

00001

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

CITY OF MILWAUKEE  
COMMON COUNCIL

In the Matter of:

736 South 3rd Street

Proceedings held in the above-entitled matter, June 25th, 2002 in the Common Council Chambers, 200 East Wells Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, before the Common Council, reported by Terese M. Schiebenes of Milwaukee Reporters Associated, Inc.

A-P-P-E-A-R-A-N-C-E-S

DAVID LARSON, appeared in person.  
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY, By BRUCE  
SCHRIMPF, 200 East Wells Street Milwaukee,  
Wisconsin, 53202, appeared on behalf of the Common  
Council.

00002

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

THE CLERK: The Committee recommends approval of Item 11, substitute motion to approve recommendations of the committee relative to the nonrenewal of the licensed dwelling facility license for the premises at 736 South 3rd Street.

PRESIDENT PRATT: Have members of the council read the report and recommendation of the Utilities & License Committee in this matter? We'll have roll call of that.

THE CLERK: Alderman Herron.

ALDERMAN HERRON: Aye.

THE CLERK: Alderman D'Amato.

ALDERMAN D'AMATO: Aye.

THE CLERK: Alderman Henningsen.

ALDERMAN HENNINGSEN: Aye.

THE CLERK: Alderman Bohl.

ALDERMAN BOHL: Aye.

THE CLERK: Alderman Johnson-Odom.

ALDERMAN JOHNSON-ODOM: Aye.

THE CLERK: Alderman Gordon.

ALDERMAN GORDON: Aye.

THE CLERK: Alderman Donovan.

ALDERMAN DONOVAN: Aye.

THE CLERK: Alderman Richards.

00003

1 ALDERMAN RICHARDS: Aye.  
2 THE CLERK: Alderman Cameron.  
3 ALDERMAN CAMERON: Aye.  
4 THE CLERK: Alderman Dudzik.  
5 ALDERMAN DUDZIK: Aye.  
6 THE CLERK: Alderman Sanchez.  
7 ALDERMAN SANCHEZ: Aye.  
8 THE CLERK: Alderman Pawlinski.  
9 ALDERMAN PAWLINSKI: Aye.  
10 THE CLERK: Alderman Breier.  
11 ALDERMAN BRIER: Aye.  
12 THE CLERK: Alderman Nardelli.  
13 ALDERMAN NARDELLI: Aye.  
14 THE CLERK: Alderman Murphy.  
15 ALDERMAN MURPHY: Aye.  
16 THE CLERK: Alderman Hines.  
17 ALDERMAN HINES: Aye.  
18 THE CLERK: Mr. President.  
19 PRESIDENT PRATT: Aye.  
20 THE CLERK: 17 ayes.  
21 PRESIDENT PRATT: 17 ayes.  
22 THE CLERK: Are the following licensees or  
23 complainants or their representatives present and wish  
24 to address the council: Licensee David Larson?  
25 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes, sir.

00004

1 THE CLERK: Did you wish to address the  
2 council, Mr. Larson, this morning?

3 MR. LARSON: Yes, I do.

4 THE CLERK: And let me ask if any of the  
5 complainants are present and wish to address the  
6 council: David Martin, Dain Maddox? Those are the  
7 two.

8 ALDERMAN NARDELLI: Mr. President, I want to  
9 formally object because the recommendation is to  
10 approve, making their appearance here unnecessary.

11 PRESIDENT PRATT: So your objection again,  
12 Alderman Nardelli?

13 ALDERMAN NARDELLI: We're recommending  
14 approval of their license. What's the argument?

15 THE CLERK: This one is recommended for  
16 nonrenewal.

17 PRESIDENT PRATT: Alderman Dudzik would move  
18 that we go into committee as a whole to hear oral  
19 arguments on behalf of the licensee or the  
20 complainants in opposition to the report and  
21 recommendations and a statement presented by the city  
22 attorney. Any objections to that? Roll call that.  
23 We don't have any objections to that, don't have to  
24 roll call it. Hearing no objections, if none, so  
25 ordered.

