs, there's any list of things, as long as they don't fly through the air or go bang they're legal.

- But, I'm saying, it's just still legal to sell them.

- Well, at one time, and this is where I would ask Attorney Bungert to take a look at the statutes.

You actually, to buy those fireworks that fly through the air, go bang, you had to have proof of insurance, showing that you had liability insurance.

- No, they don't.

- And I don't know if they changed the law on that. And that might've been what opened the flood doors. So you can actually possess fireworks that are illegal to light off. And it was a scam pulled by the firework lobby, and they got a bunch of legislatures to buy in. So really the only way to stop it from happening is, the citations for the users and also would be to see, are we issuing permits to the people that sell the fireworks we don't want in our community? See that Menards and some of the big box stores are selling fireworks that I believe some of them would be illegal if they're used. And so, and if we've got tents and that setting up, I wasn't aware that the city sold permits to these individuals. So I guess, I would hope that staff would check into that or has checked into it and we'd go from there. But really, if you want to stop it, you gotta stop it at the state level. Or we gotta get a lot more cops out working and have them actually take action the first time, instead of some of the policies that were established over the years, when we had a mayor that said it was okay to do illegal fireworks. And so the police were told to stand down, basically. So it takes a change of attitude in government and the police department from the top down on enforcement. It's gonna take a change in the state legislature to change the laws. Thank you.

- Mm hm. And that's what's wrong. I'm sorry, I've had a few people tell me that the police do not, if they're the kids, they just say, okay, just don't do it anymore. And they're not issuing any citations. They're not taking the fireworks away, I heard. And unfortunately some are Hispanics and that, and they don't want to make an issue of it. And this is something that if we have an ordinance, we have to enforce it. If we find people with fireworks, at least if they're kids, take it away from them. Don't allow them to have them anymore, shoot them off. If you catch them a second time doing it, then they should be fined, 'cause the fine, isn't it like \$600.00 or more? I thought, it was pretty expensive.

- Alder Lefebvre?

- Yeah.

- I would respectfully disagree with you. When we do come across kids with fireworks, we do confiscate the fireworks.

- Okay.

- Yes, there are times where we might not issue the citation, like every citation is officer discretion. You have certain times a year, like your timeframe, right around the 4th of July, in terms of priority calls. I'll let you know what our procedure was this year. If we got a complaint on the firework or for a loud noise, we would investigate it. Or if it was too close to a house where someone was worried it would cause damage, we would investigate it. I can tell you, I received a lot of anonymous, on the city's website, the request for service, where they would remain anonymous. And they would email it to me on a Friday night saying someone's lighting off fireworks somewhere on the east side, is what I would get. And I could tell you with my schedule, and even on our request for service tab, it says that it's not monitored 24 hours a day seven days a week. I wouldn't see that email until Monday morning. And by then, whoever's having the party, it's done and over. So yes, like Alder Galvin said, yeah, if we could put more police officers out there, it's just pretty much the week before, and with

the 4th being on the Sunday, we were pretty much, from the end of June, up until the 4th of July, the day after, it was not a priority call for us here at the police department, unless someone called to complain, hey, it's gonna cause damage to my property or it might cause a fire because it's too close to the house. But a lot of the calls we get on them, they're anonymous, and they'll say it's somewhere three blocks east of me. I live on Elm Street, it's three blocks east of me. We'll go and try and find out. We just don't have the time or the manpower to stay there. But if we do come across kids, we do confiscate the fireworks. We have a big garbage can here, full of water. We bring them back to the PD and we dunk them in the water to get rid of them. So whoever was telling you that, could there have been a time some kid might've had fireworks on them that we didn't see? Yes. But if we see them and they're lighting them and causing issues, we do confiscate them.

- Okay, thank you.

- Chairman Stevens, I'd like to make a motion?

- Go for it.

- Receive and place at file at this time, until we get something down the road from the state, just to receive and place on file, the request.

- Do I have a second?

- Thank you.

- Do I have a second?

- That probably would be the route to go, because no matter what we do locally, it's just, you know, we spin wheels a lot of times. I would second it, with the fact that we could bring this back up. But again, like I said, I'm looking for the state to do something. And I think it's important that we pursue that angle of it right now. I know Alder Lefebvre doesn't think anything can happen, but I think if you got a little groundswell of support, you might be able to do something. So, I will second it because of that.

- And I'll make a comment too. I think we also need to rely more on, like Alder Galvin said, see if we get more officers out there to combat this issue with fireworks, especially during the week of the 4th. And that's something they could look at in the future. But I see Joanne has a comment.

- Just really quickly. While the discussion was going on I was just kind of briefly reviewing the statutes. And it looks like under State Statute, the definition of fireworks don't include anything that leaves the ground. It's essentially like sparklers, a toy snake, the fountain, like things that produce audible or visible effects or have just a certain amount of explosive mixture. So those items that go up into the sky that are usually used for like commercial, like fireworks displays, are classified separately, and I think are defined potentially as explosives under federal regulation. And so that's what the state legislature currently and what the state statute currently, are classifying fireworks in the state. So it wouldn't necessarily apply to those that leave the ground or explode in the air. And then it does provide municipalities to regulate, but within the confines of what the state provides. So kind of in line with the discussion of seeing what our state representatives are able to accomplish with respect to changing the regulations, that would still be in line. If they do putting something that's

a little bit more restrictive and give municipalities a little bit more local regulation with respect to prohibition. Currently it applies to, any city can enact an ordinance to define fireworks, which includes what the state definitions include, to prohibit the sale of fireworks as are defined under the statute and to regulate the sale, possession, or use, as defined by ordinance of fireworks. Again, the definition of fireworks that are permitted in the statute. And we can have something that is, it can't be less restrictive than what the state provides, but it can be more restrictive. But again, if the state legislature is looking to make changes, then it would follow suit for us to hold off and see what the state does, and then go from there.

- Okay, Alder Scannell?

- First of all, there's three classes of fireworks. Class C is the fountains, sparks, sparklers, that kind of stuff. Class B is the stuff that shoots up in the air and goes bang, bang, bang. Class A is the stuff that shoots up in the air and goes bang, bang, bang, like you see on 4th of July. It's a matter of amount of powder. So what we're seeing a lot of, our biggest complaints are with Class B fireworks. And if we can, I didn't know, we could do this, if we could just outlaw selling Class B fireworks within the city limits, maybe instead of putting a timeframe on it, do that. That's the problem, is the Class B fireworks. So I would maybe recommend amending the motion to just outlawing of Class B fireworks within city limits. I don't know, I mean, again, you're not gonna have to go very far to purchase them. There's no such thing as illegal fireworks. It's true the Class A fireworks are federally regulated, but Class B fireworks, all you need is a permit and that's what the places that sell fireworks do, they have a permit that says on this date you can come to this place and shoot off your fireworks. And the person who buys the fireworks agrees to that permit. But then of course, they take the fireworks and they do whatever they want. That's what makes the sale legal. So I don't think there's much we're gonna be able to do about that, but especially, we have no control at all around the surrounding areas. But if we can prohibit the sale of Class B fireworks within the city limits, that might be something. Like I said, you don't have to go too far to get the Class B stuff, but I think that makes more sense than just a few day limit. It's really the Class B fireworks we want to put a lid on. Thanks.

