



Mayor of Providence

Brett P. Smiley

January 12, 2023

Honorable Members
Providence City Council
City Hall

Dear Honorable Members:

Pursuant to Sections 302(b) and 1102 of the Providence Home Rule Charter of 1980, as amended and Public Law, Chapter 45-50, Sections 1 through 31 passed in 1987, I am this day re-appointing Dylan B. Conley of 82 Dexter Street Providence, RI 02909, as a member of the Board of Licenses for a term ending on January 17, 2026, and respectfully submit the same for your approval.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Brett P. Smiley", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Brett P. Smiley
Mayor

IN CITY COUNCIL

FEB 02 2023

READ

WHEREUPON IT IS ORDERED THAT
THE SAME BE RECEIVED AND APPROVED
A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Jina L. Mathew", followed by the word "CLERK".

PROFESSIONAL LEGAL EXPERIENCE

CONLEY LAW & ASSOCIATES.

2008 - Present

Provide advocacy, legal research, analysis, and counsel for clients regarding government law, land use, labor relations, public education, and civil litigation. Draft, file, and argue legal memoranda, complaints, and motions, in state Superior and Supreme Court as well as federal court. Open Meetings and Public Records expert. Legal Counsel in various capacities to the following public agencies:

- | | | |
|-----------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| · Johnston | · Johnston School District | · Woonsocket Housing |
| · Cumberland | · Pawtucket School | Authority |
| · Westerly | District | · Coventry and Central |
| · New Shoreham | · Warwick City Council | Coventry Fire Districts |
| · Pawtucket | · Warren Housing | |
| · Central Falls | Authority | |

CITY OF EAST PROVIDENCE

Assistant Solicitor, 2016 - Present

Provide day to day municipal legal support, including representation of the Council, Mayor, review of contracts, bids and other purchasing issues, Access to Public Records Act officer, research, and drafting ordinances.

- | | |
|---|---|
| · Former lead counsel to the East Providence Planning and Zoning Boards | · Lead counsel for the negotiation of fire, police, steelworkers, and municipal employee union collective bargaining negotiations |
| · Lead counsel to the East Providence Charter Review Commission | · Management of public property sales |
| · Management of the Transition in Government from Manager to Strong Mayor | · Management of high-profile employee investigations |

CITY OF PROVIDENCE

Board of Licenses Chair, 2017 - Present

Review all liquor and business license applications, preside over all show cause hearings. Appointed to ensure that the Board update its policies and procedures to best practice standards, including but not limited to bolstering the record in cases of appeals to the Department of Business Regulations and decreasing burden on businesses while increasing neighborhood protections. Rewrote and passed new regulations, management through COVID-19. Media management.

LAND USE WORK

History of representing government agencies, municipal boards, local advocacy organizations, non-profits, school districts, as well as private sector developers. Work has included:

- Rhode Island State Land Use Commission re: the revision of all of State of Rhode Island Land Use Law, member, Speaker Shekarchi appointee
- I-195 District, Lead Regulatory Drafting Attorney
- Winner, 2022 Grow Smart RI Policy Award, Lead Drafting Attorney of the Innovation Overlay District Regulations designed to enhance green spaces and create private sector financial incentives to develop Workforce and Affordable Housing
- Citizens Bank World Headquarters, representing the Town of Johnston through the Tax Stabilization Agreement, RIDOT, Water, Sewer expansions, Community Benefits Agreement, Planning and Zoning Review. Estimated timeline of all negotiations, permitting, council, planning and zoning board approvals, less than nine (9) months
- Public School Developments including Project Labor Agreements Studies, Project Labor Agreement Negotiation and Development, Planning and Zoning Approval for several Pawtucket and Johnston Schools
- Management of Tri-lateral land acquisition, DEM site remediation of Gravel Mine, and conversion into Solar Farm with Net-Metering Agreement
- Private Sector Developments include, Spring House proposed Inn, Strive Realty 663 Admiral development, Providence Living's Historic Refurbishment of Tockwotton Nursery Building, Relentless Realty Residential Campus at Admiral and Douglas, myriad of Unified Development Review, Use Variances, Dimensional Variances, Minor Plan Development and Major Plan Development reviews and approvals
- Supportive work to lead counsel William J. Conley, Jr. – Amazon Distribution Center, Johnston, RI again including Tax Stabilization Agreement, RIDOT, Water, Sewer expansions, Community Benefits Agreement, Planning and Zoning Review. Estimate is that it will be one of the largest Warehouse style buildings in the world upon completion

123 Dyer Street, Suite 2b
Providence, RI 02909

DYLAN B. CONLEY

DConley@ConleyLawRI.com
(401) 415-9835

MISCELLANEOUS & PERSONAL

- Millennial Rhode Island, Founding Board Member
- Federal Hill House Association, Former Vice Chair of Executive Board
- Thrive Behavioral Health, Member of Board of Directors
- Former Member of the Rhode Island Bar Association Labor Law and Government Law Committees
- Continuing Legal Education, Teacher, RI Liquor Licensing
- Former United Way of Rhode Island, Policy Board member, focused on Affordable Housing
- Op-ed Contributor, Providence Journal, Providence Business News, GoLocal Prov, Westerly Sun
- Husband to Jenica Reed, 5/16/15
- Father to Copeland James, 1/16/19

EDUCATION

<u>FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW</u>	<u>Tallahassee, FL</u>
Juris Doctor	May 2012
Oxford College of Law Program	Summer 2010

<u>BOSTON COLLEGE</u>	<u>Boston, MA</u>
Bachelor of Arts	May 2009
Majors: Political Science, History	
Minor: Philosophy	
Focus: Middle Eastern Studies	
International Scholar Laureate Program	Eastern Europe, Summer 2006

<u>LASALLE ACADEMY</u>	<u>Providence, RI - 2009</u>
-------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Opposition to Confirmation of Dylan Conley to Board of Licenses

John Heaney
jsheaney@SolidObject.com

I lived in the Federal Hill area of Providence for 16 years. In 2014, my wife and I purchased our house at the corner of Spruce and Dale, just off of Atwells Avenue. We spent well over one hundred thousand dollars turning it into a home we could live in for the rest of our lives. My wife retired at that time and I left my last salaried position at the start of January, 2017. I had been a software engineer for 40 years and decided to work on a project of my own. Our home was outfitted with a well-equipped workshop to support my product development. I had a home office with an electronics workstation and 3D printers. We have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on my venture for which I have been granted four patents to date.

In August of 2021, we suddenly were inundated with nuisances that made our living situation intolerable. Some of it was caused by the closing of Atwells Avenue every weekend for al fresco dining. That inspired nearby restaurants to start indoor and outdoor live entertainment, which is illegal in that area. Mostly, it was music venues across the highway in the Valley District that started playing outdoor concerts that were so loud that the sound permeated our entire home. This was in clear violation of the city sound ordinances.

Being a longtime resident of Providence, I am well acquainted with city noise, but this was all new to me. I met with the owner of the business in question and was met with belligerence. I determined that businesses are regulated by the Board of Licenses and, after doing extensive research into the city ordinances, my wife and I attended our first BOL meeting on 9/1/2021. That's when the real nightmare began.

We spent the entire next year fighting to restore our quality of life to no avail. It became clear that Dylan Conley was always going to side with the businesses and never going to support us as residents. I will provide evidence of this in this document.

All of my assertions are backed by the record. All BOL meetings are recorded and audio is available online through the Open Meetings web portal. In addition, City Council Committee meetings are also recorded and available for review. These records online date back to 2014 and I have listened to many of them and transcribed some relevant portions.

In addition to recordings of Conley during his official duties, there are also various quotes from interviews as Chair of the BOL.

We sold our house and moved to Rumford, East Providence in late October, 2022. We were forced to give up our dream home that suited us perfectly. Not only did our home become

unlivable for us, but I lost a great deal of time on my project during that one-year period and still have not completely returned to spending %100 of my time it, as I write this document. Much of my time was spent researching and understanding the city ordinances and then searching for a new house and then packing and unpacking and establishing a new workshop and home office in our new house.

This has been a serious blow to our financial situation, but we had to move. I am developing a product intended to save 10 billion gallons of fresh water every year and any delay in completing my mission represents 1 million gallons of fresh water wasted every minute. As much as I wanted to continue fighting for our rights and the rights of our neighbors, I have a moral obligation to complete my work.

Nevertheless, I feel one final obligation to expose the damage being done by the BOL led by Dylan Conley. I understand that other people have different opinions about the character of the city and the balance between residential and commercial interests. I offer no opinion on these matters other than what I have just stated about what my wife and I were able to tolerate. I speak for no one else, although I can state as matters of fact and record that neighbors of mine also complained to the police, offered in-person testimony at public BOL meetings, offered written testimony to the BOL, and signed petitions submitted to the BOL. Many were also driven out of the neighborhood by decisions of the BOL, often without any understanding of the role of the BOL.

The BOL acted outside the spirit and scope of the law. My interpretation of the law has been validated by present Council President Rachel Miller, past Council President John Iggliozzi, Councilor David Salvatore, State Senator Sam Bell, State Representative John Lombardi, City Solicitor Mario Martone and Attorney and advisor to the BOL Louis DeSimone. The legal opinions of Martone and DeSimone are part of the audio record in public BOL meetings.

The role of the BOL is to represent the public interest. Dylan Conley is a property lawyer that represents commercial interests. These roles are not compatible. It would take an enormous amount of discipline to make a living representing commercial interests and then hop over to the other side of the fence to represent public interests as a part time job. I will document many instances where he has failed to make this leap.

