

MINUTES
SEX OFFENDER RESIDENCE BOARD
Wednesday, September 14, 2016
City Hall, Room 207
2:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Dean Gerondale, Ben Heiman, Kathy De Cremer, Heidi Michel

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Renee Keehan

The meeting was called to order by Dean Gerondale.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval of the August 10, 2016 Minutes of the Sex Offender Residency Board meeting

Motion made by K. De Cremer to approve the August 10, 2016 Minutes, seconded by B. Heiman. All in favor. Motion carried.

2. APPEALS

(a) Appeal of Steven Gittens requesting to move to 3569 Satellite Lane

Steven appeared in person with his attorney, Sean Linnan. Because Steven is deaf, the City provided captionist services. D. Gerondale advised Steven of his right to discuss treatment issues in closed session and informed him not to use the names of the victims.

D. Gerondale stated the board will discuss Steven's offense, mitigating circumstances relating to the crime and any treatment he has received. The board will use this information to determine if they feel he is a risk to reoffend and whether or not this is a good location for him to reside.

Because Steven has appeared before the board previously, they did not ask him to go over the details of the offense again. D. Gerondale asked Steven if he agrees the board has gone over his case previously. Steven stated, "Yes, I do."

Steven stated his treatment can be discussed publicly.

D. Gerondale asked Steven to describe what treatment programs he's completed. Steven stated he completed a six month SOT program with a private therapist and provided the certificate to confirm this. Through treatment he learned this type of crime

can affect someone for the rest of their life and it is something they will never forget. Also in treatment, they discussed his past and the present.

D. Gerondale asked Steven what made him do what he did. Steven explained he had gone to the hardware store that day and on the way home decided to see if anyone would actually show up. He was just curious. He had no intentions of having sex with a minor child. He's not that kind of person. If he had met someone underage, he guarantees nothing would have happened. Steven can't believe he's being accused of that because he never would have done it. Steven stated he would never hurt anyone. He likes helping people.

D. Gerondale asked Steven if he is denying he went there to meet an underage girl. Attorney Linnan stated Steven just said he did go there, out of curiosity, to see if she was real. He didn't say he wasn't going there to meet her. He said he knew her age and is not denying that.

Steven admits talking to the girl on line. She did not ask to meet Steven for sex. She just asked to meet and asked what they'd do if they did meet. Steven said they could just chat and see what happens from there. Steven explained that statement is not to imply he was going to have sex with her, but admits if someone wants to distort the truth, this statement could go that route. He would not have sex with a 15 year old girl. That is so far from the truth. Steven stated the girl then said, "Oh, well, I was hoping for more." Steven felt this statement was an important fact in defending his case in court, the fact that the "victim" started the conversation.

D. Gerondale asked Steven to confirm he was convicted of that crime. Attorney Linnan stated he pled "no contest." There is a material difference between admitting guilt and pleading no contest, which implies that if it were to go to trial, he would stand a substantial likelihood of conviction. These are two entirely different things.

D. Gerondale would like Steven to describe what he's learned in sex offender treatment. Attorney Linnan commented that it sounds like D. Gerondale is trying to take over the job of the sex offender counselor who has already verified in writing and in a number of other documents that Steven completed treatment successfully.

D. Gerondale indicated the board is asking these questions to help them decide if they feel Steven is a risk for recidivism. The board was not in his treatment sessions, so they would like to hear from Steven, in his own words, what he's learned. Attorney Linnan believes the board is second guessing the methodology the counselor used to decide whether or not Steven successfully completed his treatment.

D. Gerondale said all they have to go by is the certificate. It would help to have a detailed summary from the counselor regarding the risk for recidivism, triggers, etc.

Steven stated he also completed his assessment with ATTIC services.

D. Gerondale asked Steven what triggers could potentially cause him to do this again. Steven said there are no triggers that would make him do that. He has no interest in meeting a 15 year old girl. He's been in a relationship with Julie for three years and is happy and in love with her.

D. Gerondale asked Steven why he thinks he should be allowed to live in this community and why people should believe he's not a risk to their children. Steven replied that he would never hurt anyone. He would help someone. He works hard. He doesn't sit around the house all day. If a neighbor needed help with something, he would gladly help them out. They have nothing to fear regarding their children. He's not that kind of person. People that know him would tell you this. Steven has a daughter of his own who is in college. They talk on the phone and text. She supports Steven and is aware of what is going on.

