00001	
2	CITY OF MILWAUKEE
3	LICENSES COMMITTEE
4	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
5	
6	In the Matter of the auto wrecker application for:
7	EDWARD TALYANSKY Agent for MIDWEST AUTO RECYCLING, LLC 2431 North 30th Street
8	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
9	
10	COMMITTEE MEMBERS
11	ALD. JAMES WITKOWIAK - Chair ALD. JAMES BOHL, JR., - Vice-Chairman ALD. TERRY WITKOWSKI
12	ALD. ROBERT PUENTE
13	LICENSING DIVISION by REBECCA BARRON NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES by TOM WESSEL
14	HEALTH DEPARTMENT by PAUL ZEMKE POLICE DEPARTMENT by SEARGENT CHET ULICKEY
15 16	OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY by ATTORNEY BRUCE SCHRIMPF
17 18 19 20 21	Proceedings had and testimony given in the above-entitled matter, before the LICENSES COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF MILWAUKEE, on the 29th day of October, 2007.

00002	
1	PROCEEDINGS
2	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: In the 15th
3	District, Edward Talyansky, Agent for "Midwest
4	Auto Recycling, LLC," Auto Wrecker application
5	for "Midwest Auto Recycling" at 2431 North 30th
6	Street. Good afternoon.
7	MR. RANDALL: Good afternoon.
8	(Whereupon the Applicant was sworn.)
9	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Your name and
10	address for the record, please.
11	THE APPLICANT: 930 East Wabash Place,
12	Bayside.
13	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: What's your
14	address?
15	THE APPLICANT: 930 East Wabash Place,
16	Bayside.
17	MR. RANDALL: 930.
18	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: 930. Okay. And
19	your name, for the record?
20	THE APPLICANT: Edward Talyansky.
21	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Okay, Edward.
22	Thank you. Neighborhood Services?
23	DNS: We have a hold for occupancy
24	permit and to comply to department orders to
25	provide for an inspection of the premises.

00003 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Okay. Health 1 2 Department, you don't inspect these places, do you? 4 HEALTH: No. 5 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: State your 6 presence for the record, please. 7 MR. RANDALL: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, 8 members of the Committee, Brian Randall, Attorney with Friebert, Finnerty and St. John, 330 E. 9 10 Kilbourn Avenue. And Alderman Bohl, my cell 11 phone is off. John Finnerty may have turned it 12 on and flipped it in my pocket. And the other 13 question I have for the committee is whether any 14 of Mr. Schrimpf's cupcakes are still left in the 15 back room. 16 MR. SCHRIMPF: They are, as a matter of 17 fact. 18 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Yes, they are. 19 MR. RANDALL: That's amazing. I - - I 20 really give you a lot of credit for catching up 21 as far as making this meeting on time today. I 22 know you've had a long day, and we hope not to 23 take too much longer than our allotted 15 24 minutes, but I suspect I may need a few minutes

25

past that.

00004 1 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Okay. Mr. 2 Randall, does your client admit to receiving notice in the mail there's a possibility that 4 your application could be denied because of items 5 contained on the police report? And objections 6 stated that if this applicant is granted a 7 license that operating an auto wrecker in the 8 City of Milwaukee without the required licenses 9 is in the applicant's previous record and 10 operating a business, that these items - - that 11 these items may cause this committee to - - to 12 deny this application. 13 MR. RANDALL: He does, and I've seen 14 it. 15 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Okay. Sergeant, 16 the police report, please? 17 SERGEANT ULICKEY: On 7/28 of '03 at 18 ten a.m. Mid City Auto Salvage received a 19 citation for non-registration of auto. Was found 20 quilty and fined a 75.20. 21 On 7/28 of '03 at ten a.m. Mid City 22 Auto Salvage received a citation for failure to 23 display vehicle license plates at 2100 West North 24 Avenue. They were found guilty and fined 50 dollars and 40 cents.

25

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

On 6/15 of '06 at 9:47 a.m. Milwaukee Police were sent to 2431 North 30th, Mid City Auto Salvage, regarding a license premise check. Officer spoke to the manager identified as Sean Williams Braden, who was not able to provide officers with the documents that the Auto Salvage had obtained a license for junk collecting and auto wrecking. Braden was issued citations for operating auto wrecker business without a license and operating junk collection or dealer business without a license. The owners, Edward and Alfred Talyansky were out of town and unable to be contacted. As to the citations issued to Mr. Braden, he was found guilty of both counts and fined 165 dollars and 320 dollars respectively. On 6/16 of '06 at 1:30 p.m. Milwaukee Police were sent to 2431 North 30 to perform a license premise check - - Excuse me - - at Mid City Auto Salvage. Officers found the business was in operation, observed several tow trucks delivering junked motor vehicles to the yard. Officers located one of the owners, Alfred Talyansky, who was on the premise. Investigation revealed that the business was operating without

a junk collectors license, and operating an auto

2.4

wrecker business without a license. Alfred Talyansky was issued both citations for the two violations, operating a junk - - without a junk collectors license, and operating a wrecker without a license - - or wrecker business, I should say. He was found guilty of both and fined 320 and 165 dollars.

On 6/19 of '06 Milwaukee Police conducted a license premise check at Mid City Auto Salvage. Officers spoke with Sean Braden who was the manager on the scene. Braden advised officers that they have applied for a license and showed officers a license application dated November 25th of 2005. Braden also provided officers with an expired auto wrecker license, an expired junk collectors license, both of which expired on April 30th of '03. Officers then issued Braden two citations for the above offenses, because the business was still actively collecting junk autos. They were found guilty of both citations and fined for both.

On 6/20 of '06 Alfred Talyansky received two citations for operating an auto wrecker business without a license and operating a junk collection or dealer business without a

00007	
1	license. Was found guilty of both counts and
2	fined 320 dollars and 165 dollars.
3	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Do you have any
4	questions about the police report?
5	MR. RANDALL: The only question I had
6	was a copy, I think, in the packet there were
7	five items related to Alfred Talyansky, one
8	through five. I believe those were on the
9	printed version we had, but not part of your oral
10	report.
11	SERGEANT ULICKEY: That's correct.
12	MR. RANDALL: So those are no longer in
13	the file?
14	SERGEANT ULICKEY: Well, they are in
15	the file, yes, but we typically I only read
16	five years back.
17	MR. RANDALL: Okay.
18	SERGEANT ULICKEY: I could include
19	those, if you like. I mean, I could read those.
20	MR. RANDALL: I don't think that's
21	necessary. They They have it in writing.
22	I'm going to briefly address them.
23	The only final question then, just to
24	clarify. In that police department record search
25	there was nothing personally on Edward Talyansky

00008	
1	or Midwest Auto Recycling, LLC, was there?
2	SERGEANT ULICKEY: As As I
3	mentioned, he was listed as an officer
4	MR. RANDALL: Of Mid City Auto.
5	SERGEANT ULICKEY: of Mid City.
6	MR. RANDALL: Right. Okay. Thank you.
7	Those are the only questions I had of the
8	Sergeant.
9	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Okay. Alderman
10	Puente moves to make the entire police report
11	part of the permanent record in this hearing.
12	Hearing no objections, so ordered.
13	Do you want to give us some Do you
14	want to give us some opening comments here?
15	MR. RANDALL: I would be happy to, Mr.
16	Chairman. Although I do know there is one
17	individual who in who wishes to speak in
18	support of the application, and I believe he's
19	here on his own time out of work, and so, I would
20	invite, if it's agreeable with the committee, for
21	Leroy Holmes to speak. And then if he wishes to,
22	he can leave and and get back to his job.
23	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Okay. Is there a
24	Mr. Holmes in the audience here?
25	THE WITNESS: Yes.

