

From: [Palmen Troy](#)
To: rebeccaforsaintpaul@gmail.com; [Noecker, Rebecca \(CI-StPaul\)](#); [*CI-StPaul Contact-Council](#); [CouncilHearing \(CI-StPaul\)](#)
Subject: Shadey's Tavern Relicensure Hearing
Date: Tuesday, August 23, 2022 7:02:29 AM
Attachments: [Shadey's Signed Conditions Affidavit.pdf](#)

Dear Council Member Noecker,

I am writing today to encourage you and your colleagues to vote no on relicensing Shadey's Tavern to operate on the city's West side. In the nearly twenty years my wife and I have lived across from Shadey's/Winner's we've seen three people now operate this bar that has served our neighborhood no favors. This is an establishment with a long history of violence, drugs, and prostitution (per incident report and personal surveillance), and nothing in this toothless "list of conditions" signed by Mr. Sontoya (see attachment) for licensure makes us believe it will be otherwise. In fact, the list of conditions itself is an acknowledgment of the past problems and future predictions of the same. Isn't that why the liquor license was previously pulled? What has changed that would witness a new outcome? As I stated in my objection letter, there are already three bars within walking distance of Shadey's, and a vibrant cantina row on Cesar Chavez street near El Burrito Mercado that's situated perfectly in an entertainment district. Why should a problem bar be allowed to reopen smack dab in the middle of a residential neighborhood? Especially one that provides no value for the community? In short I implore you and your colleagues to vote no and save what has been built organically over the past two years during Shadey's closure: a safe and welcoming neighborhood for all residents.

Apologies for the 11th hour sending of this missive, but I was awaiting the city's minutes to reference from the licensure hearing on the 28th of July. To date, no minutes have been posted even though we've been told by the executive assistant, Mr. Greg Weiner, twice that minutes would likely be posted earlier in August, and again likely on the 18th of August. In fact, if not for Mr. Weiner informing us by email of the decision of the hearing, we would not have known if the license had been approved, denied, or otherwise.

Thank you,

Troy & Karen Palmen