In his assessment, H. Michel indicated Steven reported that he had difficulty with self-regulation as indicated by lack of emotional control, impulsivity, boredom and loneliness. She asked Steven how he deals with these issues now. Steven stated he's gotten back into his woodworking hobby. He helps his sister out. He's on medication for his depression. He has support from his family. He helps his sister's son on the farm. He is friendly and would like people to give him a chance.

H. Michel asked how he's handling the lack of emotional control and impulsivity. Steven said he's doing great. He's happier more now than he's ever been. His relationship with his girlfriend and family are strong. He's not as depressed as he used to be now that his medication has been increased. He's just trying to move on with his life.

H. Michel does not feel he's answered her question. Attorney Linnan stated he himself doesn't understand the question. H. Michel stated Steven admitted he had a lack of emotional control and impulsivity. She is obviously concerned about "impulsivity." How is Steven addressing that? Steven stated, "That's in the past." H. Michel then stated he self-reported issues with that.

Attorney Linnan stated Steven explained he is now in a stable relationship and is taking medication.

H. Michel pointed out his assessment states he lacked remorse. He took a victim's stance in relationship to the legal consequences of his crime. H. Michel asked Steven how he has addressed that. Steven stated he doesn't understand the question and asked for help. Attorney Linnan asked H. Michel to ask the question differently. H. Michel stated: "During your assessment, you took responsibility for your crime, but they indicated you lacked any kind of remorse."

Attorney Linnan believes it's been over a year since that assessment was done. Steven completed seven months of treatment after that and it helped him understand his "would be" victim would have been impacted by this type of behavior. The board should remember there wasn't an actual victim in this case. H. Michel stated the therapist

doesn't state if Steven has remorse. Steven stated he accepts responsibility for what he did.

As stated in the past, D. Gerondale believes Steven has accepted responsibility for his actions. However, D. Gerondale clarified that H. Michel is specifically asking him if, at the time, he had remorse for what happened. Steven stated that at that time, he wasn't expecting anything to happen. D. Gerondale then asked, "So the answer would be 'no' then." Attorney Linnan then stated, "Well, I don't think that's fair. Generally speaking, remorse is related to the actual victim and what impact he had on that person. But there wasn't a person. It was a sting. He was never in communication with a 15 year old. So asking him if he regrets how he made her feel is a little bit of a tough answer to give, don't you think? Is he remorseful that he ended up getting arrested for doing something stupid? I think he took responsibility for that and served time and paid fines and he's doing this because of it."

K. De Cremer stated there could very well have been a victim, but this just happened to be a sting. As an example, Attorney Linnan then stated: "If I drive drunk and I don't hit somebody, I can't be remorseful for what I almost did. I can be regretful of making bad choices."

D. Gerondale then asked Steven if he had any regrets for participating in the soliciting of an underaged minor? Steven said, "Yes, it's something that never should have happened." He learned a valuable lesson from this. Steven pointed out that at the last meeting D. Gerondale stated Steven had shown remorse and that he has come a long way in his rehabilitation. D. Gerondale agreed he did make that statement.

D. Gerondale stated the board received many letters in support of Mr. Gittens: Kelly Gittens (his sister); Patrick (his father); Gail (his mother). Steven also provided an informational letter from his agent.

Alison Wineski, 3581 Satellite Lane – Alison lives on Satellite Lane. She is here to represent the community and other neighbors. The neighborhood has been peaceful since Steven's last appeal in July. Steven has manipulated the system and has a long rap sheet. Since nothing has changed in his status since then, he should not be allowed to appeal again. Mr. Gittens likes being outside. A lot of children play in this neighborhood. They are against him living at this residence.

D. Gerondale stated the reason Mr. Gittens' appeal is being heard again today is because he was not represented adequately in terms of communicating at the last meeting. There is someone here today to help communicate adequately.

Maureen Rasmussen, 910 Barronwood Drive. Maureen lives near Satellite Lane. She feels it's Steven's responsibility to find a proper place to live in accordance with his crime. Maureen does not think this is an appropriate neighborhood. He and Julie deceived them and manipulated the system. Kids roam freely between the houses.

Alder Barbara Dorff – Ald. Dorff submitted a written statement for the last meeting because she could not be in attendance. She represents District 1 and neighbors have contacted her with their concerns. She reiterated concern that Mr. Gittens did not follow proper procedure when he was at the Wiggins Way address and now at this Satellite Lane address. This area has a lot of kids and teenagers. She asks that the Board deny his appeal.

