

From: [Owczarski, Jim](#)
To: [Connelly, Kristin D.](#)
Cc: [Koster, Vanessa](#); [Lee, Chris](#)
Subject: RE: Protest Petition (Received 09-05-17).pdf
Date: Monday, September 18, 2017 12:29:09 PM

Given this and ACA Mukamal's comments below, I will ask that Chris include this e-mail chain in the record as certifying this petition as to form.

Unless, of course, I hear objections.

Thanks,

Jim

Jim Owczarski, CMC
City Clerk
(414)-286-2998
@mkeclerk

From: Connelly, Kristin D.
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2017 12:13 PM
To: Owczarski, Jim; Connelly, Kristin D.
Cc: Koster, Vanessa
Subject: Re: Protest Petition (Received 09-05-17).pdf

This is the property that we note as the owner signature on the petition not matching what is shown on the Assessors database - immediately north of the subject site. Therefore, we did an analysis with and without including this property. It does not affect the outcome and the 20% threshold of valid signatures is still met.

Sent from my U.S.Cellular© Smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: "Owczarski, Jim" <jowcza@milwaukee.gov>
Date: 9/18/17 11:56 AM (GMT-06:00)
To: "Connelly, Kristin D." <Kristin.Connelly@milwaukee.gov>
Cc: "Koster, Vanessa" <Vanessa.Koster@milwaukee.gov>
Subject: FW: Protest Petition (Received 09-05-17).pdf

Please see ACA Mukamal's inquiry below?

Jim

Jim Owczarski, CMC
City Clerk
(414)-286-2998
@mkeclerk

From: Mukamal, Stuart
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2017 11:24 AM
To: Owczarski, Jim
Subject: RE: Protest Petition (Received 09-05-17).pdf

The petitions are satisfactory as to form. They all appear to be in order and valid, with one possible exception—the second one in the stack, signed by CCRT Properties. The defect is extremely technical and perhaps not relevant, but I should bring it to your attention. The notary (Deborah Lewandowski), who acknowledged the signature of the partnership’s agent, put her own name in the space setting forth the name of the person whose signature was being notarized, and not the name of the signer/petitioner, as should have been the case. This was undoubtedly an oversight, but could possibly void the signature as a matter of form. Rather than get into those weeds, let me ask whether this single petition affects satisfaction of the mandated 20% threshold needed to trigger the $\frac{3}{4}$ supermajority requirement? If not, this defect is of no consequence.

Stu.