00009	
1	MR. RUNNER: Mr. Chairman, may I
2	interject?
3	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Oh, go ahead.
4	MR. RUNNER: I wonder if this is
5	relevant, but if Mr. Holmes is an employee
6	employee of Midwest.
7	MR. RANDALL: He's not.
8	MR. RUNNER: He's not?
9	MR. RANDALL: No, he's not.
10	MR. RUNNER: All right, then. Thank
11	you.
12	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Okay. Sir, could
13	you come up here and we'll take your testimony?
14	Is there While we're on this, is there anyone
15	else here to testify relative to Midwest Auto
16	Recycling license application at at 2431
17	North 30th Street? Let the record show no one
18	else acknowledges that question. Sir, if you
19	raise your right hand, we can swear you in.
20	(Whereupon the witness was sworn.)
21	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Your name and
22	address for the record, please.
23	THE WITNESS: Leroy Holmes, 4700 West
24	Capitol Drive.
25	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: And, Mr. Holmes,

00010 1 what - - what is - - How close do you live to this location? THE WITNESS: About - - About 40 blocks 4 or so. Maybe a little further than that. 5 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: And what is your 6 testimony, sir? 7 THE WITNESS: I came to give some 8 support for Midwest Auto. I've done business 9 with them in the past, and I have my own repair 10 facility. And we do work back and forth with 11 Midwest Auto. And in the past I had been working 12 with Al, and, you know, we worked together, and I 13 was just coming to give my support. And maybe 14 enlighten people on some of the things that goes 15 on in other repair facilities, about what happens 16 when people have complaints and things like that. 17 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Who is "Al" you're 18 referring to? 19 THE WITNESS: Pardon? 20 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: You said "Al". 21 You did business with Al. Who is Al? 22 THE WITNESS: Al was the owner of Mid 23 City Auto. 2.4 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Was that the owner 25 before this gentleman?

00011	
1	THE WITNESS: Yes.
2	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Was that also his
3	brother?
4	THE WITNESS: No, that was his son.
5	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Oh, his son.
6	Okay.
7	THE WITNESS: Um-hnh.
8	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Okay. Any
9	questions by members of the committee?
10	MR. RANDALL: Mr. Chair.
11	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Go ahead.
12	MR. RANDALL: I do have one or two
13	quick questions for Mr. Holmes. You indicated
14	you live about 40 blocks away, but is your
15	business, your shop, nearby the proposed location
16	on 30th Street for Midwest?
17	THE WITNESS: Well, it used to be.
18	MR. RANDALL: It used to be.
19	THE WITNESS: Yes.
20	MR. RANDALL: But it's not located
21	close to it any longer?
22	THE WITNESS: No. I have a business on
23	24th Place and Capitol Drive. I used to have a
24	shop on Teutonia and Meinecke.
25	MR. RANDALL: Okay. And you mentioned

00012 1 that you worked with Al Talyansky in the past under Mid City. Have you had the opportunity to work with Midwest Auto Recycling and Ed 4 Talyansky? 5 THE WITNESS: Yes, I have. 6 MR. RANDALL: And - - Go ahead. THE WITNESS: And things are quite a 7 8 bit different than what it used to be when I was 9 dealing with Mid City. You know, Al was - -10 Things were kind of - - Kind of was a hothead 11 about things. You know, he'd fly off the hound 12 sometimes about parts and getting things done 13 when there was a problem with different things. 14 On the second time with Ed right here, you know, 15 since he's opened up Midwest, we done - - we 16 developed quite a good working relationship. 17 MR. RANDALL: So quite a bit different 18 in a positive way. 19 THE WITNESS: Yes. 20 MR. RANDALL: And you mentioned to the 21 committee that you could elaborate briefly on the 22 type of business or this industry, can you share 23 with the committee your experiences as far as 24 when customers can be frustrated or upset if

they're without their vehicle and they're waiting

25

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

for a part and how you think Midwest treats those customers and - - and acts when they promised to get a part?

THE WITNESS: Well, what happens with people a lot of times is when they order a part, and people forget, when they order a used part, it is just that, a used part, and people seem to think that a used part is just as good as a brand new part. And when you get something used, it's just that. It's used and then sometimes things go wrong and you have to replace the part. And a lot of times you'll order parts, say, for instance, from Midwest right here, and they would have to get the part from some other place, referring to an engine or a transmission, and then something could be wrong with it, and then there goes the turnaround of having to call them, and they have to call the place they got it from. And the people don't understand that when it comes to a problem with their cars. Where they right away want to blame the main person. I bought it from you, and you didn't do it right, and that's how things goes with that.

MR. RANDALL: My last two questions are you - - you do business right now with Midwest,

00014	
1	and they're located in Cudahy. Would it be
2	easier for you to do business with them if
3	they're in Milwaukee, or would you prefer to do
4	business with a company that's located in
5	Milwaukee, the City of?
6	THE WITNESS: Yes, it would be a lot
7	easier if they were back, you know, if they were
8	in Milwaukee.
9	
10	MR. RANDALL: And do you have any
11	reservations about this company being awarded a
	license to do business in Milwaukee, as far as
12	supplying used auto parts?
13	THE WITNESS: None, whatsoever.
14	MR. RANDALL: Thank you. I don't have
15	any other questions at this time.
16	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Thank you.
17	Questions by members of the committee?
18	ALDERMAN BOHL: Mr. Chairman.
19	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Alderman Bohl.
20	ALDERMAN BOHL: I'm For Mr.
21	Talyansky. I'm I'm curious how it is that
22	Midwest is going to operate differently now as in
23	the past. I mean, how how What What
24	What things are you going to to do or to
25	change to ensure that we don't see some of the

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

same issues that we had in the past? I think that there was - - It's fair for me to say there was a blatant disregard of - - of the law. And based on the fact that the police department came out and informed you, you don't have the valid licenses. And would come out the next day and say, here's your citation. You don't have the valid licenses. You can't operate. Two days later they'd show up. You're still operating. mean, you know, at what point can you - - What assurances can you provide this committee that - - that your bell was rung loud enough to the point where you are going to be a law abiding citizen, law abiding business. In addition to that, be a good operator to prospective - prospective customers in the City of Milwaukee and even, you know, nationally, because I know that - - that the parts that you're sending are - - are going all over the country. MR. RANDALL: I have a number of

MR. RANDALL: I have a number of responses to that, and I have a number of documents. But I think the quick answer to that that I'd like to offer now is number one, we are applying for the license we need to conduct business in the City, and we have not done so,

not conducted business since been denied - - the Mid City entity was denied. So the - - the main issue that arose from that experience was the police department having to come out time and time again when they were operating without a license, and we've demonstrated that Midwest Auto Recycling has not operated without a license. We are asking this committee to grant us the license to turn the lights back on the building at 30th Street that is dark and vacant right now.

Number two, they have addressed the customer complaint issues, and again, I'll be able to show you more documentation in that regard. But the number of complaints is much lower than the Mid City entity. And I - - I think Mr. Holmes may have touched on the very reason. The former person responsible for operating it was a little bit more short-tempered, and Edward Talyansky is in charge of the day-to-day operations. He's the sole owner, sole licensed agent. And so, therefore, not only have we proven that the number of complaints have declined, but we also have a number of procedures in place where we're going to address those that may come up. And again, referring to what Mr.

00017 1 Holmes explained, it is an industry that unfortunately is prone to complaints. But we believe that when there are complaints, we've 4 either demonstrated that we've responded, or as 5 the Better Business Bureau concluded in a number 6 of instances, there is an - - an agreement to 7 disagree. That people have their two sides of the story, and there are instances where both 8 9 sides can be right. 10 ALDERMAN BOHL: If I may, just one 11 follow-up question. 12 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Go ahead. 13 ALDERMAN BOHL: Thank you, Mr. 14 Chairman. The issues where - - where you 15 demonstrate that the - - that the number of 16 complaints have gone down. Is that reflected in 17 any way of - - of volume of business that's gone 18 down since - - since the - - this particular 19 company here has moved to Cudahy? 20 MR. RANDALL: No. In fact, our volume 21 of business has gone up. And one of the 22 documents I was going to reference is a Statement 23 of Consumer Policy. But it's also in our 2.4 Supplemental Plan of Operation. They receive 25 approximately 300 e-mail messages per day that

00018 1 they process for a response. They send out about 2 20 components per day from the Cudahy location. And so that's an annual number of about 6,000 4 engines and transmissions, which I believe is 5 higher than what Mid City was doing. And again, 6 they ceased operations in June of '06. But it is 7 a business that has taken off since it grew from 8 simply a walk-in type of business, which we 9 really do not even have any longer, to the 10 Internet based economy and the service of finding 11 an engine maybe elsewhere, sourcing it, and then 12 delivering it to the customer, wherever they may 13 be. So that the volume has increased, and it's a 14 very small percentage of complaints at this 15 point. 16 ALDERMAN BOHL: Sounds good. 17 you. 18 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Anything further 19 by members of the committee? Comments from the 20 Alderman's office? 21 MR. RUNNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 22

MR. RUNNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. There's such a litany of infractions and indiscretions that it would be comical except that so many people have been ill-treated, not just by Mid City but by Midwest. I have reports

23

2.4

25

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25 here by the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection, numerous complaints against Midwest, the new incarnation.