Officer Matheny – Officer Matheny suggested the board obtain reports from Ashwaubenon Public Safety to make an educated decision regarding this appeal. Officer Matheny feels Mr. Gittens has made deceptive comments today. For example, that he wouldn't hurt anyone. He has a disorderly conduct conviction. Also, Mr. Gittens told Officer Matheny, personally, that he and Julie didn't have his black SUV there because he didn't want the neighbors to know that he was still living with her. This was even though Officer Matheny issued him citations for being there.

Officer Matheny asked if Mr. Gittens has an ankle monitor. Attorney Linnan stated he is on an ankle monitor and has been the entire time Officer Matheny cited him for being at Julie's. This would have demonstrated he wasn't staying there. Steven didn't understand the process.

Officer Matheny stated his boss did ask probation and parole for Steven's GPS information and they refused to give it to them. Attorney Linnan stated that doesn't mean he's guilty. It just means you didn't get the proof. Attorney Linnan said Officer Matheny is referring to a domestic dispute that happened back in 2005. Officer Matheny stated he's talking about a pattern of behavior.

Attorney Linnan stated Mr. Gittens does not have a driver's license. He can't operate the car. The reason it was at Julie's house was because it needed to be stored somewhere. But because it was at Julie's house, it misled the entire community into thinking he was living there, that it was his personal vehicle he was driving to and from the house. He's had the car a long time but now his driving privileges are revoked. Julie's statement that she drives him to and from the house makes sense when you consider the fact he cannot operate the car. She wouldn't have made that statement if he could operate the car.

Attorney Linnan stated that obviously if you look at someone's past, you can find reasons why they might not want to be neighborly. In this case, the statute is crystal clear and the only criteria this board can even be concerned with is his likelihood of reoffending, his threat to the community and the welfare of the community. And welfare needs to be read, in his opinion, with a high level of scrutiny, because we're not talking about -- is he popular, is he a nice guy, is he going to be a good neighbor? We're not talking about if he's going to mow the grass sufficiently to meet city code. We're talking about whether or not he's going to be a threat. Attorney Linnan does not know if that's something that's been lost in the board, because at one point Steven was denied and one of the suggestions was that he go out and get to know his neighbors. Steven's parole officer reached out to Attorney Linnan, specifically, and said had he done that,

had he gone door to door and met the neighbors and introduced himself, he would have been arrested for violation of probation. He's not allowed to go door to door. It's a violation of state statute 946.46.

Aside from not being able to hear, aside from frankly wanting to keep his distance from the neighbors – and Attorney Linnan has a hard time imagining that the neighbors would want him to be around more than he already is – It seems odd to Attorney Linnan that they would suggest he could have been more neighborly. He thinks had he been more neighborly, they would be coming in with the exact same concern -- This guy is around too much!

The other concern Attorney Linnan has is that this situation comes close to violation of the Fourteenth Amendment, and because it does that, hundreds of jurisdictions across the United States have already decided that these types of ordinances, these sex offender registration residency restriction programs, are unconstitutional. The board should want to protect the community's continuing right to do this by giving it a high level of scrutiny and not pandering to the fact that the majority doesn't like him, that they don't want him around.

According to Attorney Linnan, the real question is, at the prior address where he was approved to live, and the times he was given these 30 day periods of probation, did he do anything wrong? Was he a bad neighbor? Did he reoffend? Attorney Linnan finds it ironic that the board denies him permission to live at Julie's house because he was illegally living at Julie's house. The very permission that the board can give him is the thing that would have made what he did legal. Attorney Linnan understands it's a failure to remain law abiding. The reason this ordinance is so troublesome generally speaking is because it forces so many people into homelessness. Steven doesn't have any employment. His employment options are extremely limited. He has social security income. So the idea that he can just go and set up shop somewhere else is a fairly farfetched thought. In the meantime he's homeless, which Attorney Linnan thinks puts Green Bay, as a whole, in a worse position in terms of monitoring and making sure that he is not a risk to society.

One of the objections that this board had last time was that he didn't have a lot of friends and family in the audience to support him. At that exact same meeting, the board approved a girl who had no one here and whose own statement was, "My friends and family ditched me. They are not going to have anything to do with me." Attorney Linnan is not comparing cases, but the point is that this ordinance and the fact that it precludes people from living with their support network, only reinforces the likelihood that family and friends are going to become more despondent from (recording unclear).

