From: Craig Roen
To: *CI-StPaul LH-Licensing
Cc: Virginia Housum; Tom Alf; Tom Moss; Craig Roen
Subject: UST License Expansion Application
Date: Monday, October 13, 2025 1:25:44 PM

Dear Legislative Hearing Officer Vang:

I want to thank you for your kind consideration of my position and allowing me to be fully heard. You indicated at the end of the hearing that I may submit in writing a response to several statements made by UST's representatives. Please consider this email as my written response.

The Number and Size of Events Will Exceed What UST Has Represented

UST stated that there would be approximately only 10 large events per year. However, their own prior statements contradict that claim. Even excluding women's hockey and basketball events (which they claim draws only about 500 fans), there are still approximately 25 men's home hockey and basketball events that will be held at the arena, this according to their own representations contained in their Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW). Further, they stated in the EAW that those events will draw fans *in the thousands*. Therefore, taking their own representations as true, we are still at approximately 30 sporting events per year when including home football games. Add to that the fact they plan to host concerts, *but we have no idea how many concerts they plan to host.* Therefore, the total number of large events is not known to either the City or to the residents in the surrounding neighborhoods.

Alcohol Sales and Consumption Will Exceed a 2-Drink Limit

I was happy to see that you drilled down on the issue of how many drinks each event patron may be served. UST has been touting a two-drink maximum. You clarified that this representation is not correct. It is two drinks per ID card *per visit to the bar*. So, Fan A can go back for as many drinks as they like, late into the evening, until they are obviously intoxicated, at which point service would be denied. Too late. And, as it turns out, that assessment may be made by Levy employees as young as 18 years old. In turn, Fan A, and likely hundreds of other event patrons who have been drinking, will then spill into the residential neighborhoods, get into their cars and drive through the neighborhoods. That is a recipe for disaster. Must we wait until a drunk driver hits a child crossing the street before the City recognizes how problematic UST's plans are?

Traffic and Parking are Inextricably Intertwined With Liquor Sales

UST stated that their traffic and parking plan (event management plan) has been approved as part of the EAW, and as a separate plan that they unveiled just a few weeks ago. However, that plan makes no mention of the effects of alcohol consumption because it was presented and vetted on a completely separate track than the liquor license application. In other words, though UST is attempting to convince you that one has nothing to do with the other, I am sure you understand that one problem (event patrons using our neighborhoods as a free parking lot) will be exacerbated by another problem (neighborhood parkers returning to their cars after drinking, and then driving). The two problems are inextricably intertwined. They should be viewed that way when considering whether the City should allow a massively expanded UST's liquor license.

UST's Representation That It Will Limit Sales During the Next Academic Year Does Nothing to Address the Larger Problem

UST's position essentially boils down to this: "Give us the expanded license now. We'll take full advantage of it a year from now. If our traffic and parking plan doesn't work out, then that is unfortunate for the surrounding neighborhoods. But we still have our expanded license." So, they would get what they want without regard to whether or not their plan works. The City should not permit this.

I will close by reiterating my primary point: The City must wait to see if UST's event management plan is effective *before* the City issues any form of expanded liquor license. The City should not issue an expanded liquor license unless and until it becomes clear that UST can demonstrate it can adequately protect the surrounding neighborhoods from event patrons using our neighborhoods as a parking lot. Therefore, the application should be denied outright, or failing that, tabled until UST can show that its event management plan meets the City's mandate to protect the safety and livability of the surrounding neighborhoods. Otherwise, everyone is flying blind.

Thank you for your consideration.