00005

1                   Okay, Mr. Larson. Each side shall be  
2 limited to five minutes. You have five minutes, Mr.  
3 Larson, and arguments shall be limited to the subject  
4 matter of the report and recommendations of the  
5 committee.

6                   (Whereupon, DAVID LARSON was duly sworn.)

7                   MR. LARSON: Members of the Common Council,  
8 the process for renewal of this rooming house license  
9 began with a notice from the Department of  
10 Neighborhood Services in February of this year. In  
11 early March, I submitted my application for license  
12 renewal, paid the required fee, and on March 20th  
13 passed the building inspection required for renewal.  
14 Unbeknownst to me was that previous to the building  
15 inspection, March 14th to be exact, a complaint from  
16 Mr. Dain Maddox had been recorded with the city clerk  
17 objecting to a rooming house license for my building.

18                   According to Mr. Dain's letter, he was  
19 renewing his previous request to deny a license for  
20 this location. There are two very disturbing issues  
21 here. First, I didn't receive notice of this or any  
22 other complaint until May 23rd, more than two months  
23 after the recording of the letter. Second, in his  
24 letter, Mr. Maddox expressed his concern over a number  
25 of rooming houses in the neighborhood, not legal

00006

1 justification for the denial of renewal of a rooming  
2 house license. He specifically stated that, quote,  
3 "We do not need more rooming houses" in this  
4 neighborhood.

5 Mr. Maddox recently attempted to have the  
6 renewal of a license denied for another rooming house  
7 less than a block from his home. While I applaud his  
8 concern for the neighborhood, I must suggest that Mr.  
9 Maddox is on a crusade to reduce the number of rooming  
10 houses near his own home beginning with my facility.

11 Consider that I was not informed of any  
12 complaints, concerns, or objections to the rooming  
13 house by any of the neighbors directly for the entire  
14 time I have owned the building nor have any of my  
15 tenants, guests of tenants, or I received any fines,  
16 citations, or warnings from the police, the Department  
17 of Neighborhood Services, or other city departments.  
18 In other words, the rooming house has a clean history  
19 during my time of ownership.

20 Also consider that it has been only 32 days  
21 from the time I first received notice of any  
22 neighborhood concerns, specifically the city notice  
23 of the formal process for reviewing the rooming house  
24 license application to today's hearing. That's hardly  
25 enough time to address concerns and bring about change

00007

1 for the rooming house, if indicated. Please remember,  
2 no one from the neighborhood has offered me the  
3 opportunity to discuss or work on resolving any of  
4 their concerns or issues.

5 Of additional concern is the bias with which  
6 the findings of fact, conclusion of law, and resulting  
7 recommendation was completed by a hearing examiner.  
8 Much of my very relevant testimony and mention of my  
9 only witness, Mr. Albert Wellstein here today, and his  
10 supporting testimony were omitted in addition to many  
11 inaccuracies in reporting. This is certainly not due  
12 process but appears to be to me hostile grounds for  
13 legal action.

14 The building has been for sale for four  
15 weeks. Although most parties interested in the  
16 property have expressed no desire to operate a rooming  
17 house, some have. It is my feeling that if the  
18 rooming house license is not renewed, this will hamper  
19 my efforts to sell the building. There's certainly a  
20 stigma attached to a property denied the opportunity  
21 to operate as it was intended. Even with the  
22 suspension of the license, the same stigma is  
23 attached.

24 My final concern is for the welfare of the  
25 tenants of the rooming house. 10 individuals, some

00008

1 without employment, would be forced to find new homes.  
2 Two tenants, one 18 and the other 19, are just  
3 beginning to learn what living independently is all  
4 about. My tenants are not bad people, just less  
5 fortunate in many cases than most of us. Although I  
6 do not know how much time they would have to  
7 accomplish relocation, it's very difficult to find low  
8 income housing. Some will undoubtedly end up homeless  
9 and would probably remain right in the neighborhood.  
10 I don't want any part of being responsible for putting  
11 anyone out on the street.