The city has laws and residents have a reasonable expectation they that will be obeyed, but it cannot be reasonable to expect citizens to obey the law if the people running the city don't. The City Council must take its oversight role seriously. Confirmation hearings are the only tools available for holding city officials accountable. Otherwise, officials like Conley perform their duties with absolute power, which as everyone knows, corrupts absolutely. The only other measures that can be taken involve the council expelling sitting officials or filing a lawsuit in municipal court. Neither of those alternatives are reasonable.

I urge the committee to reject the nomination of Dylan Conley and insist that the Mayor nominate someone that represents the rights of the residents, as required by law.

1. Home Charter

1.1. Creation and Control by Ordinance

The Board of Licenses is established by Section 1102 of the Home Charter of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Providence. Subsection (a) establishes the terms of the members and that those members have duties prescribed by law within the city ordinances.

There shall be a board of licenses which shall have and exercise such power and duties relating to licenses as may be prescribed by law or ordinance.

The city ordinances are structured such that specific duties are enumerated elsewhere in the code of ordinances, but substantial powers are defined in this section. In particular, the board is established as a quasi-judicial agency capable of rescinding licenses based on reports by the police department or other departments. It has broad powers to investigate such matters, but also to initiate investigations, according to subsection (b).

The board of licenses, subject to such terms, limitations and conditions as prescribed by state law, this Charter or ordinance of the city council, shall:

There are notable observations to make here. The powers of the board are superseded by state law, as is the authority of the city council. In particular, much of the licensing in the city is liquor licensing, which is a function of the state. As such, any decision related to liquor licensing may be appealed to the state Department of Business Regulation by the licensee. This fact has received a great deal of attention.

On the other hand, entertainment licensing is purely the purview of the city. The state has ceded all matters related to entertainment licensing to the towns and cities. This bears repeating: the BOL has complete and total authority over entertainment licensing. Its decisions cannot be appealed to the state DBR. It is, therefore, useful to focus on entertainment licensing in reviewing the performance of a board member.

Furthermore, the board is explicitly subject to the conditions set forth by the city council. The board is not directed by the mayor or any other department of the city. It is not the role of the board to implement policy other than enumerated by ordinance.

It is essential to note that this section, in introducing the enumerated duties therein, uses the word "shall". The duties of the board are not optional.

1.2. Duty to Investigate

Subsection (b)(1) requires that the board investigate concerns brought by the police. It also empowers the board to require investigation based on its own concerns.

(1) Require an inspection, investigation and report by the police department on the application for any license and of the person making such application in all cases in which the police department has an

interest or concern therein. Such board, in the same or other cases, may require a similar inspection, investigation and report to be made by said department or by any other officer, department or agency of the city.

The key phrase is that the “board...may require...” It is within the discretion of the board to initiate investigations that arise from public testimony. Time and again, the board, led by Dylan Conley, has refused to exercise this authority, even in the face of live testimony by the licensee to behavior that violates the terms of the license.

Subsection (b)(3) makes clear that the duty of the board is to protect the public interest.

(3) Unless otherwise provided by state law, suspend, annul, rescind, cancel or revoke any license issued by the board of licenses for any reason which the board may deem to be in the public interest;...

Elsewhere in the ordinances, the board is required to hold public meetings on matters related to licensing to enforce both state and city law. It is understood that the term “public interest” specifically is in opposition to business or commercial interests. Note there is no mention of commercial interests in this or any other governing ordinance. There is no mention of any balancing of rights between business owners and residents. No mention of hardship to business associated with revoking a license. No weighing of cost to the licensee to comply with the law. All businesses should be aligned with the public interest.

To be clear, the role of the board is NOT to advocate for the licensees or to advance some agenda or policy, not enumerated by ordinance, that would serve to defend license holders against complaints by the public. It is up to the license holders themselves to defend their own behavior. To the contrary, the purpose of the board is to represent the public interest.

Subsection (c) gives the board broad power to adjudicate these matters. Each board member has the power to administer oaths and to issue subpoenas for witness testimony and documents and to seek contempt charges for non-compliance.

In summary, it is the role of the board to adjudicate matters related to licenses and to represent the public, not commercial, interest.

1.3. City Council President John Iggliozzi

My interpretation of the law stems from the plain reading of the home charter establishing the BOL, but is not just my opinion. John Iggliozzi was the chair of the Finance Committee when Dylan Conley was first confirmed on January 12, 2017. The following is some of the transcript from his directive to Conley.

“[I hope]...whether a neighborhoods there whether a Council person is there, a representative, or whether a next door neighbor is there that you stand in the shoes of the person that's not there...because I view just like we give voice to the

voiceless...because not all constituents show up. They count on us to stand in their place, to stand in their position. And that's why they elect us and we now potentially elect you because we're voting to elect you...you become our representative; the council's, not just the executive branch."

"What happens is sometimes someone gets on it (the board) and they kind of think or become this kind of independent agent. No, you're really there as a representative for people that can't show up that day..."

"My goal is to expect you to be there for my constituents. Not just to listen to what the police say or to the multiple lawyers that are hanging around down there but to the constituents that live around there."

All of his statement is of the same vein and is consistent with the home charter. There is no mention of looking out for the commercial interest or taking into account the burden on an establishment in maintaining the public interest.

1.4. Dylan Conley

Dylan Conley is an attorney specializing in property law and represents commercial interests. He would have to be extremely disciplined to then represent the public interest against commercial interests. The following is evidence in the public record demonstrating the lack thereof.

On May 8, 2019, Dylan Conley, as Chairman of the Board of Licenses, issued a letter inviting 46 businesses operating in the Atwells Avenue commercial corridor to a public meeting to discuss best practices. The invitation included the following statement:

A license to serve alcohol or have entertainment is a privilege that comes with certain responsibilities. Prime among those responsibilities is the need to respect neighbors and the community. The role of the Board of Licenses is to facilitate the silent but inherent partnership between each licensee, the business community at large, and the residents in the neighborhood. The Board does this by hearing public comment and pursuing fair remedies to unreasonable problems or by revoking licenses when no other remedy is sufficient.

Notably, the invitation was not extended to the residents. So much for public comment. A few residents got wind of the invite and showed up to the public meeting, which was held on May 16 and lasted about one hour. On its face, this invitation seems like a good opportunity for the board to assert its proper role. In actuality, there was much helpful discussion, but the underlying message did not favor the public.

Dylan Conley: This is a few notes on my philosophy generally for the whole city. I want to grow the nighttime economy. Alright, I think that would benefit everyone in this room. But I cannot grow the nighttime economy without the support of residents. Residents get upset about nuisances and residents get really upset about violence and crime, so it's simple: the more that we can control nuisances the better we can take care of our residents, the easier it is for us to adopt policies and help businesses that would allow us to grow our nighttime economy.

While this statement by Dylan Conley at the start of the meeting may seem laudable on its face, it is important to understand that his concern is not for the residents. He is concerned about growing the nighttime economy and the residents are an obstacle to that agenda. He is seeking the cooperation of these businesses in service of this agenda. If that wasn't plain, he continues:

Dylan Conley: I can't underscore enough that I don't like problems. I don't like incidents. I hate closing businesses. It's the worst thing we do here.

That, of course, is not the worst thing the board can do. Worse still is allowing a business to be a nuisance for the residents. And, of course, that is exactly what happens. For all the talk in this meeting about keeping control over the "bad apple" businesses, the record of the board shows it is extremely rare that the board ever says no to licensees or limits them in any way.

There are many statements by Conley during this meeting that show his understanding of the law and the underlying issues with respect to nuisance business establishments. He is, after all, a practicing property lawyer. Indeed, the following statement, demonstrates his understanding of the duty of the board.

Dylan Conley: One of the things that is the most difficult for this board to do...is we can only rule based on the evidence we have before us. So, collect evidence and submit it to this board, right? If there's no evidence in front of us, then we can't do anything.

He understands the board can look at evidence from the public so that it can make adverse rulings against license holders. But the record is clear that the board does not accept evidence from the public when it does not WANT to rule against a license holder. In fact, the board has adopted rules and regulations, under Conley's leadership, that make it nearly impossible for members of the public to submit evidence to the board. His rules and regulations have created a Catch 22 situations whereby the board can only look at evidence in a Disposition and Review hearing, but a D&R hearing can only be scheduled based on evidence. That will happen if the Police Department initiates an investigation because that is required by law, but it will not happen if a member of the public submits evidence to the board.

Further evidence of Conley's agenda came later in the same year in this article in the Providence Journal, "Wild place in the city?", dated September 10, 2019. The article describes his proposal to create a 24/7 nightclub and entertainment district. Frankly, anyone reading this proposal delivered from a sitting chair of the Board of Licenses would have to question why such a person is in this position. Indeed, an editorial from the Journal staff in the same issue begins with

"...the proposal of Dylan Conley, chairman of the Providence Board of Licenses, to create a 24/7 nightclub and entertainment district along the capital city's Allens Avenue is a bit of a head-scratcher..."

His attitude has not changed in the meantime. This is a quote from an article in the Providence Journal, "Rats the size of squirrels': Locals complain about Federal Hill quality of life", June 10, 2022.

"One of the great challenges of this sort of NIMBYism is that we hear two or three people that are complaining about an event that over the course of a day, 2,000 people were at and we completely ignore the joy and value that the 2,000 people had because of two or three people that are complaining. It's just life in a city."