- Yeah. Alder Lefebvre?

- My question is then, if we did put in a motion tonight, as Alder Scannell mentioned, prohibit the sale of Class B, that means that nobody within the city could sell those? So then there would be no need for my motion, what I have, or what my request, but it would change it.

- Well, we would need Alder Vander Leest to change his motion.

- Yeah, we didn't vote yet.

- But go ahead, Joanne.

- Yes. So we would need, I think at that point, I would probably recommend it being referred to staff to do a little bit of research, simply because the statute doesn't necessarily designate or classify the fireworks as Class B, as Alder Scannell was providing. It just classifies all fireworks. So then we would need to do a little research to see if we can pick and choose from that list as to what can be prohibited, what can't be prohibited, and so forth.

- I'd agree with that.

- If we look at one, if you look at, it's 167.10 Regulation of Fireworks. Fireworks is a whole list of things. Everything from fuel to a firearm cartridge, to a flare, to a sparkler, to a model rocket engine, to tobacco, a home fountain, those are all inclusive. It's not exactly the way that Alder Scannell was mentioning.

- So I'd ask--

- I'm saying the point is, that way we'd need to look into, we need to look into specifically as to which of those items we would be prohibiting.

- So I'd like to ask Alder Vander Leest, would you want to change yours to directing the staff to look into this?

- We could do that. We could do that, in other words, also, receive and place on file, but recommend that the staff would. So we'd have more answers at this time, in other words, when they come up with the answers that they would give us the feedback of what was revealed.

- Refer to staff, then? Would that be the motion?

- Okay, before I get a second, Alder Gerlach's been waving her hand over there.

- Maybe this is a moot point now. I've been trying to follow this and you always talk about not being able to sell fireworks. Do I understand that there is already an ordinance, because it's a state statute, that bans the use of Class B fireworks in the city limits? No?

- No. Wait?

- Yes.

- Our Ordinance 18-93 provides that fireworks purchase and use prohibited. The mayor is authorized by statute to delegate to the fire chief or their designee the authority to issue permits for the purchase and use within the city of those classes of fireworks and pyrotechnics authorized by said statute.

- But you said fire chief?

- Fire chief or designee, that's the way that our ordinance is currently .

- So can the fire department issue tickets?

- No.

- They issue the permit.

- Okay. But they cannot go out and issue tickets for illegal use? Okay. Randy?

- Yeah, to get a permit, that's where you go. The places that sell these things that have a permit, like I said, they have a permit that says specifically a date and a place they can be shot off. They have to get that from whoever at fire, the fire chief has jurisdiction over that area. So we could, I don't know if our fire, if we have issued any permits for those kinds of displays within city limits, I don't think anybody's ever come, I'd be surprised if anybody's actually done that. So all the fireworks that are Class B that are being shot off, are shot off illegally. It's not the sale that's illegal. It's the shooting them off that's illegal, because they're not following the permit they signed to purchase the fireworks. So anybody who wanted to, like, let's say you want to have a big party, a 4th of July at a park, and you want to shoot out fireworks that are Class B, you could go to the fire chief to get the permit for that. And it'd be for a specific date and a specific place.

- All right, thank you. So we have a motion to refer to staff. Do I have a second?

- Second.

- All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- All right, thank you, Alders, for your, are you ready, Joanne? Okay, consideration with, go ahead.

- Yes, go ahead.

- Number eight, consideration with possible action on a request by Alder Scannell for the city to pass a nonpartisan redistricting resolution. Proposed resolution language is on the second page. So Randy or staff, who would like to go first? Alder Scannell?

- Sure. Okay. I just had to make sure my mic was on. I had minimized my screen. I couldn't tell if my mic was on. Yeah. The League of Conservation Voters has asked me to bring this forward. It's a nonpartisan group, and I've had, certainly many others come to me on this issue. It's really a bipartisan issue, as the League of Conservation Voters is. The majority of citizens want this. Polls show that 72% of voters want a nonpartisan commission to draw legislative maps. 56 counties have passed it, including Brown County. There's, as far as the breakdown, 63% of Republicans agree with this, 76% of Independents, and 83% Democrats. So this really isn't a partisan issue to me, it's a practical issue. I don't think, looking at ourselves, we would think that it'd be appropriate for us to draw our own districts. I don't think why we would think it's appropriate for other politicians to do so. So I'm all in favor of sending this resolution to the state to lend our voice, to those who are fighting to get fair maps.

- I have a question.

- Alder Steuer?

- Thank you. Alder Scannell, you put this together then, correct?

- Ah, well this is actually--

- Or is it a standard?

- Well, it just came from, all the whereases came from, what was it? I forgot, Stevens Point City? I forgot exactly where. But I tweaked the resolution, so this is--

- Okay, well I'm glad you mentioned about the various parties, the percentages and that, because it's like anything else, everything is so politically charged these days, you gotta be careful, I think. I think having correct redistricting maps is a good thing. I know it's been an issue forever and a day. I don't know how you're ever gonna fully get away from all of that. My question is like who, and I probably have heard this answer, but some of the folks that redraw, let's say for Brown County, well you have to wait until the census figures come in. So partly is when is the timeframe when that will happen? And then also, who will be doing it? So if anybody can answer that, I'd appreciate it.

- Most people are advocating for is the Iowa Model. For quite some time. And it's worked out pretty well, as far as nonpartisan redistricting. And it composes a group of politicians and independent citizens who have a stake, or stakeholders who are in this subject. So there's a way to compose the group to redraw the maps that would really take a lot of the partisanship out of it. The last time this happened, the party in power did so with computer software that they ended up destroying. And they did it in building offsite from the Capitol. It was really pretty shady. And I really don't see how, I know there might be, some people think of this as a controversial issue because there are some politicians who are very vocal about this, but I don't know why we need to listen to them, just 'cause they and some of their media outlets favor their own empowerment, it's not something we should, I feel, need to pay any attention to.

- All right, well--

- Any other questions? Alder Lefebvre?

- One thing I want to say, we mentioned Iowa, and they're becoming very partisan. But they have kept it. They have not changed it. I think they, everybody likes it. They feel it's fair. It's simple. And it's a good thing to do. So I think if Iowa still keeps it, I think that's definitely, we should be pushing for this. And as Randy has mentioned, I know all the statistics too, that so many, this has been put up as resolutions in different cities and counties and people overwhelmingly support this. They think this is fair. This is the fair thing to do. And I would say, too, one party who's right now questioning our last election, oh, everything was wasn't done right. It was improper. Don't wanna do this improper. So, I mean, come on, let's do the same thing. Let's do something that is fair for everybody. And this is the way it should be set up, that you should be voting, the voter should be picking your representative, not the representative picking their voters. So yeah, we support this. This is a good resolution, I read through it. It's very good. It's very fair. It doesn't mention, it says, I don't care who does it, I don't care if Republicans are in there, I don't care if the Democrats, I know the Democrats did it before, but now it's getting worse. I mean, it's just going so far. It's time. Thank you.

- Do we have any more comments on this?

- I'd like to make a comment, whenever you've got a chance.

- Alder.