12 I'm asking that you allow for renewal of  
13 this rooming house license and hope that the matter  
14 ends here. Thank you for your time and consideration.

15 PRESIDENT PRATT: Thank you. Questions from  
16 members of the council to Mr. Larson?

17 ALDERMAN SANCHEZ: One.

18 PRESIDENT PRATT: Any other questions from  
19 members of the council of Mr. Larson? Thank you, Mr.  
20 Larson. We'll now hear from the City Attorney.

21 MR. SCHRIMPF: Thank you, Mr. President.  
22 While I was drafting the committee finding of fact,  
23 which, of course, are largely based on the hearing  
24 examiner's findings of fact, I went through the  
25 transcript references that the hearing examiner



00009

1 included in the report to the Utilities & Licenses  
2 Committee, and all of those transcript references upon  
3 which he based his individual findings of fact checked  
4 out. Therefore, the record contains the facts the  
5 hearing examiner says were in the record regarding the  
6 basis upon which he ultimately came to the conclusion  
7 he did.

8 So as far as notice was concerned, I think  
9 the objection of Mr. Larson relates to whether or not  
10 the neighbors who were objecting had contacted him  
11 prior to the time that they filed something formal  
12 with the City of Milwaukee. It would be nice if  
13 neighbors would do that. The experience of the  
14 Utilities & Licenses Committee is that sometimes  
15 neighbors do and sometimes neighbors don't. The  
16 ordinance requires that if they have a specific  
17 objection and if they file that with the City of  
18 Milwaukee, then at the point in time that the City of  
19 Milwaukee is considering the renewal of the license,  
20 the City of Milwaukee must provide a list of the  
21 written objections to the neighbors, to the licensee,  
22 which was done in this case.

23 The final point that I'd like to address is  
24 the issue raised by Mr. Larson regarding the number of  
25 rooming houses in the area, which was raised by Mr.

00010

1 Maddox. That was specifically dealt with by the  
2 hearing examiner in Conclusion of Law No. 2 in his  
3 report, which was replicated in the committee report;  
4 namely, that there was the objection as to  
5 concentration of rooming houses, and he specifically  
6 rejected that conclusion or that argument in drafting  
7 the findings because this was a renewal and not a new  
8 license, and concentration of outlets or concentration  
9 of licensed facilities is an issue that applies only  
10 on an application for a new license. So Mr. Larson's  
11 concerns in that regard were, in fact, addressed by  
12 the hearing examiner by rejecting those matters  
13 outright.

14 I stand ready to answer any questions  
15 that you have.

16 PRESIDENT PRATT: Alderman Richards.

17 ALDERMAN RICHARDS: Yes. Attorney Schrimpf,  
18 could you recount for me -- I believe Mr. Larson said  
19 that he had something to the effect -- and I just want  
20 to get it accurately -- that he had no complaints, no  
21 violations. But what is his record in terms of  
22 operating the rooming house in this period?

23 MR. SCHRIMPF: The hearing examiner  
24 determined -- and this was supported by the transcript  
25 -- that the Department of Neighborhood Services

00011

1 appeared, and she indicated there were no pending work  
2 orders or code violations on the property at that  
3 time, and therefore, the Department of Neighborhood  
4 Services had no objection to renewal of the license.  
5 Furthermore, the Milwaukee Police Department had no  
6 objections, as well.

7 That is something that relates to the  
8 physical condition of the building and whether or not  
9 the police department actually has got a record of  
10 some violations that occur at the premises. This was  
11 a situation, not unlike other situations the Utilities  
12 & Licenses Committee routinely sees, where there are  
13 problems that are observed by the neighbors. The  
14 neighbors appear, they testify about those problems,  
15 notice of those problems is given by the city to the  
16 licensee, and the licensee rather has the opportunity,  
17 one, to introduce countervailing evidence, and two,  
18 cross-examine the witnesses that are appearing and  
19 testifying as to these particular problems.