The is a gross mischaracterization on many fronts. It is obviously a hyperbolic statement intended to disparage anyone opposing his own agenda. NIMBY (Not In My BackYard) is a term used to disparage members of the public that oppose unwanted development. Again, that represents commercial interests, not public interests. The term NIMBY should not be used at all by a sitting chair of the BOL, who is obliged to represent the public interest.

Furthermore, this pitting of 2,000 people against 2-3 people is completely made up. There is really no event I can think of that matches this sort of ratio. This Journal article, for example, was not about a particular event. It was about a hearing of a new "neighborhood event" ordinance. That hearing only included public testimony because my wife and I collected 75 signatures to force the Ordinance Committee to open the meeting to public testimony. But that is all moot. The "joy and value" criteria is nowhere to be found in the licensing ordinances and is not something to weigh against the rights of residents. 2,000 people might find joy and value in partying in your backyard, but that doesn't make it legal. The truth is that number of patrons of an establishment or attendees of an event will generally outnumber the residents negatively impacted. This is just common sense. But the patrons go home after a short period of time, the residents do not. If patrons aren't finding "joy" then they leave. The residents cannot. These apple and oranges comparisons make no sense and the chair of the BOL should not offer them up to the public.

And, the characterization of “an event” matches the Columbus Day Festival on Atwells Avenue over the holiday weekend, for example. It does not match closing Atwells every weekend for 21 weekends for al fresco dining. Both of these have been deemed “an event” by Dylan Conley, but one is more than a magnitude more impactful than the other. Few people would consider an activity spanning more than 5 months a single event.

Finally, the “life in a city” comment is nothing more than condescending. I moved the Providence in 2006, more than a decade before his confirmation to the board and well before he was a resident of the city. I lived in Boston before he was born. I am well experienced with noise in a city.

Conley portrays himself as a person that sees his role as representing business, rather than advocating for the rights of the residents of Providence. No member of the Board of Licenses should be pursuing such an agenda.

2. Live Entertainment

The state governs the licensing of liquor but has completely ceded entertainment licensing to the municipality, so the Board of Licenses is completely in control over entertainment licensing.

2022 Rhode Island General Laws Title 5

5-22-12. License fees — Revocation of license

Town or city councils, bureaus of licenses, or boards of police commissioners shall demand and receive of every person to whom a license is granted under this chapter a sum not exceeding one hundred dollars (\$100) for any single performance, show, exhibition, concert, entertainment, moving picture exhibition, dance, or ball, that they deem proper; provided, that performances and entertainments given by religious and charitable societies and volunteer firefighting companies duly organized and incorporated for the purpose of furthering their religious, benevolent, or firefighting work are excepted from the provisions of this chapter as to fees. Any license granted under the authority of §§ 5-22-5 – 5-22-12 may be revoked at the pleasure of that city or town council, bureau of licenses, or board of police commissioners.

The best illustration of this in action is the recent brawl that occurred on Block Island over Labor Day weekend. The township of New Shoreham suspended both the license to operate (serve liquor) and the entertainment license for two weeks. The owner appealed to the Department of Business Regulation (DBR). The DBR granted a stay on the liquor license, but left the suspension of the entertainment. That’s because there is no appeal with respect to entertainment.

Management of entertainment licenses, therefore, is the best way to protect the health and safety of the public. Most of the problems come from establishments with liquor and

entertainment. The board tends toward controlling the liquor license, but that runs afoul of the DBR. The board should suspend entertainment licenses, primarily, because they are outside the purview of the DBR. Secondarily, they can suspend liquor licenses.

2.1. Licensing Regulation

During the reconfirmation of Conley on January 7, 2020, Vice Chair Ryan lauded him for his efforts to bring the BOL in alignment with the city ordinances and for his efforts to modernize the rules and regulations of the BOL that govern its procedures and processes. In particular, she was pleased that there was a dramatic decrease in the number of cases overturned by the DBR. I was not even aware of the BOL at that time, but I did listen to the audio recording of that meeting. In retrospect, I take issue with the characterization of the vice chair. I think the policies of the BOL now favor the commercial interest over the public interest. The procedures for adjudicating potential violations operate as a first defense of the license holder. It is often not adversarial and the public is excluded from the process. The public can listen, but not testify.

That aside, there is a major flaw in what Conley has done. At every turn, Conley has conflated liquor and entertainment licensing, but they are entirely separate licensing schemes.

- Liquor licensing is a function of state law. Entertainment is governed by city ordinance.
- Liquor license penalties can be appealed to the DBR. Not so with entertainment.
- Liquor licenses are annual. Entertainment is monthly or by event.
- Entertainment licensing includes explicit noise ordinance compliance.

Even though entertainment licenses “may be revoked at the pleasure of” the BOL, the board does not use this to its advantage. In fact, the board does not take entertainment licensing at all seriously. From its Operations and Procedure manual posted online and date July 26, 2022:

16. Violations in the sole control of the Licensee.

a. Entertainment without the Proper Zoning.

iii. Third Violation – Permanent reduction of hours of operation to 11:00pm on weekdays and 12:00pm[sic] on weekends.

Anthony’s Authentic Italian Cuisine, a restaurant at 441 Atwells Avenue began holding regular live entertainment on their outdoor patio. They are located in a C1 zoning district. Live entertainment is not permitted in this zone, so they cannot apply for an entertainment license. They close at 9:00 pm on weeknights and 10:00 pm on weekends. According to this discipline schedule, the most severe penalty that can be imposed would have no impact on this establishment. In effect, this policy overrides the city zoning land use ordinances.

17. Entertainment Licenses.

a. Ancillary Entertainment.

The Board of Licenses shall only require an entertainment license for entertainment ancillary to the primary use of the establishment if the sound will be heard outside the four walls of the building after 11:00pm.

This makes no sense whatsoever. A venue is able to hold outdoor entertainment without a license before 11:00 pm. It is a condition of an entertainment license that the license holder comply with the sound ordinances. But an entertainment license that does not exist cannot be revoked. Therefore, there is no enforcement of the sound ordinances in this case, which is very typical. This essentially guts any application of the sound ordinances on businesses.

There are multiple concerns regarding impact of entertainment and the judgement of what is in the public interest is largely vested in the board. But not all concerns are up to the board. In particular, license holders are required to adhere to the city sound ordinances and the board is required to condition licenses upon that compliance. But that is not happening.

2.2. Revival Brewery outdoor entertainment

This is where our problems started. In August of 2021 a new establishment called Revival Brewery was licensed to hold live outdoor entertainment outdoors at the edge on the opposite side of the building they were leasing from the Providence Redevelopment Agency on the other side of the Route 6/10 connector in the Valley District. They were extremely loud and the stage was directly aligned with an alley, which acted like a giant megaphone directing the sound at Federal Hill.

I walked over to that area and was able to speak with, Sean Larkin, the owner of the establishment. I asked him to turn down the volume; especially the bass. He was very belligerent about his "right" to have this entertainment and he refused to adjust the sound in any way. After doing some research, I gained some understanding about the sound ordinances and the role of the BOL. I complained to the office and found out there was an upcoming BOL meeting I could attend and Sean was set to appear, mainly because he was a new licensee. Note that entertainment is licensed every month.

September 1, 2021

This was the date of the first BOL meeting my wife and I attended. Sean was applying for entertainment for the month of September. During public testimony, I gave a presentation as to my understanding of the sound standards.

Sec. 16-92, 93

Unnecessary, excessive, or offensive noise: ...noise audible to a person of reasonably sensitive hearing at a distance of two hundred (200) feet from its source, shall be deemed a **prima facie violation**...

The distance from the source to my house was approximately 850'. There are sound standards, involving decibel levels and time of day, related to the zoning designation of the receiving property, but those standards are only relevant within the 200' radius.

Sec. 14-196. - Entertainment license conditions.

(3) Noise. The board of licenses may specifically require the use of...equipment...to contain and mitigate...amplified sound as a condition to the issuance or renewal of an entertainment license. Entertainment license holders shall comply with the regulations...entitled "Noise Control,"...

After describing the particular event and playing a recording of the sound from my phone, the business owner said the following.

Sean Larkin: So the event in question was a birthday party on Sunday night where the guests rented the facility, rented the area until 11:00 o'clock. The complaint came in midafternoon from the gentleman behind me. And you know we took the record...or I took a record of the sound outside of this House just to have a video record what the sound was like. I'm not disputing that you can hear sound across the highway. I'm just saying that we're not the only sounds in the area.

Having made this statement, the testimony of the licensee, me and my wife were in agreement: the sound was clearly audible from my property. That is, by definition and without dispute, a prima facie violation. But that did not register with Dylan Conley.

Chairman Dylan Conley: I don't think the goal is perfection. The goal is just, sort of, you know, efficient improvement until we get to a place that everyone can live with.

The board is given some latitude to address the problem by applying sound mitigation measures, but the goal of the mitigation is to bring the license holder into compliance with the objective standards set forth in Section 16-93. There is no interpretation of the law that suggests a subjective standard of "a place that everyone can live with." That policy is made up from whole cloth.

Chairman Dylan Conley: We are not going to deny anyone's entertainment permit when they are zoned for it and it's happening safely.

This policy is inconsistent with the law. There is no entertainment permit that allows for excessive noise. In this case, the M1 zoning designation of the Valley District allows for live outdoor entertainment. It does not allow for violating the sound ordinances. I would note that this specific point was addressed in the Ordinance Committee hearing when the entertainment ordinances were passed. This hearing is available online and I have listened to it.

Chairman Dylan Conley: ...incremental trial and error until we get to a place that's at a better balance so that they are able to enjoy their entitled land rights, so are you...