- Alder Gerlach first, she can go first.

- Who?

- Alder Gerlach?

- Oh, she's--

- She had her hand up.

- Oh, she did? I didn't see it. Sorry. Alder Gerlach?

- So my comment is absolutely technical. Of course I completely support this. I would just beg to make this grammatically correct, and in the future to start making all of our resolutions grammatically correct by moving to the second section and from there on removing the comma after whereas every single time, because it doesn't belong there, even though that's what most Americans are doing. And please remove the comma after therefore be it resolved. Those commas don't belong there. Let's start doing it right, please.

- I think I didn't bother. I was so busy, I just typed out what I had. I'll go over it.

- And I know you just copied it, because 90% of them are like this. but Matt Matousek and I are on a mission to try to get it right for the City of Green Bay. So only the first one should have a comma after whereas. All those other commas need to go.

- Yeah.

- Thank you.

- And if I may add, I meant to end up with this, is if we could refer this to staff, the Legal Department, so they could give it their go over and their blessing or change anything that they think needs changing. And then instead of coming back to committee, if I could then go right to council. 'Cause anything--

- Yes, if the committee just wants to approve the resolution, then we can have staff look at it and get it finalized for council. So then it will be in the report for P and P. And then in the resolution section, under the agenda, it will be formatted the way that it should.

- Okay.

- Okay.

- I'll take a motion?

- Well, did, Mark has--

- I just want to make a comment before you--

- I had one comment.

- Okay, Mark? Alder Steuer?

- Okay, just one quick comment. Like I said, I think generally it's pretty good, but like I said, like anything else, if we approve it tonight, then that's it. So if there were any of these slight tweaks that might need to be made, is this, well, I guess this is time sensitive? If I see a lot of head nods, time sensitivity, it's like anything else. There was just one line in there where they talk about whether this was done by the Republicans or Democrats. Granted, those are the two major parties, but there are other parties as well. So, who's gonna decide who does this? It could be an Independent or a Libertarian, some other, I know you're shaking your head, Randy, but I'm just looking at this from a standpoint that there might be some people falling through the cracks on some of this, where you're just looking at the power that be.

- They're the ones who decide. No Independent will be able to, if there's an Independent in the state house, they'd be voting on it, just like anybody else.

- Yeah. I knew the answer. I just was throwing it out there. So, I don't know what else I can say on it. Generally, I think it's okay. As long as it's transparent in the sense that it doesn't matter who is doing this, that's it. And the whereases, I agree with Alder Gerlach. That's all. Thank you.

- Thank you. Alder Vander Leest?

- Yes. Thank you, Chairman Stevens. My thoughts are that, I think the state is gonna be actually doing the work. This resolution is not a binding resolution, is that correct?

- Correct.

- Yeah, in other words, it's a recommendation going forward. From what I've heard on, that they might not even have time to do the redistricting. They might not get it done. It's gonna be done at a very, how would I say it? The timeframe where, on the, actually for voting and things, I think it's so close that they don't know if they're gonna even complete it in time. That that's some of the feedback I've heard on some of the redistricting. So in other words, the state is evidently behind on getting things done, is that correct? Does anybody know that or not?

- Joanne, do you know that answer?

- I believe that's true, but there are statutes on, there is a timeframe that has to be met or there has to be some kind of legislature, I think, to give them extra time due to the circumstances.

- Yeah, I know that was going in front of them. Did they vote on that yet, do you know?

- I don't think so, no. No, not yet. And even if it is off, I mean, so.

- I'd like to hear from the attorney on that.

- No, I'm not aware on the redistricting and the corresponding census that is attached to that. It's primarily in the Clerk's Office. And so we only have the updates that were provided by Clerk Jeffries the last time redistricting was on the agenda, I believe in connection with Alder Wery's

communication.

- Alder Lefebvre?

- From what I heard, the state legislators, the one party that's in control, they are looking to delay it. I think they're looking at different court procedures or something, they're trying to delay it. They want to keep it as it is as long as they can.

- Spring election.

- So I don't know what, yeah, so I don't know, yeah, where that's going. So I think we need to, and all these other communities gotta do this too. We gotta keep beating over the head on this, come on! We want this done. Let them know. So I'd like to make a motion that we, let's see, how was that, we want to approve this resolution with the changes, only the first whereas has the comma, all others are removed. And out, also, that one you take it off, the comma. And have staff check it over for the legalities or make sure that it's proper. And then it'll go on our agenda for our next council meeting as a report from Protection and Policy, and then it'll go into the resolution section. Is that right?

- Yes.

- Okay.

- Yes.

- Do I have a second? Do I hear a second?

- Who made the motion?

- Lefebvre.

- All right, I will second.

- All in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Oops oops.

- Oh.

- Nay.

- Aye.

- Sorry, Alder Gerlach is trying to talk.

- I'm a nay, because I think we have to have more information. I think we need more information.

- Okay.

- I'm sorry, Alder Vander Leest, was that you're voting aye or no?

- Who?

- I vote no.

- All right. I'm gonna go through the roll call, just to double check. Alder Stevens, aye. Alder Vander Leest, nay. Alder Steuer, aye. Alder Lefebvre, aye. That passes three to one with Alder Vander Leest voting no.

- I'd like more information, personally, it's kinda vague. And I think we should hear it from our state legislators, both on the Democrat and the Republican side. And then they can help us out in a, you know, give us the real answers. So a resolution on this, well, if that's, if you want to approve it, that's up to you guys, but I'd like more information. So thank you.

- All right. Thank you. Alder Gerlach, did you still want to comment? Oh, you're muted.

- Once the vote is taken, there's no point on commenting.

- Okay. Are you ready, Joanne?

- Yes. Item number nine.

- Number nine.

- Nine.

- Okay. A request by Alder Brian Johnson for consideration with possible action to modernize the ordinance and permit fees related to the operation of food trucks in the city of Green Bay, including possible partnership with the Brown County Health Department. I don't see Brian, but I think Alder Dorff is on his behalf.

- I am, I'm here on his behalf. And my behalf. I had actually contacted the Clerk to have this item put on the agenda as a communication and discovered that it was already on. Alder Johnson has been ahead of the game. He asked for this back in February, and it was, there was a mistake, and it was left off of the agendas. And so I also, when I told him I would speak, I wanted to give him full credit for being on top of this. I've had requests from people in neighborhood associations, my neighborhood associations, that they wanted to have a food truck. The licensing fee is \$500.00 in the city. Currently we have two food trucks that are licensed in the city of Green Bay because the licenses are so expensive. And so Alder Johnson and I would be very happy with no charge as long as they went through the Brown County Process because they already have to do that. They have to go through the Health Department and I'm not sure what Brown County charges, but I think it would be an opportunity for neighborhood associations and others, to be able to have these food trucks come in. And I see at the Bellevue Y that I go to, they have food truck Thursday and food truck

Tuesday. And they, we're kind of cheating our residents out of something because it's so high for the fee. I also spoke with the Clerk and she is very much supporting what Alder Johnson and what I am saying. And she said, it doesn't take much time at all. That it's really, \$500.00 is way too high. If we want to maybe just have \$25.00 or something, we could do that. So what I'm hoping for is that tonight we can refer this to staff, so they can start working on it, that we don't really make any hard decisions tonight, because we need to see what the parameters are and how much does it really cost, and what is Brown County charging? All of those kinds of things. And maybe take it up at the next meeting when Alder Johnson is available.