Steven has not demonstrated he will be a bad neighbor. Lying about whether or not he lived at the house – that's bad judgment, if it happened at all. Attorney Linnan believes there was proof available that he wasn't there. If one reads the statute about residency, it says that you have to be living somewhere overnight for a consecutive period of 30 days. As an attorney, Linnan knows that is not how residency is supposed to be

defined. The definition of residency is extremely murky. So for someone who stays at her house 15 or 20 nights of the month, you might view that as residency. The court might see that as residency, especially given the fact that Steven doesn't have an alternative residency. This just demonstrates that that level of bad judgment is not nearly as high as Officer Matheny would like them to think it is.

D. Gerondale asked Mr. Gittens if he wants to comment on any of the statements made from the officer and residents.

Mr. Gittens stated he can't believe it's come to the point where he had to hire an attorney to be present with him today.

He knows for a fact there are people worse off than him that are being allowed to live in Green Bay. Some things he's read in past minutes are just completely off the wall. When he was allowed at Julie's for 30 days, someone made the comment he was outside just for his own enjoyment. He has better things to do with his time than watch what other people do. He has his own responsibilities around the house to take care of. As far as his rap sheet goes, that's in the past and it's starting to get old. He has not repeated any domestic offenses. That was due to a bad relationship. His girlfriend was a chronic diabetic and when her blood sugar got low, she would get nervous and call the police. Steven would leave and stay with his sister. That's in the past and should have nothing to do with today.

He's been trying to sell his truck. It needs work before it can be sold. He has to find people to take it places. Julie uses it now and then. It's still in the garage but he is not living there. He's bouncing around and staying in hotels.

Mr. Gittens said he's really a good person and should be given a chance to prove that. He works hard and feels he deserves a second chance. He took his SOT seriously and has a letter from his therapist saying he's not a threat to the community.

His girlfriend's son just had two baby boys. She is now a grandma and Steven hopes someday he'll be able to meet the boys. Julie is Steven's chaperone.

K. De Cremer commented that Steven made a lot of good points, some convincing and some not. She voted against him living in that neighborhood, not because of his past, because he has come a very long way and it states he's a low level risk, but because he played the system twice by not coming before the board. The first time she can understand, the second time she can't. Now he is really paying the price.

As D. Gerondale stated previously, he feels Mr. Gittens has come a long way. Ultimately, the board has to look at the ordinance (which is now a state law in terms of the distance). Green Bay is one of the few communities that has an appeals process in this. The board members are all citizens of Green Bay. They are not attorneys and are not paid by the city. They are not elected. They are just trying to do the best they can for the community in terms of looking at the particulars of an incident. The reason they

ask a lot of questions (regarding treatment programs, what they're doing right now, trustworthiness, etc.), is to try to get a better picture of the risk of recidivism. Until you get to know the person and understand the circumstances relating to the crime, and how they've gone forward or not gone forward, is ultimately what they are trying to get to in terms of what an issue is going to be. The board has a phobia of approving somebody that does reoffend at one point in the future, so they try to balance that with the offender in front of them.

D. Gerondale feels the board has been very fair regarding Mr. Gittens in terms giving him opportunities to speak in front of them and to give them information to make a decision. It will be based upon the ordinance and potential risk factors.

Regarding K. De Cremer's comment, D. Gerondale feels it's important to note that it isn't so much lying or using the excuse you didn't know or understand as being the issue for D. Gerondale, personally, because if you don't take responsibility for the mistake you made, what's to prevent someone from taking responsibility for another act. One in ten offenders will reoffend and that is a big risk.

A motion to DENY the appeal of Steven Gittens was made by D. Gerondale, seconded by B. Heiman.

Discussion: K. De Cremer stated she is torn but isn't comfortable with the location.

All in favor. Motion carried.

(b) Appeal of Nicholas J. Meyer requesting to move to 2601 Appian Way

Nicholas Meyer contacted the law department and asked that his appeal be withdrawn.

(c) Appeal of Eddie Broadnax, Jr. requesting to move to 1100 N. Van Buren Street, Apt. 2

Eddie appeared in person. D. Gerondale advised Eddie of his right to discuss treatment issues in closed session and informed him not to use the names of the victims.

Eddie appeared before the board in 2012 and was approved to live on Denis Place.

In 2004, Eddie was convicted of 2nd degree sexual assault of a 15 year old. Eddie was 20 years old. At first he didn't know the victim's age. When he did find out, she was pregnant. Eddie dated the victim throughout her pregnancy. He found out later it wasn't his child.

Eddie received three years' probation. He is no longer on paper for this offense.

Eddie completed IOP treatment and is currently in aftercare. They meet once a week for 1-1/2 hours. They discuss triggers and thought processes to prevent relapsing.