Conley is a land use attorney. I'm sure he is aware that the entitled land use rights of a business do not include violation of the municipal sound ordinances.

There was one mitigation that was discussed, which involved rotating the concert stage to point in another direction. Sean Larkin suggested that this would be expensive (hundreds of dollars), so the outcome of this meeting was that the board required Sean to appear before the board on October 6, more than a month later, with a list of other possible mitigation. Meanwhile, he was granted his entertainment license to operate without conditions for the month of September.

Subsequent to this meeting, I sent Councilor Rachel Miller an email describing my understanding of the sound ordinances. Her response:

Councilor Rachel Miller: I completely agree with your read on the noise ordinance.

A week or so later, she came to my house and met with me and some of my neighbors. She stood on our back deck, facing the valley, and witnessed our problem for herself.

October 6, 2021

After more than a month passed, Sean was required to appear before the BOL, ostensibly to deliver his list of potential sound mitigation measures. He had none.

Note that one of my neighbors came to the meeting and testified, in addition to my wife and I. We also had a petition with about 25 signatures and a letter from another neighbor.

Having had a month to dig deep into the ordinances, I gave a detailed presentation on my understanding of them. After my presentation, City Solicitor Mario Martone, the prosecutorial attorney for licensing, said the following.

City Solicitor Mario Martone: I can tell you that the reading of the ordinance is correct. Even with an entertainment license, you should not be able to hear the music from more than 200 feet away.

Dylan Conley responded with this.

Chairman Dylan Conley: We have a city ordinance, which as briefed by the city solicitor and the member of the public, is that you're not supposed to be able to hear sound from 200 feet away, even though it's perfectly legal to issue entertainment permits for outdoor entertainment. I mean, you can hear me watch a Red Sox game from 600 feet away, so the idea that you can't

have sound that's audible from 200 feet away in an outdoor entertainment environment...it's essentially pointing out that there are issues within the code of ordinances that are practically impossible to manage.

There is, of course, a very easy way to manage this at zero cost. Tell them to turn the volume down. I should also note that, having acknowledged my understanding of the sound ordinances, the lawyers and Conley started offering excuses about trying to adhere to the RI State "take it outside" effort to deal with COVID.

The board voted to approve the same outdoor entertainment for two months. That was essentially the rest of the season, October and November. It's not generally possible to have outdoor entertainment past October, although Sean was going to try. There were two conditions on the license.

1. Sometime during October, Sean was required to rotate his stage to point in another direction. This was the original suggestion for a possible sound mitigation discussed on September 1. We were all supposed to show up again in two months to evaluate the effectiveness of the mitigation.
2. Sean offered to stop any performances at 11:00 pm and the board supported that.

Late in October, they did have one performance after rotating the stage. It helped a bit, but it did not eliminate the problem and they were still violating the sound ordinances. They also kept going until after midnight, so they violated the curfew. I sent all of this information to the BOL that very night with pictures and recordings.

November 24, 2022

The day before Thanksgiving, Revival Brewery was in the Consent Agenda for December entertainment, including the same sort of outdoor entertainment. Being in the consent agenda, Sean was not required to appear. My wife and I did. In other words, if we did not show up then they would have granted the license without discussion.

The item was pulled out of the consent agenda. It was deemed necessary to have Sean show up to defend himself, so we all had to come back on December 1.

In preparation for this meeting, I researched the RI State "take it outside" initiative. At the state level, a law was passed to relax zoning ordinances so that restaurants could quickly implement changes to accommodate social distancing and outdoor dining. Mayor Elorza issued a series of executive orders to implement the state guidelines. Live outdoor entertainment was explicitly banned, which makes sense. Loud music forces people closer together so they can hear each other talk over the loud music. This is counter to social distancing. So the COVID rationale for ignoring the sound ordinances was nonsense.

Also, we brought another letter from a different neighbor and another petition, bringing the total number of signatures to 35.

December 1, 2022

We showed up with one more neighbor who testified on behalf of the residents of the Walgreens condominiums. Sean showed up with a lawyer and two business partners.

Sean was seeking an entertainment license for up to 8 outdoor events, but he didn't have any clients or performers identified, so the board eventually agreed that he should wait to apply when he actually had someone lined up. That never happened so we were done for the winter.

But it all started up again in the spring.

April 20, 2022

Sean was applying for one outdoor event on the last day of April. We, of course, showed up to oppose any amplified music, since they had still not demonstrated any ability to adhere to the sound standards.

City Solicitor Mario Martone: What I will say is that there is, there has been some I think leniency and latitude the past couple of years because of the pandemic and people moving things and being encouraged to move things outside. I will say is that I would ask that legal counsel review the entertainment ordinance. There is a limitation on sound. Sound should not be heard more than 200 feet from the establishment, and I don't believe that the same latitude that we've granted in the last few years is going to be afforded this year.

I would say a lot of latitude came from the state's emergency as well. So those, those are over. So you know any, any entertainment event should be strictly adhered to with regards against entertainment ordinance and that ordinance says that **you should not be able to hear music more than 200 feet from your establishment**. So I think that's something that that we've always enforced. Last couple years were a little different, but I would expect that's going to be the goal going forward.

Attorney to the board Louis DeSimone: I would agree with Mario. This board has, and I'll use the term prior to COVID. Prior to the Governor's emergency orders, this board has accommodated entertainment events and required mitigation of sound in a number of different ways. Some of the nightlife on the water. This board has had speakers reconfigured; stages reconfigured so that the sound where it would travel more than 200 feet it would sort of limited towards the buildings. Those type of things are going to come into play. I mean obviously I don't, I don't prosecute the matters, but those are going to come into play from a violation standpoint going forward. I think while we were

urging everybody to get outside for a period of time, some of that is going to be rolled back and obviously there's no longer any emergency exceptions, so those city ordinances got to come into play now.

Chairman Dylan Conley: When we say city ordinances, does this board have control over the city ordinances?

Louis DeSimone: You do not. I know that sometimes this board would like to control...

Chairman Dylan Conley: A few of them. Just maybe one or two.

Louis DeSimone: But that's correct. The board does not have control over those. Nor does Mr. Martone.

April 27, 2022

City Solicitor Mario Martone: I do agree that there are some objective things that are in place. One is that there is a sound ordinance. Sound should not be carried more than a certain amount. Second thing is, and I don't think this is the case but I just want to make sure because I thought I heard last time, is all, every venue is responsible for the performers with regard to sound. So it's not it's not the situation that oh, so and so DJ came in and they blast the music. It's the venue's responsibility for the music.

And then they approved the outdoor entertainment without condition.

May 4, 2022

This was for May entertainment, including outdoor entertainment. At this meeting two more neighbors showed up to testify about these problems. I played more sample of audio of the music we could hear from our home.

Sean Larkin: "I will admit that the music is audible in those recordings..."

Despite four of us testifying and Sean admitting, yet again, that his music was audible across the highway, the board approved the same entertainment without conditions.

2.1. Dusk outdoor entertainment

Dusk is a lounge that operates as a nightclub on Harris Avenue. Unlike Revival Brewery, which is hidden behind a building, Dusk is visible across the highway. It is a bit further to the East, so impacts my neighbors a bit more than me, but we had direct line of sight. They were at that location for years before we moved to our home. From 2014 to 2021, they were problematic

for us exactly one time. They had an annual outdoor event every Fourth of July weekend. We could hear it, but it was one day a year and we tolerated it. In 2019, though, they had music that was extraordinarily loud. It literally rattled our downstairs window. I recorded a video of it.

The next day, I walked over there and talked to the owner, Rick Sunderland. He was very apologetic and said it would never happen again and it didn't, until 2021. Apparently, he was given permission to have his entertainment outdoors whenever he wanted, so he was operating outdoors several nights a week. It became more and more problematic as the season wore on.

This was going on while we were battling Revival Brewery. Being a new business, Revival was showing up on the BOL agenda for his monthly entertainment. Dusk was not and so we never really directly addressed the issue of Dusk in a BOL meeting, although we and our neighbors complained incessantly to the police and on the PVD311 website.

As I read through the city ordinances, I ran across Section 23-36, which controls the permitting of public property use. It plainly states that permits to use public property, including streets, cannot be issued for commercial use. I could not understand how it was that Dusk was able to close the street next to them for this outdoor entertainment. As I searched through the BOL meeting history, I found that the BOL was licensing nighttime entertainment on public property throughout the city.

Sec. 23-36. - Special event permits

- (a) **Events** including, but not limited to, parades, performances, athletic competitions, community or charitable events, block parties, or fairs, **which take place**, in whole or in part, **on public property** require a special event permit.
- (b) A special event permit **shall be denied** under the following circumstances:
 - (2) **The activity** is to be held for the primary purpose of advertising products or goods, and/or **is designed to be held for commercial profit**.

The plain reading of this ordinance makes it clear that public property is to be used for public purposes. It is not intended to be used by businesses to make money. This is confusing to people because many public events involve people making money (e.g. food trucks, bands). I can clarify by using some examples.

India Point Park is used to host the RI Symphony for a concert free to the public for a Fourth of July celebration, culminating with fireworks. That is permissible. The BOL licensed a promoter to host live music at India Point Park. It was gated and people had to pay a cover charge to get into the show. That is illegal.

Neighbors get together for a birthday block party that requires closing off a block to use the street. That is permissible. Dusk was allowed to close the street next to them and have concerts on the street. That is illegal.

