

**VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE  
PLEASANT PRAIRIE VILLAGE BOARD  
PLEASANT PRAIRIE WATER UTILITY  
LAKE MICHIGAN SEWER UTILITY DISTRICT  
SEWER UTILITY DISTRICT "D"  
9915 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Pleasant Prairie, WI  
November 7, 2005  
6:30 p.m.**

A Regular Meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Village Board was held on Monday, November 7, 2005. Meeting called to order at 6:30 p.m. Present were Village Board members John Steinbrink, Alex Tiahnybok, Steve Kumorkiewicz, Jeff Lauer and Mike Serpe. Also present were Mike Pollocoff, Village Administrator; Jean Werbie, Community Development Director; Kathy Goessl, Finance Director/Treasurer and Jane Romanowski, Village Clerk.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- 3. ROLL CALL**
- 4. MINUTES OF MEETINGS – OCTOBER 3, 10 & 17, 2005**

**SERPE MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE BOARD MEETINGS OF OCTOBER 3, 20 & 17, 2005 AS PRESENTED IN THEIR WRITTEN FORM; SECONDED BY TIAHNYBOK; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**5. PUBLIC HEARING**

**A. Petition for Municipal Water on 59<sup>th</sup> Avenue South of 104<sup>th</sup> Street and on 105<sup>th</sup> Avenue West of 59<sup>th</sup> Avenue.**

- 1) Resolution No. 05-62 - Final Resolution Authorizing Construction of Public Improvements and Levying Special Assessments Against Benefited property for the Construction of Municipal Water on 59<sup>th</sup> Avenue South of 104<sup>th</sup> Street and on 105<sup>th</sup> Avenue West of 59<sup>th</sup> Avenue.**

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, the Village received a petition for the extension of municipal water on 59<sup>th</sup> Avenue and on 107<sup>th</sup> Street. We received that petition, I don't have that date here, but the Board adopted a resolution to conduct a hearing. Any time a petition for a municipal improvement is brought before the Board, the Board cannot proceed with the project until under Chapter 66.60 we've gone through and given everybody an opportunity to comment on the proposed project and the schedule of assessments.

There are some projects that the Village utility undertakes as part of system growth or development that are integral to the development of the water utility, and 104<sup>th</sup> Street would be a primary example of that. In the subdivisions along the way, the policy of the Board has been petitioned for water is extended only by petition by the residents, the affected residents. It would be something they would generate. We have had a previous petition for water in this area that was declined.

We've also subsequently received a petition opposed to the extension of municipal water with reasons contrary to the petition before. The statutes don't provide--once the Board starts to process and conduct a public hearing and give everybody notice, the Board can't stop the process and say we're not going to have a hearing. We have to continue the process and have the hearing. The important thing for the Board in order to make a decision on the project and to get everybody's comment on record is to conduct a public hearing. Tonight's agenda, in fact, does that. It presents a petition and a resolution that if the Board decided after hearing all the comments that they wanted to proceed with the water it would adopt the resolution. If you decide you don't want to proceed with the water, you deny that resolution.

This is an area where municipal sanitary sewer was extended might be ten years ago. Rural profile roads, and the project as it's proposed would involve 59<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 105<sup>th</sup>. There's one home that did petition on 107<sup>th</sup>, and given the level of improvements on 107<sup>th</sup> and the fact that there isn't a right of way that we could run a water main down to service the houses on the petition, I recommended that that be deleted from the project.

There is no specific number of people that are required to activate a petition or to start the process. According to the Public Service Commission, the Village has a statutory obligation and responsibility to be able to provide municipal water to anybody who is either suffering from a public health problem, if a documented public health problem exists, or somebody cannot get water. We've had a few cases of both in prior history in the Village where somebody has drilled one well, two wells, three wells and they can't get water and the Village was required to bring the water in. But from my recommendation or my standpoint on this, this is solely a process driven by whatever the desires of the residents are. The water utility really doesn't stand to gain or lose anything by the construction of this project if it does proceed.

I'll have Bob describe the particulars of the project. And also, Bob, if you could just as a point of information describe what peculiar things have been happening in the construction trade that makes the price on this higher than we've probably seen in previous hearing.

Bob Martin:

Mr. President and Board members, Mike just described where the water main was and I won't go into that in any more detail. The estimated cost is \$184,429 and some change, and that includes a 15 percent contingency. That's added to the estimated construction cost, and there's 15 percent of engineering and admin added to that. So the contingency is just under \$21,000, and the 15 percent additional engineering and administration is \$24,000. However, the actual cost of whatever gets assessed will be the actual cost of the construction which includes the engineer's cost. And if there's no contingency used, for example, that would drop that price significantly.

So we try to make the estimate on the heavy side so we don't want any surprised at the end. In this particular case it's a little bit more than typical because the sanitary sewer is on the east side of the road, so the water main either has to go down the road or on the other side, and there's a gas main on that side. So that makes the project a little bit higher, and it has to have a granular back filler. That was taken into account.

So the estimated price on the cost per foot is \$62.20. That's what that cost is. Again, if the contingency was not used, that would bring it down to \$55.14, so that kind of just shows what the flexibility of that is. As Mike alluded to the cost of material has gone up significantly, and it went up within a day of the hurricane in New Orleans. We had PVC pipe that not quite doubled, but it got into that upper range. It went from \$12 to \$19. So that's just for the materials, and it affects these kinds of smaller projects obviously.

There are 25 parcels that would be affected by the assessment if the project was to proceed, and that's on the water main. And the services would be extended from the water main to the right of way line to the property line that's estimated at \$1,500 per service, and that's per parcel that would be adding that service. Each property owner has a year from the completion of the project to connect to the water main. That's important here because it's not optional by the assessed project. The water service from the property line to the house to the residents and inside would also have to be paid for by the resident, so that's another added cost. But that's just a part of what would have to be undertaken by the residents in this particular case.

Typically a project if it's completed in or by September of any given year the cost would be certified and levied against the property, and a property owner may pay off the full assessment by November 1<sup>st</sup> to avoid any incurred interest costs, and that's typically what the Village does is charge 9 percent on the unpaid balance over a ten year period. So if people select that option they have that. The Village really doesn't encourage homeowners to do this, since there are less costly options and that is home equity loans if they're available. Those are lower percentage rates and they can be deducted from taxes, for example, so those are some of the options that people have.

I personally received two phone calls from residents that objected to the project and had some lengthy conversations with one party. With that, if there's any questions for me?

Mike Pollocoff:

Just what Bob indicated as far as the price of materials being doubled, there's going to be an item later on the agenda tonight where I'm recommending that some bid prices on pipe that we're bidding for other utility work be rejected because the prices are out of line. This market is not a good time to be buying pipe, and I don't know when it's going to get better. But everything leads me to believe that at some point this is going to settle down and the markup can't be as high as it is. So that coupled with some of the fuel increases on trucking for stone and trucking for waste materials are also significantly high. With that, Mr. President, if you'd like to open up the hearing.

John Steinbrink:

Questions for Bob first or after the hearing?

Village Board Meeting  
November 7, 2005

Mike Pollocoff:

Anybody have a question for Bob?

Jeff Lauer:

Bob, I didn't get the total cost. What was the total cost with the contingency?

Bob Martin:

The estimated cost is \$184,429.24.

Jeff Lauer:

Okay, thanks.

John Steinbrink:

With that I'll open the public hearing. We ask that you give us your name and address for the record. I do believe we had a sign up sheet this evening.

Jane Romanowski:

Yes, we do, and because of the number of sign ups there will be a three minute time limit, and the first speaker is Ken Cronic.

Ken Cronic:

Hello, I'm Ken Cronic. My address is 10605 49<sup>th</sup> Avenue. I oppose the water coming through down 59<sup>th</sup> Avenue. I was also co-author of the second petition with my neighbor, Ben Ramos, basically because of cost. Reasons being number one I am a skilled tradesman, and over the course of the last two or three years I've had a lot of time off. I've been laid off quite a bit especially during the winter months. My budget is very tight, and it would not be wise of me to go ahead with a project of this nature. I just can't afford it. I moved out to the Village three years ago, and it just doesn't work out very well with my finances to go through with this project.

In fact, Item number 3 on the second petition, I'm on a shared well. I share it with four other families. We do have a little bit of a sulphur smell. I had recently installed a new filter system. The cost of this was just under \$1,500. It was installed this last February. With this new system I have no sulphur smell, no taste, and I drink the water straight from the tap. I have no problems with it. I have lived in the City of Kenosha all my life. Come spring, summer and early fall months with the amount of chlorine that they add to the water quite often it smells like a swimming pool coming through the water through the faucet. That's just something I prefer not to work with. Living out here I have a well and there is nothing wrong with it. The water is not contaminated. With the filter system my water is perfectly clean. I've got good water pressure, and it's just not financially feasible for me and my family to go through this at this time. Thank

Village Board Meeting  
November 7, 2005

you.

Michael Caputo:

Hello. My name is Michael Caputo, 10636 59<sup>th</sup> Avenue. It happens to be on the corner of 59<sup>th</sup> and 107<sup>th</sup>. If you run the water down 59<sup>th</sup> Avenue and stop, my sewer lateral comes in off of 107<sup>th</sup>, and at that time I put a water line in with my sewer lateral, so you're telling me I'm going to have to dig another line and pay for the same thing twice, plus I have to hook up within a year. Am I going to get charged for that other half when they do decide to run it down 107<sup>th</sup>? So at this time I do not want the water.

Ben Ramos:

Thank you. My name is Ben Ramos. I live at 10520 59<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and I want to express my feelings of not wanting the water at this particular time because it's not a danger for our community. We've lived there for 25 years, and we have had other times where we have had some contamination and we chlorinated the water and it turned out fine. The cost is about \$62.20 which is quite substantial for the neighbors, almost \$184,500 and that's a lot of money. Plus the gentleman here, Mr. Pollocoff, referred to the tubing and the pipes being very expensive material, being very expensive. We could start at one price and then end up in another which would end up much more costly.

I did take a petition against bringing the water in. We have about 14 or 15 signatures. I believe my neighbor Gary at the end he has three lots which is 300 feet of frontage for his home, and they can speak here. There are about maybe 17 people that oppose it. Some recanted from their petition, about six of them. So I ask that you not bring the water. Thank you.

Larry Nelson:

Larry Nelson, 10616 59<sup>th</sup> Avenue. I kind of weighed the pros and the cons of this whole thing, if fuel prices do go up, but they are at an all time high right now. It's not a good time. I agree with Mike that it's not a good time to really buy. However, in the future, of course, there's no guarantees it's going to come down. But the bottom line for me is we have a well, we share it with six people, we all get along fine, and if we had to put a brand new well in for some reason at \$40 a foot which is about what it costs plus or minus, 250 feet I think is where we are now, that's less than \$1,600 apiece, \$1,700 apiece that we would have to kick in for a brand new well. And there's nothing wrong with our well at this time, so I can't see spending money on something that I really don't need at this time. Thank you.

Village Board Meeting  
November 7, 2005

Vince Seliga:

Vince Seliga, 5930 105<sup>th</sup> Street. I feel the same as quite a few of the other people. We don't need water at this time. We have wells that are working fine. And I think there might be some other solutions for people that have problems maybe as far as filtration goes. Thank you.

Maureen Meyer:

Maureen Meyer, 6025 105<sup>th</sup> Street. If you look on both of your petitions the first petition I said I'm interested in only hearing what you said, have this meeting, because the lady is entitled to her meeting, and I think that's only reasonable. But I look at the cost and look at my neighbors and I'm not interested in building a new lateral or any of those things. I would vote against it. I only wanted the lady to have her change for her hearing. Thank you. I vote note.

Jane Romanowski:

That's all the sign ups I have, Mr. President.

John Steinbrink:

Anyone else wishing to speak on this item? Yes, sir?

Fred Parker:

My name is Fred Parker. I'm at 5911 106<sup>th</sup> Street. Looking at the cost at this time and looking at the water that I have from my well right now which is completely satisfactory, and what it costs me financially I can't see this as a benefit so I'd have to vote no.

John Gamberini:

My name is John Gamberini, 10635 59<sup>th</sup> Avenue. I had my name on a petition and I'd like to take it off and not go with the water at all.

Steve Rosenburg:

My name is Steve Rosenburg, 10571 59<sup>th</sup> Avenue. We have the newest house on the street. We put in a well about two or two and a half years ago. Very clean water. We've actually bypassed our water softener. The water is so good and we have no problems whatsoever. We could put in three more wells for the price it would cost us to put in a water line at our house so I vote no on the water line right now. Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Anyone else wishing to speak on this item?

Gary Dieter:

Village Board Meeting  
November 7, 2005

My name is Gary Dieter. I live at 10507 59<sup>th</sup> Avenue. I'm the gentleman with the three lots. Two of them are unbuildable. I don't feel I should have to pay for something I can't build a house on. When the sewer came through I had to pay for it. It was over \$15,000. I had to put a lateral in for a lot that cannot be built because of the power line right of way, and I am just against water.

Frank Cebolski:

My name is Frank Cebolski, 5919 105<sup>th</sup> Street. My well is only ten years old, works great, I don't want the water either.

Roger Erdahl:

My name is Roger Erdahl, 10432 59<sup>th</sup> Avenue. I've had my well in for years. It's been working fine, and we had to put in the sewer line already and we don't want any water coming in now. Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Anyone else wishing to speak? Anyone else wishing to speak? If not I'll close the public hearing and open it up to Board comment or question.

Mike Serpe:

Mr. Chairman, this is really a tough decision but I'd move to deny the petition.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I second that.

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion and a second on this item. Is there any further discussion?

Mike Pollocoff:

We did have correspondence from Mr. Clark and he wanted it read into the record.

Mike Serpe:

He was opposed to it. If you want to read it in okay, but I think we're granting his wishes.

Mike Pollocoff:

Village Board Meeting  
November 7, 2005

Yes, he was against it.

John Steinbrink:

We also had another letter also, correct, with Mr. Clark's?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes.

John Steinbrink:

Both those letters will be entered into the record. Any other comments or questions? We have a motion and second on the floor.