20 MR. RICHARDSON: Another question. Would  
21 you -- and I read the hearing examiner's data end  
22 report. In reading that yourself, did you get --  
23 It's hard for me to judge, when I see, for instance,  
24 the owner of the property, I -- H.I. -- the owner of  
25 the property testified that at times the door of the

00012

1 property is left open and locked. Without any  
2 doorbells on the property, this leads to noise and  
3 nuisances of honking horns and people yelling upstairs  
4 to tenants. I know we all get irritated when that  
5 happens.

6 I had a sign I printed in my newsletter,  
7 "Your horn is not a doorbell." It didn't cause a  
8 massive change of behavior in my district or anywhere  
9 else, I guess. How substantive was this complaint?  
10 Was it widespread, was it occasional? We're talking  
11 about a rooming house, and I don't think any of us  
12 live in a rooming house by choice. I know none of us  
13 says, "Gee, if I get enough money, I'm going to go and  
14 move in a rooming house." That's sort of not the  
15 first choice of people, it's where people go. And we  
16 do want to have rooming houses. We need them, and  
17 they need to be well run. We're trying to decide  
18 whether or not this one is well enough run to continue  
19 its license. That's what I'm trying to get at.

20 MR. SCHRIMPF: With respect to -- That  
21 particular problem, at least from the transcript, did  
22 not stand out as any greater problem than the other  
23 problems that were associated with the rooming house.  
24 This was one of those situations where you have a  
25 variety of episodes of conduct by either the residents

00013

1 of the rooming house or guests of the rooming house,  
2 and that while that particular problem occurred and  
3 while that particular problem occurred on a number of  
4 occasions, as was testified to, it was a problem that,  
5 combined with the other problems, were creating the  
6 animosity of the neighbors and the concerns of the  
7 neighbors for the peace and quiet of the neighborhood.  
8 By itself, probably not enough to deny renewal of the  
9 license, but coupled with everything else, it  
10 indicates the pattern.

11 And I might add if the rooming house is not  
12 equipped with doorbells, that is something that would,  
13 in fact -- there's no legal requirement for doorbells,  
14 but if, in fact, the operator of the rooming house is  
15 interested in getting along with the neighbors and  
16 this is a problem that's occurring, then that's  
17 something that could be installed to address that  
18 particular problem, and at least one issue would be  
19 deleted from the case.

20 ALDERMAN RICHARDS: I guess one last  
21 question. How many rooming houses do we have in the  
22 city?

23 MR. SCHRIMPF: If I told you, I would be  
24 hazarding a total guess. I have no idea.

25 MR. RICHARDSON: Couple hundred?

00014

1 MR. SCHRIMPF: I would guess it's in that  
2 area. That's totally a guess. I have no idea.

3 ALDERMAN RICHARDS: And of the rooming  
4 houses that we have, what percentage have these kinds  
5 of difficulties?

6 MR. SCHRIMPF: Again, that would be  
7 hazarding a guess.

8 ALDERMAN PAWLINSKI: Mr. Chairman, I can  
9 probably answer that question. I can answer the  
10 question this way, in that in two-and-a-half years now  
11 serving as chairman of the committee, we have not had  
12 a rooming house license come up for renewal except for  
13 these three, which were legitimately filed by  
14 complainants. So you have a case where very few reach  
15 the level where we need to conduct a hearing on this.  
16 I don't think technically the committee conducted a  
17 hearing since 1998. So most of the rooming houses  
18 operate in a manner that is not detrimental to the  
19 health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood.

20 MR. SCHRIMPF: I would agree with the  
21 Alderman. The experience of the committee is that  
22 these are relatively rare.

23 PRESIDENT PRATT: The Chair recognizes  
24 Alderman Marlene Johnson-Odom, then Alderman Angel  
25 Sanchez. Alderwoman Johnson-Odom.