In addition, we're - - it was just stated that they have been compliant and not operating, that's up for debate, as I think DNS can attest to. DNS has tried to go many times. We've had numerous residents seeing people go in and out. The lights have been on on occasion. In fact, Angela Farrell was scheduled to meet, she's tried and pushed the deadline back further and further and further. Today, the Applicant was supposed to meet with Angela Farrell again, stood her up. So we really believe that they are - - They're not opening the doors. They're not allowing people to go inside. So that doesn't bode well for them. But even aside from all that, we have all these complaints. I have more than a dozen complaints here. I will grant that many of them are Mid City/Midwest. But there are some just Midwest and if I may, this is - - I would like to read one short sample complaint, which is sort of indicative of all the complaints we've gotten.

MR. RANDALL: Mr. Chairman.

00020	
1	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Yes.
2	MR. RANDALL: We object on hearsay. I
3	don't know what he's reading or where it's coming
4	from. But
5	MR. RUNNER: We did share this with
6	you. This is the Department of Agriculture,
7	Trade and Consumer Protection Report that we sent
8	you that you requested.
9	MR. RANDALL: I've seen the letter. I
10	still object, unless there's someone from the
11	Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer
12	Protection to testify.
13	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Mr. Schrimpf.
14	I'll call upon you for your expert advice at this
15	time.
16	MR. RANDALL: And may I add that what
17	Mr. Runner wants to read though is something from
18	
19	MR. RUNNER: Runner, actually, Runner.
20	MR. RANDALL: Runner, I'm sorry. It's
21	something from the Department of Ag, Trade and
22	Consumer Protection file. So it's not a document
23	generated by the department, but it's an alleged
24	complainant.
25	MR. RUNNER: It's of from Kenilworth in

00021	
1	Dearborn, Michigan. This is against I chose
2	this one, because it is against Midwest Auto and
3	not Mid City.
4	MR. SCHRIMPF: Wait a minute. I'm not
5	finding it.
6	MR. RUNNER: Um.
7	MR. SCHRIMPF: What's the date of it?
8	MR. RUNNER: August 13th, 2007.
9	MR. SCHRIMPF: Mr. Chairman, I'm
10	looking.
11	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Is that one of
12	those that's in in our package?
13	MR. RUNNER: It should be. But the
14	license committee perhaps can speak to that. And
15	the Alderman's office also wondered if DNS could
16	could verify the the attempts to make
17	contact.
18	DNS: Yes. Inspector Farrell, through
19	our zoning section, does have an open order that
20	was issued on 9/13/07 to provide an inspection of
21	the property. I spoke with her around two
22	o'clock this afternoon before returning to this
23	meeting, and she said that Mr. Talyansky was a
24	no-show for her appointment this morning.
25	MR. RANDALL: Mr. Chair.

00022	
1	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Yes.
2	MR. RANDALL: May I ask a question of
3	the DNS representative?
4	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Go ahead.
5	MR. RANDALL: In In the DNS file,
6	is there any evidence that there are operations
7	in the facility, or just the fact that Mr.
8	Talyansky missed an appointment, and is this a
9	routine inspection or, again, is there any
10	evidence that there are activities. And if so,
11	what types of activities?
12	DNS: The last fire prevention
13	inspection that we did in March did show that the
14	property was vacant at that time. There was an
15	additional complaint, it looks like the last one
16	was December, that Inspector Farrell went out.
17	MR. RANDALL: And Mis Mr. Runner
18	referenced lights on at the facility. Is that
19	Does that constitute occupancy or something
20	that DNS would be investigating?
21	DNS: Um
22	MR. RANDALL: Does that equate to auto
23	wrecking?
24	DNS: In and of itself, no, it does
25	not.

00023 1 MR. RANDALL: Thank you. 2 MR. SCHRIMPF: Mr. Chairman, I - - In the packets that the committee has, I have not 4 found that letter of August the 13th, 2007. 5 Typically, on the hearsay question, it is, of 6 course, hearsay, but one of the recognized 7 exceptions to the hearsay rule are governmental -8 - reports of governmental agencies conducted 9 within the parameters of their statutory 10 authority. And certainly the letters that are in 11 the - - the committee file would meet that 12 definition. The letter that the Aldermanic aide 13 has appears not to be in the file, and so there 14 would be a problem with foundation. Further, 15 there's a problem with not having provided it to 16 the licensee ahead of time. 17 MR. RUNNER: I think the record - - Mr. 18 Chair, if I may, the record is substantial, and 19 - - and it's not necessary that I read this. I 20 just thought it would augment the already strong 21 case. 22 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: I'm curious as to 23 why we have five other letters from the 2.4 Department of Ag and here and not that one. You

25

know.

00024	
1	MS. BARRON: Mr. Chair.
2	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Yes, Ms. Barron.
3	MS. BARRON: I don't have that letter
4	in the file. So I'm not sure
5	MR. RUNNER: It may have been a recent
6	addition. These complaints have continually come
7	in.
8	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Let's Let's
9	Let's Unless the committee feels
10	otherwise, let's not take this letter into
11	testimony at this time. Okay?
12	MR. RUNNER: No problem. If I may,
13	though.
14	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Go ahead.
15	MR. RUNNER: Just
16	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: With some
17	testimony not including that letter.
18	MR. RUNNER: Sure. Not including that
19	letter. The general trend seems to be that
20	although there are challenges with this business,
21	that Mid Midwest, and Mid City, but just
22	focusing on Midwest, has a track record of not
23	not replying to people who make orders.
24	Sending defective equipment, defective engines,
25	not honoring payment agreements, and it's just

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

quite similar, if not identical to the Mid City complaints. So that's why the Alderman has objections.

CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Okay. Go ahead. MR. RANDALL: Thank you. The file does have some of these matters that Mr. Runner referenced, and I do intend to respond to those. But the first thing I do want to make sure each of you have is our September 7, 2007 Supplemental Statement of Operation. I noticed in the packet with the police report, our exhibits, the documents that were part of that document were in there, but not the actual narrative. So I'd ask that that be added to the file, and if one of you would kindly move to add it to the permanent file, that way you can make sure that we have more than just the simple short plan of operation in the application itself, but also, the more detailed one that does address a number of the issues, and I have one for you, too, Alex.

I want to just speak briefly on the background issues, because there is a division here, and a point at which Edward Talyansky and Midwest Auto Recycling is not responsible for Mid City Auto and the operations it conducted. To be

1 clear and to let the record show, Mr. Talyansky was a 50 percent owner of Lev and Ed, Inc, which did business as Mid City. And Mid City operated a salvage yard in the same location since the 5 1980s, and the site, in fact, has housed an auto 6 yard since at least the early 1970s. Mid City at 7 one time had various licenses that were required 8 to conduct its auto salvage operations. And for 9 reasons that are not relevant really today, those 10 licenses lapsed, and there was a considerable 11 period of time that it operated without those 12 required licenses. After it discovered that it 13 did not have them, they did file applications in 14 November of 2005, and they finally came on for a 15 hearing in the Spring of 2006. Although we did 16 not represent Mr. Talyansky at the time, who 17 incidentally Edward Talyansky was not the 18 licensed agent and was not responsible for the 19 day-to-day operations of Mid City. I did have an 20 opportunity to review those two hearing 21 transcripts and the materials that were in the 22 file, and it appears that this committee immediately focused on the fact, as I heard today 23 2.4 already from Alderman Bohl, and rightly so, that 25 the company continued to conduct its business

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

without the licenses, especially after very clear warnings from each of you. Maybe not each of you. Several of you. Because I know Alderman Witkowski is new to the committee. The committee recommended denial of the applications on June 27, 2006, and it was rec - - and that recommendation was upheld by the full Council, July 12, 2006.