- I would make that motion, for refer to staff.

- Do I have a second?

- Second.

- [Steve] Before you do that, could I bring up, I remember talking to Celestine about this issue probably three or four years ago. Another issue that the police department has is the way the boundaries are written or drawn, where food trucks can legally operate in the city. It is very convoluted. It's very difficult. And I do remember, I thought the Law Department, we were all working together to try and redistrict those?

- I see--

- Yes.

- Oh, if I can, sorry, if I can jump in?

- Go ahead.

- Unless Alder Dorff goes first. So yes, so I believe it was actually, so the revision of the food truck ordinance in general is something that's on the Law Department's to do list, which we all know is very long, but it is on there. We just haven't, obviously, we've had just higher priority things that have come ahead of that, particularly in the last year or so with the pandemic. So we weren't able to address it. But last year I believe we did pass an amendment to the ordinance that stripped away as much of the ordinance as possible and just left in the bare bones requirements we needed in order to adjust to the pandemic reality. So that was implemented last year. So as Alder Dorff was mentioning, the Law Department can certainly start looking into this a little bit more and just was asking for any recommendations, which I did note, to specifically look into those actual costs and work with the Clerk's Office as to what a reasonable fee should be for administrative costs.

- I'd like to make a comment, Mr. Stevens, whenever someone's--

- Go ahead, Alder.

- I think if we made, we should do a little checking, like our attorney said, the actual administrative costs, how much it costs to put everything in it. It wouldn't be out of the ordinary for a business to, in other words, it's not a real high fee. And I know there's quite a bit of paperwork involved. And so, they might want to look at what it actually costs to do all the paperwork for the staff and everything,

that we cover our costs there. And I know the \$500.00 fee is a lot of money, but maybe if we can get it more like \$100.00, that would be, cover some of our costs administrative-wise and make it so that people that are in on the food trucks that they'll be more in tune with what the city really wants. So that that'd be my recommendation, a \$100.00 fee. So they can write that on the books, as far as their information and take it with them right now. So thank you.

- Okay. Alder Steuer, then Alder Galvin.

- Thank you, Chair. I guess the question I had is with the permit, does the permit cover just the event that they're at? Or does it cover for a year? I just needed a clarification on that.

- I'm not sure what the timing of it is, but it actually licenses the actual, the establishment itself, so to be able to actually operate a mobile food vending business. So it's not per event.

- So it's a one time fee, per year, is it per year?

- No, it does renew, I think, on a yearly basis.

- Okay. Thank you.

- Mm hm.

- Alder Galvin?

- Thank you. I guess this would be a question for Attorney Bungert. The fees that we're charging, are these one of those fees where we're only allowed to charge what it actually costs to administer the license?

- Yes. So typically any fees that, I don't want to say any and all, but typically when a municipality charges fees for a permit or a license, unless that fee or permit is established by statute, we do have to justify the amount of the fee so as not to be making a profit, but to essentially be recouping the cost, maybe a smidgen above. So in order for it to be a defensible fee, it does have to accurately reflect what our administrative costs are in that fee. So essentially that we are paying back for time and hours of staff in reviewing paperwork, uploading...

- Okay. So as I understand it, it's the Health Department that's really licensing these trucks to be able to make and sell food out of it. Our interest is just to make sure that they're, probably that they've got a valid driver's license, that their vehicle is lawfully licensed. I would have, I'm not in the committee, but I don't think we can charge more than what it costs to actually do it. And that would be my suggestion to you, that your recommendation, if you're going to charge for a license, would be that just what it costs our staff to do it.

- Mm hm.

- Thank you.

- Yeah.

- Thank you. Alder Lefebvre?

- Yeah--

- No, oh, no, Alder Gerlach?

- Okay.

- Sorry.

- I just have a question, because I listen to these things and I just get more confused. Alder Dorff mentioned neighborhood associations wanting to bring in a food truck for an event, and I've experienced that too. So I thought you were saying that if the neighborhood association wanted to bring in a food truck, they would have to pay \$500.00 for a license. But now I think what you're saying is a food truck or a company food truck company owner, \$500.00 per year to run a food truck, and then they can go wherever a neighborhood association or somebody wants them to go to do it. Okay, so that's a totally different picture. I just wanted to make sure I understand it. Thank you.

- You're welcome. Alder Lefebvre?

- So in last year we reduced a lot of the fees, did we not, to help out businesses, for different fees? Did we reduce this fee? Or did, no it stayed? Okay. And then we redid a lot of the ordinance so that it helped not just the food trucks, but it was the restaurants in that, right? You said that we streamlined it, or?

- Right. We took away as many regulations as we could for the food trucks, just to allow them to operate a little easier. And so those changes were done. And then as far as reduction in fees for restaurants or "Class B" establishments, we did pass a temporary, it was a sunsetted provision, that allowed bars and restaurants to sell intoxicating liquor in their original package to help them sell off some inventory while they were shut down. And then we also reduced the liquor license renewal fees down to their statutory minimums.

- Mm hm. Right. So the food trucks, the fees stayed the same. But now you're saying, too, because we took a lot of the, out of the ordinance for these food trucks, then our time spent on it, you streamlined it quite a bit. So it shouldn't take that long for us, especially if we say, Brown County has the Health Department, they'll do the main part. And then all we have to do is just make sure that the food trucks have the license from Brown County, it's just a checkup. So then we should be able to reduce that fee, I would think, way down to even like the 25 or the 50, so maybe we should make it a motion that we would ask staff to look at the ordinance itself to make sure everything is okay on that, and then our fee. Would that be a proper motion?

- When looking and reducing the fee amounts, staff essentially would be discussing with the Clerk's Office to actually look what the tasks look like in taking in and reviewing the application, if other departments need to be consulted, reviewed, and what all goes into the process of reviewing and approving the application, and then coming up with what an actual number of hours would be and then translating that into a cost.

- That'd be great.
- All right, okay, I have a question, or I guess, clarification, Joanne?
- Mm hm.
- So Brown County Health Department already issues a permit to food trucks?
- For the purpose of vending food. So like it's inspected to make sure that it's clean, they're abiding by sanitary guidelines, and so forth, because it is--
- And they also do that for brick and mortar buildings? Restaurants?
- Correct.
- And Green Bay does not do that for brick and mortar?
- No, we don't do that at all. It's Brown County Health Department that regulates the--
- Yes, they regulate all of the food businesses. So why does the city want to regulate a food truck if Brown County is already doing it?
- Because they don't regulate the truck itself, they don't regulate and make sure that the person is licensed. They don't regulate to make sure that the person, the license has sufficient vehicle insurance on the truck. Doesn't have potential violations and convictions for offenses that essentially relate, like driving under the influence, that could potentially indicate that the person may not be able to safely drive or operate a vehicle like that on our right of way.
- So, do we know if Brown County does all that? Before they get the permit?
- No. No, the Health Department, all they're doing is making sure that the facility is safe for the service of food to humans, to the public.
- Alder Stevens, I'd like to make one comment.
- They're not checking anything else with respect to the person. And then also, we also have some historical perspective. Previously, a lot of the regulations also had to do with location, because I believe the discussions at that point had a lot to do with concerns of local brick and mortar restaurants and food trucks parking, for example, directly across from a restaurant and potentially driving business away. So a lot of the public input and discussions that arose initially when the food truck ordinance was passed several years ago, was designating areas where food trucks can operate so as to not create potential conflict or unhealthy business competition with brick and mortar restaurants. So it's regulating where this business is conducted to make sure that it's beneficial for the city at large. And then also to make sure that the business is being operated in a safe and responsible manner.
- But a brick and mortar, we don't oversee them?