Eddie is employed at Regatta 220. He has been living at 1230 S. Greenwood Avenue for the past two months. In 2009, Eddie was released from prison for an OWI.

D. Gerondale asked for a motion. K. De Cremer feels Eddie's OWI is a concern as far as reoffending.

A motion to approve the appeal of Eddie Broadnax, Jr., address specific, was made by H. Michel, seconded by D. Gerondale. Two in favor, two opposed (B. Heiman, K. De Cremer).

Discussion: K. De Cremer asked Eddie if he is drinking at all. Eddie stated he is not. His life is going well. He is working full time, different shifts.

A motion to APPROVE the appeal of Eddie Broadnax, Jr., address specific, for a period of 60 days, was made by K. De Cremer, seconded by B. Heiman. Three in favor, one opposed (D. Gerondale).

(d) Appeal of Kenneth Roeder requesting to move to 2934 Suzanne Court

Kenneth appeared in person. D. Gerondale advised Kenneth of his right to discuss treatment issues in closed session and informed him not to use the names of the victims.

Kenneth appeared before the board in April 2016 and was denied at that time. The board asked him to bring a copy of his report and any treatment documentation.

A motion is made by K. De Cremer and seconded by B. Heiman to move into closed session to discuss Kenneth's treatment, pursuant to Section 146.82(1), Wis. Stats. All in favor. Motion carried. A motion is made by K. De Cremer and seconded by B. Heiman to return to open session. All in favor. Motion carried.

Kenneth is currently looking for employment because he was denied disability. He would like to live at this location with his mom and dad.

During the daytime, Kenneth helps around the house and attends group on Wednesdays. He also has doctor's appointments and sees his probation agent once a week. He attends SO2 treatment sessions.

Robert Roeder, 2934 Suzanne Court, is present on Kenneth's behalf. He is Robert's father. They have lived in their home 10 years. Kenneth lived with them 6 years before his prison sentence. With his probation officer's approval, Ken has been coming to their home seven days a week, 10 to 11 hours a day. They keep him busy. Neighbors have mentioned hardly ever see Ken. They are home all the time and take Ken where he needs to go.

A motion to approve the appeal of Kenneth Roeder, address specific, was made by K. De Cremer. No second. Motion failed.

Discussion: H. Michel acknowledges his family is very supportive of him. However, she feels Kenneth needs more treatment under his belt. Four sessions aren't enough, since he is to attend 60 sessions. H. Michel would feel more comfortable if he had 15 sessions completed and then came back to say how he's doing.

A motion to APPROVE the appeal of Kenneth Roeder, address specific, for a period of 60 days, was made by H. Michel, seconded by B. Heiman. H. Michel would like him to provide updated treatment documentation at that time. D. Gerondale agrees with H. Michel's motion because D. Gerondale is not yet comfortable with the situation and the seriousness of the crime. D. Gerondale suggested he provide a detailed letter from his therapist. Three in favor, one opposed (D. Gerondale). Motion carried.

(e) Appeal of Mark Perrigoue requesting to move to 822 Division Street

Mark appeared in person. D. Gerondale advised Mark of his right to discuss treatment issues in closed session and informed him not to use the names of the victims.

Mark is currently living with his brother in Allouez. In 1992, Mark was convicted of first degree sexual assault. The victim was under 12 years old. The crime involved kissing and touching, no intercourse. It happened in Florida. The victim told a friend who then told her mother. Mark pled guilty. The assault lasted 2-1/2 years. The three offenses were all related to the same victim.

Mark was born in Green Bay and lived here 18 years. He went into the military and was transferred to Florida. He lived there for 35 years. He would like to move back to Green Bay because his daughter had a baby and he wants to be near his family. He came back to Wisconsin three months ago.

Mark received 15 years with 10 years' probation. He served six years, with ten years' probation. He has been off paper since 2010.

The 2-1/2 years he was in jail prior to incarceration, Mark took sex offender treatment. When he was released, treatment was mandated. He completed that.

Mark will be living by himself. He wants to purchase this property. He would close on it the end of September. At one time, Mark was self-employed and owned a lawn care business.

Joseph Perrigoue, 308 Greene Avenue, appeared on Mark's behalf. He is Mark's brother. They welcomed him back home. He's been living with them since June. The neighbors were notified and they welcomed him and said hello. He wants to get back on his feet after getting divorced.

Jenny Perrigoue, 518 Season Street, Combined Locks, appeared on Mark's behalf. Mark is her father and she brought his granddaughter with her today. She trusts him with her daughter and she wants her to know her grandfather. She believes her father has been rehabilitated. She does not condone what her father did, but she loves him.