Since that time, the auto wrecking operation stopped at the 30th Street site, and Mr. Talyansky then reorganized and improved the business as Midwest Auto Recycling, LLC, a different business entity. He is the sole owner and officer, and he is responsible for the dayto-day operations. He began leasing space in Cudahy and moved his operation to that city with as many employees as he could support. And that is about ten to 12 people. And they're all in -- City of Milwaukee residents working in Cudahy. Ten to 19 dollars per hour is what they make with benefits that include health insurance. For the past year they've all traveled to the City of Cudahy, but it certainly has posed to be a challenge from them, and I'll reference as I get along, a number of them are in each of your

2.4

districts, and I believe they did have letters to explain to you how important it would be for them to have a job in the City.

But in any - - any event, Midwest Auto vacated the Milwaukee building that it could not use without a license, did not appeal the denials that this committee recommended back in 2006. It complied with the prohibition that it not reapply for a year. And has focused on building and improving the business to a point where it is now applying to return to the City of Milwaukee with these good jobs and turn the lights back on, although it sounds like one or two lightbulbs may be on, with a building that is currently vacant and for the most part, dark.

As far as the consumer complaints, we did engage dialog with Alderman Hines' office, and I do appreciate Mr. Runner's up front and - - and forthright dialog, because we did have three letters with - - to his office specifically, and he did kindly invite us to meet with him on September 26th. So we have certainly tried to engage the office and understand what the concerns of the President of the Council may have. And Mr. Talyansky and I took from that

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

meeting that one of his main concerns, and we're hearing it again today, is the customer complaints. And not so much that Midwest Auto Recycling's current number of complaints, but the fact that they were the same type of complaints that Mid City had.

And we were aware of the certain letters from the Department of Ag, Trade and Consumer Protection that were in the file, and the complaint letters. And I made an appointment with the Consumer Specialist who wrote those letters, and I reviewed those files out on Potter Road. What I discovered culminated in the three response letters that we sent on to the Department last week, copies of which were filed with the license clerk, and sent to each of you and Alderman Hines. But I do have additional copies this afternoon, which I would like to give to each of you, and if it could be added to the permanent record, we would appreciate that, as well. Mr. Runner, there's one there for you, too.

CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: At this time, Alderman Bohl moves to accept the - - what's entitled the Supplemental Plan of Operation and

00030 1 make it part of the permanent record in this hearing. Hearing no objections, so ordered. MR. RANDALL: And this goes to the 4 comment that Mr. Schrimpf made before as far as 5 the ones that were in the file, and these were 6 distributed along with the police report and the 7 notice that the application may be denied, and I 8 counted six warning letters from the department, 9 and we responded to three of them, copies of 10 which you each have now. Those are the Frank 11 Garrett's letter, and to clarify that one, Mr. 12 Garrett's received a 100 percent refund. That 13 was at his request. Johnny Patterson. He failed 14 to repair or replace other vehicle parts 15 connected to the engine that were not sold by 16 Midwest, and those parts are what apparently 17 failed. And so it not being our part, it was not 18 covered by our warranty. And Nicole Colmer, who 19 received a replacement engine under a warranty 20 claim, but like Johnny Patterson, that second 21 engine, I believe that one was a water pump

failure, and that's an express term in our

warranty. The mechanic should be replacing that.

Because Midwest Auto Recycling either

We don't sell those. And that did not happen.

22

23

2.4

25

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

refunded the customer's money at their request or performed under the warranty and cannot do anything about a part we did not sell that ultimately failed, we did ask the Department to rescind the warning letters, which as best I can tell, since you've each seen those from the police file, they're a form letter, some of them even admonished the - - the company to say that we did not file a written response, when, in fact, I think in two of those instances that is not true. There is a written response in the Department's files. I did see it when I was out on Potter Road, and, in fact, their form letter still came out saying we didn't respond and we violated Wisconsin Law. So we've - - we've asked that that be cleared up.

The other warning letters in the police report, though, were issued to Mid City. Allen Erhredt, Susan McDonald, and Gary Smith, those were all for transactions going to early 2006. That's when Mid City was operating, albeit, without a license, and it should not have been. But that entity is an entirely different business entity. Mr. Talyansky was not the agent and was not responsible for the day - - day-to-day

2.4

operations, and it does not exist any longer. So that those complaints will be out there, because the business does not operate.

So, therefore, and I'll renew my objection to those, despite having that response, that based on foundation and relevance and the hearsay, we do object to the Department's letters being considered, and specifically the Mid City ones.

However, I don't want to sidestep the issue, and we are - - we did commit to Alderman Hines, and we intend to demonstrate to you that Mr. Talyansky is not running Midwest Auto Recycling the same way as the old Mid City. And I'd like to briefly discuss the substance of the issue by the current operation. We now employ office staff members who field calls and e-mail inquiries dedicated - - Excuse me - - e-mail inquiries, and one employee is solely dedicated to the customer service. And much of this is in our plan of operation that I did file back in September, and I did distribute to you earlier.

Midwest Auto Recycling also offers a comprehensive warranty for all of its sales, and that warranty is prominently displayed on its

00033 1 website and sent out with each customer transaction. All customers must sign to state that they've read the warranty and they agree to 4 its terms. As I indicated, this is primarily and 5 Internet based business now, and if a customer is 6 not happy with that warranty and those terms, if 7 they don't want to buy an engine that doesn't 8 have its water pump or timing belt warranted, 9 they can go somewhere else, see Google used auto 10 parts, and many, many hits will come up. So the 11 customer is agreeing to our warranty. We are not 12 sending it to them after the fact, and they have 13 agreed to that, and it's clearly spelled out. 14 MR. RUNNER: Mr. Chair. 15 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Yes, Mr. Runner. 16 MR. RUNNER: Sorry. If I could just 17 interrupt. 18 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Go ahead. 19 MR. RUNNER: The nature of these 20

21

22

23

2.4

25

CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Go ahead.

MR. RUNNER: The nature of these
complaints, the time - - the stressed timing belt
or faulty water pump is not disclosed on the
website. I, myself, went to the website and - and in these issues where there are complaints,
that is not made clear up front. I just wanted
to add that.

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Thank you. Before we go any further along here. The - - Alderman Bohl wishes to make this packet with the cover later - - cover letter from Friebert, Finnerty and St. John dated October 29th, 2007 part of the permanent record in this hearing. Hearing no objections, so ordered.

MR. RANDALL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And one more document. Mr. Runner, thank you. would like to pass out the Statement of Consumer Policy that, again, was filed and may be in your materials, but I wanted it to be before you, and - - and at the appropriate time. If that could be added to the permanent record. That does include as an attachment, the warranty that's on Midwest Auto Recycling's website and is available in printed form, but it does reference, I believe, it's a little page six on the very bottom, number - - paragraph six. There's no warranty on oil leaks, on engines or transmissions due to seals or gaskets. I think that was Mr. Patterson's problem, if we go back to the department complaints. And number seven, engines are not warranted against water pumps, wires, injectors and such bolt-on items. And I

1 think that was Ms. Colmer's problem, water pumps. 2 And I don't know if any additional pages specifically instruct mechanics, but I - - I4 believe there is some instruction in - - in the 5 mechanics. If Mr. Holmes were still here, he 6 could probably tell you what a good mechanic 7 should know to do as far as when they're 8 replacing something. You can't put a dog in 9 something that - - and then just expect it to 10 work perfectly. But in any event, the Statement 11 of Consumer Policy is part of what - - further 12 response to Alderman Bohl's question on what are 13 we doing differently and - - and what is 14 different. And it's - - It's really a 15 documentation of what Midwest Auto is doing as 16 compared to Mid City, but also, a commitment that 17 it will respond to the Better Business Bureau or 18 the Department of Consumer Protection if these 19 issues do come up. And as I've indicated, there 20 are oftentimes two sides to every story. And 21 speaking of the Better Business Bureau, I do want 22 to point out, and this is in the materials, that 23 Midwest Auto Recycling does have a satisfactory 24 record, and the Better Business Bureau has found 25 that it's properly addressed matters referred by