- Not restaurants, but bars we do.
- Right, restaurants.
- We oversee, right. Which a lot of our restaurants have alcohol served at them. There aren't that many that don't. So the ones that do have alcohol, we're regulating the license and making sure that the person--
- Sure, I understand.
- That the building is, right, okay.
- Okay, Alder Galvin, then Alder Lefebvre.
- Attorney Bungert, but do restaurants have to get a permit from the city to operate that business?
- No, the city does, not a straight restaurant. If they don't have a liquor license, if it's food only, it will go through Building Inspections, I believe, to make sure that they have, they're in compliance with all zoning regulations. And then they have to have the go ahead from, or the green light, from the County Health Department to make sure that they have all of the requirements and mechanisms in place to meet those codes.
- Okay. Craig, we had an individual that wanted to obtain a permit to sell ice cream out of a truck several years ago. The reason why it became an issue was because he had several convictions. He was issued a permit and he ended up selling drugs out of the truck. Anyway, but, and I'm not saying that's what's gonna happen here, but for that purpose, that's why the city has to know who's in these trucks, who's operating them, like trucks coming in here from outside the area, flooding the area with no control as to where they set up or how long they set up, or if they're trespassing on people's property. Or like the attorney said, there was some real angst with some of the restaurants when trucks were setting up literally right in front of their establishment, so taking their customers. And you've got taxpayers, restaurant owners paying taxes for that property, and here their business is going away. And so there has to be a certain amount of regulation, but like I had said before, I think the fee we should be charging should only be just what it costs to get them licensed and get them permitted and on the road and selling.
- Well, I agree with you on part zero.
- That's all right.
- Who was next? Alder Lefebvre or Mark Steuer?
- Alder Vander Leest wanted to talk before, that's okay, I had something else to say, but I'm not gonna.
- Okay, I'll just make one quick comment. I think we need regulation on the food trucks. We want outside venues coming in that aren't licensed, and this can keep a tab on them. It just makes for good sense. And as far as, whatever the administrative cost is, we shouldn't lose any money on the paperwork that has to be done and we should make it so that the City of Green Bay doesn't lose

money and whatever it costs for the administrative work to be done on licensing, that's what they should pay. Not anything less, not a reduced figure. These are businesses and the businesses that are running. In other words, all the regulations that they have. So I think the food trucks should be accountable as well. And I support the licensing of them, just as we've been talking about it, our attorney has been talking about, and the cost that, whenever it incurs on the administrative part of it, that's what they should be paying. Thank you.

- All right. Thank you. Alder Steuer, then Alder Dorff.

- Thank you, Chair. I know this ordinance, we worked on that for a while some years ago, and I agree with most of the comments made that they, taking business from other restaurants and things on that order. So part of it, it sounds like it, could be a combination of neighborhood associations, where you'd have a food truck come in to probably a residential neighborhood. You have food truck days in different areas. Food trucks are here to stay. That's part of society. Things are changing. People like the concept of having food trucks around. So I think that we've gotta work around it or figure that out. I think making sure of the regulation, or if there's any felonies or anything, misdemeanors, felonies, I should say, we need to look at that as well. My concern would be the location, where these food trucks would be. So if that's part of the research, if we send this back to the staff to look at, part of the research would be like, where could we locate these trucks in a reasonable manner? There might be setbacks. You might have to be X amount of feet away from a commercial area, things on that order. And I thought the ordinance kind of talked about that already. So if we refer this back to staff, I would really like to have them look at the location of where these trucks would be and the timeframe, that type of thing. Thank you.

- Thank you. Alder Dorff?

- I just wanted to say that this has been a healthy discussion. My intent was to get it referred to staff so that we could wait until Alder Johnson was here to have the healthy discussion, so we'll probably have to have this healthy discussion yet again. Please asking if you guys would just mind voting on referring it to staff, and then we'll talk when staff comes back with something? Thank you.

- Sounds good.

- I'll entertain a motion.

- I'll make that motion, to refer it to staff.

- Is there a second?

- Second.

- All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- It was fun talking about it.

- It is.

- It was.
- And I'm sure Brian will watch the video.
- Maybe.
- On YouTube.
- You ready, Joanne?
- All right. Item number 10. Yep.
- All right.
- Good, number 10. Consideration with possible action on a request by Alder Galvin to reexamine the municipal fine for possession of marijuana. Alder Galvin?
- Thanks, folks. And I'm not looking for a real deep discussion on this tonight. What I'm looking for is for staff to do a little work on adjusting the fines. And the reason I bring this up, I did have a constituent that reached out to me and asked me to put forward a communication to either not enforce or reduce the fine to like a dollar. I'm not in agreement with that, and we had a discussion about it. But I did realize after reading several articles on fines and how they affect the people of a community, that when I found out, I asked the police, they've got a fine, I think, set at \$500.00 plus costs. And I think that was reduced to that from a higher fine, I'm not sure. But when you figure in the costs, that's over \$800.00. And I just wanna put it in perspective. If I'm making \$15.00 an hour, that's what, 80, 120 bucks a day. You're gonna have an \$800.00 fine, you're basically taking over a week's worth of wages from someone. And they pay the fine and everything. But in today's day and age, we know someone making \$15.00 an hour is probably living paycheck to paycheck. And although the municipal judge has the right to reduce that fine, if the person goes to court, a lot of people don't do that. They don't have the money, so they don't pay the fine, they end up with a warrant. They end up going to jail to pay the fine. The city pays a turnkey fee of close to 50 bucks or more every day they're in jail. It's just a, the person loses their job. They have their license revoked. They can't get to work by car. And I'm just thinking that maybe we need to be a little bit more realistic when we're fining people. And if we can figure out a way, average wage, something, we're not charging people or costing people such a large sum of their money. Sure, let's, I mean, it's supposed to be a little bit of a punishment to get that ticket. And then that's all it is, you can't go in jail or anything else for it, it's a fine. The only way you go to jail is if you don't pay it and you end up with a warrant. But to hit someone with a ticket that's gonna cost them up to two weeks worth of wages, in some cases, to me is, I think, over the top. And we certainly can't expect the officers to fill out a form and find out how much the guy's making at the time or anything else like that. So I'm wondering if we could adjust our ordinance so that we come up with a fine that, say it's \$60.00 for the first offense plus costs, something like that, to keep it within a reality that this person who has gotten a ticket and is found guilty, can't pay. And I know our judge also gives them time to pay it. But again, when you've got an \$800.00 ticket hanging over your head, that's a long time to have it hanging there. So I'm just asking if staff can, if we can recommend a staff to look into this and try and come up with some options or ideas moving forward with this.