**SERPE MOVED TO DENY THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION NO. 05-62 - FINAL RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS AND LEVYING SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS AGAINST BENEFITED PROPERTY FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MUNICIPAL WATER ON 59<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE SOUTH OF 104<sup>TH</sup> STREET AND ON 105<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE WEST OF 59<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

## **6. CITIZEN COMMENTS**

Jane Romanowski:

One person signed up, Sylvia Hinz.

Sylvia Hinz:

Sylvia Hinz, 4819 104<sup>th</sup> Street. I just wanted to hear the Board's comments on the proposed expansion of Highway 165 and if the Village has responded to the DOT in any way. Thank you.

Gina Tiahnybok:

Good evening, gentlemen, and members of the Village. In response to today's article that was in the *Kenosha News*—

Jane Romanowski:

Could we have your name and address for the record please.

Gina Tiahnybok:

I'm sorry. 8757 Lakeshore Drive. My name is Gina Tiahnybok. I happened to get an e-mail today with the information from the *Kenosha News* documenting the two additional Board members that were added on as of April '05. And I was a little surprised with the feedback that was shared by some of the Village Board members who've been around for a while, including Mr. Pollocoff.

Let me go ahead and let you guys know that in order for someone to get up and stand up and talk to the Village Board, let alone run for elected office representing people from your community, it takes a certain kind of person. I happen to know that Alex Tiahnybok is that kind of person. He doesn't sit back and watch things. He goes ahead and takes action. The comments about him not trying to get down to work I think is completely false. I don't know if you guys know but he works full time. He has a family. He has other Board-related commitments, other civic involvements. He corresponds very well with the members of the community, and perhaps he is not clutching coffee or hanging out in the Village Board office, but as being a spouse of someone who is a Village Trustee to a new elected office who is not one of the former original standard Board members, I happen to know that there's quite a bit of effort in trying to work into becoming knowledgeable in the way the Village works.

I know that any reporter can take any information and share it any way they like, but I thought it would be important for me to share with you this evening in this forum that the information in that particular article representing Trustee Number 1 is extremely false. I guess maybe just because Jeff was elected the same time I can simply say that I think he's done whatever he can go ahead and do to represent his constituents as well. I know that Trustee Number 1 has and he is going to work, and it may require somebody to go ahead and critique some of the standards, and the reason for that is because he's an analytical thinker. He doesn't take things for face worth. He goes ahead and investigates, and he may not be hanging out in the Village office, but he's corresponding to his constituents, he's taking the time to find out about this stuff and research. And, yes, he is a quick learner. That's all I have to say.

John Steinbrink:

Anyone else wishing to speak under citizens' comments? Hearing none I'll close citizen comments.

## **7. VILLAGE BOARD COMMENTS**

Mike Serpe:

Sylvia, in answer to your concern, Highway 165, the way it's proposed at the 150 or 160 foot right of way is totally unacceptable as far as I'm concerned. I don't see that highway as busy as Sheridan Road. I see it about as busy as 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue, therefore does it need that type of profile? I don't think so. Would I be in favor of the curb and gutter storm sewer 85<sup>th</sup> Street profile, four lanes that could be utilized when necessary? Absolutely. I think that would be a safer way to go, a more reasonable way to go. There's no major commercial developments going up on 165 other

Village Board Meeting  
November 7, 2005

than the Village Green and that's not going to be anything like Southport Plaza, so the necessity to have that type of right of way is really overkill as far as I'm concerned. So I wouldn't support that, but I would support a reconstruction of 165 to a safer profile, but not 150 foot right of way.

John Steinbrink:

Other Board comments or questions?

Alex Tiahnybok:

To follow up Mike again, I don't have the data with me, but the DOT presented traffic flow predictions on the various stretches of 165, and certainly between where the real improved part and 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue area I think the traffic flows justify significant improvements. But east of 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue even the long-term projections don't support a four lane divided highway with those kind of right of ways. So when I have an opportunity to chime in on this to the State I'll be recommending something of a tuned down version also.

Mike Pollocoff:

I might indicate that the process is the staff will be making a recommendation to the Board, and that recommendation is going to be based on two major things. One is the Village's land use plan, and that's the plan that's been adopted by the Plan Commission and the Board as to how the Village is going to grow and develop. That in turn was the basis for the traffic transportation plan that the Village has undertaken, and I think that's really the numbers to me that can be substantiated and justified. Those numbers are far less than a divided highway that was shown.

Now, if the State wants to use this road for other purposes other than going through the Village they'll need to tell us that. But I think at the end of the day the Village is going to be the one that has to pay for 25 percent of that road, whatever that road ends up looking like. And my recommendation is we do a thorough and a well engineered analysis of what we think is required and review that in the community and then send that back as our recommendation. To pay for anything else I think we'd be paying for way more than what's required by our own plan and standards. We'll have that prepared before the phase two meeting comes up which is in February.

Jean Werbie:

February or March.

John Steinbrink:

Maybe you could just go through the whole process, Mike. A lot of people were confused by this. There was a pre-hearing before the hearing and the State had made some comments on time tables and the process that it follows where the State has their presentation, we have comments, and the Village then makes its presentation.

Mike Pollocoff:

Right. The State did the public information meeting that was held here, and then Pastor Hackbarth had an additional meeting before that. The purpose for the public information meeting is to put the concept out based on what the State's design criteria is, what they are proposing to put out there. And in a way that's important, because if the Village wasn't to respond or to contest it, there's some significant impact on property owners along the way, and they deserve to have as much advanced notice as to what the State's proposing.

And in that process they give everyone an opportunity to, one, come into the meeting and also to submit written comments that they'll incorporate in any revisions they make. The Village will, in turn, be making a representation as to what the community wants after that proposal based on our engineering and design has gone to the Plan Commission and to the Village Board to make that as a resolution to the State as to what we're looking for. We'll send it off to the State and they'll make some modifications to the plan, and what they'll come back with is, hopefully with everything being equal, they would come back with what we want. If they don't we're going to have to go another step and keep working towards that.

At some point the conflict gets a little more intense when the State wants to proceed with the project and they'll be looking for a commitment for the Village to pay the 25 percent for the project to commence, and at that point that's when the Village, if they're not in support of the project, would not enter into that agreement. So at that point the project would tend to stall. At some point that starts affecting abutting property owners when they want to get things like access permits because the State will withhold those as that goes along.

But as a community we worked through the Highway 31 process where that project was done. We worked through the Highway 50 project back in the early to mid '80s and we got that worked out. To me I think we should be heading in a positive way where we're going to have the Village's recommendations based on some sound engineering and planning principles. It's going to be less expensive for the State and less expensive for the Village. Our plan in this all along is we need to know what that profile is going to look like, because as development occurs along 165, along the project area, we're going to want the developers and subsequently the people who are buying homes or businesses or whatever to make their contribution for the oversizing for the enlargement of that road.

If there was never going to be any more development in the community than what we have today, we could probably get by with what we have. But if it's going to need to get bigger, that's going to be because of growth in the Village. Without really knowing what that number is, and that number is really dictated on what the profile looks like. That's hard to do. We've got some estimates that we've worked with for Village Green Heights, but at some point we need to know what the number is. The people that live along that road need to know what the profile is, and there still may be some people under that smaller profile that the State may want to look to relocated. Even with a smaller road they're still going to be considerably--they may be so close to the road that they might need to do the acquisition anyway. Until that new alignment is determined I don't know what that is.

The process is a long process and there are three separate places for public input as well as direct input from the Village. Trustees can comment at the public information meetings. Typically, though, I think that the Department of Transportation is going to pay closer attention to an

adopted resolution by the governing body of the Board as to what the interest and needs of the community is.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you, Mike. There was confusion out there. After the hearing some people had the belief that in two years their property would be gone. That time table is much farther out and there are many, many more hearings and a lot more input to be had on a project like this. As you said, it comes down to the financing, and the State has many, many projects on their burners and where they're going to get the dollars for 165 I don't know.

Mike Serpe:

On another matter, John, today's article in the *Kenosha News* was interesting. I do believe that things like that do none of us on this Board any good, not one bit. I think it's time that we conduct Board business at Board meetings. We can disagree, we can argue, we can fight, but I think it's time we move forward and let's quit looking for some notoriety or whatever we're doing here that's causing all this dissension and contentious Board meetings that are going on. It's doing nobody any good. Like Mrs. Tiahnybok said, we're here to serve the people and I think that's what we have to do.

I think we have to concentrate on keeping our Board business at a Board meeting. If we're not happy with what was decided upon, I don't think it's a good idea to make phone calls the next day to some media and express your displeasure. That's just not going to do us any good. One thing the people don't like whether you're right or wrong in your feelings, people are going to see this as problems up there and everybody goes and you're going to serve nobody and that makes no sense. There's enough intelligence on this Board that we can discuss matters in an intelligent manner as gentlemen and move this Village forward as it's been doing for the last 20 years.

Jeff Lauer:

I second that motion, Mike, every word you said. The only correction here and John is sitting in the back, John called me as well as other Trustees. But I agree with that wholeheartedly.

Alex Tiahnybok:

As usual a follow up to Mike's comments. I agree, Mike, it's been seven months now since Election Day, and it's been a very trying seven months. We had some serious issues to deal with. I think everyone got off on the wrong foot with Mike Pollocoff's contract, and we dealt with the public safety issue and more recently some budget matter issues. It's been seven months and it's the worse part-time job in terms of dollars per hour I've ever had. You brought up the *Kenosha News* article today, and the *Pleasant Prairie Sun* has addressed some of the issues with the Board recently, too. Just as recently as two weeks ago after a couple of contentious meetings to his credit Steve Kumorkiewicz apologized for some maybe overly aggressive behavior. I'm glad that you recognize that.

Pleasant Prairie certainly is a model in terms of Village government, and it shows that it can be

Village Board Meeting  
November 7, 2005

effective, but effective doesn't necessarily mean monolithic either. I think there's a lot of room for differing opinions, and I think most people agree that alloys are combinations of different kinds of metals to make the best looking finished product. The Village of Pleasant Prairie waxed our floors this weekend, so I'd like to suggest that we add some polish to our Board meetings also.

In my academic endeavors I earned an MBA, and some of the best classes I took were in negotiation skills and conflict resolution. If the Board will indulge me I put together a little PowerPoint presentation discussing conflict resolution. It would be easy to take pieces out of that and point fingers and say this is what you did wrong and this is what you did wrong, etc., etc., and I guarantee you I'm not going to do that. If you gentlemen will agree, I left a CD on the desk and I'd like to take five minutes and explain the various aspects of conflict resolution.

John Steinbrink:

It's not an item on the agenda this evening.

Mike Pollocoff:

It is Board comments, though.

John Steinbrink:

So we can carry it under there no problem?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes.

Alex Tiahnybok:

On October 9<sup>th</sup>, while we were in the midst of some of our more interesting conversations, the *Kenosha News* published an article called Handling a Conflict Reflects How You Are As a Person. I did print out a copy of each of these things for the Board. It goes through a little bit of describing what conflict looks like. It's hard to read, of course, but some of the steps in regarding handling conflict are accepting responsibility, setting the stage for dealing with the conflict, clarifying the problem, searching for common goals, collaborate in problem solving, agree on a plan of action and schedule follow up meetings to continue discussions and evaluate progress.

Conflict is a situation where your concern or desire is different from another person's. It's pretty obvious but that's the bottom line. That's what conflict is. Again, this is from school, but there are basically two aspects to conflict and how you handle it. One is cooperativeness, and that's the horizontal axis and assertiveness is the vertical axis. And depending on the situation and skills of the situation you actually can determine which conflict resolution mode is the best one to go with.

There's five. The first one is just called competing. We've seen a lot of that up here recently. Basically in a nutshell it's my way or the highway. That's the easiest description for what

competing is. It's where quick decisions, unpopular decisions, vital issues, protection, public safety, military command, those are all situations where there's little room for cooperation but a lot of need for assertiveness. Some of the skills, and I'm not going to go through all the detail on these, but the skills required to compete are the ability to argue and debate, the ability to use rank or influence, asserting your opinions, standing your ground and stating your positions clearly.

If you overuse competing what you wind up with is a lack of feedback, there's actually reduced learning, low empowerment of the people that are involved, and ultimately surrounded by yes men. If competing is underused, meaning that there's a lot of accommodating going on, then people actually wind up with restricted influence, the organization winds up indecisive, it slows down the process, and people get dismayed and actually withhold contributions.

The total opposite extreme which is really heavy on cooperation and low in assertion is called accommodating. A sentence to describe it, it would be my pleasure. It's a situation where you can show reasonableness. You can develop performance from people involved. You can create good will of the participants as a way to keep the peace. And typically it's issues of low importance. Skills required are the ability to forego your desires, to be selfless, to obey orders, the military example again being on the receiving end of the orders, and the ability to yield.

Overusing accommodating means that your ideas ultimately get little attention, again the opposite restricted influence, loss of contribution and too much accommodating leads to anarchy. Underuse of accommodating creates a lack of rapport because, again, it's heavy handed, it creates low morale, exceptions are not recognized, and the organization tends to be unable to yield.

The conflict resolution mode that's low in both of these characteristics, the characteristics assertiveness and cooperativeness is called avoiding, and that's basically putting things off. That's a way to handle things of low importance, to reduce tensions, to buy time if necessary. If the participants have low power it's a way to get things done, and it's also a way of allowing others to lead.

Skills involved in avoiding are knowing when to be able to withdraw, to sidestep an issue, a sense of timing, and also sometimes just the ability to leave things unresolved. Overuse of avoiding results in a lack of input from the person involved. Decisions get made by default. Issues fester because they're not handled, and you wind up with a cautious climate because nobody is taking changes. Underuse of avoiding is where, again, heavy handed, hostility and hurt feelings, people tend to take on too many causes, and there's a lack of prioritization.

The middle ground which people think is always the best is compromising. It's kind of middle on both of the characteristics. That's on issues of moderate importance where there's an equal power structure, issues where temporary solutions are required, time constraints and it can be served as a backup plan. Skills required are negotiating, being able to find a middle ground, making concessions and assessing the value of the situation.