00036 1 the Bureau, and that the company does not have an unusual volume of complaints for governmental actions involving its marketplace contact - -4 conduct, and the Business Bureau does not have 5 any concerns about Midwest Auto Recycling. 6 Admittedly, Mid City had a failing 7 record with the Better Business Bureau, but Mr. 8 Talyansky has changed his operation, and the 9 record will show it has a satisfactory record. 10 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: So the - - the 11 company you're referring to as Mid City - -12 MR. RANDALL: Yes. 13 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: That was his son? 14 MR. RANDALL: He and his son owned 15 that. 16 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Okay. 17 MR. RANDALL: Edward Talyansky was a 50 18 percent owner, and Alfred Talyansky was a 50 19 percent owner, and Alfred Talyansky is Ed's son. 20 And Alfred Talyansky was the licensed agent when 21 they did have a - - he was a licensed agent 22 during the 2005-2006 applications, and Alfred 23 Talyansky was the operator of Mid City. Ed 24 Talyansky is the owner, application agent and 25

operator of Midwest Auto Recycling, the new

00037						
1	entity.					
2	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Can I ask where					
3	where where his son is now? Can I ask					
4	that?					
5	MR. RANDALL: I I mean, I don't					
6	know where his son is right now.					
7	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: It's Alfred,					
8	right?					
9	MR. RANDALL: Yes.					
10	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: I mean No, I					
11	mean where he is in What's his relationship					
12	to this new business now?					
13	MR. RANDALL: He is an employee but he					
14	isn ot responsible for the decision, the day-to-					
15	day decisions.					
16	ALDERMAN BOHL: Mr. Chairman.					
17	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Alderman Bohl.					
18	ALDERMAN BOHL: I just When you say					
19	"employee," does does he still own 50 percent					
20	interest in this company or or better or what					
21	what percentage, if any, what percentage of					
22	the ownership does he have?					
23	MR. RANDALL: No. In fact, we					
24	anticipated an issue about that, and I don't know					
25	if it's part of this type of license, but we did					

00038 1 file a statement of stock ownership, which was an attachment to our original application. I know I've used that for - - It's required for liquor 4 licenses. I didn't know if it was required for 5 this, but it does indicate that Edward Talyansky 6 is the 100 percent owner. There's no even 7 decimal point percentage in there. And, again, 8 our track record demonstrates that Ed Talyansky 9 has done a fine job in controlling this business 10 and being responsible for it. So he - - This 11 gentleman is the 100 percent owner of the limited 12 liability company. 13 ALDERMAN BOHL: Was this if I - - if I 14 may, Mr. Chairman. 15 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Go ahead, 16 Alderman. 17 ALDERMAN BOHL: Was - - Was this a new 18 company that was created from inception here a 19 year ago? 20 MR. RANDALL: I'm not sure. We did not 21 represent them in creating them. And many people 22 create LLCs on their own, but I believe - -23 ALDERMAN BOHL: Well, I'll ask Mr. 2.4 Talyansky if that's the case. 25 MR. RANDALL: Sure.

00039	
1	ALDERMAN BOHL: Mr. Talyansky, is this
2	a brand new company or was this somehow some part
3	of of Mid City?
4	MR. RANDALL: When did you create
5	Midwest Auto Recycling?
6	MR. RUNNER: June, 2006, Mr. Chair.
7	The Better Business Bureau says.
8	THE APPLICANT: One year ago.
9	ALDERMAN BOHL: One year ago?
10	THE APPLICANT: Yeah.
11	ALDERMAN BOHL: Did What happened
12	to the What happened to the LLC that was Mid
13	City? Was that something that was disbanded with
14	the State of Wisconsin? Did you just
15	MR. RANDALL: Do you know what happened
16	to Lev and Ed? I believe it just dissolved
17	itself. It was
18	THE APPLICANT: Dissolved.
19	MR. RANDALL: It was out of business
20	because it didn't have that license.
21	ALDERMAN BOHL: What role, Mr.
22	Talyansky, do you anticipate your son having in
23	this new business?
24	THE APPLICANT: Just an employer.
25	Answer question
	-

00040 1 ALDERMAN BOHL: He's - - He's got to 2 have some kind of management role. You're telling me he's been demoted to the point where 4 he's just running parts for you? Because I'm 5 going to - - I'm going to assume that your 6 business and the volume that you were doing at -7 - at - - at your previous location and his having 8 a 50 percent stake in that share, that he was 9 making a little bit of money, and you're telling 10 me right now he's been demoted to the position of 11 a parts runner? 12 MR. RANDALL: Well, we do have 12 total 13 employees. I don't know specifically - -14 ALDERMAN BOHL: So he's going to be 15 earning ten to 19 dollars an hour? 16 MR. RANDALL: I don't know. I - - I 17 don't know what Al Talyansky's specific duties 18 are. My main contact is Edward Talyansky, and 19 the record speaks for itself. 20 ALDERMAN BOHL: I - - I understand 21 that. But I - - My position is this much. We -22 - We had a company where we had a person who at 23 least was the public face, not necessarily yourself, but your son. That, blatantly - -24

blatantly, when told day in and day out, your

22

23

24

25

1 doors must be shut, you are operating illegally, continued to say thank you for the ticket, officer, and start operating the next day. 4 then, were handed a ticket and said your doors 5 must be shut. Thank you, officer. Over and over 6 and over again. Now what I'm questioning is, is 7 with this whole new public face - - I mean, I've seen this once. I've seen it before. What I've 8 9 seen before was Grand - - Grand - - or Grandview 10 Windows where they played this sort of game back 11 and forth between the - - the son and - - and the 12 father on who was doing this, who was doing that. 13 Literally, you know, it - - The claim was that it 14 was - - it wasn't this person. It was that 15 person who were doing this. Well, I didn't 16 believe it then. And I'm just trying to - - to 17 garner if this is just a means of - - of - - of 18 obscuring who is necessarily running, give us the 19 license, we'll get it back in the door, and 20 everything will be peachy keen. 21

Well, if the son has a part in this business, I'm just curious what the role that the son is, because obviously you've changed the name and the son is still working for you here. He may have zero stake interest, but I'm wondering

if your son is - - is one of the persons calling the shots. Is he a manager? Is he one of your go-to persons? Is - - Outside of yourself, as the owner, is he the person running the day-to-day operations? It may be that he is. And if he is, then you can just say absolutely yes, and you can say look at our track record. We've improved things.

MR. RANDALL: Sure.

ALDERMAN BOHL: But if - - But if it is, be honest and be up front about it, because that's what I'm all about, is be up and honest and up front about it. But rather than obscure this and say essentially well, I don't know, you know, he - - we have ten - 12 employees, well, you know, as I said, if - - if he's earning, you know, 12.50 an hour, and he's been demoted to that, then admit it. Say that. I don't - - But I - - But I think that - - that based on the fact that there - - there have been problems in the past, that it's a fair question for - - for us to ask, given the fact that there's a track record of day in and day out, day in and day out obscuring of the law.

MR. RANDALL: And I - - My first

1 response was going to be that is a fair question. You took the words out of my mouth. I think that this is not a sophisticated operation. Ed was 4 telling me, as we came down the elevator to - -5 or came up the elevator, that there are days when an employee doesn't show up, and he has to go and 6 7 an order comes in or it has to go out the door, 8 and he is involved with the ground level work, as 9 well. So the fact that we're here admitting and 10 telling you that Alfred Talyansky is an employee, 11 it really isn't much beyond that. I think it is 12 fair to say that we have paid the price. We did 13 not reapply for over a year. The law prohibited 14 us from doing it. We even waited several months 15 past that. And so, to just have some speculation 16 at what may be going on, number one, Edward 17 Talyansky did not reapply, and he hasn't tried to 18 push the issue. And number two, he has shown 19 that he has changed the operations. The 20 Department of Neighborhood Services, that's why I 21 was very curious as far as if they had anything, 22 is there one indicia of evidence that this 23 company is not doing what it should be doing, or 2.4 cannot follow the rules. And we submit that it's 25 very clear, and you rightly so denied Mid City.

00044 But after over a year, and this gentleman 1 changing the business, irrespective of his employees, I'm going to tell you a little bit 4 about some of his other employees later, who are 5 through the Department of Corrections 6 Reintegration Process, and we have a letter that 7 no one's seen yet because it just came through 8 the fax, that they praise this man and his 9 company, because he is able to give good jobs and 10 skills to people that are - - are on work 11 release. They go back to the Racine Department 12 of Corrections, wherever they may be at night. 13 But they're getting good skills. And so, the 14 employees aren't what should be relevant here. 15 What is in the record is, I submit to you, the 16 only thing you can consider in looking at this 17 application. And Mr. Talyansky has worked very 18 hard to show you that the record does have some 19 complaints out there, but at least he has 20 responses for those, and he is willing to 21 continue on that and bring these good jobs to the 22 City. 23 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: How many full time 2.4 employees does Mr. Talyansky have at this

25

location?