00015

1 ALDERWOMAN JOHNSON-ODOM: Attorney Schrimpf,  
2 in your opinion, if this were denied and Mr. Larson  
3 took this to court, would he win?

4 MR. SCHRIMPF: The standard that's typically  
5 applied to one of these is whether or not there was  
6 any evidence in the record upon which the Common  
7 Council could come to the conclusion that it did.  
8 There certainly is, because it was specifically  
9 referred to and cited in the transcripts, and that's  
10 precisely why I cross-checked those citations in the  
11 transcripts. So applying the usual rules of law,  
12 there is sufficient evidence in the record to support  
13 a finding, in this case a recommendation and a finding  
14 of nonrenewal of the license.

15 ALDERWOMAN JOHNSON-ODOM: I don't know if I  
16 can ask this next question without going into the next  
17 renewal, which had more objections than this one  
18 presented to the committee.

19 MR. SCHRIMPF: I'm sorry, I didn't hear all  
20 that.

21 ALDERWOMAN JOHNSON-ODOM: The next license  
22 was renewed.

23 PRESIDENT PRATT: On this license,  
24 Alderwoman, do you have a question on this one?

25 ALDERWOMAN JOHNSON-ODOM: I read the

00016

1 findings of fact, and there were fewer people  
2 objecting to this one than the one coming up, which  
3 was approved. So I'm just wondering if this kind of  
4 thing could be used in court. If the judge would  
5 approve it, it supersedes our action here.

6 MR. SCHRIMPF: Are you referring to 902  
7 South 3rd?

8 PRESIDENT PRATT: The last one is 902 South  
9 3rd, File No. 011680.

10 MR. SCHRIMPF: Well, Alderman, you don't  
11 particularly look at the number of specific findings  
12 of fact or the number of the particular complaints,  
13 you look -- and that's what the hearing examiner is  
14 required to do, the committee and this council is  
15 required to do -- you look at the substance of them.  
16 And I think what is very clear from reading the  
17 substance of these particular complaints is that the  
18 hearing examiner -- this was supported by the record  
19 -- was impressed by the fact that not only were there  
20 these complaints, but there were some of these  
21 complaints and calls for police service that were, in  
22 fact, generated by the operator of the rooming house,  
23 and that seemed to play very large in the hearing  
24 examiner's recommendations. The licensee says, "Look,  
25 that indicates that I'm managing the property properly



00017

1 because when I hear of a problem, I call the police,  
2 which is the proper thing to do."

3 The hearing examiner and the council have to  
4 look at the issue of well, why are the police being  
5 called, because obviously, if the police are being  
6 called, there are problems that are being generated,  
7 there is noise that is being generated, there are  
8 concerns for the safety of the residents in the area,  
9 and from that, do you conclude that this is operated  
10 in such a manner that it's consistent with the  
11 ordinances of the city? Certainly one of the items in  
12 the ordinances is the fact that if the location  
13 generates police calls to the point where it is -- you  
14 are concerned about the health, safety, and welfare of  
15 the citizens both residing within the facility and  
16 those residing immediately around the facility, then  
17 you have a basis for concluding that no, this is not  
18 being operated in a manner consistent with the  
19 ordinances, which is what the hearing examiner did.

20 ALDERWOMAN JOHNSON-ODOM: My last question.  
21 This decision, was it based on what the hearing  
22 examiner said, and did he examine all three?

23 MR. SCHRIMPF: I'm sorry, I couldn't hear  
24 the end of that.

25 ALDERWOMAN JOHNSON-ODOM: Were all three of

00018

1 these rooming houses examined by the hearing examiner?

2 MR. SCHRIMPF: Yes. On different days, but  
3 they were all before the same examiner.

4 ALDERWOMAN JOHNSON-ODOM: So the conclusion  
5 was based on what the hearing examiner said?

6 MR. SCHRIMPF: It was based upon several  
7 factors; number one, the presentation of the hearing  
8 examiner, number two, the evidence that was cited by  
9 the hearing examiner, and number three, the facts that  
10 were provided by the hearing examiner as well as the  
11 conclusions of law.

