



# Board of Health

## Regular Meeting

### Minutes

335 South Broadway  
De Pere, WI 54115  
[www.deperewi.gov](http://www.deperewi.gov)

---

Monday, September 29, 2025

5:15 PM

335 S. Broadway, De Pere, WI 54115

---

Call to Order

1. Roll Call

**Present:** Dennis Hibray, Teresa Gulyas, Pamela Gantz, Devin Perock, Robyn Lauritsen

**Absent:** Cassie Schandel

**Excused:** Other attendees: Chrystal Woller, Sara Lornson, Kelly Burke, Eric Erdman, Andrew Ropson

2. Public comment on matters not on the agenda. Comments made during the public comment period shall pertain only to matters under the jurisdiction of the Board of Health. §6-3(f) DPMC

No Public Comments

3. Hearing on the City of De Pere Determination of Dangerous Animal Order- 312 S. Webster St. issued by De Pere Health Director, Chrystal Woller on 08/11/2025. PLEASE TAKE NOTICE, that pursuant to Wis. Stats. §19.85(1)(a), the Board may convene in closed session for the purpose of deliberating concerning a case which was the subject of any judicial or quasi-judicial trial or hearing before that governmental body. The Board may then reconvene in open session to take action on any matter discussed in closed session or for such other purposes as are allowed by law.

Attorney Eric Erdman explained the criteria met to make the determination of a dangerous dog per the dangerous dog order. He also explained that a variance was granted to allow more than 2 dogs. The Health officer has now issued an order to revoke that variance.

Chrystal Woller explained that on May 29, 2024, MaryPat Barrett and Andrew Ropson's dog, Mac, was involved in an incident at their residence with another one of their dogs, Grizzly. Mac bit Grizzly's ear causing it to dangle. During the attack, Mac also bit their son.

Mr. Ropson explained that their son, Sam, is autistic, and the dogs got into a fight. Mr. Ropson tried to pull the dogs apart and Sam said he got bit but per Mr. Ropson, Sam had no signs of a bite.

Chrystal Woller reported that on April 23rd, 2025, according to the Police report, Mac and Buddy were involved in a bite to an Instacart food delivery driver. Puncture marks were documented in 3 anatomical locations. Medical care was rendered to the driver. In a letter to Mr. Ropson dated April 24, 2025, education was provided with the definition of a dangerous dog and a warning that if there was one more incident involving Mac, a dangerous dog order would be issued in accordance with De Pere ordinance and department policy. It was determined that the dogs were not up to date on their licenses and the variance approval for three dogs had not been filed. After multiple follow-up attempts, the variance request was

received, and the dogs were licensed. A conditional variance was approved indicating it could be revoked if another incident occurred.

On August 9, 2025, per the police report, Mac was involved in a 3rd bite involving another food delivery driver without provocation. Medical care was rendered.

The victim of the bite on April 23rd, 2025, Heidi, gave her account of the event. She was delivering food to the lamppost on the property, per delivery note instructions. The dogs came to her when she was near the lamppost and began jumping and nipping at her. She ended up in the driveway near the garage where she was bitten in multiple body areas by the dogs. She called the police. She did have an open bite wound and received medical care. At a later time, she received the police report which said she provoked the dogs, but that was not the case. Since the incident, she is now hesitant of dogs. Per Heidi, the owners of the dogs did not offer assistance, but asked whom Heidi reported the incident to. Heidi never went past the fence to the property. Heidi was bitten by all 3 dogs. They were jumping on her and biting her. Heidi reported that the physical fence on the property has openings for the dogs to pass through.

Mr. Ropson explained that they have an electric fence and a wrought iron fence. The dogs can only go about 6 feet from the garage door due to the electronic fence. The electronic fence is 6 feet back from the lamp post. Mr. Ropson says he paid for an electronic fence service with an established number of visits to make sure his dogs are not crossing the electronic fence.

Heidi responded that the dogs were vicious on the day she was bitten. She had pulled into the driveway and was walking around the front of her car by the lamp post when the dogs bit her. Mr. Ropson stated the victim was not following instructions, which were to leave the groceries at the lamp post. He addressed the Board of Health pointing out the fencing lines on an online image of the property. The electronic fencing runs under the cement in the driveway, about 6 feet down from the garage. Mr. Ropson stated the family has made some changes since the incidents. They only allow the dogs in the front yard when he or his wife is home. They have contracted with a pet trainer to work with dogs. Per Mr. Ropson, the dogs were raised as emotional support animals. However, they are defensive of the children in the house.

Heidi's stated her insurance did cover the doctor visit, but her pants were also ripped. Pamela Ganz asked if Mr. Ropson reached out to the victim to verify, she was alright. Heidi commented that he would not have been able to reach her once she closed the delivery in the app.

The third victim from August 9, 2025, Chris, gave his account of the bite incident. Chris was driving for Uber Eats. He parked on the road and was walking up the driveway to put the food on the front porch. When he got to the end of the parked cars, the house door opened and two dogs ran out. The first one jumped up on this leg and nipped him above the knee. The girl (resident) grabbed that dog off Chris. Then the second dog came around her and bit the side of Chris's leg. Chris put the food on the hood of the car. The girl asked if he was alright, and he responded that he was bit a couple of times and was going to have it looked at. He drove straight to the Emergency Room. They called the police, whom Chris spoke to.

Teresa Gulyas questioned if he was given any instructions to leave the food in the driveway or not go past a certain point. Chris responded "No." The bite went through his clothes, ripped his shorts and broke the skin. Chris is paying his own medical bills, which will go to

his deductible. Chris suggested modifications to the fence at the corner, so the dogs couldn't get to the driveway. Chris never made it to the porch as the dogs met him at the front of the cars that were parked in the driveway.