- Thank you. So, Alder Scannell, I thought we reduced this fine to like 50 bucks?

- No no.

- Can you clarify that?

- It was like over a thousand or something, we reduced it to 500.00.

- Okay.

- And I'm all for sending this to staff to see if there's more we can do. The reason we settled at 500.00 was a couple of reasons. One, we wanted to get buy in from the PD and from staff. And they felt that 500.00 was, they still need, for example, our city attorney wanted to have it at 500.00 so that he had wiggle room to negotiate with someone that they would then, instead of contesting it, which would then cost the city, they would be more willing to plead guilty for a reduced fine, that the city would then lower it more or something, part of a negotiation tactic. And then PD at the time felt that going less than 500 was just too, I dunno, they didn't want to do it. I'm all for, if we can get, I always looked at it as a first step. And if we're ready to take another step of reducing this even more, that's fine by me, as long as we can get buy-in from PD and staff as to what's practical, what works for everybody. Super.

- All right. Thank you for that clarification.

- Alder Stevens, I'd like to make a comment, whenever you have, the people ahead of me go ahead.

- Right? Staff, but I also think we should also know how many fines were issued and how many of those were reduced by city, from the attorney's office. Alder Steuer had his hand raised,

- Thank you, Chair. I was gonna ask Attorney Bungert, it might be a silly question, but I know Alder Galvin brought up the fact of the pay. I guess there was an assumption maybe there that the folks maybe aren't making a lot of money or that they might be in a different financial bracket, as opposed to others, and there's people that have money that get busted for this as well. So I'm just wondering if there's anything that you've ever seen that will relate the fine to the percentage or what kind of salary they're making. I know that sounds like a reach, I know, like this should be a one size fits all, I would think that. But I'm just wondering if there's anything out there that would prorate it according to that? Am I correct in, you're nodding your head.

- I do believe there are some, and I think maybe this is at the Circuit Court Level, to file as an indigent person, someone who doesn't have any source of income. But I'm not entirely sure if that's an option at the municipal level. And as far as our numbers, as far as how many of these citations were reduced, I think we could possibly look into that to see what records we have within the last year, as far as how many possession of THC citations there were, how many were contested, how many were negotiated down? However, the numbers are, I do have the actual numbers of what the bond amount was previously. So previously, our max forfeiture amount was 1,000.00. So we reduced that to 500.00. But with costs that was 1,321.00 down to 691.00, because there's the citation amount plus court costs for the ticket, if they contest. So the bond amount that was set by the judge previously under the old \$1,000.00 max forfeiture was 880.00. So the ticket was 650, or the ticket itself, the citation amount was 650 plus costs, a total of 880. Following the amendment of our

ordinance, the bond. Amount of 502, so that's a ticket of three. That is what the police officer defers to, \$350.00 plus costs, so it's a total of 502.00. So that's how that's currently is in place.

- Did we make a motion on this? I don't think so?

- I'd like to make a comment before we make any motions.

- Okay. I'm good.

- Alder Vander Leest?

- I might want to remind the city council and our committee, that there was a long discussion on this already. They had a woman come up there and mention that her daughter was killed by a person that was using marijuana for the whole day. Her daughter was killed by this person and her daughter's not with us now. And she made that comment that she didn't think anything should, I think the city council did a reputable thing. They reduced the fines down, and they're working with Brown County and the surrounding communities. And I think that as far as reducing anything down, people that are under the influence of alcohol, they get pulled over, they get a fine. They don't ask them how much money they're earning. They're driving erratically, they get pulled over. And if they're using marijuana and they're driving the same way, they get pulled over for the same thing. And these are situations that are very serious, as far as, this woman lost her daughter, from a person that was using marijuana. The guy admitted that he was using marijuana the whole day, and he piled into the person. So, I think as far as reducing the fines, you might want to look at more education methods, not reducing fines. In other words, drunk driving, you talk about drunk driving, driving under the influence of marijuana is just as serious as drunk driving. So I think that they should look at more educational things as far as how we can reduce some of these situations rather than reducing the fines. We want to make it not sound like it's not serious. Anybody that's driving under the influence of alcohol or marijuana use--

- Point of order. We're not talking about driving under the influence. We're not talking about driving under the influence. I'm talking about simple possession. A guy on the street, he's got a joint, whatever. We don't even fine people for being intoxicated while walking down the street.

- Well that's fine. What I'm saying is this, that--

- If that person that killed that girl who was smoking marijuana was probably charged with a felony and was adjudicated that way, the same as a drunk driver. I'm talking about the person with a little bit of marijuana on the street. We solve nothing. I did police work for 35 years, and we never changed the possession of marijuana on the amount of people using it one iota. Okay, we didn't change it one iota. We had prohibition on alcohol back in the thirties. We didn't change anything there. This horse has left the barn. We can't close the door on it. We can do what we can. But I'm talking about to take a person and have them, would you want a person to lose their job for simple possession of marijuana? You want them to lose their apartment and become homeless and become a drain on society? This is what I'm talking about when we have fines this high. That's all I'm talking about. I'm not saying we decriminalize it or anything else like that. We just make the fine more appropriate to what the common person can afford. If you want to put in a scale in there where first offense is like 60 bucks, second offense is 120, third offense is 180, so if they're not getting the message, their fines go up, I'm okay with that. But I'm just saying, to charge someone over \$600.00, which is a month's rent for many people around here, it makes no sense because they can't afford it. They're not gonna

pay it. And we're gonna end up with a whole lot of other problems with this person. That's that's all my concern is. Thank you.

- I think that we should find out the number that are being arrested first, before we do anything. How many people are being arrested for having one joint? Are they arresting the people? It's up to the police officer, his discretion, if he's gonna arrest you, if you have one joint in your pocket. I think that has to be all weighed in. We should be talking about our law enforcement that is doing the job right now. Are they arresting people for one joint in their pocket or not? And if they are, we want to hear the numbers. How many people have been arrested since the first of the year on these kinds of offenses, before we vote on anything. Thank you.

- Lieutenant.

- I was just gonna say, if you like, yes, I could get you numbers for the next meeting or get them over to the Law Department on how many citations we write. Once again, it is up to the officer's discretion. Do some officers find people in possession of a small amount of marijuana and not write them the ticket? Yes. Other times are they cited? It's normally because there's extenuating circumstances. There are other things that are going on. But I can either bring it back to the committee, or Attorney Bungert, the amount of citations that we wrote. Just give me the timeframe that you would like them, if it's this calendar year or in the past couple years, just let me know and we could get that data for you.

- All right. Thank you. So I have one comment. I don't know who can answer this. So we always say that it's always up to the discretion of the police officer when it comes down to tickets. Can Common Council recommend a ticket be issued no matter what? Lieutenant?

- No no. We would not want to take that authority away from our officers. To me, you're going down a very slippery slope where you're having the legislative branch of government dictate what the officers are gonna do. Here at the PD, we don't even set policy dictating that certain citations get issued because every situation is unique and different. So I would be very strongly against that.

- I just wanted to know. But Joanne, I see you had your hand up.