Overusing means sometimes the big picture is lost because you're always looking for the middle ground. There's a lack of values and trust because nobody really knows what's important, and does it create a cynical environment. Underuse is, again, creates unnecessary confrontations, there are frequent power struggles and the inability to negotiate effectively.

The ultimate, though, is collaboration where two heads are better than one. It's also called integrative bargaining. It's where you integrate solutions, it's an opportunity to learn, a chance where perspectives get to be merged. People from both sides of the argument tend to gain commitment, and it is a way to improve relationships. Skills are the ability to learn creating a nonthreatening environment, the ability to analyze input and to clearly identify concerns. Overuse if it's not an important matter you can spend a lot of time doing this. Responsibility tends to get shared. Others can take advantage if one party is dedicated to collaboration and the other isn't, and it is a laborious process. Underuse is, again, the opposite. People get deprived of mutual gains. There's a lack of commitment, low empowerment and loss of innovation.

Some of the elements of collaboration are looking at needs and interests and we've talked about that. A real classic example is called the orange story. Basically two chefs are in a kitchen and they both need an orange and they start fighting about the orange. Initially there's no way they think they're going to come to a conclusion because they both want the orange. But then they sit down and talk about it and one guy says that he needs the juice from the orange because he needs to make a sauce. And the other chef says he needs the rind of the orange because he needs to put it into some kind of favor mixture. So, in effect, they both thought they had a conflict, but when they sat down and talked about it they realize that there was a solution that all they had to do was look into and figure out what each party needed.

Mick Jagger, I don't use him as a reference too often, but he had something to say once, too. He said you can't always get what you want. I'll let you read the rest of it, but you know the rest of the story, but if you try real hard sometimes you find out you get what you need.

Some of the elements in collaboration are brainstorming, where a group gets together and actually throws out ideas without evaluation immediately. This way you maximize the number of options and you can build on the options that have already been identified. After you're done with that, the next step is measuring the options where after you determine what the interests are you can see how well the options match up against the interests, and you can use that mutually to have a positive environment and that does lead to improved relationships. That's all.

Mike Pollocoff:

If there are no more Board member comments, I just wanted to bring to the Board something we received last week in Madison and it's the Wisconsin Award for Municipal Excellence. You can pass it around and leave it up here for people to take a look at. They presented it to John Steinbrink last Wednesday in Green Bay. So for any difficulties we have someone thinks we're worthwhile.

John Steinbrink:

The Board has always acted upon issues in a prompt manner and I think that's our obligation and our job. It's up to Board members to do their homework, be prepared, and to offer input at the meetings. I've been doing this for many years with Mr. Pollocoff and Mr. Terwall and Mr. Serpe and many other Board members, and never did we ever have any problems. There were always disagreements. It's my belief here that we've had disagreements but really no problems. I wouldn't call it contentious at Board meetings. I think everybody acts in a civilized manner. Everybody is recognized. Everybody has input. They may disagree with the final outcome, but the direction the Village has gone and the direction the Village is heading and where we've been is proof of what we've done in the past. What we do in the future is up to this Board and how we conduct the business is up to this Board and up to its members.

As my part I will recognize every member, give them every opportunity to talk which I always have, and I guess I would appreciate your input at the meetings. If you're not satisfied with the meetings and you require to go to the news with it or feel you need to air your grievance in the press that's your right. You can do it in the form of a letter or you can do it any way you wish, but it doesn't serve this Board or this community by conducting matters or affairs in that manner. I think everybody on this Board has always been straightforward with each other. We've always disagreed on different issues, some more passionate than others. So I guess it's up to the Board members how they want to conduct their business or how they want to conduct the Village's business. But we have the opportunity to do it here, and I would appreciate it being done here. If you have a problem, express it here. Otherwise we'll go through the same ritual over and over and over. I appreciate the presentation by Mr. Tiahnybok. Knowledge is always good.

He made reference to Mr. Pollocoff's contract and the problem they had with that and the different Board members had with it, the new Board members. That was a timely issue. It had to be acted upon and it had to be done. That issue was delayed to allow your input and Mr. Lauer's input as we did. And that we were fair on, but it was not an issue that could be delayed as the issue of the Sheriff or anything else where you draw these issues out for months and months and months because that's not the way you do business. People elected us to make decisions, we made the decisions. We act in what we consider our best interests for the community.

Whether you disagree or agree everybody gets input, and at the end of the day the majority rules. There's been a lot of talk about what's a majority and who should be in the majority, but right now the majority is the Board members that are here and vote in the majority. Sometimes you're in the majority with us and sometimes you're not. That's no different than any other community, whether it's the City Council, County Board, Salem, Bristol, not everybody agrees all the time.

Oftentimes there's disagreement. But the Village has a lot of potential. We have a lot of issues to handle, and I hope we can continue to handle them in a disciplined manner. To call the Board meetings contentious I don't think I'd call them contentious. I don't think there was screaming, yelling, shouting, people being ignored, anything like that. But if you're not happy with the outcome, have more input at the meeting. Let your feelings be known and we'll try and work on that. And if you feel there's more input that's needed we'll address that issue also. If not, I will close Board comment.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I'd like to make a comment. I don't mean to be personal, but to me when the election ends everybody has to work together. To go back here and say we want . . . has to stop. My door is a . . . open always to any member of the Board. Jeff, you know that. How many times have . . . We shared a room for six days, and I was hoping that we could work together and that was my intention from day one. I'd like to work together. We have to put the election behind us. We're one body here. Even the newspapers say that. I have more white hair in the last several months than I had in the last 69 years. We've got to work together. We have to forget who won or lost or whatever. We don't always agree but we can disagree as a gentleman, no arguing, nothing like that. As you said in the beginning it's a learning curve. I remember when I came here to this Board I was sitting here a long time listening what's going on before I gave my opinion because I wanted to make sure I was talking about. And sometimes I know it's rough when you don't know the issues. If you don't know the issues I'd be glad to answer any telephone call. That's all I have to say. I don't mean to be personal with anybody . . . .

## **8. NEW BUSINESS**

### **A. Discussion of the Proposed FY 2006 General Fund Budget.**

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, we finished our budget deliberations last week to the extent that we could publish a notice with a proposed budget to be adopted that we're going to hold our hearing on November 21<sup>st</sup>. And at that time we indicated that there were still some loose ends that needed to be completed. One of the large ones was the insertion of manufacturing revenue from the State. The State does the manufacturing assessments for everybody and we hadn't received that as of that time.

I also went through some more evaluation of some of the proposed program and cuts. One program that wasn't submitted initially, but one of the things I think we need to think about as we move forward in this year's budget of the freeze is that we're in essence in dealing with numbers around \$300,000 to \$350,000, and we have very little capital funds to use. Next year that number is probably going to be tighter if only because we've got some surpluses that we're able to tap into this year that we won't have next year. And a lot of that is contingent on whether or not the Board decides to establish the storm water utility. That's another thing that can wind this thing and cut it back. That's really one of the reasons I took an additional look at this. These are some additional recommendations that I have for tonight. I'd like to discuss those and go through them with you and answer any questions or I guess strategize about how you want to get the Village

positioned for this budget year as well as for the coming budget year.

Changes that have occurred at our last meeting is we recognized the savings of \$117,000 in modifying our health insurance plan by increasing the deductible, increasing the co-pay, the pharmaceutical component of it, and we also moved one full-time fire medic from the non-recommended list to the new program list.

Changes that I'm looking at now from our police contract negotiations that was adopted by the Board at the last meeting that was a savings of \$10,330. I've completed my negotiations with the Fire Department on their contract. They're going to be in the process of ratifying that contract, so based on our ending negotiations there's a savings of \$7,238.

Another program reduction that I'm recommending we adopt would be to eliminate exempt fire and rescue fees. Those are primarily rescue fees that we haven't charged before such as going to a Village program, softball or football or whatever, going to the schools, going to RecPlex. That would bring about additional revenue based on our experience of \$26,900.

An additional change that I'm looking at doing is adding in one police officer. This is one that we didn't add, and to be honest with you part of it was in light of taking a look at the Sheriff Department's proposal and looking at our expenses. Would this have changed the numbers that were presented by the Sheriff or our proposal? It wouldn't have, but I think given the fact that we're going to be in a position this year to have that be added onto the levy, I think right now we're at 1.45 officers per thousand, and we're under the average, I believe this is a position that we can use now and I know we're definitely going to need last year.

The other item after some second thoughts that I'm thinking about removing as a program reduction is the verbatim minutes. Tonight we slayed a few trees and got some big stacks of minutes. But without meetings being televised, we can probably talk in circles about what's a good time to have a meeting and when can people come and when can't they come, but the one thing we know we can do is on the website get the entire minutes out on the site and the people who can't come to the meeting they can read the minutes or scan through them. I think that has some value just from a public information standpoint that the public has as much information of what transpired at the Board meetings versus a summary version which we would have. So I looked at that as saving some money, but I'm not sure that it really served the public interest. As you know when you go through the minutes, I think the transcription service picks up almost everything. If somebody doesn't talk into their mic or if they're not talking clearly it might not get picked up, but outside of that whatever ends up on the tape goes in so I think that's a good thing to have.

The increased levy that based upon certified manufacturing assessments that would be outside the TID District that we can count on as value is \$28,852. The State reduced our computer aid. Computer aid exempted taxes on computers a few years ago and then they prorate some of that back to us. That's gone down. I think it will continue to go down.

So from our last meeting we started with a net of \$3,775. You can see the savings in revenues and reduced expenses were \$190,320. The added expenses were \$128,498 with an ending net income of \$65,597. That puts us at a point with the changes I'm recommending tonight that

would be the surplus. Then beyond that, given the way we're structured in our health insurance, the Village always assumes liability but we're assuming some level of uncertainty because we're going to be self-funding a portion of the deductible. And the \$44,542 I think is correct where Carol us, but that assumes 50 percent of our employees are going to execute the full deductible. We think it will be around 30 percent, but rather than cutting back operations to make up the difference, I'm recommending we have it at 50 percent.

The manufacturing appeal exposure, Lawter and General Binding have appealed their manufacturing assessment to the State. They're appealing the State's finding on their values, so if that went south on us that would be something the Village has to make up for and that would be \$21,055. That covers the contingency. Now, Lawter and General Binding might be unsuccessful in their appeal. We won't know that by the time we see the levy is the problem. So in both these we could come out in surplus on it. But if we had a contingency of \$65,597, I think that would give us some room to move with those uncertainties. That leaves our budget balanced.

Here you can see the changes proposed revenues from our last meeting at \$10,049,716, adjustments brings it up to \$10,105,000, a 7 percent increase. Property tax is a 9 percent increase. I want to make sure everybody understands that that's because the value of the Village, not reassessments, but because there's more improvements in the Village from the last tax roll have been added to the Village so that they're available to--we have more people to help spread the cost of government around. And other revenues have grown by 3 percent. The most significant thing in other revenues is by and large State shared revenues and the transportation aids.

Under expenses we have some cuts in public works, administration, community development, increases of \$36,000 in public safety and a contingency of \$65,507, which takes care of the net loss of that \$3,774, so we balance out the budget at that level.

The recommended new programs we had the top eight. Create the Clean Water Utility represents unloading \$112,119 off the general fund. Charging developers for inspection services, again, that's a revenue source of \$2,600. We have the part-time commercial electrical inspector that shows a net of \$238. Promoting a sergeant up to \$8,470. There's one officer that would be promoted up to sergeant level. The rehab of a 1994 fire engine that's suffering from some severe corrosion \$35,000. Realigning a snowplow truck \$3,700. Adding four police radios \$7,200. And then contract consulting fees for developing a clean water impact fee of \$6,000.

More that were recommended the part-time web intern, database intern that's being funded by fees from permits, a reclassification of a public works employee up to an equipment operator, hiring one part-time seasonal public works employee, the actuarial evaluation for post employment benefits is a gap required study we need to do, painting the salt shed and epoxying the shop floor as maintenance items, and then the two personnel additions brings us down to the total of \$108,093. That would be my total recommended new programs for the budget.

New programs not recommended a total of \$150,981. One thing I'd advise the Board on, these were programs that were recommended that made the final cut after the department heads presented to me. The process that I go through is everybody submits their budget to Kathy and myself, and I go through and make the ones I'm recommending. I put those in there and there's

some I wouldn't even recommend bringing to the Board if they're totally impossible or not in keeping with where we want to go. I know and so does Kathy, and the department heads also knew that there was no way that the budget was going to be able to fund all the departments' requests. But I think it's important for the Board to know and the community to the extent they're here is to get a full range of understanding of what the department's needs are and they're looking at that they want. Something that we don't fund this year or next year, usually it doesn't go away. It either deteriorates or the problem gets bigger, but if they don't tell us that it's out there then the first time we see it is I don't want to see it when it's a disaster and neither does the Board. They want to know what the department's needs are.

Program reductions we're recommending reducing attorney fees in dispatch, reducing the number of newsletters from four to two at \$12,450, eliminating an already vacant part-time engineering position at \$2,435, the impact of health insurance contributions at \$4,680. The two other things, the plan update and the short-term disability we're going to be evaluating those this year. Those are reductions I do want to take but we don't have a number. That number doesn't exist now, but that's something that the staff is going to continue to work on. Again, I'm recommending we add in the elimination of exempt fire and rescue fees.

Then there was \$246,607 in reductions that I'm recommending we don't accept and those are prioritized. My recommendation is if you want to take more reductions I'd start at the top rather than the bottom.

The creation of the Clean Water Utility. I think there are two policy questions. One is do you want to create the Clean Water Utility? If you don't, then we need to remove \$112,000 from the levy. This is a new requirement as far as what we're going to need to do to make sure that storm water meets the new federal standards and State standards, so we're going to be doing some things that probably would have typically come out of public works, but it's more than what we did before. We're going to be doing lab testing of water. We're going to be doing some different types of maintenance and additional maintenance that we haven't done before that now we're required to do as part of the Clean Water Act. . . . becomes a user charge based on not the value of someone's property but the imperviousness of their property and the size of it. Again, I think Bob made a good presentation on this a month or so ago, and I think one of the benefits of this is that it takes that pressure off the general fund property tax base and it really gets it addressed at some of the bigger users we have that are currently exempt from paying any of that.