A motion to APPROVE the appeal of Mark Perrigoue, address specific, was made by H. Michel, seconded by B. Heiman. Three in favor, one opposed (K. De Cremer). Motion carried.

(f) Appeal of Jason Ludke requesting to move to 135 S. Buchanan Street

Jason failed to appear. A motion to DENY the appeal of Jason Ludke was made by K. De Cremer, seconded by H. Michel. All in favor. Motion carried.

(g) Appeal of Bryan Bathke requesting to move to 330 Norwood Avenue

Bryan appeared in person. D. Gerondale advised Bryan of his right to discuss treatment issues in closed session and informed him not to use the names of the victims.

In 2013, Bryan was convicted of 2nd degree child enticement. It was a sting operation. He was on a chat room regarding a Craig's List ad for a brother helping a brother. The ad was for a 21 year old brother to help a 15 year old brother find sex. Bryan was chatting inappropriately.

Bryan was feeling lonely at the time and was looking for friendship. Bryan didn't realize it was a sting operation until they agreed to meet at the Ashwaubenon Bowling Alley. Bryan assumed the person he was chatting with was 15 years old. He went to meet this person and would see where it went after that.

Bryan completed SO1 and SO2 treatment and provided certificates. Bryan learned about the importance of boundaries. When a thought comes into your head, there are positive ways to change it. Bryan is currently married but they are separating after 12 years. He has a daughter and a son. That is why he's trying to purchase this house on Norwood Avenue. Bryan is self-employed. He's owned a lawn care business for 2-1/2 years. His agent helped him get it going while he was in jail. His agent has been a big help to him.

The offense is what is leading to his separation. Bryan has come out. He is gay. His children will be with him at times. His agent has approved this.

Bryan is starting this new step in his life. Bryan is still staying at home with his wife but they don't really talk. Bryan now has people who support him and he can call when he needs to (a neighbor, a good friend he worked with at the restaurant, and his mom).

D. Gerondale asked Bryan how he will deal with loneliness. Bryan said he will keep busy. He works every day and his kids will be with him sometimes. The kids are what keep him going.

H. Michel asked how old his son is. Bryan stated he is 6. H. Michel asked how he will handle situations when his son gets older and has friends come by. Bryan hopes he can keep things separate using the boundaries he's learned. If he ever got in a bad spot again, he would call one of his support staff.

Amanda, 106 S. Broadway, Apt. B, De Pere, appeared on Bryan's behalf. She's known Bryan four years. They worked together and she knew him before this happened. He shared the situation with her. She feels he's been alone in his household for a long time. This is a much needed transition for everyone concerned. They need to heal and move forward. She trusts Bryan and believes this was a one-time thing. She has nephews and would have to problem leaving her nephews with him. She will be a strong support system.

Sherry, 2018 Jordain Lane. Sherry owned Red Restaurant in Green Bay. Bryan is his neighbor and also worked for her. Bryan is her best friend and she has known him 8 years. When he completed the required counseling, he signed up for more on his own. He is a great father and is well respected in their neighborhood. Sherry will support him 100 percent. They do a lot of things together with his kids. He will be missed by the neighbors because he always helped them out.

Kathy, 4011 Alpine Way, Wisconsin Rapids (his mother). Bryan has a heart of gold. He helps all the neighbors. He's done well in his business. His kids like to go with him and help him. He's a good dad. Bryan keeps very busy. He just wants a nice home environment for the children with a yard to play in. Kathy will be co-signing the mortgage loan. She loves him and believes in him.

H. Michel asked why Bryan didn't call any of these people here today for support when this was going on the first time. Bryan stated he was more ashamed than anything. He didn't know what they would do, if they would leave him. He now knows they are here for him and love and care for him.

A motion to APPROVE the appeal of Bryan Bathke, address specific, was made by K. De Cremer, seconded by H. Michel. All in favor. Motion carried.

(h) Appeal of Harold Treadway requesting to move to 714 Cherry Street

Harold Treadway's appeal was withdrawn.

(i) Appeal of Philip Ross requesting to move to 1170 Harvey Street (upper)

Philip failed to appear. A motion to DENY the appeal of Philip Ross was made by K. De Cremer, seconded by B. Heiman. All in favor. Motion carried.

3. NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting date of October 12, 2016 was confirmed.

A motion to adjourn was made by H. Michel, seconded by B. Heiman. All in favor.
Motion carried.