00045 1 MR. RANDALL: Do you have ten full time 2 employees or 12? 3 THE APPLICANT: 11, I - - Yeah. 4 MR. RANDALL: 11 employees. 5 THE APPLICANT: And everyone's a full 6 time employee, not part-time. 7 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: At this time 8 Alderman Bohl moves to make the Statement of 9 Consumer Policy, which was submitted to us, part 10 of the permanent record in this hearing. Hearing 11 no objections, so ordered. 12 MR. RANDALL: Thank you. Mr. Chair, I 13 have just a couple final comments here. And I 14 would like to focus in these final comments on 15 the notice and the matters that we - - that the 16 Department Licenses Division indicated we may be 17 denied. Some of these will overlap and so I will 18 gloss right over them. 19 But first is the attached police 20 report. And as you may have gleaned from my 21

But first is the attached police report. And as you may have gleaned from my questions of the Sergeant, I wanted to find out, because, importantly, the police report contains nothing adverse in connection with the applicant before you, Edward Talyansky. He is the sole owner and licensed agent. What it does contain

22

23

24

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

are four pages worth of information on his son, Alfred Talyansky, who operated the old Mid City. And, therefore, we object to much of the police report to the extent it's based on relevance and foundation, and that the committee shouldn't consider matters related to an employee for this particular application.

Let me address those citations that are in the report that were issued directly to Mid City itself, and admittedly, Edward Talyansky was a 50 percent owner, but he wasn't responsible for those day-to-day operations. Numbers three to five were a "no city alarm" citation, which I think those went back to 2001. They may have been some of the older ones Sergeant Ulickey referenced. He took care of that problem. I know many businesses had issues with that. think that related to calls going directly to the police departments when they should have had a security firm shielding those calls first. But in any event, we will have, as paragraph seven B of our Supplemental Plan of Operation indicates, our security system will comply with any required City ordinances and licenses.

Number six and seven date back to 2003.

2.4

Those were failure to display license plates or registration. I believe those were promptly taken care of.

Numbers eight through 11 relate to Mid City not operating with the required licenses, and it paid the fines. I addressed this earlier. It did not appeal the license denials. It did not appeal the Municipal Court ordinance convictions. And it has more importantly, Mr. Talyansky has complied with the ordinance by not reapplying for over a year. And so, therefore, because he has demonstrated he chooses and he cannot operate without the license, we are reapplying now to engage in the operations, and the Milwaukee Police Department will not have to pursue enforcement actions because he will only operate once he has his license.

Second, the second paragraph of the notice indicates objections based upon adverse impact on public health, safety, welfare of the neighborhood by creating litter, noise, traffic problems and other undesirable neighborhood problems. I have not heard testimony on any evidence of that in the record today, so I'll be brief. The Supplemental Plan of Operation anti-

2.4

- does anticipate that, and I direct your attention to paragraph five, where it gives a detailed description of our proposed operation showing that there won't be an adverse neighborhood impact. Paragraph six describes the adjoining uses in this neighborhood, and many are industrial or manufacturing sites. Paragraph seven dictates the plan for site cleaning, rubbish removal, snowplowing, and the site cleaning and rubbish even if it's not generated by us. We'll have a daily patrol on the exterior of the premises. One side of the property also is along railroad tracks, so that just gives you an idea of where we are.

There are employee and fire safety components in our plan of operation. Security plan. And traffic and deliveries will only occur during normal business hours. And the congregation of people will also not be a problem. As I explained earlier, walk-ins are generally not allowed. We do a phone and e-mail and Internet business, and so, therefore, we do not have a guy who pulls up on the street and says I need a tranny for my '79 Buick, can you help me out. We really do not have that kind of

2.4

operation, and we do not do the replacements on site.

So, to the extent that the record shows any neighborhood concerns, which I don't believe it does, we've shown that the applicant is prepared to mitigate any neighborhood impact in advance. Further though, to the extent the neighborhood impacts relate to the consumer protection complaints, and those customer service issues, I did address that, discuss that earlier, and we have shown you that those are being addressed.

Third, the objections in the notice, objections based on operating without a license, previous record of complaints and warning letters. Again, I believe I discussed that already. Mr. Talyansky has not operated since he was denied, and the complaints and warning letters have either been addressed or relate to the now defunct Mid City.

Fourth, it references a material misstatement in the application indicating that no one had been convicted of a Federal or State law or local ordinances. That's simply not true. I hope in some of our questions and answers we've

2.4

clarified that for you. The Statement of Stock Ownership, which is Exhibit A in our plan, Supplemental Plan of Operation, shows that Edward Talyansky is the sole owner of this new entity. Alfred Talyansky's violations are, therefore, are not relevant and shouldn't be disclosed, and because he was not the agent for the old Mid City - Ed Talyansky was not the agent, and it was a different legal entity altogether, number three to eleven are inapplicable. In any event, I believe I discussed most of that, and we do not believe what's in the notice should constitute a reason to deny.

Finally, I'd like to bring your attention to a series of letters that I mentioned earlier. We did file these previously with the license clerk. Second last time, I'll ask you to do that, Mr. Runner. These are letters from some of your constituents, a couple of them are Alderman Hines' constituents, and two of them I did receive earlier this morning, and I also have one from the Department of Corrections that I mentioned earlier.

MR. SCHRIMPF: Mr. Chairman, I would assume that Mr. Randall is not objecting to these

00051 1 documents on hearsay grounds. MR. RANDALL: I'm waiving that objection. To the extent the committee may or 4 wishes to consider them, we do provide them for 5 your edification. But again, I think, 6 importantly because some of them are constituents 7 it may be helpful. But just one comment about the Department of Corrections letter, and that is 8 9 Midwest Auto Recycling is a Reintegration Process 10 participant. It does give training and a number 11 of good skilled jobs to people, and I believe 12 that, and Mr. Talyansky explained this to 13 Alderman Hines last month, they've been on the 14 short end of that a number of times, because once 15 someone is done with their - - their - - their 16 sentence, they may move on and take their skills 17 to another employer. But in some instances they 18 have been able to keep someone on either who is 19 nearby or willing to stay. And so, therefore, we 20 certainly ask that you keep that in mind, that 21 Mr. Talyansky has taken very seriously the 22 ability he can to provide a good job to certain 23 people and to allow them to - - to rectify their 2.4 life and get it back on track. 25 In conclusion, and I don't anticipate

1 having any more to add, unless there are 2 questions or there are any other comments. But the record we believe is very clear in this 4 instance. And we're not denying that Mid City 5 Auto, under the partial ownership of Edward 6 Talyansky, but under the operation of his son, 7 had a number of problems. And this committee 8 took the action it did. I probably would have 9 done the same thing if I were sitting in your 10 seats. But it's been over a year now. Your 11 ordinance is very clear, both in terms of when 12 someone can reapply, but also, the standards that 13 you must apply when evaluating a new license. 14 And our Supplemental Plan of Operation very 15 carefully demonstrates, as far as the public 16 safety, health and welfare, and all the other 17 licensing standards, that this applicant is able 18 to and has a plan in place in order to comply, 19 and that your approval today will also bring a 20 number of good and valuable jobs back to the 21 City. So we appreciate your consideration. I 22 apologize for the length, but I - - I think you 23 can all understand that given the - - the matters 2.4 that are for one reason or the other in the 25 record and the position of the local Alderman's

office, which we respect, and we, again, did meet with him and tried to work this out, but we wanted to show you that in some instances there is simply a difference of opinion, and we hope that you're able to evaluate all those opinions and - - and make the right decision for the City of Milwaukee. Thank you.

MR. RUNNER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Mr. Runner.

MR. RUNNER: Thank you. I just want to make two quick points. The Alderman's office does commend Attorney Randall for his multifaceted and creative defense. But we do contend that Mid City is Midwest. The tagline or slogan, if you will, for Midwest Auto is "In business since 1987." That's their slogan that they use today. "In business since 1987."