- Yes. So Lieutenant Mahoney said that that would be beyond the purview of the authority of the council. The council can set the ordinance, but they can't direct officers or the police department to act in a certain way or act in accordance to the direction of council.

- I just asked because we have all these issues, we always ask the police department, please help, but it comes down to the discretion of the officer. So that's why I'm just asking the question.

- We absolutely could ask--

- Alder Stevens?

- The chief to direct his officers to increase enforcement and things like that. We certainly control the police department budget, if push came to shove. It's a give and take, but no, you can't mandate or create an ordinance or anything else that would force the officers to be making arrests or things like that.

- Okay. Thank you for clarifying. But Alder Dorff had her hand raised.
- Thank you. Now I'm very supportive of what Alder Galvin has brought up and what Alder Scannell had brought up in the past, of reducing the fines. And I just, again, want to say that it would be nice if we could wait, we're referring this to staff, right? To do some research and maybe we could have a more robust discussion after we get some of those answers from staff? Thank you.
- All right. Well, I'll entertain a motion to refer to staff.
- I'd like to make a motion to refer it back to staff for another robust discussion. Maybe we can mix too, but anyway.
- Joanne was here, she heard everything. So maybe she'll come back with lots of information.
- Second.
- All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Oh, can't hear you.
- I was worried this was gonna go up in smoke.
- Joanne, we can't hear you.
- She checked out. There's a time limit.
- Now?
- Yeah.
- Can you hear me now?
- Yes yes.
- Yes? Okay. So that was a motion by Alder Steuer.
- Alder Steuer.
- A second by--
- A second by Alder Lefebvre.
- Lefebvre.
- I'm sorry. My connection timed out and I did not hear. All right, so refer to staff. Okay. All right.

Onto item number 11.

- Consideration with possible action on a request by Alder Brunette to consider a refund of inspection fees for 2593 Sumac Place.

- Chair?

- I understand that this needs to be held?

- Yeah, I talked to Alder Brunette today. And he mentioned that there are some things that they're working out yet. So he wants to hold this to our next meeting.

- Second.

- And I'll make that motion.

- Second by? Alder Vander Leest?

- Yes.

- Do we want to do it for our first meeting in August or the second? Probably the second?

- August 23rd. Yeah, let's do that.

- All right.

- August 23rd.

- You okay with that, Alder Vander Leest?

- Yes I am.

- All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- All right.

- So can I quick ask a question? So then our first one in August is the 9th, our meeting?

- Yes.

- Okay. Thank you.

- All right. We are on to the informational items. Liquor violation report.

- Lieutenant?

- We have no violations to report during this timeframe. I do want to let the alders know, some of you probably received phone calls from constituents about certain activities going on along Main Street. I do want to let you know, we are forming a game plan to deal with those establishments, to work together to solve the noise problems and various other things that are going on. But for now, there are no violations to report.
- All right. Thank you. I'll entertain a motion.
- Motion to receive and place on file.
- Second.
- I just--
- All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- I just wanted a clarification as far as what area along Main Street?
- It's pretty much right along where Crown & Commons, Duel Sports, the Pomp's Tire area. There's Cock and Bull in there.
- Okay, all right.
- So between Roosevelt, around that area.
- Okay. Thank you.
- Ready, Joanne?
- All right, and the report on homelessness.
- Lieutenant Allen, you're muted.
- Yeah, if you have the latest update from Melissa, we're tracking basically the same people. We have two that are really racking up some time for us. Number six, I talk with them two or three times a week. This guy is probably not gonna engage and he's just a big drinker. But, I try to catch him in the morning and talk with him. I believe the other one was down, number 19. He has a . Was currently checked into CTC and getting some help. So hopefully that gets turned around. Is there any questions on St. John's or anything?
- I have one question or comment. So it's July. If I recall right, we started this program with St. John's to use the park. I thought we were supposed to get clarification on how it's going through with the church? Wasn't that supposed to come to us in July?
- Yeah. Did Alder Galvin or Alder Lefebvre bring that forward?

- I think that was at council. I know I had talked to Commander Warych, James from Parks. We had talked about the calls, some of the calls that were there and the uptick in calls, which are basically being manufactured by the staff from Mike and St. John's. If they see a problem or they have an unwanted party at the park, they want to escort it out or keep the peace type thing. We've been over there for that.

- Alder Lefebvre?

- I didn't bring it forward, I don't believe. But yeah, we do want to hear from St. John's and see how they feel it's going.

- Okay.

- Okay, so I wasn't mistaken? I thought that was supposed to be here in July for us.

- Yeah, I'm not sure if that was July, but I know Commander Warych, I had spoke with James, Commander Warych, and I believe Will Peters from the City, and they were compiling and getting together that report for you.

- Okay.

- So thank you, Alder Lefebvre. So question for the Attorney, do we need to put a communication forward requesting St. John's to come to P and P? Or can we just say they should be here for our next meeting to discuss how that program is going?

- I believe, I'm not sure what department actually entered into the relationship with St John's. But then it would be that department to just reach out to them and invite them. We don't have any authority to compel their attendance. We don't have any subpoena powers or anything like that.

- But when we approved the St John's program, it was one of the clarifications that in July, we were supposed to get a report from them on how it's going.

- Again, I'm not sure where, what program it was that was, was that through the police department or? Which is why I'm probably drawing a blank on this.

- No no, St. John's came, they gave us this big marketing thing about how they're gonna help the homeless within the park, and common council agreed upon that.

- Right, I think it was a Parks and Rec program, essentially, yes? That's why I'm not familiar with it, unless St. John's made that presentation to council, but I don't believe it came through P and P.

- Right.

- No, it didn't come through P and P, but there was supposed to be a directive to P and P in July to tell us how that program is moving along?

- If that's correct, I can follow up with Director Ditscheit to try to find out where that report is, because that hasn't been brought to my attention.

- Right. If we could get that on the next P and P, that'd be great. Right, Alder Steuer.

- I agree. I agree.

- Okay. Alder Gerlach and then Alder Galvin.

- Is it possible that that was a directive that they are to report to the council at the end of July, rather than to P and P? I don't remember.

- I thought I went to P and P, but I could be mistaken.

- That was to committee, and then eventually to council. Well, anyhow.

- Well, Joanne can look. Alder Galvin?

- Thank you. And again, my concern is, my whole concern this whole time has been with the compliant, homeless individuals, mainly who are suffering from a long list of maladies, such as, mental health illness, addiction issues, things like that. I did go out with Lieutenant Allen one morning and he visited three people. And it brought a lot of memories back to me, of the individuals I used to deal with. It just seems to me that there seems to be more of them, or at least they're more concentrated and focused where their services are. We had a very long presentation from, I can't remember, what was the name of it? On homelessness, that community foundation, who's working with Brown County? And I guess, I think our PD and our Park Department is doing everything that they can. My concern at that time back then was what is the county, with Health and Human Services, that's their specialty area. And now the community foundation is kicking in. I guess I'd love to, if we get, instead of the broad thing we had, if we could get some information from them on what they plan on doing to help the city with these chronic, non-compliant, homeless people. Again, it's a small number, but they're the ones that everyone sees on the streets. I just forwarded some pictures to Lieutenant Allen from a constituent that has seen several instances of individuals sleeping in the parks, on the ground, not just at St John's, but other nearby parks. And these people need help. And I'm just wondering what help can we expect from not only Brown County, but also from this housing coalition organization that's put itself together? Thank you.

