

**TOWN OF ST. GERMAIN
P. O. BOX 7
ST. GERMAIN, WI 54558**

Minutes, Sexually Oriented Businesses Committee
December 21, 2020

1. **Call to order:** Meeting called to order by Ritter at 6:36pm.
2. **Verify posting of meeting:** Ritter posted the agenda in accordance with town board posting procedures on December 14, 2020
3. **Roll call, establish a quorum:** Members present by virtual attendance – Reese, Reuling, McGill, Hiller, Swenson with Ritter attending virtually from Room 4 of the St. Germain Community Center
4. **Public comments:** There were none.
5. **Approve minutes of October 29, 2020 meeting:** Motion Reuling, second McGill to approve as presented. Motion passed by unanimous roll call vote.
6. **Discuss:**
 - a. **Court cases supporting ordinance authority to regulate sign imagery:** No cases specific to what constitutes First Amendment violations were found. However, Reese found evidence that obscenity is not protected by the First Amendment and a properly defined obscenity restriction should be included in a municipal sign ordinance. To the contrary, McGill learned from an American Bar Association document that the interpretation of what constitutes obscenity is so subjective that establishing a definition of what sign imagery is protected by the First Amendment and what is not is seemingly impossible to achieve.
 - b. **Review of draft St. Germain sign ordinance in light of the Reed vs Gilbert Supreme Court ruling:** There was no discussion of this
 - c. **Other ordinances that may serve as a template for a St. Germain sign ordinance:** Reuling found some interesting provisions in the Town of Manitowish Waters sign ordinance that could perhaps be included in St. Germain's version. Of particular interest was the provision prohibiting signs on parked vehicles for more than six days in any 60 day period.
 - d. **Topics for next meeting:** It was agreed that while our research is interesting, our findings are sometimes inconsistent with other findings which leaves us uncertain of what would be defensible ordinance language. What we are missing are decisions of State or Federal Supreme Courts providing clarity on what constitutes language or imagery that is not protected by the First Amendment. Perhaps we should contact law schools or law students to determine what is being taught regarding this topic.
7. **Next meeting:** 6:30pm, Monday, January 18, 2021
8. **Adjourn:** Meeting adjourned at 7:43pm

Minutes prepared by Ritter, Committee Chairman