Atwells Avenue is closed for the annual Columbus Day Festival with a parade and booths and fair rides. That is permissible. The BOL licensed the Federal Hill Commerce Association to close Atwells Avenue for 21 weekends so that restaurants could have more tables outside on the street, expressly for the purpose of making more money. That is illegal.

Constantino's Restaurant used to have some tables along the edge of DePasquale Square, but the historic fountain was accessible to the public. After the city spent half a million dollars repairing it, Constantino's was allowed to set up 50 tables on the square, completely surrounding the fountain, making it part of the restaurant. Non-patrons no longer have access to the fountain or the square. That is illegal.

As I was doing this research, I could not find any indoor entertainment licensing for any year at all. I alerted the BOL office and asked why I could not find any licensing history. They did not reply, but in January, for the first time, Dusk appeared on a BOL agenda with a requirement to appear before the board. Note that virtual meetings were used during the winter months.

During that meeting, Rick testified that he did not know he had to apply for monthly entertainment licenses, even though he did apply for an annual outdoor entertainment license. Given that Dusk had come up in many noise complaints over the years, it was hard to believe that the BOL office personnel were not aware that Dusk was operating without a license. The operated without a license for at least a decade. Dylan told Rick he had to start applying every month. There were no consequences. He paid no fine. He paid no license fees in arrears.

The board licensed them to play outdoors many times throughout the season. We left our home on those nights because it was just too loud. They started midafternoon and typically operated outdoors until 11:30 pm. After that, they would go indoors, but they would leave their front door open and open the large windows in the front. It was not as loud as being outdoors, but it was still loud enough to hear inside of our home with the doors and windows closed. They would generally operate until 2:00 am.

A few of those days, the entertainment was a DJ playing a very bass heavy hip hop style electronic music. The bass was incredibly loud. There was actually one day that they were cited for a noise violation. The Disposition and Review meeting was held a month later. My wife and I went to the meeting, but we were not allowed to testify. The owner did not show and the board did find him in violation, reluctantly. They issued a warning and required Rick to appear before the board the next time he applied for outdoor entertainment. He applied for outdoor entertainment two weeks later and was placed in the Consent Agenda, so he did not have to appear. He applied for outdoor several more times going forward and was never required to appear.

3. 3 AM Soft Closing Permit

3.1. Creation of 3 AM Permit

January 27, 2022

This meeting included an agenda item to discuss a new 3 AM soft closing permit with an adoption vote immediately after. About six residents from across the city, including me, attended the virtual meeting. We each testified in opposition because it really is a terrible idea. After we each spoke, Dylan Conley made the following statement.

Chairman Dylan Conley: The permit prohibits the sales of alcohol. It prohibits admittance of persons into a licensed establishment. It prohibits entertainment, excepting ancillary background music. The permit requires an increase in lighting, a decrease in volume and an orderly management of patrons both within and in the immediate vicinity of the licensed establishment. So not just in the establishment itself, but in the immediate vicinity of the establishment. What the permit does is it merely allows patrons already within the establishment prior to closing time to remain within the establishment for a period of time that may be as long as one hour after the legal closing time. Such permits shall only be issued in a total, absolute and unilateral discretion of the board of licenses if and only if the Board finds that one, it is in the best interest in the health and safety of the City of Providence, and two, that it mitigates nuisances. There's a little bit of legalese there. What it means is no one is entitled to a 3:00 AM license. It's strictly up to the board who gets it, and we will only give it out if we make affirmative findings that it will be quieter and safer as a result.

The board then voted to approve this policy over our protestations.

3.2. Alley Cat 3:00 am closing

May 25, 2022

It didn't take too long for the board to violate its own policy. I was at a BOL meeting for another matter when I witnessed a club called Alley Cat apply for a 3 AM soft closing. The board approved their license and allowed them to hold outdoor live entertainment until 2:30 am. After the vote, Conley said the following, without irony.

Chairman Dylan Conley: That's late at night. Treat your neighbors well, OK?

4. Remonstrance

Remonstrance is state law pertaining to liquor licensing. It potentially comes into play with new license applications. Abutters to an establishment can oppose a new liquor license. If more than half of the abutters, measured by the area of property owners, oppose the license then it is denied. This is one of the few situations where residents can exercise decision making authority.

Since remonstrance is state law, the Board of Licensing has no say in these matters. This is a pet peeve of Dylan Conley. An establishment on Atwells Avenue was operating with a BV (service until 1 AM) liquor license. When they applied for a BX license (service until 2 AM), the neighbors opposed it because the establishment was already considered a nuisance. Here is what Conley had to say during the first hearing when confronted with the staunch opposition by the abutters.

March 17, 2022

Chairman Dylan Conley: The remonstrance issue...some of my greatest highlights are me ranting against the remonstrance law. It's awful for many, many, many reasons. And I beg relentlessly whenever I get anyone's attention up in the General Assembly that they change that law. They don't seem super intrigued in doing it.

There was indeed enough opposition for a successful remonstrance. When faced with this opposition, the application was withdrawn, rather than being denied.

This is a particularly instructive example of his attitude toward opposition by residents. There is a peculiarity in the state liquor license laws specific to the Atwells Avenue corridor. While the South side of Atwells Avenue is subject to remonstrance, the North side of the street is exempt. This provides an ideal A/B comparison with respect to liquor licensing. Another establishment applied for a liquor license on Acorn Street, a main side street off Atwells to the North. The license was opposed by many of the same residents, but remonstrance was not an option. Naturally, the opposition got nowhere with the Board of Licenses. Without the empowerment of state law, the board, led by Conley, issued the license over all objections.

Mastroianni, Tina

From: Karen Hlynsky <karen_ena@earthlink.net>
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2023 12:44 PM
To: Mastroianni, Tina; jpichardoward9@gmail.com; Juan Pichardo; hanthonyward2@gmail.com; Taylor, James; Taylor, James; Sanderboisward3@gmail.com; msanchezward6@gmail.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Finance Committee meeting - opposition to Dylan Conley's appointment

I'm writing to oppose the appointment of Dylan Conley to the Board of Licenses.

His decisions have been pro-business at the expense of neighborhood quality of life. Residents of Elmwood and South Providence have appeared before the Board of Licenses numerous times to voice opposition to licenses given to Broad St and Elmwood Ave clubs. Dismissing our concerns, licenses have been given only to have the clubs dismiss noise ordinances and to host clients whose behaviors lead to violence.

We need people on the Board of Licenses who listen to the voices of residents who live with the clubs (and the Boards decisions) day by day.

Regards,

Karen Hlynsky

Elmwood Neighborhood Association

1/23/16

Tina Mastrioni, City Clerk

City Council President, Rachel Miller

Finance Chair, Helen Anthony

City Council members

Re: Approval of re appointment to BOL, Dylan Conley

Dear Finance members and City Councilors,

Over the past several years we have experienced a dangerous 'shift' on behalf of the BOL that systematically disregards the neighborhood dynamics, and appears to give precedence to connected nightclub owners and lawyers.

Some examples:

Pasha Hookah Bar, 840 Allens Avenue. in Washington Park. This establishment was able to open as a restaurant, without ever receiving a proper certificate of occupancy for an eating establishment. This went on for several years. There was a fatal shooting there in 2015, the first of its kind in Washington Park. Several abutters pleaded with the BOL to close the bar, to no avail. Two home owner family's moved out of the neighborhood, one a direct abutter.

Mi Sueno. Broad St. The 'music show' at Mi Sueno was allowed to thrive, knowingly breaking the noise ordinance for several years. over intense opposition of residents and abutters. An effected resident obtained their own lawyer, at their expense. Mi Sueno owners opened a new bar next to Bell Funeral Home, on Elmwood Ave, over the strong objections of the owner of Bell and several residents. Again 'rubber stamped' and approved as a restaurant, within 6 months there is now a

2 am bar/ nightclub. Again, the 'residents' suffer and the 'connected few' thrive.

A few years ago, Dylan Conley wanted to promote a 24hour nightclub district here in South Providence, along with business owners, over the disapproval of the residents.

Most recently, there were 'new rules' dictated by the BOL that included a 3 am closing rule. Again 'rubber stamped' OVER THE OBJECTIONS OF THE POLICE who testified against it, and several residents. Again, 'rubber stamped' by the BOL.

This is like the BOL version of 'caught in Providence'. The residents are held 'hostage' by the BOL, with little or no ability to participate in the decisions, short of obtaining council.

In addition, Mr, Conley represents Lammar Advertising Co., and other business owners. I feel there is a conflict with his re appointment. The citizen public needs 100% assurance of transparency, trust, and integrity from all members and appointments at the BOL.

If our city is allowed to 'give out' as many licenses as asked for, without question, the residents who live here will continue to experience severe hardships and an even more reduced quality of life. More residents who can afford to will move away.

Beware of zoning requests from R1.2 and 3, to C1 and 2. This only reduces residential spaces, of which we need more of, not less!

Sincerely,

Linda Perri

Washington Park Association

Providence City Council Finance Committee
Providence City Hall
Providence, RI 02903

This letter opposes the confirmation of Dylan Conley as the chair of the Providence Board of Licenses [BOL]. As a witness to Board of Licenses [BOL] hearings regarding restaurants and bars proposed for the South Providence neighborhood, the board ignored abundant community testimony against such establishments and granted licenses. One such restaurant petitioned to be a family restaurant and applied for and was granted a license to stay open much later would be expected for an establishment purporting to be a "family" establishment.

The noise associated with late closings as well as live entertainment elsewhere disturbs residents' sleep and degrades their quality-of-life.