And the other thing is to what extent does the Board want to capitalize that utility to do more than just O & M. Right now at \$112,000, we'll be doing O & M. We'll be doing the sampling, the cleaning, we'll be doing those required activities that we now have to do with the existing equipment and personnel and that's it. So do you want to fund capital through the storm water utility, or do you want to fund capital for storm water improvements off of the property tax? That's another policy question I think we need to discuss and think about. As we indicated there a buck per ERU gets you \$235,000 a year. So it would be a buck in addition to the 48 cents. The dollar isn't the total, it's an additional dollar to get you to that amount.

The level of improvements that we need to make in the storm water, and I think if you just look at the list, whether you've been here a week or for a long time, some of these names just come up because they've always been problems. The most critical one is the Barnes Creek bridge

replacement, and then beyond that Carol Beach Unit 2 storm sewers, Carol Beach Unit 4 storm sewers, 104<sup>th</sup> and 52<sup>nd</sup> which is just adjacent to the people that were here for the water hearing tonight. Those are constant, chronic storm water problems in the Village. One thing I can say about storm water, I won't say we plodded along with storm water improvements, but we have made storm water improvements in certain areas, and examples of that would be Pleasant Homes off Cooper Road, the Cooper Road area, the French Drive area, Graystone, and when we've done those projects it's eliminated the problems. A lot of this stuff isn't mystical, it's just money. It's kind of going in and retrofitting an area that didn't have improvements built up, and now we've got to find a way to take care of it.

So the policy question that we need to think about is do we want to do this--I think everybody wants to take care of storm water projects. I mean you don't want to see anybody flooding, it's just how you get to that point. And how much do you want to put into the storm water utility. The list we have there is \$205,000. We have some minor projects. Where at one point we were able to carry those in the general fund, as you can see from the numbers down there with \$100,000 in '07 and \$82,000 and \$45,000, in a budget as tight as ours those get to be difficult projects to assume in addition to those other ones.

In capital, we're going to see the need to replace police vehicles every year. You're probably going to see that same amount give or take inflation, because we roll out a squad when it's got about 110,000 or 120,000 on it and it's dead. Those are hard miles. Replacement servers, we have a lot of automated or IT . . . in this Village and we need to keep the service up so we can keep the thing running. Appraisal vehicle \$13,000. The true cost of that is a lot less because the consortium will pick up almost half of that, more than half of that. A plow truck with a side wing that's another thing that every year unless we decide to limit our level of snowplowing we need to take a 20 year old truck out of service and put a new one in. When a snowplow is 20 years old we're using it, but I can guarantee you it's in the shop and we've got it back in the shop almost every storm and something is wrong with it. So they should probably be replaced more frequently than 20 years but we've been limping along with this 20 year replacement.

John Steinbrink:

Mike, maybe you could explain we replace the plow trucks with a side wing.

Mike Pollocoff:

What we've done is to be able to get more area plowed it's the dump truck, it's the snowplow, it's the mag chloride tanks on the back of it, it's a spreader and it's a side wing. We use a side wing because the newer roads are 37 feet wide. So if we have a wing on it, you're almost getting two truck width of what we normally had with one truck pass. We can get a lot more plowed. We have some routes where they might not use it with small narrow streets in some of the older parts of the Village, but the majority of the Village if we have a wing on it we can really get a lot of plowing done. Again, we're holding onto not only the truck for that period of time but the plow and the wing, so we're rebuilding those over the years to make those go.

The zero turn mowers is not a very sexy item but we have a lot of mowing to do. The mowers are going to be 11 years old if we don't fund this. One of the things is you kind of pay in one place

and you save money in another, typically we have kids driving these mowers. And John will be the first one to tell you he's on them all the time to be ginger with them, but every now and then I see them riding arm and rocking them over. They don't tip them over, but they take a beating.

The civic dashboard is something that's really going to enable as a budgetary tool the departments to manage our budgets and that will bring us up to on time rather than looking or keeping a list for a month to see what your expenditures are. Before we process a payment we know where we're standing with those accounts. That's something we don't have right now. So I'm looking at total capital of \$303,000.

The next item is the capital not recommended. Again, the last list you saw wasn't prioritized but was alphabetized. This is a priority list. Are we going to fail if we don't do this stuff? Yeah, at some point. One of the things that we'll have to come to grips with I think in our next budget is we still don't have \$160,000 for an ambulance next year. Next year based on what I think we're going to have that will take half our money. In all reality we'll use most of our development new growth money to respond to the additional payroll expenses that we're going to have next year, whether it be health and salary. Eighty percent of our budget is people. That's what's sucking up our money right now. So unless we start getting rid of people we're going to have this problem. And I think that we're still going to need squad cars next year, we're still going to need a snowplow.

As you work down these items, a Hurst Tool if you've ever seen one of those work, we have a Hurst Tool that's 20 or 25 years old, almost 30 years old. We can almost get a Hamilton Beach can opener to work faster than this thing when you're opening up a car in an accident. It's one of the things we need. It's not something that's a wish list of. Redesigning our dispatch center and re-equipping it, that's going on 12 years old. Radios, the technology on them changes and how we're doing things over there. One of the things we want to do is redesign that so we can keep our need for additional people down but make it so that equipment has got to stay up to date.

Pickup trucks, whether it's parks or public works, that's what we use to operate. If we don't have pickup trucks then we've got people standing around. The assessment management database upgrade, again, not a real sexy item, but come assessment time we want to make sure that Rocco's people have--that their assessment system is going to be able to deliver the work that they need to do so they're as accurate as possible and as fair as possible in doing the assessment.

I could go down the list. I don't think any of this is frivolous. I've got to be honest with you. Some of it jumps out at you. But some of it when you look at how it manages operations for us it gets people information and that's why we need it. Here we go down to the end. Again, if there's capital you want to recommend adding in it would be the top of this list. If there's capital at the bottom of the list where that line is, anything above that is the lower priority items.

Road maintenance projects and storm water projects, I frankly think that a policy decision that we're going to have to make is, and we'll go to road maintenance first, we know that assuming that we're going to fund something for next year to meet the needs identified in the road maintenance and improvement project that the Board evaluated a while back that would be \$1.4 million. We know that as time goes on certain roads are going to deteriorate and they're not going to be in as good of condition. They won't get better by nothing happening to them.

They're going to get worse. That expense grows by about a million that next year. One of the things I think that we're going to have to look at is do we want to take this issue to referendum, or do we want to take a pass on it? I think that road maintenance is probably one of the most misunderstood things in the Village. Everybody's idea of road maintenance is just pave my road when you want to do something and I'm happy. We know there are a lot of things that we can do that are intergaps that are going to be accessible in some areas. We went through the chip sealing process. We even chip sealed a road this year and I haven't heard a complaint on it. And we paved some roads and I haven't heard any complaints on those, but we have a lot more that we need to do.

This is an area that if we want to go to referendum you could say just do a one year issue and say we want to do next year \$1.5 million in round numbers in road improvements and that's going to cost you so much in your levy. Or, do we tell the residents over a five year period we can bring all the Village roads up to an acceptable standard and thereafter have a lot less cost to maintain them to keep them at that level. We won't be spending that much each year afterwards and have it voted on that way. That's something we don't need to decide tonight, but I think it's discussion that needs to start happening as to how the Board wants to approach that. As much as everybody is going to be happy that their tax bill is the same this year as it was last year, if they've got a junky road, we're ignoring a problem that's getting bigger.

Next is equipment purchases. We had a beginning need of \$1.3 million for equipment. We funded \$303,000 so there's \$1 million worth of equipment that we didn't fund. The major equipment being some of the fire and rescue equipment, some parks equipment. The police got funded and public works, and that goes each year. Some of the years you've got some major fire expenditures. You've got that fire station 3 out there on the 2008 bubble. Those are other issues again, when we're looking at a freeze year where next year we might have about \$160,000 within levy limits to fund in capital so we're going to be significantly short.

So for the budget as I have it set up now we'd have an operating budget of \$4.2 million, round numbers, capital \$271,000, debt service \$2.4 million, total of \$6,989,277. The mill rate resulting from that levy is \$3.54 per thousand of assessed value, so there's no Village tax increase for current property owners. That's pretty easy to evaluate this year because last year we didn't have a revaluation. I mean this year we haven't had one so the values for everybody that's existing stayed the same with the addition of people who came to the community and just ramped up this year or their home is in some phase of being completed from a new home start.

My understanding from the worksheet that was sent to us from the Wisconsin Department of Revenue in calculating out what our compliance is with the tax freeze we haven't gone up to the maximum allowed by the tax freeze. The budget that John directed me to put together was to keep taxes frozen so that peoples' property taxes are the same for the Village this year as they were last year. If you want to go up higher, there's a certain amount of level you can go up higher and still be in compliance with the tax freeze requirements that were set forth by the State.

This is a history of where the levy has been and where the mill rate has been. You can see in 2002 the mill rate was \$4.46. At that point we had a levy change of 9 percent. Then we froze it at \$4.07 for two years and now we've done \$3.54. The Village's levy, we've been through this, and this is really our fourth year of intense tightening down on the budget. This is the tightest

that we've gotten. But this isn't anything new. This is year five, and I think that people wanted to see the impact of the freeze and what's the impact, well, this is the impact. Some communities went ahead and rocketed over and they adjusted their mill rates to fund some of those things we haven't funded whether it be capital or additional equipment. We haven't done that. We've been slowly cutting back on capital. We haven't issued any more debt, so our reserves for capital have been depleting down to where at this point there's nothing. We spent it somewhat slowly but that's where we're at. This is just a graphic visualization of what \$3.54 is.

This is a slide from a broader historical perspective. You go back to 1997 the Village mill rate was at \$5. That was a year when the TIF had not been retired yet, TIF 1. That's the year when probably the TIF was the most painful for the Village. We had probably close to 8,000 employees out there in private sector, all the businesses needed police services, all the streets were there, we were taking care of them. We had a lot of new things we had to do but we weren't receiving any tax dollars from the TIF District yet. '97 was the year that was the most painful. As the TIF began to retire, we had a partial year in '98, then you look in '99 and we came down to a \$4.06, so it's a significant drop in the equalized rate. We were at \$4.26 at the actual rate.

We did some capital improvements in 2001, actual rate went up, and then again we came down in 2002 and then we're down to where we are at 2005 So you can see the Village aside from one blip in 2001 our mill rate and even though the budgets haven't been going down because the Village has been growing over that whole period, we haven't taken advantage of the increase in value to fatten up the budget.

Where do we sit? We can sit here and pound our chest about that we're saving taxes, but if you compare us to our comparables, our peers, these are communities that kind of clump up with us in the villages and cities in that range from the State of Wisconsin, we're at \$3.54, and these are the tax rates in those communities as of last year. Our is still \$3.54. For a community of 18,000 people for the levy we have it's not one of the higher levies, so it doesn't reflect that we're using an almost \$2 billion of value to generate a low rate but we also have a lower levy. In the rankings of the 60 largest communities, and we're the 26<sup>th</sup> largest in the State, we're the 60<sup>th</sup> in levy for tax rate. We're at the bottom.

You can also compare Pleasant Prairie, and I didn't put this up there, to the Town of Bristol or to a town government where they don't have a police department, they don't have a planning department, they have a very small highway department, and their mill rate is about 20 cents per thousand less than ours. So you guys operate a full service government for about 20 cents more per thousand and provide significant services over and above what a town does. If you compare us to the villages out in the County, we're the lowest tax rate of any incorporated municipality in Kenosha County.

How much lower you want to bring it down, again that's a policy decision. If you guys want to crank down the mill rates lower yet, I respectfully state you're already at the bottom. We're not average even. Average would get you around the \$5 mill rate. Another thing that the Village's mill rate doesn't accomplish is the State of Wisconsin will give you more money in shared revenues if your mill rate is \$5 or higher. In Wisconsin you're rewarded for having a high mill rate and you're penalized for having a low mill rate. That's significant money. It's called disparity aid. Their disparity aid is higher than their shared revenue. We don't get any of that. Again, this is a graphic interpretation. That might be a little bit easier to see where we sit when

Village Board Meeting  
November 7, 2005

compared to other municipalities. That's it for that.

I know I brought some more stuff to the table as far as additions. If there's any comments or questions. You've looked at your budgets from the last meeting. If you have any questions about my recommendation or how we arrived at the numbers I'd be more than happy to answer any questions that you have.

John Steinbrink:

Board comments or questions.

Jeff Lauer:

I have some here. Regarding the Clean Water Utility that's mandated, is there a set year that it has to be implemented or started?

Mike Pollocoff:

The rules will be effective in 2006. The Village received a grant of \$120,000. It was an 80 percent grant, and we're just now completing that to identify the storm water areas and get that addressed. The State has been hazy on their rules but I think they're coming out. To not be in a position to address them for next year I guess you'd be looking at the possibility of some compliance orders for noncompliance.

Jeff Lauer:

And the other question I have regarding the clean water, I know Virchow Krause is going to investigate an impact fee. Does that tie in together with the Clean Water Utility?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right now the Village pays on a storm water project, if it's in an existing area, we'll pay for half of the cost of the improvement. And then the affected property owners pay for the other half. One of the things that we're going to look at is in some areas there could be a developer requirement to pay an impact fee if they're having a significant off site effect impact on downstream improvements. So they want to be able to develop, pay the impact fee so that improvements can be made to the downstream structures to handle the upstream water.

It gets to be a little dicey and having a utility and figure out a way to recognize that. If you take and get the impact fee and utility fee is the same as everybody else, and then they're paying as part of the utility fee for any improvement that the utility is making, you want to make sure you don't nick them twice. If they're going to pay for someone's improvement downstream, you've got to be sure you don't hit them twice. It's a great way to budget and make money but it's probably not fair. So that's why we're going to do that. But I think there are definitely opportunities for some impact fees to occur. An impact fee would have to be for an impact that the developer would cause over and above what happens there right now.