12 PRESIDENT PRATT: Alderman Sanchez.

13 ALDERMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Mr.  
14 President. Just simply I wanted to let everyone know  
15 that I support all the recommendations that the  
16 hearing examiner made. Only some rooming houses from  
17 time to time have been a problem in the district. I  
18 know some of the rooming houses. There's others that  
19 will be coming up, as well, in the near future. And so  
20 I'll support the recommendations from the hearing  
21 examiner. Thank you.

22 PRESIDENT PRATT: Thank you, Alderman  
23 Sanchez. Two other lights on. Alderman Richards and  
24 Alderman Henningsen.

25 MR. RICHARDSON: One question on the written

00019

1 testimony by Mr. Larson on the second to the last  
2 page. Page 3, Item 6, "My only witness, his testimony  
3 was omitted." Could you comment on that?

4 PRESIDENT PRATT: Excuse me, Mr. Schrimpf.  
5 Could you speak up a little louder. The court  
6 reporter is having some problems picking up. Could we  
7 speak up a little louder. Go ahead.

8 MR. SCHRIMPF: One witness who lives there  
9 has indicated that he has not seen or was aware of --  
10 which was the exact testimony -- drug activity,  
11 prostitution, or other illegal activity with the  
12 tenants. That is a fact that was testified to by one  
13 of the witnesses. The hearing examiner then also  
14 looked at other witnesses who testified who said that  
15 they did see these things, and the licensee himself  
16 who said that yeah, not only did he see and was aware  
17 of these things, but he himself had to call the police  
18 regarding some of these matters.

19 So you take that testimony in light of this  
20 testimony, and what the person is saying is, he's not  
21 saying I deny that this activity is occurring, he's  
22 saying I'm unaware of it. And there are other  
23 witnesses who testified who knew the licensee who  
24 said, "Well, yeah, we are aware of it." So obviously,  
25 what the hearing examiner did was disregard the

00020

1 testimony of Mr. Wellstein, probably because he didn't  
2 deny that the activity was going on, he was simply  
3 unaware of it, which really kind of doesn't get you  
4 anywhere when you have other witnesses who testified  
5 to dates, times, places, circumstances, and events  
6 that they can nail down with particularity and say  
7 yes, this did occur.

8 MR. RICHARDSON: In other words, you're  
9 saying that the hearing examiner omitted his testimony  
10 because it wasn't substantive or it was irrelevant or  
11 it didn't prove any point?

12 MR. SCHRIMPF: It doesn't prove a point,  
13 because the person doesn't say it didn't occur, he's  
14 saying I'm unaware of it.

15 ALDERMAN RICHARDS: It doesn't open us up  
16 under review for saying he was selective in accepting  
17 testimony?

18 MR. SCHRIMPF: No, because it's something  
19 that courts have to do all the time. Witnesses see  
20 different things different ways all the time, and you  
21 have to make choices as to the testimony.

22 PRESIDENT PRATT: Alderman Henningsen.

23 ALDERMAN HENNINGSEN: There was one telling  
24 fact that was recited and then disputed that I'd like  
25 to ask you. The gentleman said he evicted nine

00021

1 people. Isn't it true that he was owning that for a  
2 period of time and he originally rented to those  
3 people?

4 MR. SCHRIMPF: That's true. He may not --  
5 Wait. They may have been there at the point that he  
6 took it over, that's a possibility.

7 ALDERMAN HENNINGSEN: That was not asked?  
8 Because it always gets me -- and I've had some  
9 experience with the rooming house thing, I think we  
10 amended the ordinance years ago to have these types of  
11 hearings just like tavern licenses -- but it's always  
12 amazing that landlords can come in and say, "Well, you  
13 know, I evicted the damn guy when you called." I  
14 said, "Yeah, but you rented to him in the first place.  
15 How did you do that?" Well, no screening, no record  
16 check, no credit check.