Craig M. Roen
183 Mount Curve Blvd.
St. Paul, MN. 55105

From: Kathryn Mitchell
To: *CI-StPaul_LH-Licensing
Cc: Terry Brueck
Subject: Liquor license in a residential neighborhood
Date: Monday, October 13, 2025 1:26:54 PM

You don't often get email from mitch040@msn.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Nhia Vang,

Please hear the cries of my distressed neighbors and do not approve this liquor license that will surely bring even more havoc to our neighborhood. The arena is a huge and untested facility. Let's take a year to see how it unfolds and what issues arise. No one is going to die because they did not get this license right now. Unfortunately the opposite, that someone may die if it is granted, is entirely in the realm of possibilty. Please do the diligent thing and allow the arena to come into being, see what the track record is like and revisit this possible license in a year.

Thank you for your service to the community.

Kathryn Mitchell

2279 Summit Avenue

From: Virginia Housum
To: *CI-StPaul LH-Licensing
Cc: Craig Roen; Tom Moss; Tom Alf; McDonough, Amy G.
Subject: License amendment hearing for University of St. Thomas, license ID # 20110002908
Date: Monday, October 13, 2025 2:18:26 PM

Legislative Hearing Officer Vang and Mr. Weiner, thank you for your attention this morning to the concerns around the expansion of St. Thomas' liquor license. The hearing this morning demonstrated clearly that the city's piecemeal approach to the St. Thomas arena has failed to protect the safety and livability of city neighborhoods.

The city approved UST's event management plan without UST providing even a mention that it intended to seek an expansion of its liquor license. The event management plan is untested, and may prove inadequate in moving traffic through the neighborhoods surrounding the arena safely. Exacerbating the uncertainty by expanding UST's liquor license is a complete abrogation of the city's duty to its residents.

So many of the assumptions underlying the event management plan are subject to questions, including whether attendees will use the shuttle service, and where others will park (whether assigned a space or not), not to mention the important question of how many events will actually take place at the arena--which remains a complete unknown. As was pointed out this morning, there literally could be use of the venue every single day of the year. In addition, UST's assertions about the number of people who will attend events is a total shot in the dark. What we do know is that traffic congestion along Cretin Avenue and Mississippi River Boulevard has already increased. The parking lot at the World War I monument at the end of Summit Avenue is now rarely available to city residents, because UST students take up all the spots. Students park next to fire hydrants and in the intersection of Goodrich and Woodlawn. They park in locations where a parking permit is required. Traffic enforcement and parking enforcement are inadequate, to put it mildly. It is only reasonable to expect that these violations will increase with thousands of attendees at events, many of whom will not be familiar with the neighborhood. We also know that on football game days, and maybe in the evenings before other athletic events on campus, there is a lot of drinking going on--I personally have witnessed students in the streets who are drunk in advance of games, especially around a home on the corner of Finn and Lincoln. Is there any reason to think that with more people attracted to the campus, any of this will change? In fact, it is very likely to get worse. To date, there has been little meaningful enforcement of traffic and parking laws in the neighborhood.

It would be a terrible mistake to add alcohol to the dangerous mix already being

experienced in the neighborhood. If the event management plan works exactly as hoped, that will all be to the good. If it doesn't work as planned, adding alcohol will make everything worse, and will endanger residents of the neighborhood.

The point of this is that this piecemeal approach to UST's planning for the arena has been and is destructive of the neighborhood. The city should not add "dangerous" to the relevant adjectives. Please table the request for an expanded alcohol license until the event management plan has been in place for at least one year. Let UST absorb what it has created before imposing even more on the residents who live in the vicinity.

Please contact me with any questions.

Ginny Housum

ginny.housum@gmail.com

From: Terrance Brueck
To: *CI-StPaul_LH-Licensing
Subject: License Hearing - University of St Thomas - 2115 Summit Ave
Date: Monday, October 13, 2025 4:56:19 PM

Dear Nhia Vang,

Thank you for hearing my testimony this morning. I want to add two significant items to my comments in your courtroom:

1. UST makes the case that the arena EAW was approved by the city and the courts upheld. However the EAW only required an Event Management Plan (EMP) to be developed - it did not exist when the EAW was approved. I have only seen a cover page of the EMP at the hearing today that was dated September 2025. What process allowed for community input to the plan? I have no idea even though I have been on the "list" to receive information from UST. Will the plan effectively deal with all of the aspects of the arena impact - not only parking but all human ingress/egress to the arena site that impacts the neighborhood? The EMP should not only have been subject to community review and input, but also what are the consequences when the plan "fails" ... how will it be measured? UST has tried to separate the arena EAW and EMP from the issue of the liquor license application. But the consequences of drunk behavior should be dealt with in the EMP outside the arena that impacts the neighborhood!