Mr. Conley as the chair of this board doesn't have sufficient social and emotional intelligence to see the consequences of his poor leadership/decisions and must be removed from the BOL. Such decisions indicate a lack of respect for any form of social justice.

Further the BOL leadership and membership should be subject to increased public scrutiny and be reflective of the public at large.

Alfred Jeffries
South Elmwood
January 23, 2023

Mastroianni, Tina

From: Azure Carter <azurecarter@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2023 10:27 PM
To: Mastroianni, Tina
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Board of Licenses Appointment

Attention: Tina Mastroianni, City Clerk

It has come to our notice that Brett Smiley wants to appoint Dylan Conley to the Board of Licenses. We do not have faith that Mr. Conley will responsibly look after the interests of residents in the city. As constituents who voted for Mayor Smiley and who live Downtown, we are watching very closely to see how this administration deals with the serious quality of life issues that the city faces. Thirty years ago, when there were very few residents living downtown and very few businesses operating Downtown, it might have made sense to encourage nightclubs. But the city is taking a new direction and the Downtown is being revitalized and stabilized by a growing residential population, and to appoint someone with a history of leniency towards nightclubs with a history of violations and violence is not the way to lead the city into its Future. As Mayor Smiley knows from attending Ward 1 neighborhood meetings, there is a history of nightclubs in the city that are not good neighbors. We have had numerous neighbors take their tax dollars and leave the city, and we think about it as well, because they can not take the noise (it can be 70-90 decibels in our apartment with the windows closed and curtains drawn), and the drunken brawls on the street at closing time. We need an appointee who will stand up to offending nightclubs and not one with a history of being permissive.

Sincerely,
Azure Carter and Alan Sondheim
385 Westminster Street
Providence, 02903

Douglas R. Victor

Chair, Elmwood and South Providence Crime Watch

co: 103 Princeton Avenue, Providence, Rhode Island 02907

January 24, 2023

Ms. Helen Anthony, City Council Finance Committee Chair
Members of the City Council Finance Committee:

I wish to express my concern regarding the reappointment of Dylan Conely to the Board of Licenses. In his tenure of Chairmanship of the Board of Licenses, we have seen a continuation of a decades-long troubling historical practice where too many easy green lights have been given to start up liquor licenses, especially in the Southside of the city. The Southside has become the defacto "Nightclub District" to the detriment of the quality of residential life. Mr. Conley is not a good fit for this committee. His background is property law. He has not expressed concern for neighborhood voices who

I urge you to please review the March 2022 approval of the Vivix nightclub located at 549 Broad Street. This gives an example of how a meeting must not be run and how resident voices were mocked in the proceedings.

In addition, I wish to take this opportunity to name overall neighborhood concerns about the Board of Licenses which comes from years of community involvement and advocacy for reasonable residential life.

Lack of real neighborhood concern. The purpose of the BOL must be redefined and not only serve as a gateway for businesses to get established, especially liquor selling establishments in neighborhoods with an already disproportionate existing number. Our neighborhoods deserve equal treatment as to what kinds of businesses will enhance resident quality of life and access to services and appropriate retail markets. Do no harm needs to be the guiding philosophy behind every decision.

System bias. The way the BOL does business is a pseudo court model which favors lawyers and disfavors neighborhood input. The physical set up of the space does not guarantee that all attending will be able to hear all aspects of the proceedings. Lawyers speak, often in low voice and without being required to use available microphones, directly to the Board with the public sitting behind. The public is limited to 3 minutes to speak with no opportunity to re-speak as the proceedings take place. The lawyers, their clients and the Board are not time limited. The Chair of the BOL often refers to lawyers by their first names but does not do so with members of the public. The meetings are not available via zoom which serves to limit citizen engagement.

Neighborhoods first. The BOL needs to be set up so that neighborhood considerations are at the forefront of their decisions. The current face of the BOL is one of limited listening and dismissal. Relevant City Councilors and neighborhood organizations must be directly notified of new applications and scheduled hearings.

Policy vs. Charter mandate. What the BOL is allowed to set as policy is of an unreasonable scope, often resulting in unfair and inequitable decisions. An example of this is the recent policy; 3:00 am nightclub closing.

Lack of oversight. Set up a mechanism where the BOL is answerable to both the Mayor and to City Council. We have lived through the danger when it is the Mayor only who gives the BOL its direction.

Thank you for your needed attention to this pressing matter.

Douglas R. Victor

cc: Ms. Rachel Miller, Council President, Members of City Council

Mastroianni, Tina

From: E. Anthony Santurri <e.anthonysanturri@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2023 2:09 PM
To: Clerk, City
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Letter of support for Dylan Conley

Dear Providence City Council,

I am writing in support of Dylan Conley as our Chairperson of the Board of Licenses. I have been a license holder for over 15 years in our great City and have been given the opportunity to work with many elected and appointed officials. I have found Chairperson Conley to be a fair and impartial leader who is always willing to meet, listen and explore new ideas to further the growth, safety and prosperity of our nighttime economy. I would like to add that his demeanor and professionalism are what I respect most about his leadership.

As the Founder of the Providence Responsible Nightlife Organization, a Board member of the JDA and DNA neighborhood associations and of the Rhode Island Pride organization, I have developed a deep understanding of the relationship needed to have a safe, responsible and prosperous nighttime economy. Together with Chairperson Conley we can continue making Providence the world class destination so many of us enjoy.