What we've done now is--she's gone, but Sylvia lived in a place where water shot through her property. It went through her property anyway from an abutting development, but it was coming through at a more controlled constant rate and we required that developer to put a storm sewer through her property so she wasn't harmed any more than she was before. Although we made him pay for the whole thing, that could be something that's funded by an impact fee.

Jeff Lauer:

I do have a few questions and I'll try to get through them if I can and take a break and let somebody else talk. I saw that we have inspection attorney fees that we pay. I'm not sure exactly what those are, if it's a needed cost that we have to do.

Mike Pollocoff:

Some years we don't spend them. Typically if someone sues the Village over an inspection our insurance company will cover. I think we have to pay for the first \$1,000 and then after that the insurance company will pay for us. But typically what happens is if we get somebody who won't comply with an inspection order, if the problem is more significant than giving them a \$600 ticket in Municipal Court, what we really need is to have a correction effectuated immediately, then we may have to go to Circuit Court and get a court order. An example would be a dilapidated building that needs to be razed, and the property owner fights us on that. Or, a health problem, somebody is keeping junk and garbage and debris, and we've had a few of these over the years where there's everything in somebody's yard and if we need to go get a court order to do that, we're going to spend some of the attorney money to get that order. I think the amount is \$3,000. It's not big money. But it's usually an action that we're initiating rather than somebody making a claim against the Village.

John Steinbrink:

One example would be the Town Club property that we've had to pursue.

Mike Pollocoff:

Right. Town Club in Carol Beach, the neighbors there were set with it. We did some orders on it. The guy paid his ticket when we gave him the orders. He didn't respond to it, so we had to take him to court and have the nuisance abated. If you're going to go to court you have to have an attorney draft it up and get it done. That would be something that would fall under the inspection attorney fees.

Jeff Lauer:

Just a couple thoughts on what else I was reviewing in my mind, and Board members please feel free to give your thoughts. Is it, and I don't want to use the word necessary, but I saw we were going to possibly hire, according to the current budget, a part-time web intern and a part-time database intern. I understand the part-time database intern would come from increased permit fees.

Mike Pollocoff:

Correct.

Jeff Lauer:

Is that increased fees all across the board or specific fees that this goes through?

Mike Pollocoff:

It's zoning permit fees I believe that we're doing. That's primarily what that person is going to be doing is updating the zoning maps on the GIS. So it wouldn't be fees across the board but just for that.

Jeff Lauer:

Just for the zoning, okay. I guess a couple other items I had here. I'll try to give my thoughts on it and I'm sure everybody could hopefully assist me on this one. I'm happy that the Village has a road maintenance program, and there's a cost involved in doing that. I believe the people know there's a cost involved in doing that. Obviously the bottom line comes down to where we get the money. Obviously, I think it's like we heard people earlier saying they don't have the money to pay for the water. My concern is if we let the road maintenance program, do nothing next year, it's going to possibly cost more in 2007 and on and on and on. I think it might be a good idea to put it on a referendum. I guess the question I have is if we decide to do something like that, we'd have to have a special election for it and how does that work? Let's say we did a referendum, for example, next April and the people approved it. Would we be able to start the road maintenance next year?

Mike Pollocoff:

It would be the following year. I think the die is cast as far as for this coming budget year. But if the Board decides that they want to do a referendum on a road project, I guess it really depends on the question and how the question is put to the voters. If you want to say here's how we plan to bring the roads up to spec and maintain them going forward, it's going to be a five year program and here's how the roads will be done. The engineer and the staff have come up with a map that shows what roads are going to get done when so people could evaluate that and know what it is. My recommendation would be to have it at a November election for next year because that would be a general election. You'd get the biggest turnout typically so you'd get the most input on it at that point. There's nothing to say you couldn't have it in April, but that doesn't mean you'd be able to accomplish that road work next year.

Jeff Lauer:

That was a question. Does anybody have any--because it is a concern. One way we're going to

have to do it, and I think if we can get the people's voice in it. I'll say publically I'll lead the charge and tell them why. In fact, they'd even told me this that they'd be willing to pay for it. But I know I think most Board members have heard people saying I want my road done, this road done, that road done, okay, here's the opportunity to tell us what you want.

Mike Serpe:

Could I comment? Because of the State law on the levy freeze, I don't disagree that we might have to go to referendum some day to get the money to do what we have to do. I agree with that. The only thing I don't like is for this Board every time we come up with a major capital item that we have to go to referendum all the time. We're elected to make these decisions, and if we have to raise the mill rate a few cents to cover these costs then that's what we're elected to do. Those are the hard decisions you're required to make.

If we're going to do a referendum in November for the road maintenance, I think there's a couple other things that we have to consider to be a part of that referendum and involved in public safety items as well, and that's a rescue squad for \$160,000. You guys weren't here on the Board but we got bombarded from the Cooper Road/80<sup>th</sup> Street people about 80<sup>th</sup> Street going through to 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue because it's such a bottleneck at 80<sup>th</sup> and Cooper. We've been promising these people that that road is going to go through. Well, guess what, we don't have \$600,000 to do that now.

So these are items that are going to benefit everybody, the road maintenance, the rescue squad and traffic safety moving people through a congested area like Lance Junior High School. And if we're going to do a referendum for X number of dollars, then I think we have to pick and choose the important items that we want to see passed in a referendum so we can run this Village the right way. I don't want to go to referendum every year asking for pennies to do this and to do that. I don't think it's a good way to run government.

So I agree I think we're going to have to because of State law and what it's saying, but when we do it let's make sure we cover all the necessities that we have to have.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

The way I look at that we're going to have to go to referendum. The question is the way to educate the people the way this referendum is going to be implemented. Because the first comment when you're talking with somebody about it is the first thing they say is I pay taxes. We all pay taxes, but they don't understand that only a portion of the taxes they pay go for roads or whatever. So the need to know exactly where the money is going and how it's going to be spent. So we need a level of education. For people who never read the newspaper they look at the taxes going up and complain. That's why we need to next year educate the people in these decisions.

So next year when they go to vote they know exactly what they're going to get and when they are going to get it, otherwise it's going to fail. The referendum passed for the schools. I think there was a very well done explanation this time compared with the one two years ago that was \$64

Village Board Meeting  
November 7, 2005

million. People knew exactly where the money is going. That's the same thing we'd have to do now in any issue that we take. Explain to the people in the simplest way that we can so they understand how are we going to spend the money.

John Steinbrink:

Any other comments on Jeff's proposal?

Jeff Lauer:

I do agree with Mike. I had one or two or a couple residents say, well, you spend a certain amount you should go to referendum. I go no because obviously it comes up to a point where we can't tie the hands of the Board on that. There might be other options when we get to budget time next year then if we want to wait until next fall. Maybe we can work it out in the budget what the mill rate is going to be and tell the people what it's going to be to see which is the better route to go. It's a huge cost and I know we all know that.

Mike Pollocoff:

You're not able to do that, though. The State has the levy freeze whereas the Board, not that they're easy decisions, could have said we really think this needs to get done and we're going to approve a levy that's going to fund road improvements at a certain level. The Board made the conscious decision for the last four years to be frugal because the input from everybody was that the taxes are too high and we've got to hold taxes down. That's been going on and what we've done is ate into our capital reserves where we're not able to do that anymore. And next year the amount you have to work with is going to be smaller than this year's unless we make cuts in programs.

Mike Serpe:

A question Mike or Kathy. If the Board were to take the action to take the 3.2 percent increase in the levy, is that right? Five cents on the mill rate I think it came to, right?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right.

Mike Serpe:

Five cents on the mill rate, just tell me in figures what kind of money are we talking about?

Mike Pollocoff:

\$67,000.

Mike Serpe:

So you raise the mill rate five cents and you can buy half a rescue squad.

Mike Pollocoff:

. . . came to the realization last week at the League meeting. The other thing that was cut in the budget was the ability of the Community Development Authority to issue bonds for any redevelopment. If you do that you have to take it out of your operations to pay for the bond. So the Community Development Authority what we have now is going to be okay because that's TIF related, but some of the other projects that we're looking at doing, unless we create a TIF District there that's not going to happen.

Jeff Lauer:

Kathy has been helping me the past couple weeks. One thing is since I've been sitting at home reviewing all the numbers, one thing that stands out to me is the Village's debt, the whole cumulative debt which obviously I'm nervous about because now it's approximately maybe \$93.5 million or \$94 million depending on what we look at. I guess I need to understand how--Kathy explained like with amortization you pay so much, but what's the ability to pay, and this is a big question, to pay more on it to get the debt down. Obviously that would mean revenue from somewhere. One thing I want to make sure we look at is the debt. I have the breakdown of the general and the RecPlex and all that, but it's a concern to me because if any debt goes bad it's the whole Village that's responsible for it. For whatever reason it goes bad we hope it don't obviously, but I don't know, is there a system in place on how we can--I guess the question is to pay it down maybe quicker or how if possible that can be done. I know it can be refinanced to get a lower rate.

Mike Pollocoff:

If you think back to the chart that Kathy had at our last meeting, debt and the responsibility for any debt we issue is the general obligation, the full faith and credit of the Village that we're going to stand behind our issues and get them paid. In my 20 years here we've never come close to having a non property tax related debt issue going back on the tax roll. That did happen to the Town of Pleasant Prairie back when they built the 731 treatment plant. There was a point where some of that went back on the tax roll because that development never happened. That's why we decided three years ago, almost four years ago, we had one little part of debt issues, the general fund and the general fund budget is that fund that collects property taxes from people to do things we didn't issue any more debt. We stopped issuing debt so we don't crowd out the borrowing.

There is no doubt that RecPlex has a significant amount of debt, and the pro formas and the plans we had as we did the RecPlex and IcePlex is they have to pay their own way. The user charges have to pay their own way. If they need to have a rate increase to do that they need to have a rate increase to do that. They have to do whatever they have to do to cover their debt and they're doing that.

In the case of the TIF District we paid off \$24 million in principal ten years ahead of schedule in

TIF #1 and whatever interested we had accrued in there. I really believe we'll be in a position to pay off TIF #2 ahead of schedule based on some of the things they're going to develop out there. I think the Village made a decision back when they created those TIF Districts and started issuing a debt. I'm not saying it's rolling the dice, but I believe the decisions to incur debt, to eliminate the adult bookstores, the military salvage yard, the trailer place, all that stuff was based on the premise that we'd put a plan together that was going to drive economic development, and that economic development was going to create value that was going to retire the bonds. And I think that's happening.

We have a fair surplus in TIF increments that we're building right now in the TIF fund. So if you're looking to retire debt quickly, in the case of RecPlex you could say let's increase our rates and charges so that we retire debt more quickly. I'd be more inclined to say let's find ways to be more profitable and make people more interested in coming to programs and doing things like that. In the TIF District what we need to do is make sure that we do everything we can to make sure that district is successful, that we complete the work we've started in there, and enable that area to develop. That's what's going to get that big amount of debt off the books.

The debt that we're carrying in general fund is a couple million dollars a year and that's significant. But for a community that's 34 square miles big and 18,000 people it isn't that big. I think the Village Board has already adopted a prudent way to address the capital expenditures and whatever we're going to do it has to pay its way at the time. We're not going to incur any more debt. I could see a point where we would have no debt in 10 or 11 years assuming the TIF District does what we think it's going to do, but at some point you're going to want to and maybe in the near term you're going to want to look at incurring debt and do some additional work on south Sheridan Road to clean that up. That's an ideal use for tax incremental dollars and community development powers to clean up a blighted area. The same thing is true in some other areas of the Village, and you're going to want to issue debt for it. Those are things that, again, I think hopefully are made on sound planning principles and planning and policy principles that's for the good of the community.

I think given the way the state of finances are in Wisconsin I don't see this community and I don't really see a lot of communities taking on additional debt. That's really what the Governor's proposal, that's what the Assembly's and the Senate's proposal really drives people to in this last go around is debt. You guys could issue more debt and you could levy a tax for it. You are permitted to increase taxes to pay for debt if you want to do that. On one hand if you're going to say we're going to freeze taxes but we're going to issue more debt to pay for operations, you're going to meet yourself coming and going.

Jeff Lauer:

One question if I may.

John Steinbrink:

Just going back to the debt. Over the last few years there's been a lot of assumptions and we'll call them Kentucky financiers looking at our debt picture and making their own assumptions and predictions. But if you want a true measure of it or of our financial security you look at what our

Village Board Meeting  
November 7, 2005

bond rating has done over the years. These are people that understand finance and understand where the position of the Village is and rate us on that. Mike, could you tell us what that is?

Mike Pollocoff:

Our bond rating has gotten actually better over the time that we've decided not to issue debt in the general fund. We've maintained an appropriate reserve. The debt we've issued they can see we're retiring that debt as we said we would. We've met our plans, and for a community our size to have an A+ and an A1 rating that's nothing to sneeze at. You can't buy those. You can't take somebody out to lunch to get one. They give you a thorough going over and that's how you get it. So there is a lot of debt. I'm not say there isn't. But, on the other hand, it's being managed.

Jeff Lauer:

One last one. This might not pertain. If it doesn't, that's fine and we won't discuss it. Have we, regarding the budget process, has the water issue come to fruition? I know it was mentioned that Kenosha is seeking another rate increase.

Mike Pollocoff:

Water is done. We'll adopt that after the hearing, but there really is not change in water that we're requesting. It's the sewer that we don't have the rate numbers from Kenosha yet. To be honest with you, I think they're going to wait until December until they get their budget done and then figure out what they're going to charge everybody else.