2. UST cited "standards" for serving liquor at sporting events that Levy would use. There are no industry or authorrity "standards" that exist because every sporting venue creates their own rules - https://cyalcohol.com/article/why-stadiums-with-alcohol-sales-limit-in-and-out-privileges. UST license application is for alcohol to be served from 10am to midnight - far beyond any "standards". What will be the enforcement of these "standards"? How can they be changed by the current vendor or if a new vendor puts new "standards" in place? The proposed "standards" are already far beyond what the University of MN currently allows: sales cut off at halftime for basketball and during the second intermission of hockey games.

The combination of the unproven, yet to be tested EMP and the "loose" alcohol consumption rules, brings me to an analogy. If NASA had a new rocket to be tested, would they load it with astronauts for the test flight? The EMP is a test flight for our neighborhood ... let's make sure it flies before we load it with drunken astronauts!

Please "table" the UST liquor license application for at least the first year of operation of the new arena.

Thanks for your attention.

Terrance Brueck
2279 Summit Ave
St. Paul, MN 55105

From:	Tom Moss
To:	*CI-StPaul_LH-Licensing
Cc:	Virginia Housum; Tom Alf; Craig Roen
Subject:	Hearing on Liquor License for the University of St. Thomas, license ID # 20110002908
Date:	Tuesday, October 14, 2025 12:13:32 PM

Hearing Officer Vang and Mr. Weiner:

Thank you for the opportunity today to testify in opposition to the University's (UST's) dramatic expansion of their liquor license. In response to their final rebuttal statements, I offer these comments:

*** UST is under-representing their expected attendance.** UST is now a Division 1 NCAA school; That's why they had to build a much bigger arena and expand all their athletic facilities. As a Division 1 school, they will need vastly increased revenues to pay expanded expenses, including across-the-country travel costs, attraction of wealthy donors, payments to top athletes, and facility operating costs. They need the arena to generate as much revenue as possible — through ticket prices, attractive premium club seating, and concession sales — especially alcohol. Moreover, by being Division 1, they will be playing larger, more competitive schools, and that will drive bigger attendance.

Several times, UST has cited CURRENT athletic attendance statistics to project FUTURE ticket sales. But in fact, they need drastically increased ticket sales and that is why they built such a large arena. There will be vastly more people going to all games than in the past.

*** It will be extremely easy for anyone to obtain liquor at this site.** I would wager that every UST student knows someone who has a very good fake ID. As was noted, — by Levy's policy — with an ID anyone can buy two drinks per visit at a serving stand. They can then consume them or GIVE THEM TO ANYONE, and then return for two more drinks, and return again, as often as they want. The only curb would happen if the buyer appeared inebriated to the server.

*** It's not at all clear how liquor consumption will be enforced, and who would do it.** UST assumes that Levy will carefully carry out all its policies, and that fans will abide by responsible drinking guidelines. That is naive. Who will watch over drink sales and fan behavior and report on it? Will UST send "secret shoppers" in to test whether ID's are being checked? Will under-age fans who are drinking be removed and disciplined? Will it be up to other fans to report violations? None of this was offered or discussed.

These concerns and other reasons raised at the hearing are why you should table consideration of this HUGE expansion of UST's license until we see how the wider impacts of this arena unfold, and until UST creates definitive enforcement mechanisms for this level of liquor sales in a residential neighborhood.

Respectfully,

Tom Moss
175 Woodlawn Avenue
Saint Paul, MN 55105