Respectfully,

Anthony Santurri
Co owner Colosseum Nightclub
And Freeplay Bar Arcade

Sent from my iPhone

License Enforcement Activity 2022

BUSINESS	ADDRESS	VIOLATION	DATE OF INCIDENT	DATE FORWARDED	LICENSE TYPE	REPORT NUMBER	HEARING DATE	DISPOSITION
1 1070 North	1070 North Main St	Hours of Operation	1/1/2022	1/1/2022	BX/N	22-100	Pre-Con 1-27	Warning
2 Xtremo	897 Eddy Street	Entertainment w/o a license	1/16/2022	1/21/2022	BX	22-5026	Pre-Con 2-17	\$1,000 fine and 1 day closure held 3/1-9/1/22
3 Jet Set Lounge	1091 Eddy Street	Bottle Service	1/16/2022	1/21/2022	BX	22-3784	Pre-Con 2-17	\$1,000 fine
4 Levels	1137 Broad Street	Nudity	1/16/2022	1/21/2022	BX	22-5039	Pre-Con 2-17	\$500 fine, lose 4th 3am closing
5 Fuego	11 West Friendship	deny access, ent w/o lic, nudity	1/16/2022	1/26/2022	BX	22-6275	Held per BOL	2 day closure **owe 2 days** Jan 6&7, 2023
6 Las Terrenas	523 Hartford Avenue	Entertainment w/o License, Loud Music	1/19/2022	1/21/2022	BV	22-5048	Pre-Con 2-17	9 day closure, \$2000 fine paid, \$3,000 held 6mts
7 Mi Ranchito Restaurant	1955 Westminster St	Procurement of alcohol to underage	1/27/2022	1/28/2022	BV	22-6684	Pre-Con 3-3	Warning
8 Machupicchu II Restaurant	1366 Chalkstone Avenue	Procurement of alcohol to underage	1/27/2022	1/28/2022	BV	22-6675	Pre-Con 4-21	Warning
9 Downtown Liquors	308 Charles Street	Procurement of alcohol to underage	1/28/2022	1/28/2022	BV	22-8844	Pre-Con 3-3	Warning
10 Barnaby's Public House	385 Westminster St	Procurement of alcohol to underage	2/3/2022	2/3/2022	BV	22-8594	Pre-Con 3-3	\$250 fine
11 Black Sheep	397 Westminster St	Procurement of alcohol to underage	2/5/2022	2/5/2022	BX	22-9148	Pre-Con 3-3	\$500 fine, 1 day closure held 3-1 thru 9-1
12 Mega Liquors	961 Manton Avenue	Overcapacity	2/10/2022	2/10/2022	A	22-10418	Pre-Con 3-3	\$500 fine
13 Bukana's	190 Plainfield Street	Procurement of alcohol to underage	2/10/2022	2/10/2022	BX	22-10428	Pre-con 2-17	warning
14 Bukana's	190 Plainfield Street	Disturbance	2/8/2022	2/16/2022	BX	22-9688	Pre-con 2-17	\$500 fine and 2 day closure held 3/1-9/1/22
15 Union Liquors	558 Admiral Street	Procurement of alcohol to underage	2/17/2022	2/17/2022	A	22-12294	Pre-con 3-10	Dismissed (store changed owners, relocating)
16 Esquire Liquors	824 Charles Street	Procurement of alcohol to underage	2/17/2022	2/17/2022	A	22-12296	Pre-con 3-10	\$250 fine
17 City Liquors	1173 North Main St	Procurement of alcohol to underage	2/17/2022	2/17/2022	A	22-12310	Pre-con 3-10	warning
18 Maya Azteca	264 Pocasset Avenue	Disturbance	2/19/2022	2/22/2022	BX	22-12674	Pre-con 3-10	Warning
19 Las Terrenas	523 Hartford Avenue	Entertainment, Capacity, No clicker, hours of	2/19/2022	3/7/2022	BV	22-12681	P/C 4-28 N/5, 7/21	6 day closure [Sept 2,3,4,30, Oct 1,2]
20 Lovley VIP	1266 Broad Street	Bottle Service	2/20/2022	2/22/2022	BX	22-13002	Pre-Con 4-7/6-9	4 day closure [2 weekends] June 3&4, July 1&2
21 Legacy Lounge	307 Manton Avenue	Person w/a Gun & Disturbance	2/20/2022	2/25/2022	BX	22-12976	Pre-con 4-28	\$500 fine
22 Sage Kitchen	332 Atwell's Avenue	Hours of Operation, Loud Music, Ent WO	2/20/2022	2/26/2022	BV	22-14432	Pre-con 3-17	Warning
23 Espinal Restaurant	564 Plainfield St	Oper w/o lic, Liquor License Req'd	2/25/2022	2/25/2022	no licences	22-14419	Pre-con 6-9	Closed on 2/25-3/1. Appeared at BOL 3/1 reopen
24 Montecristo	488 Elmwood Ave	Entertainment w/o License, Loud Music	2/27/2022	3/2/2022	BV	22-14946	Pre-con 3-17/6/9	
25 Muldowney's Pub	121 Empire Street	Disturbance	2/25/2022	3/2/2022	BX	22-14238	Pre-con 3-17	\$250 fine
26 Sage Kitchen	332 Atwell's Avenue	Expansion & Ent. W/O a License	3/3/2022	3/7/2022	BV	22-15833	Pre-con 3-17	\$500 fine
27 Isla Bar and Grille	1040 Chalkstone Ave	Procurement of alcohol to underage	3/10/2022	3/10/2022	BV	22-17906	Pre-con 4-21	\$250 fine
28 El Patio	690 Public Street	Disturbance	3/13/2022	3/15/2022	BX	22-18565	Refused Pre-con	1 day closure **owe 1 day**
29 Tatino	370 Valley Street	Disturbance	3/13/2022	3/15/2022	BX	22-18573	Pre-con 4-7	\$250 fine
30 Sage Kitchen	332 Atwell's Avenue	Hours of Operation/Expansion	3/13/2022	3/15/2022	BV	22-18576	Pre-con 3-17	\$500 fine. 1 day closure held 3/1 thru 9/1/22
31 Mezzo	393 Charles Street	Disturbance	3/11/2022	3/15/2022	BX	22-17957	Now a June 19/22	See 9/18
32 Brass Monkey	800 Allens Avenue	Disturbance (Day Party)	3/17/2022	(Report locked)	BX	22-19796	N/A	No violation
33 Lit Lounge	971 Broad Street	Disturbance (Day Party)	3/20/2022	3/28/2022	BV	22-20813	Pre-con 4-7	combined with 3/25/22
34 Muldowney's Pub	121 Empire Street	Procurement of alcohol to underage	3/24/2022	3/25/2022	BX	22-21974	Pre-con 4-14	1 day closure held (4/1/22-10/1/22)
35 Muldowney's Pub	121 Empire Street	Procurement of alcohol to underage	3/24/2022	3/25/2022	BX	22-21974	Pre-con 4-14	combined with above
36 Muldowney's Pub	121 Empire Street	Procurement of alcohol to underage	3/24/2022	3/25/2022	BX	22-21974	Pre-con 4-14	combined with above
37 Syn Hookah Lounge	114 Spruce Street	Entertainment w/o License, Loud Music	3/31/2022	4/1/2022	BV	22-23889	Pre-con 4-28 N/5	pre-con 6/9, \$1000 fine, 2 day susp(held to 12/31/22)
38 Wonderland	257 Allens Ave	Disturbance (Day Party)	4/1/2022	4/1/2022	BX	22-24235	Emergency Hear	close 72 hours
39 Tatino Restaurant & Lounge	370 Valley Street	Hours of operation	4/2/2022	4/4/2022	BX	22-24259	Pre-con 4-7	\$250 fine
40 Lit Lounge	971 Broad Street	Bottle Service	3/25/2022	3/29/2022	BV	22-22253	Pre-con 4-7	\$2000 fine, combined with 3/20/22
41 Espinal Restaurant	564 Plainfield St	Oper w/o lic, Liquor License Req'd	4/8/2022	4/9/2022	no licences	22-26077	Pre-con 6-9	Closed on 4/8
42 Espinal Restaurant (Antojito)	564 Plainfield St	Violation of board order/no food license	4/13/2022	4/19/2022	no licences	22-27523	Pre-con 6-9	2 day closure, \$250 fine, 6/16, 6/23 close
43 El Caribeno Restaurant	226 Academy Ave	Disturbance	3/30/2022	4/18/2022	BV	22-23593	Pre-con 6-9	\$350 fine
44 McCormack's	312 Veazie Street	Hours of Operation	4/17/2022	4/20/2022	BX	22-28721	Pre-con 6-9	Warning
45 McCormack's	397 Westminster St	Overdose X3	5/7/2022	NA	BX	22-34551	NA	\$250 fine
46 Black Sheep	1206 Broad Street	Missing Juvenile	5/7/2022	NA	BX	22-34600	NA	No violation
47 Venus	727 Cranston St	Firearm Arrest	5/7/2022	NA	BX	22-34553	NA	No violation
48 Flow	393 Charles Street	Firearm Display	5/8/2022	NA	BX	22-35026	NA	No violation
49 Mezzo								