Jeff Lauer:

I was just curious because I know it was brought up.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I love spreadsheets, and I just wanted to thank Rocco for helping me see the big picture. I think it's worthwhile mentioning that there are estimated for in 2006 that \$36.2 million in property taxes will be levied on the taxpayers of Pleasant Prairie. Of that we've, of course, talked about the \$6.9 or almost \$7 million that the Village is taxing the property taxpayers for, but some other numbers, and this is only the Village portion, this is not school district wide or County wide, but the Village portion of Kenosha Unified's levy is going to be \$17.2 million. The County portion taken out of Pleasant Prairie is going to be \$8.6 million. Gateway is going to tax Pleasant Prairie for \$2.8 million, and the library system is going to charge Pleasant Prairie nearly \$700,000, and all those numbers add up to \$36.2 million. So the efforts that Pleasant Prairie has made to keep the total taxation down here I think are commendable.

The difference between the 2004 and 2005 levies of \$137,000 approximately in my opinion is entirely based on growth. I think it's demonstrated at least to me and I think others that have looked at this that the mill rate when applied to the existing or current tax base stays the same, and the assessed values of those properties stays the same, and therefore the actual tax bill for those individual properties stay the same. We did a calculation on a \$228,000 value home, and

Village Board Meeting  
November 7, 2005

the Village portion on that is expected to go down a dollar from \$806 to \$805, while the total bill will go up slightly because of the increased mill rates for the other taxing bodies from \$3,952 to \$4,014. So I think overall the Village has demonstrated an effort to control taxation for any existing housing stock and to extract the rightful amount from the new development that's happening. That new development should pay taxes, and there are costs associated with providing services to that new development. So it all makes sense.

I only have one more comment and that's about mill rate. The word rate itself suggests it's a ratio. It's basically, and I know this is very elementary, but it's the levy divided by the valuation. And a rate only makes sense if one of the factors used in calculating the rate is fixed. In this case with the assessed values being fixed, then the mill rate does make sense. But just to illustrate another rate that we're all very familiar with on a daily basis is speed. We tend to measure our speed in miles per hour. But 95 feet per second is the same thing as 65 miles per hour. They don't sound like the same number, 65 and 95, but they actually mean the same thing. So just going forward, I don't think we should be stuck on mill rates. I think we need to be stuck on total levy and make sure that it reflects growth and only growth.

John Steinbrink:

Any other comments or questions?

Mike Serpe:

Jeff, I'm not being sarcastic. I don't want to make reference to the paper, but last week you made mention about the levy increasing and you felt that that wasn't a tax freeze. Do you still after all your studies and deliberations feel the same?

Jeff Lauer:

Truthfully anybody can say anything to make it sound the way they like it. I understand the logic and everything. I don't want to bring up--when I was talking to people I said I will commit not to spend more in the levy this year than I did last year. I'm going to commit to that. Why? Because my word is my bond. If I make up an excuse to say, guess what, the mill rate is going to say the same, the people are going to look at me and see that my character is nothing because you told me this and then you did this and you're making up excuses.

Mike Serpe:

Okay, you're satisfied with the mill rate the way it is?

Jeff Lauer:

I wish it was \$2 but yeah.

Village Board Meeting  
November 7, 2005

Mike Serpe:

You're satisfied with the mill rate?

Jeff Lauer:

Yeah, I could be satisfied with that. I mean comparing it to other communities, too. Glendale is \$6.

Mike Serpe:

Alright.

Mike Pollocoff:

I guess I'd like to get some feedback on the storm water utility. What I would be looking to do is prepare an ordinance for adoption at the budget hearing. If the Board doesn't want to adopt the ordinance, then we need to pair \$112,000 out of the budget.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Mike, would you explain for my benefit and I'm guessing maybe others what the ERU, the equivalent residential unit means again and how it compares to the average residence? What does that mean?

Bob Martin:

What's typically done is to take an average parcel, in our case it's a third of an acre. And an average impervious area is around 2,500 square feet. So that's the standard size with the impervious area. So when you do calculations of runoff it's based on that. So the average home will receive the one ERU charge, whatever that is for example. And I would say the reason that it's a fair issue in that it addresses the wide spread that we have from hundreds, thousands, a few thousand square feet up to millions of square feet, but it's still based on the same premise that there's a certain amount of impervious surface and so on. But it just goes back to the fairness of what people get charged. But the majority, and I can't answer you exactly, but the majority of the charges were in between I think the example I gave was 50 cents, so they'd be in between like 50 cents and \$1 of the 90 percent or 80 percent or something like that, so it's a very high number. Then you've got them on the other ends of the spectrum. But the average household would pay whatever you pick for that equivalent runoff unit and it's very common.

I might just add that I believe that \$4 is probably the average, \$4 or \$5 per ERU is what most communities have adopted in Wisconsin. Basically they've done similar things. They've taken on capital projects that would otherwise be unfunded and so on so they get used. Mt. Pleasant I believe they collect a million dollars a year is what I understand. So it's pretty substantial, but it goes towards some of their bigger projects.

Alex Tiahnybok:

So regardless of lot size, it's actually structure size? That's the determining factor? So you're saying an average structure would get one ERU?

Bob Martin:

Again, it's based on a third of an acre lot. That's the parcel size, and around 2,500 square foot of residence. And I think we threw in 700 square feet for driveway and other impervious areas, so you don't end up splitting hairs with accessory buildings. That's a lot more work. So the average home, again, I'd say that for most homes that you see in today's subdivisions they would pay whatever that unit is. If it's 50 cents or \$1 per ERU that's what they would pay. That would be pretty much the monthly charge.

Alex Tiahnybok:

So each tax parcel would be assigned an ERU? Is that how this works?

Mike Pollocoff:

Every parcel whether they're a taxable parcel or not. So even the Village Hall, just like we pay a sewer and water bill here, we're going to have an ERU designated for this. The RecPlex will have an ERU. The cemetery will have an ERU.

Bob Martin:

There are parcels that are worthless parcels if we're being candid I guess. Those would not be and neither would ag land under what was proposed to the Board.

Mike Serpe:

John, I think we have to be responsible in this, and I think it's only appropriate that we authorize the Village Administrator to make the ordinance for the Clean Water Utility. It's \$1.48 on the average?

Mike Pollocoff:

I'm recommending the .48, then it really depends on what level you want to fund capital at. If you want to do it at the dollar, that gets us \$205,000. We could start the work towards setting the money aside for the Barnes Creek bridge. That was the highest priority that I had. You're going to be having a storm water hearing with Carol Beach I think this month or first of December. That one is \$220,000. So in that one year there if there's projects you want to defer or if you want to increase it to pick up those shares.

Now, we're going to have that money, and if we follow our same policy Carol Beach is \$220,000, we would assess \$110,000 so you'd get some of that money back, but we'd need to have the money up front to pay for the project to go forward.

Mike Serpe:

Carol Beach is a part of Pleasant Prairie. We may not like the comments that we get from citizens that we're not doing anything for the water problem, and they do have a water problem and they are a part of our Village. I think it's only responsible on our part that we do the dollar for the capital and address it and take care of it and get it done. Get those people taken care of, because it's been too long and too many years.

Mike Pollocoff:

I don't want to say they're the bulk of our problem, but a lot of improvements are there because they're at the bottom of the hill . . . any improvements.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I propose that Mike come back to us with a plan where the ERU rate is set on a yearly basis, on a year by year basis, to fund those projects that need to get done. So if in the first year it's \$205,000, then the rate would be .9 or whatever it is.

Bob Martin:

If I could just add, too, there's been a lot of discussion about the roads and I think this is no different. As we add infrastructure every year and it ages, it turns into the same situation. Typically the only difference between sewers, storm sewers and paving, is that you can have a pavement fail catastrophically and people just get upset. Go buy shocks. But if you have a failure with a sanitary sewer or storm sewer it can become a dangerous situation. So the utility is really set up to build up over time so that you can address an aging infrastructure and take care of that so you don't end up with multi million bond issues, for example. That would be another way that Mike talked about. But that's incurring debt, and typically you pay quite a bit more for those bond issues just because you're paying the interest on the principal every year and that adds up.

So the storm water utility can help get way ahead of that curve and start eliminating those problems because we're adding a lot of infrastructure every year. We're adding a lot of new streets, and every street we add has a storm sewer. So I think it's wise to grow with that and not only provide for these projects but what's coming down the pike.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Then I'd like to restructure my recommendation, and that would be to set the ERU in the previous year so that in this case for looking ahead to '07 that the funds to accomplish those projects would already be available. Instead of borrowing the money we can be looking forward.

Mike Pollocoff:

So we collect the funds in 2006, is that what you're saying?

Alex Tiahnybok:

To fund the 2007 necessary projects.

Mike Pollocoff:

I'd be glad to do that. I might also if it's okay give you a smooth out because maybe having it go up and down--no one will ever thank you for it going down but they'll always remember that you brought it back up. And maybe that smoothing approach talks about providing some base for going into a sinking fund so that we've got some reserves built up to handle projects.

Mike Serpe:

How does that work with the ordinance as far as--you're going to draft an ordinance for this but then it's going to change. Will that ordinance change then?

Mike Pollocoff:

It will be just like the sewer/water ordinance. The ordinance will define operations and how we do it, and then each year the Board will adopt a budget for the utility. So the numbers will change.

John Steinbrink:

A lot of years ago we addressed the issue of sanitary sewer in the Village. Not a popular issue, but the same people--that was contentious. We had rooms full of people screaming at us saying I don't need a sanitary sewer even though sewage was running in the ditches clearly visible. It was a hardship to a lot of people to do this, but it was a necessary thing we had to do to address the problem. And the Board made the commitment to do it, and we did a lot of projects, especially in the '80s and early '90s, which today most people say I'm glad you did that because the realization is it was unhealthy, number one.

Storm water is probably the next biggest issue we address always, the flooding and every time it rains there's a problem. If it's a dry year nobody has a problem. But the minute it rains and we get the big rains like we did last year in the spring then it becomes an issue. Water is something that's a little more flexible for us, but I'm glad to see we're looking at creating a fund to address the issues or the projects that are coming up. They won't get any better. Some of these have been consistent areas, and we've been able to address a lot of these problems through new development in these areas, putting in retention/detention, storm sewer, stopping water from going into problem areas. These are ones that we've been unable to address and we really need to address over the time table that's set up here.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

What I like about creating a utility in that case all the properties in the Village are going to pay including the exempt. Otherwise half of the population is going to be paying for . . . when in this case every piece of property in the Village is going to pay, exempt or non exempt which is good. So the utility I think is the best thing we can do.

Mike Pollocoff:

I'll prepare, as Trustee Tiahnybok indicated, a rate that addresses the needs of--I guess I'll do it both ways for you, showing it on a year to year basis or on a smooth basis but building a fund.

John Steinbrink:

We've looked at inflation costs over the projected?

Mike Pollocoff:

We can, but after what we're going through now—

John Steinbrink:

. . . storm sewer pipe . . . concrete, right, and right now concrete is projected for a \$9 increase I think I heard the other day, per yard.

Mike Pollocoff:

We'll take a look at that and see if we can true up our numbers. We true those up every year and see about our projections. Hopefully that stuff goes down. Any recommended changes on reductions or new programs that you'd like me to consider before we put the package together.

Mike Serpe:

Personally I like what you proposed to us, Mike. I especially like the addition of the police officer. We're a growing community. Just in Village Green Heights alone this year, we're going to add what, Jean, about 300 people?

Jean Werbie:

Right.

Mike Serpe:

And then what's happening west of the I eventually it's going call for additional patrolling and calls for service. So it's a good move on your part. I'm a little uncomfortable, like I said, with tying our hands so hard behind our back. I'm just hoping that if and when the time comes that a referendum is needed that we're successful in educating the Village residents that it should pass. Do we need a motion to accept?

Mike Pollocoff:

No, it's not an action item, just some direction. I guess, Trustee Lauer, are you looking for a recommendation from me to have the levy be the same as last year or the tax rate?

Jeff Lauer:

No, I didn't recommend any of that. What I mentioned earlier when Mike was asking me a question about that I said when I was speaking to people earlier this year and last year that I would be committed not to increase the tax levy my first year. I have to stay to that commitment. I told them the next year might be different because costs go up and things go up.

Mike Serpe:

I wouldn't disagree with you on that, Jeff, but I would also point out the fact, and Alex really

Village Board Meeting  
November 7, 2005

pointed it out, that the levy increase is based on new construction. I mean that's going to happen and it's going to happen again next year that there's going to be a levy increase, but the levy isn't going to be increased on other than new construction. It's just on new construction. You're holding at your word because you can't control how many building permits are going to be taken out next year. Those are all going to be reflected in the levy.

Jeff Lauer:

I know but that's my commitment. I think most of the Board knows me that if I say something if I nudge or buckle then, Jeff, you said this. I know as a side note up in Milwaukee County Scott Walker submitted three consecutive tax levy no increases. And it's a lot bigger than Pleasant Prairie.

Mike Serpe:

And also Milwaukee is out of space. They're wall to wall built out already.

John Steinbrink:

Milwaukee is going to pay the price like Colorado. What you have to ask the people that want to hold that levy is are they willing to take a service cut because that's what it's going to amount to. Generally they'll say, no, cut somebody else's services and take care of my needs and that's not possible.

Alex Tiahnybok:

The other day my wife and I were driving in the car and we were talking about this very topic, the whole idea of a rate freeze versus a total cost freeze. We were trying to figure out what's the most simple but logical example that most of us live with every day that illustrates that. We thought about a newlywed couple that gets married, and just a fictitious number to make it simple, at \$100 a month food budget. So their levy is \$100 and their mill rate is \$50 per person. Then they have a child in year two. If they have a frozen levy in food budget they'd still have \$100 to spend. That means now they've gone from \$50 per person to \$33 per person for their food bill, meaning that there's a 33 percent cut. It may be a good diet plan, but regardless still a cut per person in terms of what they can spend on their food budget. If you look at it in terms of mill rate, you can say, okay, the family spend \$50 per person when it was just a couple, not they have a child and perhaps now spending \$150 a month makes more sense in the food budget. It's a 50 percent increase in the levy but the mill rate stayed the same. I think it's a very tangible example when you compare the two issues.

John Steinbrink:

At least Mick Jagger wasn't involved. Other comments or questions? I believe the Administrator has his direction?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes.

