From:	Daniel Kennedy
To:	*CI-StPaul_LH-Licensing
Cc:	#CI-StPaul_Ward4; #CI-StPaul_Ward3; *CI-StPaul_Mayor
Subject:	Re: License Hearing Notice - University of St Thomas - 2115 Summit Ave
Date:	Thursday, October 9, 2025 9:13:33 PM

Dear Mr. Weiner,

The entertainment and liquor applications you emailed about were submitted in August (or perhaps earlier) and were set for a hearing on August 25, 2025. I and other community members requested a copy of the applications from you, from Tom Ferrara in DSI, and from Jeff Fischbach in DSI; both of them were identified as contacts on the notice of hearing sent in early August. None of you would provide copies of the applications. To this day, none of you have provided the applications.

On August 29, 2025, I submitted a data practices request through the City's Minnesota Data Practices Act portal. That request (#D108619-082225) sought: "All applications and related materials submitted by the University of St. Thomas in calendar years 2024 and 2025 for an entertainment license and/or rental hall license."

Also on August 29, 2025, I submitted a data practices request through the City's Minnesota Data Practices Act portal. That request (#D108108-081325) sought: "All application documents submitted by the University of St. Thomas regarding its application for a liquor license (or modification of a liquor license) in 2025. The public notice about this application bears the license number 20110002908. Objections to this application are due to DSI on 8/15/25, so a response on 8/14/25 is appreciated so an informed objection can be submitted."

Because I had noted from transcripts of past St. Thomas liquor license hearings that complaints regarding unruly behavior connected to alcohol were commonly raised, I made a third data practices request on the same date through the City's Minnesota Data Practices Act portal. That request (#D108621-082225) sought: "All complaints and reports (including police reports, but not limited to police reports) regarding noise, litter, alcohol or drug use, public urination, theft, disorderly conduct, illegal parking, speeding or other illegal activity in a motor vehicle, or criminal activity where said activity occurred: 1. Since January 1, 2024; 2. In the roadways and properties within following geographic area: Addresses 1-250 North on Mississippi River Boulevard, Otis Ave., Montrose Place, Exeter Place, Cretin Ave., Finn St., Cleveland Avenue, Wilder St., and Moore St.; 2000-2350 on Marshall Avenue, Dayton Avenue, Selby Avenue, Riverwood Place, Laurel Avenue, Ashland Avenue, Portland Avenue, Summit Avenue, Grand Avenue, Lincoln Avenue, Goodrich Avenue, and Princeton Avenue; and 0-190 South on Mississippi River Boulevard, Woodlawn Ave., Mount Curve Blvd., Cretin Ave., Finn St., Cleveland Avenue, and Kenneth St. [in sum, within the area bounded by the Mississippi River, north side of Marshall Avenue, east side Moore Street and Kenneth Street (between Summit and Goodrich where Moore and Kenneth do not connect, the address "2000"), and the south side of Princeton Avenue]"

The purpose of these requests was to inform me and other community members, particularly the 300+ members of Advocates for Responsible Development, what St.

Thomas is asking for, what justification St. Thomas is providing, and what the implications of granting the license applications would be. Without the requested information, I cannot provide a knowledgeable answer to the simple question: What is St. Thomas applying for? I certainly do not have enough information to provide a complete response to whether the application should be granted.

All of this information is presumed to be public. The city is required to produce the data within a "reasonable time," and failing to produce it until after a hearing on the applications is scheduled and heard would not be consistent with that obligation.

The City's withholding of vital information from the community is appalling. The effect is to prevent the city's residents from performing their civic role of voicing their opinions on issues that matter to them. Because they are silenced, those who hold the power in the city — the bureaucrats, politicians, and wealthy institutions like St. Thomas — may proceed with their plans without a concern that residents will pose a meaningful challenge.

The city should not hold a hearing on St. Thomas's applications until it has provided the requested information and allowed one month to understand the data that the city provides and formulate positions on the applications.

If the city proceeds with the hearing as scheduled, the legislative hearing officer should deny the applications because the community has not had an adequate opportunity to submit informed responses. While many (including ARD) have submitted responses in opposition to the liquor license (the only license that was included in the first notice), those responses were limited by the fact that nobody could actually see St. Thomas's application or its justifications for the licenses. Although they demonstrate that the liquor license application is inconsistent with the public welfare and should be denied, their argument cannot be fully formed without full information.

The application for the entertainment license is troubling. St. Thomas is not zoned properly to operate a rental hall (either as a permitted, conditional, or ancillary use), so its plans to lease its space out for concerts, comedians, and similar shows are incompatible with the city's zoning code. I suspect that is what the entertainment license is for, but I do not know because, as stated above, the city refuses to provide a copy of the application. If such a license were granted despite being prohibited by the zoning code, it should be accompanied with conditions that mitigate the effects of the activity on the community. But one cannot guess as to what conditions would be appropriate without seeing the application to learn what is contemplated.

Even the notice of hearing issued yesterday lacks any substantive information. The notice that was sent for the liquor license application with a hearing date of August 15, 2025 at least had some limited information about the liquor license application. Despite my protests earlier, the city still has not issued a similar notice about the entertainment license. It would not be sufficient, but it also would not be a complete void of information as currently exists. Additionally, the earlier liquor notification invited responses and provided a method to submit objections. That has never been

done for the entertainment license.

I strenuously object to the lack of due process in the way the city is handling these applications. The city should cancel the hearing, respond to my data practices requests (and all others that other people may have submitted), wait a month, then send out adequate notices that inform residents of the applications' substance and invite objections.

Please make this communication part of the public record on these applications.

Sincerely,
Daniel L. M. Kennedy
Advocates for Responsible Development
info@advocates4rd.org
612-728-8080

On Wed, Oct 8, 2025 at 4:08 PM *CI-StPaul_LH-Licensing <LH-Licensing@ci.stpaul.mn.us> wrote:

> Hello,
>
> Thank you for your interest in this license application for University of Saint Thomas, dba same, 2115 Summit Ave. See attached for additional information.
>
> Best,
>
> Greg Weiner
>
> Executive Assistant – Licensing Hearings
>
> Saint Paul City Council
>
> Greg.Weiner@ci.stpaul.mn.us
>
> 651-266-8512
>
> He/him/his

From: Gail Lundeen Brand
To: *CI-StPaul LH-Licensing
Subject: opposition to UST adding Liquor On Sale
Date: Friday, October 10, 2025 7:52:32 AM

Legislative Hearing Officer
310 City Hall
15 West Kellogg Blvd.
Saint Paul, MN 55102

I am writing in protest of University of Saint Thomas's request for adding Liquor On Sale-Sunday and Entertainment (B) licenses to existing Liquor On Sale. UST's assurance that alcohol consumption will be contained within the designated UST service area does not address what happens when an arena of fans, some of which are still alcohol impaired, set out across a residential community to find and then drive their car. Having a sports arena placed in a quiet, family oriented residential area is unprecedented and should be adequate justification to severely limit the sale and consumption of alcohol at UST sporting events. Saint Paul's appeal is in the quality of life its neighborhoods can offer, please make this your priority.