Mr. Ropson offered to pay Chris's medical bill. Mr. Ropson stated they put delivery instructions in the apps, but sometimes they don't get to the drivers. Mr. Ropson said his daughter told Chris to stop, but he did not stop. Chris said he did recall the daughter saying to "get back", but by the time it registered to him, he was already in front of the parked cars and the first dog was jumping on him.

Mr. Ropson explained that the iron fence is open by the porch so the dogs can run around the house to the backyard. Pamela Ganz questioned why Mr. Ropson did not take action after the first bite.

Mr. Ropson stated they had learned how to pull the dogs apart after the first incident. From Mr. Ropson's point of view, the second incident was due to not following instructions. The third incident is when he decided they needed to do something. He is looking at increasing the fenced-in area in the backyard and talking to dog trainers.

Pamela Ganz questioned if the same dog was the culprit in all the bites. Mr. Ropson believes it is Mac. They will be training all the dogs and will have training classes available for life. Teresa Gulyas asked if they could post a sign at the end of the driveway. Mr. Ropson responded that they have a sign, but it is not very large.

Questions were asked about age and licensure. Mac is 3 currently years old. After receiving 2 citations for lack of dog licenses, the dogs are now licensed.

Pamela Ganz asked how the autistic son acts around the dogs since one bit him. Mr. Ropson responded that his son's perception is that he was bit, but he may not have been bit. The dogs have not hurt each other outside of the 1st incident.

Chrystal Woller commented that after the second bite, the health department had given guidance stating that if there is a third bite we would need to issue a dangerous dog order. Mr. Ropson stated he couldn't remember if he had read that letter. Chrystal asked Mr. Ropson if he was aware he needed a variance for 3 dogs. Mr. Ropson said he found that out after the incident with Grizzley. Chrystal Woller stated she approved a conditional variance, which stated that if there was one more bite incident, she would need to revoke that variance. Mr. Ropson stated the 3rd bite would not have happened if the driver had obeyed his daughter's instructions. Chrystal explained that a variance is an exception to the ordinance of 2 dogs, so it is not the norm. Chrystal explained that the Health Department follows the ordinance and our health department procedures, so we do the same process every time.

Dennis Hibray asked if there was a reason the dogs are not confined to the back of the house. Mr. Ropson explained that this just gave them more area to run. Mr. Ropson gave a handout to the Board with the documentation from the trainer showing the trainer has been hired at a cost of approximately \$5100. The whole family will be trained with 2 dogs. Chrystal pointed out that the document stated Mr. Ropson acquired a variance when they acquired the 3rd dog, but actually the 3rd dog was purchased prior to moving to De Pere. Chrystal also pointed out that the document stated the family voluntarily complied with the quarantine order, but a quarantine order is state law, which is mandatory. It is not a voluntary process.

Chrystal Woller summarized that the findings meet the criteria of a dangerous dog per city ordinance and are in accordance with our department procedure. Anticipatory guidance was given after the second bite and the conditional variance guidance was provided by the department. It has been documented that the animal owners do not maintain proper control of the animals residing at this property. This pattern of biting or aggressively chasing has a documented history which seems to be happening more frequently. Chrystal stated that Mac poses a significant and ongoing risk to the safety of people and other animals. Due to the multiple biting incidents and increasing frequency, Chrystal concluded the issuance of the dangerous dog order was necessary to safeguard human health and public safety.

Mr. Ropson stated that each of the incidents involved people not understanding or following instructions. Per Mr. Ropson, the police were only involved in the first incident because this son was struggling that day and ran away. Mr. Ropson stated the second incident only happened because someone came onto private property and disobeyed instructions after being told what to do. He stated the third incident was also due to someone disobeying instructions. Mr. Ropson explained that they will be training the dogs. He asked for one more bite opportunity.

A motion was made to go into closed session.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Pamela Gantz
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Teresa Gulyas
<b>AYES:</b>	Dennis Hibray, Teresa Gulyas, Pamela Gantz, Devin Perock, Robyn Lauritsen

Open session resumed.

Dennis Hibray made a motion to deny the dangerous dog order. This motion passed.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>Passed</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Dennis Hibray
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Pamela Ganz
<b>AYES:</b>	Dennis Hibray, Teresa Gulyas, Pamela Gantz, Devin Perock, Robyn Lauritsen
<b>NAYS:</b>	None

- Hearing on the City of De Pere Determination to Revoke Animal Variance- 312 S. Webster St. issued by De Pere Health Director, Chrystal Woller on 08/11/2025. PLEASE TAKE NOTICE, that pursuant to Wis. Stats. §19.85(1)(a), the Board may convene in closed session for the purpose of deliberating concerning a case which was the subject of any judicial or quasi-judicial trial or hearing before that governmental body. The Board may then reconvene in open session to take action on any matter discussed in closed session or for such other purposes as are allowed by law.

This topic was discussed in conjunction with item #3.

A motion was made to sustain the revocation of the Animal Variance and was approved unanimously.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Teresa Gulyas
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Robyn Lauritsen
<b>AYES:</b>	Dennis Hibray, Teresa Gulyas, Pamela Gantz, Devin Perock, Robyn Lauritsen

The Health Department will send Mr. Ropson a letter regarding the timeframe to reduce the number of dogs.

Teresa Gulyas recommended a sign stating to beware of the dogs. Pamela Ganz recommended confining the dogs to the back yard and having a box for drop offs.

5. Adjournment

Motion was made and passed to adjourn the meeting.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Teresa Gulyas
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Pamela Gantz
<b>AYES:</b>	Dennis Hibray, Teresa Gulyas, Pamela Gantz, Devin Perock, Robyn Lauritsen

Respectfully submitted,  
Kelly Burke