The second point is the principal listed in the Better Business Bureau for Midwest Auto is Mr. William Green, the manager. He's also the customer contact, Mr. William Green. A lot of the complaints for Midwest, this current incarnation, revolve around this Mr. Green. And there is some inference, although - - so I hesitate to bring it up, but we just wonder who

00054 1 this is. This principal contact, Mr. Green. Is this someone - - You've not mentioned him, so we'd like to just clarify who he is. MR. RANDALL: I'd be happy to respond. 5 The Better Business - - I'll go in reverse order. 6 Mr. William Green, I spoke to him earlier this 7 afternoon. He is the one who went to the 8 Department of Corrections and was able to pick up 9 that letter today. So he is the manager, and 10 he's running the business right now. And as far 11 as the contention that it's the same business, 12 we've been very clear and honest, Mr. Talyansky 13 was a part owner of Mid City. He certainly is 14 going to, on his website, express the fact that 15 he has skills and has a lot of experience in 16 finding parts, and is in the business of it. So 17 you are not in any way misleading people when you 18 say you've been in the business since 1987. 19 Correct? 20 THE APPLICANT: Yes. 21 MR. RANDALL: But is it true that 22 Midwest Auto Recycling has only been in existence 23 since 2006. Correct? 2.4 THE APPLICANT: Yes.

MR. RANDALL: You've only conducted

00055 1 business as that since '06. THE APPLICANT: Yes. MR. RANDALL: So I think that the 4 inference that it's the same, it's an argument. 5 It's not even an argument. It's a statement that I can neither refute nor deny. It's true, 7 because he was a part owner, and he's been in 8 this business since 1987. But let's be honest, 9 this isn't a sophisticated business. There isn't 10 an Internet police out there. I don't believe 11 it's fair for this committee to wonder whether 12 our website is altogether truthful when it says, 13 "In business since 1987," just because Midwest, 14 as the LLC, was only created last year. I think 15 that's a fairly difficult matter to hold an 16 applicant to for this type of application or any 17 license for that matter. 18 MR. SCHRIMPF: Mr. Chairman, I have a 19 couple questions. 20 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Mr. Schrimpf, go 21 ahead. 22 MR. SCHRIMPF: First, about the - - the 23 old Mid City was doing business under the name 24 Lev & Ed, L-E-V & Ed. Was Lev, Alfred? 25 MR. RANDALL: No.

00056					
1	MR. SCHRIMPF: Who was Lev?				
2	MR. RANDALL: Do you know who Lev of				
3	Lev & Ed was?				
4	THE APPLICANT: Lev died.				
5	MR. RANDALL: What was his last name?				
6	THE APPLICANT: Five Five years				
7	ago.				
8	MR. RANDALL: Do you know what Lev's				
9	last name was?				
10	THE APPLICANT: Barbier.				
11	MR. RANDALL: Can you spell that? Was				
12	he a relation to you or a business partner only?				
13	THE APPLICANT: Partner in business.				
14	MR. RANDALL: Lev was Lev Barbier, and				
15	he was only a business partner. No relation.				
16	The Ed was Edward Talyansky, and they did				
17	business as Mid City Auto.				
18	MR. SCHRIMPF: And Alfred then was the				
19	agent of that particular entity under which they				
20	were doing business				
21	MR. RANDALL: Correct.				
22	MR. SCHRIMPF: Mid City? Okay. Then -				
23	- With				
24	MR. RANDALL: And at the end, though,				
25	after Lev passed away about five years ago,				

Alfred bought his shares or was the other 50 percent owner. So Alfred at the end was both part owner and licensed agent when they had a license, and the applicant agent when they were applying. MR. SCHRIMPF: Okay. And with respect to the remaining warning letters, the one generated by Mr. Gary Smith, the one generated by Susan McDonald, and the one dem - - generated by Allen Ehredt, E-H-R-E-D-T. MR. RANDALL: Right. MR. SCHRIMPF: What is your position with respect to those documents? MR. RANDALL: Once again, I'll go in

reverse order, because it's the order I have in my file. Allen Ehredt was a transaction where an engine or a transmission was purchased from Mid City in April of 2006. Susan McDonald was an engine or transmission purchase from Mid City in February, February 22, 2006. And Gary Smith was Mid City, June 12, 2006. So again, and we acknowledge they were selling apparently parts that people had a complaint with, without a license during 2006, but they were all Mid City, an entity that doesn't exist, and, yes, Edward

00058 1 Talyansky was a 50 percent owner, but he was not responsible for the day-to-day operations, and he was not the licensed agent. 4 MR. SCHRIMPF: Well, so what happened 5 to those particular - - these individuals had 6 complaints. What happened to their complaints? 7 MR. RANDALL: The Department of 8 Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection sent 9 out a copy of the complaint to the old address or 10 a PO Box, and I don't believe it was ever 11 responded to, because the business no longer 12 exists. So I believe the last action, what 13 happened to their complaint, was the warning 14 letter. The department, as I've reviewed their 15 files, they will send a copy of the warning 16 letter to Susan McDonald, for example, saying, "I 17 never heard back from the person. You have the 18 rights and remedies under Wisconsin Law. You may 19 wish to find an attorney." No one's ever called 20 me, though. But they - - They can then take it 21 from the next step on their own individual 22 behalf. But I believe these letters are 23 basically the last step from the Consumer 2.4 Protection Division. 25

MR. SCHRIMPF: And I take it, that the

00059 1 current entity then intends to do nothing about those complaints, unless some further action is taken by the complainant. Is that correct? 4 MR. RANDALL: Well, the current entity 5 would have an excellent defense in court if the 6 complainant took action against it for the Mid 7 City complaints. So the answer is yes, the 8 current entity neither is responsible for nor 9 does it intend to address the Mid City 10 complaints. It's a different legal entity. I 11 don't know if it went through bankruptcy. I 12 don't know the legal existence of Lev & Ed, Inc., 13 doing business as Mid City. But this committee 14 denied its application, and it really had no way 15 of functioning as a business entity, and it 16 doesn't exist any longer. 17 MR. SCHRIMPF: And it won't reaffirm 18 those particular complaints in the current 19 entity. 20 MR. RANDALL: Correct. 21 MR. SCHRIMPF: And one final question. 22 By the way, Mr. Chairman, I don't think the 23 letters that counsel has referred to, the one 2.4

from Mr. Ehredt, Ms. McDonald and the other one - -

00060 1 MR. RANDALL: Mr. Smith. 2 MR. SCHRIMPF: I think those would be exceptions to the hearsay rule. Now what is the 4 procedure by which the current entity, and I'm 5 getting a little confused here myself, the - -6 the current entity is - -7 MR. RANDALL: Midwest. MR. SCHRIMPF: Midwest. What is the 8 9 procedure by which the current entity logs parts, 10 particularly engines and transmissions, from, I 11 would assume, junked vehicles for purposes of 12 resale so that you can certify the amount of 13 mileage on either the engine or the transmission? 14 MR. RANDALL: I don't know that. I'll 15 see if Mr. Talyansky can explain. Did you hear 16 the question and understand it? What is the 17 procedure, or how do you certify the mileage on a 18 used engine and transmission before you sell it? 19 THE APPLICANT: Because it's the - -20 they with the Car Fax, and they send us the - -21 the mileage from which cars with the engine to 22 23 MR. RANDALL: So you receive a Car Fax 2.4 report. 25 THE APPLICANT: Yes.