- Lieutenant Allen?

- Yeah, you got Captain Allen you sent those pictures to, but they got to me.

- Ha, okay.

- But it's fine, though. But yeah, so you sent me the picture of the gentleman in the red, and this is probably something just for consideration or just to put in the back of your head right now. The guy that was laying in the park that had the red sweatshirt on?

- Mm hm, yeah?

- His name is Bernard. And I have just less than a handful of guys in his situation. He works, he has like a temp agency, he works through SEEK. And he works like a second shift. They're like a power

shift, like we did at the PD.

- Sure.

- He makes it back to St. John's at like two or three o'clock in the morning, gets a couple hours of sleep in there. And then he's booted out at 6:00, due to their conditional permit, they have to be out at a certain time. They can come in at 10:00 and then they're out there at 6:00 or 7:00. Then he goes over to the park and then gets his sleep and then does it all over again, goes back to work. I guess, maybe something for consideration or just some food for thought, that maybe that, to adjust St John's conditional permit for people like that, that they can verify that they are employed, they're moving forward, they're doing the right thing, that they can open up a room with, say five to eight beds in there, and they can get their sleep and get to work and assist them in moving forward.

- Right, but the--

- There are, as far as the unsheltered homeless, we are hovering right about 20 right now. And then Wednesday, I think about 11:00 at night or midnight, St John's and a group are going out and doing what's called the pit count. And they're gonna go out and see and find as many unsheltered homeless as they can, to try and verify, hey, do we have, and we're hovering around this 20. We feel pretty confident we're at that 20, or if we have more.

- Okay. Lieutenant Allen, as it regards Bernard. And that's a tough situation.

- Yeah, it is.

- Is he able to stay at Pastor Reacco's place, over on, what is it, Chicago and Clay?

- I'd have to look into that. I'm not real familiar with it. I think it's come up in discussion a couple of times, but I'm not real familiar with that place. Mostly it's concentrated with St. John's, Newcap, and then New Community.

- Sure. He's running a shelter for men. He does charge them a fee to stay there, but it's pretty minimal.

- Okay.

- And then they also do ADOA counseling and things like that. But the main thing you have to do is you have to have a job, and it sounds like Bernard has got a job. So he's got all the pluses going for him.

- Yeah.

- That might be a place in that, he'd probably be better served there. But I do like your idea that, if you do have some transitional people and they just need a place to sleep because they are working, but don't have enough money to get a place yet. Like a good idea too, but that would be a future communication that we'd have to do.

- Yeah. And that's just food for thought. And you guys kick that around and see what you think about

it. If you guys need to approach Lexi and Matt, and speak to them about that, I'm more than happy to set that meeting up with whoever would like to have that discussion with them.

- Okay. Thank you.

- Alder Lefebvre?

- Yeah, and I think some of the others, because the way they change the laws, like especially mental, people, you can't commit them anymore. It's actually, some of it's for their own safety and everything, but we can't do that. So some of these people, we're gonna have them, and there's nothing that you can really do if they're so resistant to any help? They're probably so far gone. That's why I think that program at St. James Park was a good one because they're trying to get to these people, especially earlier ones. So not so set in their ways that it's hard for them to change, but they're trying to get to these people so that we can maybe kind of get some of them. And it's gonna take awhile, because this has been going on so long. And for awhile, we just ignored this situation. And then we tried and it's gonna take awhile on this. But yeah, anything we can do to help these people, I'm all for it. I think that, I'm glad that, Alder Galvin, you brought that up about the other shelter. Yeah, I remember when he came forward with that, that was a good program and I'm hoping he can be helped. And would we, now the city dictates for the homeless shelter, right? St John's?

- They have a conditional use permit.

- Yeah, their times, do we have, or do they set their times?

- That's in the CUP, the times of operation and when they can open, when they can close, and everything else.

- Okay, so then you're saying, yeah, there has to be another communication someone has to put in that we can ask to have that changed for certain situations. Is that right? Alder Galvin?

- Yes, we would have to, We'd have to set up a meeting with them and talk over proposals and then see if we can get it through the committee.

- Okay. So how would we go? Who should go about that? How should we go about that? Let's get that started.

- Well, the Lieutenant has certainly arranged a meeting with Lexi, and for interested alders, to get involved with it. And we can listen to what the police have to say and what the shelter operators have to say. And the CUP could be massaged, to make it easier for individuals like Bernard, to be able to have a place to stay during the day so they can get some sleep.

- Yeah, Alder, can I ask Alder Galvin if you'd be willing--

- Sure.

- To work on that? Okay.

- Mark?

- I think basically Alder Lefebvre took all the words out of my mouth.

- All right, perfect.

- So there you go.

- I do, one comment, then Alder Gerlach can have. So Lieutenant Allen, I want to thank you for sharing that information about the gentleman in the red sweatshirt. It's nice to hear that something positive in all the negatives that have been happening.

- So thank you.

- Yeah. Actually it was just less than an handful of guys of that type. That's really the only thing I can come up with at this point is maybe see if the City's willing to massage that a little bit, just for those types of people, that Micah and St John's would be very strict about week to week verifying employment.

- Sure, yeah, glad the guy's working. So if we can help him get sleep eight hours, it'd be perfect.

- I just want to make sure that I'm clear and everybody's clear that I think there are two completely different kinds of reports being discussed here. The one that, Alder Stevens, that you said was supposed to be given tonight by the program in St. John's Park, that, if I understand correctly, that was simply to report on their use of the park. And whether it was a good decision to let them use the park for that program.

- Correct.

- That didn't have anything to do with this report on police time being invested or about whether somebody, by the way, I think I've seen Bernard sleeping in the park at St John's, but, I think they we're talking about two different things. The reason I bring this up is that I know the people who run the program in St. John's, and you might remember that I was very supportive of it. And I want to make sure that we're not mixing the two. And that you remember that you were asking for a report from that group about their use of the park, specifically. Do I have that right?

- You are correct. Yes.

- Okay, thank you.

- Yeah. St John's was supposed to come back and give us a report. Any other questions? If not, I will entertain a motion to receive and place on file.

- Receive and place--

- Motion to receive and place on file.

- I'll second.

- All in favor.
- [All] Aye.
- [Joanne] I'm sorry. Can we just repeat what the, if Alder Stevens could repeat who the motion was made by and seconded?
- Receive and place on file.
- [Joanne] Just because our, for our , we're not gonna be able to tell.
- I did not understand a word she said.
- It was Vander Leest and Steuer.
- [Joanne] Can you repeat who made the motion and who seconded the motion for the record?
- I motioned.
- I seconded it, Steuer.
- [Joanne] Thank you.
- We all said aye, right?
- Aye.
- Yes.
- All in favor? Aye.
- Aye aye aye.
- Well, thank you for the conversations tonight. So, I'll entertain a motion for adjournment?
- Motion to adjourn.
- Second.
- All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Aye aye aye.
- Have a good evening.
- Good evening, everybody.

