

## Item 24-1126 Operator License for Kelly Arndt

### Safety and Licensing Committee

Wed, Jan 22, 2025 5:30PM

#### **Alderson Chris Croatt (District 14) 02:01**

So, we'll move to action items. And again, the first two on our agenda don't appear to be here. We'll take up 24-1126 which is the operator license application from Kelly Arnt which—

#### **Alderson William Siebers (District 1) 02:16**

Move for denial.

#### **Alderson Denise Fenton (District 6) 02:17**

Second.

#### **Alderson Chris Croatt (District 14) 02:18**

Okay. Motion and a second to deny. We had this on our agenda last time. We did push it to this meeting to allow the applicant to provide some additional documentation of rehabilitation. We do have that documentation, correct, clerk Lynch? Which is part of the packet listed as "additional documentation". District One, okay, go ahead.

#### **Clerk Kami Lynch 02:45**

Kelly Arnt did after we—we followed up with both the operator applicants, just reminding them who they could email and that they could get this stuff into us in advance. Kelly Arnt responded to the second email with a phone call on Monday indicating that she would not be able to make this meeting and asking if it could be held. We said that that's not our decision. That's up to the committee. She could provide the documentation or try to move her other obligation around. So, she did stop in and provide the attached documents on yesterday afternoon.

#### **Alderson Chris Croatt (District 14) 03:31**

Okay, this has—just for the record this has been held twice already. We do have a number of documents to consider. We do have the looks like a 23-page document submitted to as far as rehabilitation or treatment goes. Okay. We have a motion and a second on the table to deny. Attorney Buruin.

#### **Zak Buruin (Assistant City Attorney) 03:59**

Something—District Two, yeah.

#### **Alderson Chris Croatt (District 14) 04:00**

It's on.

#### **Zak Buruin (Assistant City Attorney) 04:01**

There's just a couple of things that I'd like to direct the committee's attention to. There are a couple of documents submitted that appear to pertain to the applicant, but it does appear like the bulk of the information provided actually pertains to a prior applicant, specifically, Cindy Reed. I don't know what the intended relevance of that. It doesn't pertain to this applicant's rehabilitation. The documentation pertaining to this applicant's rehabilitation consists of a series of appointment notifications or appointment summaries, and a

Wed, Jan 11, 2025

scant, I think, three sentence summary indicating that this person is in some type of treatment with no information regarding the nature, prognosis, diagnosis, anything substantive beyond that.

**Zak Buruin (Assistant City Attorney) 04:02**

There's nothing contained within this that would require the committee to grant the license. The committee could grant the license if it finds the documentation provided convincing, but it is going to be a discretionary decision by the committee at this point based on this information.

**Alderman Chris Croatt (District 14) 05:04**

Okay, thank you for that clarification, because you are correct. The first three pages of this 23-page document are—is that a—was that a scanning issue? Or do you know?

**Clerk Kami Lynch 05:14**

No, that these were the documents and we confirmed that that's what she wanted to provide.

**Alderman Chris Croatt (District 14) 05:19**

Okay, all right. Alder Schultz.

**Alderman Alex Schultz (District 9) 05:23**

Thank you, Chair. I'll direct this to Attorney Buruin.

**Alderman Chris Croatt (District 14) 05:25**

Sure.

**Alderman Alex Schultz (District 9) 05:26**

I'm looking at the memo from legal and the summaries states "insufficient grounds currently exist to conclude that the applicant is statutorily ineligible for the licensing renewal being sought. Renewal should therefore be granted" and then we go to the conclusion similar language, essentially saying "the defendant's application should be granted as it cannot be shown that she is ineligible at this time." Since the drafting and submission of this document to the committee, has anything changed in those conclusions? Or is this an accurate statement from legal at this?

**Zak Buruin (Assistant City Attorney) 05:57**

Are you referring? There were two memorandums filed. The one from December 13, I believe is the current one indicates she's ineligible for the license sought unless she provides documentation of rehabilitation.

**Alderman Alex Schultz (District 9) 06:11**

Okay, so that was the earlier, an earlier version of it.

**Zak Buruin (Assistant City Attorney) 06:13**

Correct.

**Alderman Alex Schultz (District 9) 06:14**

Thank you. Sorry.

**Alderson Chris Croatt (District 14) 06:15**

Okay. All right. Any other questions or comments? Okay, we do have a motion and a second to deny the license. All those in favor of denial signify by saying Aye. All opposed? Any abstentions? Five, zero. Okay, that'll be referred to the Common Council and see what happens with it there.