00061						
1	MR. RANDALL: Which is a commercial					
2	private provider report.					
3	THE APPLICANT: Yeah.					
4	MR. RANDALL: Giving you the					
5	information on each part that you have ordered.					
6	THE APPLICANT: From each part come to					
7	us.					
8	MR. SCHRIMPF: And then do you provide					
9	that to the customer?					
10	THE APPLICANT: Yeah.					
11	MR. SCHRIMPF: The certification as to					
12	the miles.					
13	THE APPLICANT: Yeah.					
14	MR. RANDALL: Yes.					
15	THE APPLICANT: Yes.					
16	MR. SCHRIMPF: Do you Do you					
17	certify to the customer as to how the part was					
18	retrieved? In other words, what happened to the					
19	vehicle? Was the vehicle in a flood? Was the					
20	vehicle in a wreck?					
21	THE APPLICANT: That, I couldn't tell					
22	you. Because when they send this to us, they					
23	give us a list, what is wrong and what is good in					
24	that engine. The parts in good condition, you					
25	can send this. If something is wrong with the					

00062						
1	part, I send the part back right away. Because					
2	we check The people who work for me, they					
3	they check everything, and then send the					
4	merchandise to the customer.					
5	MR. SCHRIMPF: That's all I have, Mr.					
6	Chairman.					
7	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Mr. Runner,					
8	anything further?					
9	MR. RUNNER: Nothing further to add.					
10	Thank you, Mr. Chair.					
11	MR. RANDALL: Mr. Chair, I just want to					
12	make sure to the extent that all my materials can					
13	be made a part of the record, we would ask that					
14	the appropriate motion be made to do so.					
15	CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: We did not accept					
16	the the committee did not accept these					
17	letters, the last packet of five or six letters.					
18	MR. RUNNER: May I ask, Mr. Chair,					
19	these this group of letters that were sent in					
20	the 11th hour, I think it was actually seven					
21	o'clock, Friday, from employees of Midwest. Does					
22	the committee take that into account, an employee					
23	of a company being asked to write a letter on its					
24	behalf?					
25	MR. RANDALL: We would object to the					

00063 1 point that there's any foundation for the employees being asked. They are letters from the employees. 4 MR. RUNNER: So they, on their own 5 volition, just decided to. 6 MR. RANDALL: They asked for these to 7 be put in the record, and it sounds like the committee is not going to take them under 8 9 consideration. 10 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: There's been no 11 motion to accept those letters. Everything else 12 that you submitted has been accepted and made 13 part of the permanent record. Is there any - -14 Is there a wish by any of the - - any other 15 committee members to make this part of the 16 record? ALDERMAN WITKOWSKI: I'll so move. 17 18 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: The motion by 19 Alderman Witkowski is to make these letters 20 numbering, let's see, one is from the State of 21 Wisconsin Department of Corrections, it's by 22 itself, it's dated October 29th, 2007. And then 23 there's a packet of five, six other letters that

were written to various members of this

committee. And they're in a packet stapled

24

00064 together, and the - - to identify is the top one 1 is dated 10/26/07 is addressed to Alderman James Witkowiak. And Alderman Witkowski moves to make 4 these seven letters part of the permanent record 5 in this hearing. Is there any discussion on that 6 motion? 7 ALDERMAN BOHL: Mr. Chairman. 8 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Any objection? 9 ALDERMAN BOHL: Mr. Chairman. 10 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Alderman Bohl. 11 ALDERMAN BOHL: On the - - On the 12 motion. I - - I think it's inconsistent with - -13 with our policy in terms of the individuals not 14 being here. The one exception I'm prepared to 15 make is on the State of Wisconsin Department of 16 Corrections, and the only reason I'm willing to 17 do that is because it is consistent with this - -18 with this body's policy to - - to request and 19 receive notification from - - from parole - -20 probation officers. So I - - In terms of just 21 going on the - - the - - the longstanding policy 22 of this committee, I think that that at least is 23 consistent. But ultimately I will object to - -24 to the - - the employees who are not present 25 here.

00065 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: And I'll agree 1 with Alderman Bohl's objection. ALDERMAN PUENTE: And I'll agree with 4 the two of you. 5 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Okay. So the 6 motion fails on a vote of three to one. Alderman 7 Bohl. 8 ALDERMAN BOHL: Mr. Chairman, I'll - -9 I'll be happy to make the State of Wisconsin 10 Department of Correction letter part of the 11 record, as I said. And - - And I understand that 12 that person, this Captain McPike is not present, 13 but at least there's established precedent on 14 this committee for receiving DOC letters. CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Motion by Alderman 15 16 Bohl is to - - is that a letter from the State 17 - - State of Wisconsin Department of Corrections 18 dated October 29th, 2007 by Captain McPike be 19 made part of the permanent record in this 20 hearing. Hearing no objections, so ordered. And 21 - - And the record will show that the other six 22 letters have been rejected, will not be made part 23 of the permanent record. Mr. Randall. 2.4 MR. RANDALL: Two final comments, Mr. 25 Chairman. Because I know what's on your

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

machines, you guys can skip around, and once it goes into the committee I can't respond. At the very end of the police report, or the original notice letter, there were a number of 2005 emails and matters related and photographs. We would object to those being considered, both on terms of relevance, because they're related to Mid City, not Midwest. In terms of hearsay, because the e-mail authors and - - and document generators are not here. And foundation, because for the same reason the people cannot substantiate. So, they're in the record, I think that police report, if they're part of it, was added to the file, but we do request that the committee not base its decision on some of those materials from 2005 Mid City.

And the final comment I just wanted to make was to remind the committee, with all due respect, that there was one person from the public here who spoke, and he spoke in support of the license, and the evidence before you, we believe, including that testimony, dictates that the license be granted. And, of course, this committee will have every power to review it upon renewals if the operations do not stay in the

00067 improved condition that Edward Talyansky has made 1 2 them in. 3 ALDERMAN BOHL: Mr. Chairman. 4 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Alderman Bohl. 5 ALDERMAN BOHL: Just one - - one legal 6 question for - - for Mr. Schrimpf, and that is, 7 Mr. Schrimpf, in terms of establishing a reasonable foundation for - - for factoring in 8 9 some of the past complaints from Mid City, does 10 - - does Mr. Edward Talyansky present here, does 11 his stake as 50 percent owner of Mid City allow 12 that to become a factor here? 13 MR. SCHRIMPF: Certainly you would 14 consider he's the new applicant now, and 15 certainly you would consider his role in a 16 previous entity as - - as part of his 17 qualification. 18 ALDERMAN BOHL: Thank you. 19 MR. SCHRIMPF: By the way, I would 20 agree with counsel on the - - the e-mails at the 21 very end. Those do not have any indicia of - -22 of trustworthiness, whereas when you're dealing 23 with a warning letter from the Department of Agriculture, you're dealing with a governmental 2.4 25 agency that has processed the information and has 00068 1 come to a conclusion that they are, by Statute, authorized to make. That's why that's an exception to the hearsay rule. The e-mails would 4 not be. 5 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: And we'll ask the committee members in making your decision, not to 6 7 consider those - - those e-mails, which we've determined to be hearsay. This matter is in 8 9 committee. 10 ALDERMAN BOHL: Mr. Chairman. 11 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Alderman Bohl. 12 ALDERMAN BOHL: Mr. Chairman, this is -13 - I'm - - I'm really on the fence in this - - in 14 - - in one respect. But the - - the bottom line is that I still in my - - my - - my heart of 15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25 hearts when I actually look at this and kind of get my gut reaction, is that ultimately that there's a tie - - I still believe that there's ultimately a tie, and - - and, you know, there was another woman here who - - who said it - - sometime this morning that, you know, you can - - you can dress a pig up in lipstick, but it still is a pig. And - - And I - - I just don't know that - - that calling this a new company sheds

itself away from - - from the fact that - - that

00069 there were some real, real obvious consumer 1 concerns and just blatant, blatant non-compliance with - - with - - with the law, when it was even 4 pointed out day in and day out, and so, I - - I 5 at this point would move to deny. I - - I think 6 that my objection will be certainly in the 7 concern that - - that over Mr. Talyansky's past 8 involvement with Mid City, as - - as well as, 9 that the objections could have an adverse impact 10 on the - - the welfare of the public. 11 CHAIRMAN WITKOWIAK: Motion by Alderman 12 Bohl is to recommend denial based on items 13 contained on the police report and - - and 14 testimony that this will have an adverse impact 15 on the public health, safety and welfare of the 16 neighborhood. Is there any discussion on the 17 motion? Are there any objections to the motion? 18 Hearing none, so ordered. Thank you. 19 MR. RANDALL: Thank you. 20 * * * * *

```
00070
1
2
   STATE OF WISCONSIN )
3
4
5 MILWAUKEE COUNTY )
6
7
                  I, JEAN M. BARINA, of Milwaukee Reporters
        Associated, Inc., 5124 West Blue Mound Road,
8
9
        Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53208, certify that the foregoing
10
        proceedings is a full and complete transcript of the
11
        Midwest Auto Recycling portion taken in the foregoing
12
        proceedings.
13
14
15
16
17
18
                                      JEAN M. BARINA
19
                                      Court Reporter
20
21
22
    Dated this
                day of November, 2007.
```