17 MR. SCHRIMPF: I don't believe the record  
18 reflects whether he initially rented to the  
19 individuals that he evicted. If he did not originally  
20 rent to them, when he purchased the rooming house, he  
21 was subject to the same -- In other words, there was  
22 a contract, and when he purchased the rooming house,  
23 he had a choice, he could either throw all the people  
24 out, which if you're operating a rooming house would  
25 not make economic sense, so you wouldn't do that, and

00022

1           therefore, you would allow that particular contract,  
2           even if it's a verbal contract, to continue.  
3                        His point in giving that testimony was to  
4           show that he is being proactive.  You are raising the  
5           counter argument why are you renting to such people in  
6           first place, why don't you run better checks?  
7                        PRESIDENT PRATT:  Thank you.  Thank you.  
8           Alderman Dudzik moves that the committee now rises.  
9           Is there any further discussion on this license?  If  
10          members approve of the committee's recommendation, no  
11          further action is necessary.  If you don't approve,  
12          then someone would have to make a motion to override  
13          the committee's recommendation.  
14                        I would request a vote of those council  
15          members in attendance to approve the recommendations  
16          of the Utilities & Licenses Committee as contained in  
17          File No. 011703.  City Clerk, please call the roll.  
18                        THE CLERK:  Alderman Herron.  
19                        ALDERMAN HERRON:  Aye.  
20                        THE CLERK:  Alderman D'Amato.  
21                        ALDERMAN D'AMATO:  Aye.  
22                        THE CLERK:  Alderman Henningsen.  
23                        ALDERMAN HENNINGSEN:  Aye.  
24                        THE CLERK:  Alderman Bohl.  
25                        ALDERMAN BOHL:  Aye.

00023

1 THE CLERK: Alderman Johnson-Odom.  
2 ALDERMAN JOHNSON-ODOM: Aye.  
3 THE CLERK: Alderman Gordon.  
4 ALDERMAN GORDON: (No response.)  
5 PRESIDENT PRATT: Excused.  
6 THE CLERK: Alderman Donovan.  
7 ALDERMAN DONOVAN: Aye.  
8 THE CLERK: Alderman Richards.  
9 ALDERMAN RICHARDS: Aye.  
10 THE CLERK: Alderman Cameron.  
11 ALDERMAN CAMERON: Aye.  
12 THE CLERK: Alderman Dudzik.  
13 ALDERMAN DUDZIK: Aye.  
14 THE CLERK: Alderman Sanchez.  
15 ALDERMAN SANCHEZ: Aye.  
16 THE CLERK: Alderman Pawlinski.  
17 ALDERMAN PAWLINSKI: Aye.  
18 THE CLERK: Alderman Breier.  
19 ALDERMAN BRIER: Aye.  
20 THE CLERK: Alderman Nardelli.  
21 ALDERMAN NARDELLI: Aye.  
22 THE CLERK: Alderman Murphy.  
23 ALDERMAN MURPHY: Aye.  
24 THE CLERK: Alderman Hines.  
25 ALDERMAN HINES: Aye.

00024

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6

THE CLERK: Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PRATT: Aye.

THE CLERK: 16 ayes, one excused.

PRESIDENT PRATT: 16 ayes, one excused. The  
committee's report is upheld.

\* \* \*



00025

1 STATE OF WISCONSIN )  
2 )  
3 MILWAUKEE COUNTY )  
4

5 I, TERESE M. SCHIEBENES, of Milwaukee  
6 Reporters Associated, Inc., 5120 West Blue Mound Road,  
7 Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53208, certify that the  
8 foregoing proceedings is a full and complete  
9 transcript of my stenographic notes taken in the  
10 foregoing proceedings.

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

TERESE M. SCHIEBENES  
Certified Shorthand Reporter

Dated this            day of                                , 2002.