**B. Receive Plan Commission Recommendation and Consider Resolution #05-61 for revision to the Preliminary Plat for the request of Rich Wagner, P.E. of Jenkins Survey and Design, Inc. agent for RLSR Enterprises, LLP, owner of the property generally located south of 116<sup>th</sup> Street east of 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue for the proposed Lighthouse Pointe Development as a result of re-verifications of wetlands on the property.**

Jean Werbie:

Mr. President and members of the Board, the petitioners are requesting to amend the preliminary plat to the proposed Lighthouse Pointe Development as a result of wetlands on the property being re-verified on the property. The preliminary plat was originally approved by the Village Board on December 20, 2004. This is for a single family subdivision primarily with some duplexes on the north end and some future condominiums on the east end that is located just south of 116<sup>th</sup> Street at about 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue or east of 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue.

The wetlands were originally identified in the field on November 23, 1993 by SEWRPC. They were re-verified on August 1, 2000 by SEWRPC. The DNR's regulations require that after five years the wetlands are required to be re-delineated, so they had requested SEWRPC to come back out to the site to take a look at their wetlands. They actually had wetlands located in the northeast corner, the east side and then some pockets on the south end of the development.

On September 6, 2005, SEWRPC reviewed the property and they found that the wetlands in the southwest corner, which is actually outlot 6, had changed on the site. The drawing that's shown on the slide indicates that the new location of the wetlands in the southwest corner of this site impacted on the lots as well as the road configuration and would require modification in that original 2004 preliminary plat. As you can see they did extend further to the north and to the east thereby causing some problems with respect to the existing proposed plat.

With respect to amendments to the proposed preliminary plat for Lighthouse Pointe, first of all, 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue would not be able to continue to the south of 122<sup>nd</sup> Street into the adjacent property, again, due to the proximity of the wetlands. Lots 47 through 63 adjacent to the western property line were adjusted and reduced in size to accommodate the expanding wetlands. The public park area was relocated to the central portion of the site. Originally it was identified at the southern end of the site, but due to the proximity of the wetlands, the drainage way and the unusable land area there for park purposes, the staff recommended that the park shift further to the north where there's a clump of older oak trees and allow a more passive park area to benefit the majority of

the residents within that subdivision. And then the area on the south end would be passive. It would be more of an open space to benefit the association and the neighbors in that area. Lot 64 through 67 were adjusted as a result of the park being relocated to the center of the site, and lots 88 through 92 were added south of 122<sup>nd</sup> Street as a result of the park being relocated.

The overall affect on the Sheridan Woods Neighborhood Plan, again, we did need to make an adjustment that 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue would not extend directly to the south. We needed to make sure that there was still an interconnection to the east so the road then could continue to the south. . . . continuity and amongst the neighborhoods by various local roadways.

So, again, as previously identified, the amendments to the neighborhood plan as well as to the preliminary plat for Lighthouse Pointe are shown on the slide. This is a matter that was before the Village Plan Commission at their last meeting. They recommended approval of the revised preliminary plat as presented. There was a public hearing. I think there was one resident that had some concerns, and I think that most of those concerns have been addressed. There was one issue she raised with respect to the need for a future variance, and that will be addressed with the developer or at the time that the matter comes before the Zoning Board of Appeals. With that, the staff recommends approval of Resolution #05-61 for the revision of the preliminary plat for Lighthouse Pointe Subdivision.

**SERPE MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE PLAN COMMISSION AND ADOPT RESOLUTION #05-61 FOR REVISION TO THE PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR THE REQUEST OF RICH WAGNER, P.E. OF JENKINS SURVEY AND DESIGN, INC. AGENT FOR RLSR ENTERPRISES, LLP, OWNER OF THE PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF 116<sup>TH</sup> STREET EAST OF 22<sup>ND</sup> AVENUE FOR THE PROPOSED LIGHTHOUSE POINTE DEVELOPMENT AS A RESULT OF RE-VERIFICATIONS OF WETLANDS ON THE PROPERTY; SECONDED BY LAUER; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

- C. Consider the request of Richard Stiles for a Lot Line Adjustment between the properties located at 2905 116<sup>th</sup> Street (owned by Richard Stiles) and 2819 116<sup>th</sup> Street (owned by Diane Valdez).

Jean Werbie:

Mr. President and members of the Board, the petitioners are requesting to adjust a portion of the lot line between two adjacent properties located at 2905 116<sup>th</sup> Street, a property owned by Mr. Stiles, and a property located at 2819 116<sup>th</sup> Street owned by Valdez.

As shown on the slide, the request to adjust the portion of the lot lines is between two existing property owners, one right next to the other. Both have existing single family dwellings as well as detached garages and some out buildings as set forth in the staff memorandum. Again, the whole purpose of them adjusting the lots lines is to make one of the lots less nonconforming and to adjust the lot lines so that an existing driveway that is currently located on the Valdez property can be completely located on the Stiles property. It's been used by Mr. Stiles over the years, but now the access to get to his back garage or barn instead of going through her property will now be completely on his property.

The property owners have been working together in order to do this lot line adjustment. I explained all the details at the Plan Commission meeting and they're set forth in the staff memorandum. Both property owners do agree with this adjustment. The Plan Commission and the staff recommends approval of the lot line adjustment subject to the recording of the proper transfer documents at the Register of Deeds office and providing a copy of the documents back to the Village. Again, the intent is to try to make both properties less nonconforming and to adjust already existing improvements and put them onto the property that's using them.

**LAUER MOVED TO GRANT THE REQUEST OF RICHARD STILES FOR A LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT BETWEEN THE PROPERTIES LOCATED AT 2905 116<sup>TH</sup> STREET (OWNED BY RICHARD STILES) AND 2819 116<sup>TH</sup> STREET (OWNED BY DIANE VALDEZ); SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

- D. Consider a Municipal Code Text Amendment (Ord. #05-51) to amend the Village Municipal Code to create a Chapter related to the requirement of digital security imaging and storage devices (video surveillance) in certain Planned Unit Developments, certain Planned Developments, certain other retail developments and certain stand alone retail establishments in the Village. (Second Reading)**

Jean Werbie:

Mr. President and members of the Board, Ordinance #05-51 is an ordinance to create the requirement of a digital security imaging and storage devices in future certain planned unit developments, planned developments, as well as other retail establishments in the Village of Pleasant Prairie. The digital security imaging system, known as the DSIS, would monitor the exterior spaces in areas of certain new commercial retail establishments within the Village of Pleasant Prairie. The DSIS would afford the opportunity for public safety departments, such as the police, and Village fire and rescue departments, to visually examine certain retail establishments and retail development sites and will provide emergency response personnel with a visual assessment of an emergency situation in advance of arrival without placing an undue burden for services on the taxpayers.

The implementation and usage of this system will facilitate law enforcement agencies in crime investigation. While it's anticipated that the implementation and usage will greatly aid law enforcement agencies in subsequent criminal investigations and prosecutions, it has to be noted that it's recognized that the DSIS alone cannot provide for or be solely relied upon for producing positive personal action or scene identification.

The ordinance goes into specifics with respect to what size of retail developments would require the DSIS systems to be installed. Specifically retail establishments containing more than 125,000 square feet of total gross floor area would be impacted, including future expansions of phases and stand alone retail stores containing more than 50,000 square feet of gross retail floor area space.

The digital security imaging storage devices related equipment and easements required provisions are in the ordinance. It specifically sets forth that easements would be granted to the Village of

Pleasant Prairie to get to that particular system. There are hardware standards that are set forth in the ordinance, and there's some implementation and planned submittal strategies and requirements also set forth in the ordinance.

The Village Community Development Department, based on recommendations from administration and public safety, would make recommendations on a case by case basis to make any necessary modifications that would be unique on a case by case basis for individual projects. Any appeals to the ordinance would follow the procedures as set forth in the Village's Zoning Ordinance entitled Administrative Appeals.

This is the second reading of this particular ordinance. As you know, Prime Retail was the retail establishment that prompted the Village to be concerned and to put together such an ordinance. They have already entered into a separate agreement with the Village of Pleasant Prairie and have identified and have donated monies for a DSIS system, and we have worked through all of those issues. In fact, after the Plan Commission meeting and before the Board meeting tonight, we had finalized the agreement with them and executed the document. So they will not come under the jurisdiction of this particular ordinance. But any and all future projects would be required to follow this ordinance.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

You say they are not covered by this right now, Prime Outlets?

Jean Werbie:

No. The Village entered—

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

But in the future they will?

Jean Werbie:

No. Well, at this point they have entered into a separate agreement with the Village that addresses their phases I through V as well as phase VI of the development. So they're proposed future expansions as presented previously to the Plan Commission and the Board, which include phases I through VI and the two outlots that all was covered under the agreement that was executed this afternoon. If they expand beyond that, phase VII or VIII, then they would fall under this ordinance or whether or not we would negotiate any further agreements based on that previous agreement that would be up to the Board.

Village Board Meeting  
November 7, 2005

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

So they're going to be covered as to what they have planned up to today. Any future new addition is going to be covered by this?

Jean Werbie:

Beyond phase VI.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Okay. I'll make a motion to adopt Ordinance 05-51.

Mike Serpe:

I'll second that. And what this does to help law enforcement is just truly amazing. It will be good.

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion by Steve and second by Mike. Further discussion on this item?

Alex Tiahnybok:

Just a quick question. Frame of reference. A 50,000 square foot stand alone, a Lowe's, a Menard's, Home Depot, what's the typical square footage of a stand alone like that?

Jean Werbie:

A Home Depot can be up to between 100,000 and 150,000 or more. I would think a stand alone might be like a Best Buy size.

Mike Pollocoff:

Grocery store.

Jean Werbie:

A large grocery store.

Alex Tiahnybok:

That's the 50,000 range?

Village Board Meeting  
November 7, 2005

Jean Werbie:

Yes.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Got it.

Jean Werbie:

A large grocery store.

Jeff Lauer:

I guess just to make it short, I'll reiterate my point from last week. First of all, do we have any data on hand that there's higher crime activities at any locations? Or, is this just more or less of if you do something?

Mike Pollocoff:

Prime Outlets we've had--everything that makes Prime Outlets a success as a retail business makes it a nightmare in the police business. It's easy on/easy off for choppers. It's easy on/easy off for vandals and thieves. We've had sexual assaults out there. We've had batteries. The thing about it and what's difficult at this site and what will be difficult at other commercial sites in the Village is the bulk of the new commercial that's going to fall under this is Highway 50, again easy on/easy off. And what this does for the Village is we don't start from scratch where the PD is going out and trying to find out who saw what and track down those people who might have been at the center at that point. We're able to look at a digital video and say here's what the guy looked like. We can zoom in and get a good picture of him. We can see what the car was. We can see what the license plate is. It gives us a fighting chance to be able to apprehend somebody without expending tremendous investigate resources to do it.

As nice as the agreement with Prime is, they're getting something that nobody else is going to get in the sense they put some money into it but we're going to maintain it going forward. What this does for commercial developments going forward is we're putting that monkey on them. Nine times out of ten, maybe five out of ten, the businesses are going to want it anyway. It's something that they're going to have. What we want to be able to do is have access to it. What we're going to be able to do with our dispatch system is a squad going to a call is going to be able to call up on the screen on his monitor in the squad and see the cameras what they're looking at as they're going to the site. What an incredible assistance for an officer for officer safety to know what they're getting into before they get there. To me this is taking advantage of some technology that's come down in price and we're using it to enhance officer safety.

If we don't do this, all we're doing is we make a more personal intense activity because you've got to do more footwork in tracking down what happens. We're on the cutting edge of this. We really looked around for quite a while to find other communities who are doing this and they're not. I've got to be honest with you. But, again, being faced with impending commercial

development and a tight budget, it just seemed like the responsible thing to do. I don't know if Chief Wagner could probably give you a more detailed answer than that. But I really to me this has really taken police work and bringing it up so we're ahead of the curve instead of behind it.

Chief Wagner:

Chief Wagner, 8600 Green Bay Road. You know retail is our most service intensive use, and that's primarily due to our experience out at Prime Outlets. That's not to say anything that Prime Outlets is doing wrong. In fact, we have a very good relationship with them, but that's really the nature of the beast. Retail is just service intensive for law enforcement. It just is. And as we're kind of standing on the cusp of a lot of retail development in the near term, and if we recognize that one of the major problems with law enforcement is the cost of it as we go forward, this is really an attempt to I think try to mitigate to the extent that we can some of those costs as we move forward. Because it is costly.

If we find ourselves involved in an investigation that takes us, as they typically do when you're dealing with establishments along the Interstate, we find ourselves dealing with an investigation that takes us to Chicago or to the north side of Milwaukee or wherever that may be. That means I have to send people physically there and we have to go and work with Milwaukee PD or the Chicago PD or the suburbs and it's time consuming. It's a costly proposition to have to do that. So what this enables us to do is it kind of gives us, as Mike indicated, a leg up on the process and we're not starting from scratch. We actually have someplace tangible to start looking. We're not having to pull out the phone book and pick a name out and figure out who did what.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you, Chief. Questions for the Chief?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I have one question. Is that the Homeland Security is there any way they can be more involved with this?

Chief Wagner:

Homeland Security funds are becoming scarcer and scarcer. In fact, following 9/11 almost all the law enforcement money that was available grant wise was funneled into Homeland Security. The way that is structured is it's really structured so that money flows through County Emergency Government. So the County pretty much manages those funds. And the philosophy with respect to those funds has really become regional now. It's not a situation where each little community is going to get this or each little community is going to get that. They focus more on regional types of endeavors, things like, well, if there's a chemical spill or something along those lines there would be a regional team that would come out and deal with that. So a lot of the money goes to fund those kinds of things, the bomb unit. Again, a County wide approach as opposed to these various communities receiving funds for its own bomb unit, things of that nature. That's where the bulk of that money is going. Recently they used that money to buy a bomb robot which, as you can expect, a pretty costly proposition. So to answer to your question it's probably no, the

Village Board Meeting  
November 7, 2005

money isn't going to be available.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Just a thought, that's all. Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you, Chief. We had a motion and a second.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Jean, at the first reading you had indicated I think, if I heard this correctly, for a development of the 125,000 square foot range a cost of something like \$80,000 for a project like this to equip?