50	La Frontera	5 Pocasset Ave	Scout Assault	5/7/2022	NA	22-34836	22-34836	NA	No violation
51	Silhouettes	245 Allens Ave	Rowdy Rebel/viol of rules and regs	5/15/2022	5/16/2022	W/BX	22-37642	5/18/2022	30 day susp of promoter (s. depina) eff 8/8/22
52	LoVera V/P	1266 Broad Street	Disturbance/Nudity	5/15/2022	5/15/2022	5/18/2022	22-37184	5/18/2022	5500 fine
53	Ibiza	86 Summer Street	Shots fired/Disturbance	5/22/2022	5/22/2022	5/23/2022	22-39352	5/23/2022	No violation
54	Ut Lounge (CC Lounge)	971 Broad Street	Preventing access/Nudity	5/22/2022	5/22/2022	5/25/2022	22-40670	5/25/2022	4 day closure Aug 5,6,12,13
55	Levells Lounge	1137 Broad Street	Hours of Operation	5/30/2022	5/30/2022	5/31/2022	22-42215	5/31/2022	4 day closure: July 29, 30, Aug 12, Aug 26
56	Nara	248 Atwell's Avenue	Disturbance/Phot's fired	6/10/2022	6/10/2022	6/15/2022	22-45852	6/15/2022	Closed 72 hrs eff 6/10/22 no addtl viol
57	Legacy Lounge	307 Manton Avenue	Disturbance	6/10/2022	6/10/2022	6/15/2022	22-46221	6/15/2022	5500 fine
58	Rosendale	55 Union Street	Hours of Operation (PVD FEST)	6/10/2022	6/10/2022	6/15/2022	22-47904	6/15/2022	Warning
59	Brass Monkey	800 Allens Avenue	Hours of Operation (PVD FEST)	6/11/2022	6/11/2022	6/15/2022	22-47912	6/15/2022	Warning
60	Nara	248 Atwell's Avenue	Disturbance (PVD Fest/Assault)	5/29/2022	5/29/2022	6/15/2022	22-46587	6/15/2022	Warning
61	Ally Cat	17 Snow Street	Hours of Operations (PVD FEST)	6/11/2022	6/11/2022	6/21/2022	22-41951	6/21/2022	1 day closure *over 1 day* 12/24/22
62	Dark Lady	306 Charles Street	Hours of Operations (PVD FEST)	6/11/2022	6/11/2022	6/21/2022	22-49969	6/21/2022	Warning
63	Downtown Liquors	312 Vesale Street	Procurement of alcohol to underage	6/16/2022	6/16/2022	6/16/2022	22-48349	6/16/2022	5500 fine
64	McCormack's	558 Admiral Street	Scout Assault (shooting)	6/19/2022	6/19/2022	6/19/2022	22-49158	6/19/2022	Closed 72 hrs. eff 6/29/22, no addtl viol
65	Admiral Liquors	2 Kennedy Plaza	Procurement of alcohol to underage	6/25/2022	6/25/2022	6/25/2022	22-51334	6/25/2022	1 day closure (August 9)
66	Day Trill Event	301 Harris Avenue	Scout Assault	6/25/2022	6/25/2022	N/A	22-51294	6/25/2022	N/A
67	Duck	1266 Broad Street	Entertainment Violation/Loud Music	6/25/2022	6/25/2022	6/26/2022	22-51361	6/26/2022	Warning
68	LoVera V/P	1137 Broad Street	Violation of Board Order/Bottle Service	6/26/2022	6/26/2022	7/5/2022	22-53231	7/5/2022	6 day closure, \$1,000 fine 12/9, 10, 16, 17, 23, 24
69	Levells Lounge	248 Atwell's Avenue	Hours of Operation	6/26/2022	6/26/2022	7/5/2022	22-51492	7/5/2022	6 day closure 9/30, 11/4, 11/25, 12/2, 12/23, 24
70	Nara	559 N. Main Street	Hours of operation	6/26/2022	6/26/2022	7/5/2022	22-51462	7/5/2022	combined with 5/29
71	High Spirits Liquors	1070 North Main St	Procurement of alcohol to underage	7/7/2022	7/7/2022	7/7/2022	22-55366	7/7/2022	Warning
72	Ego	73 Richmond St	Disturbance/Scout Assault	7/9/2022	7/9/2022	7/11/2022	22-53699	7/11/2022	5250 fine
73	Broadway Liquors	361 Broadway	Disturbance	7/9/2022	7/9/2022	7/13/2022	22-55786	7/13/2022	Warning
74	Reyes Liquors	1187 Westminster St	Procurement of alcohol to underage	7/14/2022	7/14/2022	7/14/2022	22-57592	7/14/2022	Warning
75	Mezzo	393 Charles Street	Disturbance in the neighborhood	7/15/2022	7/15/2022	7/15/2022	22-57819	7/15/2022	Warning
76	El Caribeno Restaurant	226 Academy Ave	Scout Assault	7/8/2022	7/8/2022	7/15/2022	22-55406	7/15/2022	See 9/18
77	Terra Luna Café	57 De Pasquale Ave	Entertainment Violation/Loud Music	7/18/2022	7/18/2022	7/18/2022	22-58705	7/18/2022	No violation
78	Terra Luna Café	57 De Pasquale Ave	Entertainment w/o license, Loud Music	7/23/2022	7/23/2022	7/23/2022	22-60171	7/23/2022	warning
79	Swan Liquor	805 Hope Street	Procurement of alcohol to underage	7/27/2022	7/27/2022	7/27/2022	22-61789	7/27/2022	5250 fine
80	Antojitos Restaurant	564 Plainfield St	Oper w/o lic, Liquor License Req'd	7/28/2022	7/28/2022	7/28/2022	22-62103	7/28/2022	warning
81	Area Restaurant Lounge	319 Pocasset Ave	Ent w/o lic, loud music	8/10/2022	8/10/2022	8/10/2022	22-66276	8/10/2022	closed 8/11-8/17, lic revoked 8/18
82	Parview Bakery	1228 Broad Street	Disturbance	8/7/2022	8/7/2022	8/14/2022	22-65216	8/14/2022	5250 fine
83	Mezzo	393 Charles Street	Disturbance	8/12/2022	8/12/2022	8/18/2022	22-49709	8/18/2022	1 day closure 10/28/22
84	Legacy Lounge	307 Manton Avenue	Loud Music	6/19/2022	6/19/2022	8/19/2022	22-68817	8/19/2022	See 9/18
85	Mezzo Lounge	393 Charles Street	Disturbance	August 18th, 2022	August 18th, 2022	8/29/2022	22-71435	8/29/2022	See 9/18
86	Jet Set Lounge	1095 Eddy St	Hours of Operation	8/26/2022	8/26/2022	9/6/2022	22-71021	9/6/2022	See 9/18
87	Fuego	11 West Friendship	Hours of Operation	9/4/2022	9/4/2022	9/6/2022	22-74170	9/6/2022	Loose one weekend 3am closing from Jet Set
88	Mezzo Lounge	393 Charles Street	Procurement of alcohol to underage, Loud M	9/3/2022	9/3/2022	9/6/2022	22-74903	9/6/2022	Loss of remaining 3am's
89	Mi Sueno	1070 Broad Street	Disturbance, Bottle Service	9/1/2022	9/1/2022	9/12/2022	22-73322	9/12/2022	See 9/18
90	Anthony's Authentic Italian	441 Atwell's Ave	Entertainment w/o a license	9/10/2022	9/10/2022	9/12/2022	22-76626	9/12/2022	See 9/18
91	Paris Bistro	375 Smith Street	Disturbance	9/10/2022	9/10/2022	9/12/2022	22-76541	9/12/2022	2 day closure (12/24, 31), 2held 6mts, no car show, lose 4
92	Lit Lounge	971 Broad Street	Disturbance	9/10/2022	9/10/2022	9/12/2022	22-76284	9/12/2022	Warning
93	Mezzo	393 Charles Street	Scout Assault/Disturbance	9/17/2022	9/17/2022	9/21/2022	22-78200	9/21/2022	1 day (Thur) closure, *owe 1 day/mind detail Thur nights
94	Terra Luna Café	57 De Pasquale Ave	Entertainment Violation/Loud Music	9/18/2022	9/18/2022	9/21/2022	22-78539	9/21/2022	\$250 fine
95	Jet Set Lounge	1095 Eddy St	Disturbance/Ent. w/o a license	9/23/2022	9/23/2022	9/24/2022	22-80309	9/24/2022	\$250 fine
96	Mezzo Lounge	393 Charles Street	Hours of Operation	9/26/2022	9/26/2022	9/26/2022	22-80692	9/26/2022	Loss of remaining 3am's
97	Silhouettes	245 Allens Avenue	Loud Music	10/7/2022	10/7/2022	10/8/2022	22-81042	10/8/2022	See 9/18
98	Levells Lounge	1137 Broad Street	Hours of Operation	10/9/2022	10/9/2022	10/11/2022	22-84327	10/11/2022	See 9/18
99	Layali Restaurant Bar	36 Weybosset St	Disturbance	10/9/2022	10/9/2022	10/14/2022	22-85054	10/14/2022	Loss of remaining 3am's
100				10/9/2022	10/9/2022	10/14/2022	22-85070	10/14/2022	Warning
101				10/9/2022	10/9/2022	10/14/2022	22-84701	10/14/2022	
102				10/9/2022	10/9/2022	10/14/2022	22-84701	10/14/2022	

103	Club Ego	73 Richmond Street	Disturbance	10/15/2022	10/18/2022 BX	22-86834	PC 11/3	\$250 Fine
104	La Braza	187 Elmwood Avenue	Sexual Assault/Disturbance	10/15/2022	10/18/2022 BV	22-86822	PC 11/3	Warning
105	Honduras Restaurant	175 Manton Avenue	Disturbance	10/16/2022	10/19/2022 BV	22-87441	PC 11/3	Warning
106	Scarlett's Restaurant	97-99 Academy Ave	Ent. w/o license, billiards, fire alarms covered	10/25/2022	10/26/2022 BV	22-89981	Pre-Con 11/3	Warning, extend probation to 2/28/23
107	Metals Services	198 Branch Ave	Viol. Of city Ord Sec 14-134	9/20/2022	9/20/2022	22-79238	Pre-Con 11/3	Warning
108	Mezzo	393 Charles Street	Entertainment w/o license	10/28/2022	10/28/2022 BX	22-90614	Pre-con 11/17	See 9/18
109	Medusa Hookah	648 Potters Ave	Bottle Service, Ent. w/o Lic, loud music	10/28/2022	10/29/2022 CX	22-90915	Pre-con 11/17	
110	Revel Lounge	162 O'Connell St	Oper w/o lic, Liquor License Reg'd	10/31/2022	11/7/2022 no licenses	22-911767	N/A	Hold pending re apply for liquor license
111	Scarlett's Restaurant	97-99 Academy Ave	Ent. w/o license, Billiards, fire alarms	11/9/2022	11/14/2022 BV	22-94431	Show Cause 11/15	Prob ext to 2/28/23 include 12am closing
112	Cadillac Lounge	391 Charles Street	Robbery Assault/Homicide	11/9/2022	11/19/2022 BX	22-96939	Emer Hear 11/19	close 72 hours
113	La Sonrisa	320 Broad Street	Ent. w/o lic, bottle serv, loud music	11/20/2022	11/20/2022 BX	22-97220	Pre-con 12/15, cont	
114	The George	121 Washington St	Underage drinking	11/18/2022	11/21/2022 BX	22-96915	Pre-con 12/15	Warning
	Colosseum	180 Pine Street	Disturbance (Security)	11/26/2022	N	22-100029	Pre-con 12/15	\$1,000 fine, fire 4 security officers
115	Admiral Discount Liquors	395 Admiral Street	Procurement of Alcohol to Underage	11/29/2022	11/29/2022 A	22-99778	Pre-con 1/5/23	
116	Nocera's Liquors	969 Smith Street	Procurement of Alcohol to Underage	11/29/2022	11/29/2022 A	22-99798	Pre-con 1/5/23	Warning
117	Bukanna's	190 Plainfield Street	Disturbance	12/3/2022	12/5/2022 BV	22-100942	Pre-con 1/5/23	1 day close, \$1000 fine **owe one day 2/3/23
118	City Liquors	1173 North Main St	Procurement of Alcohol to underage	12/5/2022	12/5/2022 A	22-101373	Pre-con 1/19/23	
119	Swan Liquors	808 Hope Street	Procurement of Alcohol to underage	12/5/2022	12/5/2022 A	22-101389	Pre-con 1/19/23	
120	Hartford Liquors	680 Hartford Ave	Procurement of Alcohol to underage	12/6/2022	12/6/2022 A	22-101581	Pre-con 1/19/23	
121	Scarlett's Restaurant	99 Academy Ave	Robbery Assault	12/10/2022	BV	22-102692	Pre-con 1/19/23	no further action taken by BOL
122	Bae Restaurant and Lounge	146 Acorn Street	Loud Music	12/10/2022	12/11/2022 BX	22-102729	Pre-con 1/19/23	
123	Ruby's	286 Academy Ave	Shots fired/Disturbance	12/10/2022	12/10/2022 BV	22-102480	Emer Hear 12/10	Close 72 hrs, 22 days close, 90 susp BX (thru 3/31/23)
124	Sport and Leisure	108 North Main St	Disturbance	12/10/2022	12/13/2022 BX	22-102469	PC 1/19/23	
125	1070 North	1070 North Main St	Disturbance	12/10/2022	12/13/2022 BX	22-102466		
126	Masheratti Lounge	334 Elmwood Avenue	Bottle Service, Ent. w/o Lic, loud music	12/18/2022	12/19/2022 BV	22-104900		
127	Manton Liquors	305 Manton Avenue	Procurement of alcohol to underage	12/19/2022	12/19/2022 A	22-104887		
128								
129								
130								
131								