

## Craig, Sondra

---

**From:** Ben Iuro <europa.iuro@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 5, 2023 5:17 PM  
**To:** ZZ City Clerk External  
**Subject:** Fwd: Ordinance 23-0673

Some people who received this message don't often get email from europa.iuro@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

**\*\*\* CAUTION:** This email originated from an external sender. **DO NOT** click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. **\*\*\***

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Ben Iuro** <[europa.iuro@gmail.com](mailto:europa.iuro@gmail.com)>  
Date: Wed, Jul 5, 2023 at 5:09 PM  
Subject: Ordinance 23-0673  
To: <[zzcouncilmembers@cityoflacrosse.org](mailto:zzcouncilmembers@cityoflacrosse.org)>

Good evening city councilors,

My name is Benjamin Mitchell and I live in La Crosse's District 10. I am writing on behalf of myself and my partner Katie Furlan. We attended last month's Judiciary & Administration Committee Meeting because of our concern surrounding the proposed amendment to city ordinance 23-0673. Although we came into the meeting with an opinion, we listened intently to both sides of the debate over this agenda item. After that experience, we are still firmly opposed to this amendment.

Much of the discussion around this item gets bogged down in the particulars of what *should* be done about the housing crisis in our area. We don't have a definite answer to that question, and it would be best worked on in collaboration with the organizations that work with our unhoused neighbors, such as Couleecap, on a just and humane solution to housing insecurity in our city. What we do know is that this amendment boils down to giving the city government, and therefore the police, unrestricted power to penalize, fine, and potentially incarcerate people living in public parks.

We spoke to Police Chief Kudron after last month's meeting, and while we appreciate him giving his time to us to explain his and his department's perspective, it became readily apparent that the city has no alternative in place for people that it would evict from our public parks. Again, the discussion of this amendment is not the time to decide what a better solution may be, but the amendment as it stands is plainly an attempt by the city to sweep parks with less accountability. We strongly oppose it, and we know we represent a great deal of the constituency throughout the city.

Thank you,  
Benjamin Mitchell and Kaitlin Furlan