Jean Werbie:

Actually Prime Outlets has how many square feet out at Prime, Chief? I would say they have over 250,000 square feet, and we received a donation of \$80,000 to equip that site with cameras and the necessary wiring and such to outfit that particular center.

Alex Tiahnybok:

So going back to a 50,000 stand alone setup, a fifth of that then?

Jean Werbie:

You know what, I have not done the research. I'd have to ask our IT Director. But Prime has between 40 and 50 acres of land out there with parking that we're trying to identify. So I think that the focus of this really is outside of the buildings into the parking lots, the common open space areas, or behind the buildings and things like that, not inside the store. So a lot of it would depend on the size of the parking lot and if there's interconnections, or if the facility is broken up by multiple stores and exactly how it lays out.

Alex Tiahnybok:

My train of thought simply is if \$80,000 can do the job for all the different parking areas and passageways, etc., at Prime Outlets, then a stand alone is going to be significantly smaller. So if you're talking about a budget of \$20,000 or \$25,000 for a facility that probably costs, and I don't know how much a Best Buy costs, but it's got to be a couple of million I would think to build out a place like that, it's a drop in the bucket.

Village Board Meeting  
November 7, 2005

Mike Pollocoff:

Plus Prime as retrofitting. A new facility wouldn't have that.  
Alex Tiahnybok:

It sounds like Prime Outlets has been satisfied, and this is something that moves forward for new developments. I don't see anything wrong with it.

John Steinbrink:

We set those specifications for the equipment, correct?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right.

Jean Werbie:

In the ordinance.

John Steinbrink:

And they'll have a list of vendors they can choose from or they can shop for the best price?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes, they go shopping. They just need to meet the standards.

John Steinbrink:

So what they pay will actually depend on how good of a businessmen they are.

Jeff Lauer:

Just a question. Obviously we don't know what the costs will be on a business. Does the Village tell the business where the cameras go? Do we send somebody out there and say put one here and put one there?

Mike Pollocoff:

We're going to review it to make sure it makes sense. We're going to tell them where we need to have the DVR. We'll work with them. If this is all going into a DVR which is like a server, then it's going to need to be connected through the fiber optic cable so it gets back into dispatch. I think that's going to be really where we're going to be getting directly involved in what they're

doing. We don't want to require this and then have them put it up in a way that's not going to deliver what they need. That's some of the stuff that the PD does with their evaluation of business sites as they evaluate those proposals. So that review will be between PD and IT.

Jeff Lauer:

Thanks. Again, just to summarize my position I don't like to be able to tell business that they have to do this. Oh, by the way we have to approve it; oh, by the way we get this room and that room. I understand we can use security for a lot of things. We can use it for the roads that will be done because that's a security issue. But I think unless we know the actual cost, the average cost, it's a dangerous thing to tell a business. Just because you might be a multimillionaire it doesn't mean it's a drop in the bucket for them. It's still their money. And we should force somebody to pay for something. I just have a problem with it. It's a philosophical thing.

Mike Serpe:

Jeff, I can appreciate that, but when a business lands in a community it's usually after they've done the analysis to see if they can come in here and make money. So they're looking at Pleasant Prairie as a very vibrant community, a very well off, very upscale and growing, and they're going to capitalize on that because they're investors. That's all well and good, and I don't have a problem with somebody investing their money and making a profit on it. But I also have to, at least I think all of us have to consider the safety of the people that are going to be frequenting these places. Are they going to be able to go there and feel safe and be safe, and if something does happen are we going to be able to assist them in capturing or at least apprehending the person that caused them harm or did something wrong. That's what it's all about.

As I said last week, if a company comes into Pleasant Prairie and meets with community development and community development meets with them and lays out all the plans and all the costs associated with them building and they accept it, hey, we're in good shape. If they don't, then they go to another community that doesn't require as many standards to do business. But I think this only makes your community better by being safer, by being on the cutting edge of new technology. And it certainly assist law enforcement in doing their job, and believe me you're talking to a guy that has a lot of gray hair on his head probably because of all the stone walls I ran into trying to track down somebody responsible for doing something to somebody else. So I understand where you're coming from, but I think you have to look at the broader picture to see the benefits of all of this.

John Steinbrink:

And hopefully when that business goes to another community that's not in Kenosha County, someplace where they don't do good planning and we end up subsidizing their poor planning.

Village Board Meeting  
November 7, 2005

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

One last comment, John. I believe that once we install this ordinance there's going to be a lot of communities around the County and around the State who are going to adopt this same type of ordinance . . . . They'll look at Pleasant Prairie.

Mike Serpe:

Call the question.

John Steinbrink:

We had a motion and we had a second. Any further discussion?

Jeff Lauer:

Just one thing. I thought I gave you the gray hair sitting next to you, Mike.

**KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO ADOPT (ORD. #05-51) TO AMEND THE VILLAGE MUNICIPAL CODE TO CREATE A CHAPTER RELATED TO THE REQUIREMENT OF DIGITAL SECURITY IMAGING AND STORAGE DEVICES (VIDEO SURVEILLANCE) IN CERTAIN PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENTS, CERTAIN PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS, CERTAIN OTHER RETAIL DEVELOPMENTS AND CERTAIN STAND ALONE RETAIL ESTABLISHMENTS IN THE VILLAGE.; SECONDED BY SERPE; MOTION CARRIED 4-1 WITH LAUER DISSENTING.**

John Steinbrink:

Let the record show Trustee Serpe, Steinbrink, Kumorkiewicz and Tiahnybok in favor. Trustee Lauer in the negative.

**E. Consider Resolution No. 05-64 - Resolution Relating to the Approval of the FY 2006 Solid Waste Division Budget**

Kathy Goessl:

Mr. President, I will be presenting the proposed budget for the garbage and recycling fund. Just to review, this was presented a couple week ago by John Steinbrink, Jr. The solid waste fund collects garbage weekly. they also collect recycling bi-weekly, and they do leaf collection in both the spring and the fall. They also operate a compost drop off site and maintenance of an actual composting site.

I'll first of all go over the expenditures and review the expenditures of this fund. There's four major operational categories of this fund, and this slide shows the 2005 budget and the proposed 2006 budget for this fund. We're looking at operations of garbage collection, increasing \$65,000.

That includes mainly fuel and tipping type charges that are increasing. Recycling collection going up. This is our first year in operations, 2005, for garbage and recycling collection, and the first year we worked through and the budget last year was put together before we actually went into operation. So some of these adjustments are due to us being in operation and knowing more than we did a year ago when we put together the 2005 budget. So we have recycling going up. There's a fuel charge in that category also and we re-evaluated the operational salaries in there.

The compost site, we've been operating the compost site for a number of years. We have a slight increase there due to salary adjustments. Leaf collection, I think we're in the third year of leaf collection, and it's just adjusting also mainly salaries in that category. So the total is going up \$92,000 or a 15 percent increase. This is the same budget that was proposed by John a couple weeks ago.

Another category of expenditures is administration. In this category are wages and benefits and office expense. These wages and benefits are finance, administration type allocations to this fund as well as administration type expenses, the clerical staff that work out of the Roger Prange and answer questions when people call in concerning garbage questions and recycling questions at that location. They're also there to hand out recycling bins and work with residents who stop in that area.

Other categories of expenditures here is depreciation. This is depreciation on our garbage trucks and recycling trucks as well as some of the compost site equipment and also the shed that was built to store the garbage trucks and recycling trucks. That's pretty much staying the same. We have the same equipment that we had budgeted for last year in depreciation. And we have interest and debt expense. We borrowed over a million dollars in this fund to purchase the initial garbage trucks, recycling trucks, recycling bins and also to build the building to house the trucks. So this is our debt expense. This is actually a variable rate debt. The debt's interest rate is currently going up on money that we invest as well as money on this variable rate debt that we pay.

So this summarizes all the expenditures into one area. We have operations, administration and other for a total proposed budget of \$988,000, almost \$989,000, a little over 11 percent increase. We are recommending a program reduction to reduce full-time staff at the compost side for a savings of a little over \$7,000.

The program reductions that were brought forward by the solid waste fund by John, Jr. was eliminated the spring leaf collection and reducing the fall leaf collection by one-third. We're not recommending those two reductions that were brought forward, but we did recommend the reduction in full-time compost site drop off overtime. Right now the compost site is open three days a week, Monday, Thursday and Saturday, and all those times there's a full-time staff as well as a part-time staff person assisting people that come to drop off their compost. This reduction would eliminate the full-time staff on Monday and Thursday, and just have a full-time staff on Saturday. So on Monday and Thursday the site will only be staffed by part-time staff, and then

on Saturday we'll have the same staffing as we currently have at that location. So by reducing that overtime for the full-time staff on Monday and Thursday we would have a savings of a little over \$7,000.

I'll next switch to the revenue category for the solid waste fund. The major of this fund is user fees, monthly charges to the residents of the Village for the solid waste collection, as well as recycling and also the opportunity for the compost site and leaf collection. There's a small percentage, 5 percent, almost \$60,000 that we receive from the State as a recycling grant. That grant has been around \$60,000 for a number of years. They have frozen that cap there for us.

These are the revenues that we get. The user fees, the top line, is a monthly collection that we currently have budgeted as \$941,000. Our proposed budget is \$864,800. This is without a recommended rate increase at this point. The reason it went down is we overestimated a little bit, but the majority of the decrease is due to Hidden Oaks being removed from our monthly revenue charges starting in November of this year.

Container rental, because this utility with solid waste and recycling was new, we didn't budget anything for these next four categories for last year, but we were able to generate some revenue sources in these areas. Container rental is for renting garbage containers to different apartment complexes, renting them to the RecPlex and those types of entities. Bulk pickup that the pickup of larger items that need a special request. Those are things over 50 pounds that they call in and ask for that and they come out and we bill them for that additional pickup.

Recycling containers a couple months ago we passed an ordinance charging for people to get recycling containers and this is the revenue we're projecting for next year for those recycling containers. There's a small other category that we're looking at. So a total revenue proposed of almost \$900,000. That's without the rate increase. That's actually a reduction of what we were looking at last year.

We have some interest income. Mainly last year was due to the borrowed funds we had. This year as we start gaining a little bit of fund balance in this account we're looking at interest income here. Also, this interest income is due to penalty on peoples' accounts if they don't pay on time. There's a one and one-half percent penalty per month for not paying. Also a ten percent penalty for rolling onto the tax roll so both of those are included in our interest income. Recycling grant as I mentioned before is from the State, and last year we budgeted \$60,000. We reduced it slightly because our grant is around a \$59,000. As part of this budget we're proposing a \$2 rate increase, and that rate increase would come to about \$156,000 based on our projection. So the proposed budget we're looking at for revenue is a \$1,131,514.

This summarizes our revenue and expenses in just two line items. Our revenue as the previous slide showed, but we also added a middle column showing what our estimation will be for this year. We did budget a little over a million dollars but we're estimating only to come in around \$934,000 for the year, and we're proposing \$1.1 million for next year. Expenses, we budgeted

\$894,000 and that was before we started operations. That was in our planning stages of doing garbage collection and recycling collection due to the startup costs that John, Jr. mentioned in his presentation, and we were actually coming in around \$1,045,000 for this year. Our proposed is \$981,000.

So we budgeted to gain some money of \$117,000 last year. That money was going to be put aside to start a replacement fund for our garbage truck. But we did not accomplish that. We actually lost money due to startup costs and other issues that we had. We're proposing, though, with a rate increase to start accumulating money to replace garbage trucks and recycling trucks in the future.

These are some of the reasons why we're proposing a new rate increase. The majority of the employees that started last year were brand new employees so they were at the bottom of our step scale for salaries. That means they were 80 percent of the top level of the range, so all of these employees will be getting a five percent step in December. Also there's increased tipping fees annually of three to five percent. Our fuel costs, like all fuel costs, is doubling from last year. We also have the startup cost of about \$150,000. Also, the fund currently has a negative fund balance due to the startup costs and some issues that we had.

This slide shows our negative cash balance. Currently I'm estimating the year operating wise to be a negative \$90,000. We're estimating to recover in 2006 if we stay at \$11 of \$45,000. Estimating without a rate increase to end the year with still a negative \$45,000 in cash. At \$11 per month we would not be able to gather any month to replace our vehicles in the future, therefore requiring if we don't do a rate increase to borrow in the future to replace our garbage and recycling trucks.

Historically our rates have been pretty consistent. We had Onyx for the last six years I believe, and in 2001 and two years prior to that our rate was at \$8.20. And then they gave us a rate increase in 2002 to \$10.98. That \$10.98 also includes 80 cents for us for a compost site operation. So when we took over in 2005 we raised it only 2 cents to \$11.00, and we're proposing to increase it \$2.00 this year to accumulate cash for future replacement up to \$13. If Onyx would have continued with us they were looking at rates between \$17 and \$18 to continue to provide the services that we are currently providing our residents with our own service. So this is our recommended rate increase.

So the \$11.00 will cover our current 2006 expenditures. It also will decrease the negative cash by \$45,000 for operating. The \$2.00 rate increase will be used for future capital purchases. So we're recommending a \$13.00 rate for residentials and a \$12.50 for condos, mobile homes and apartments. Currently the condos, mobile homes and apartments are at \$10.50, so each are looking at a \$2 rate increase for both.

Capital I'd like to cover next. . . . that was asked for, it was a wireless system on the garbage trucks. This system will allow them to increase their route efficiency. We thought that would be a good capital purchase to be able to save costs in the future.

Village Board Meeting  
November 7, 2005

This is a seven year capital plan that was presented a couple of weeks ago with John, Jr.'s budget. Currently we did borrow over \$1 million a year ago. We spent about \$50,000 more than what we borrowed at that point because of a need for additional recycling containers. So we started out with a negative \$50,000. With the additional \$2 we'll gather about \$156,000 a year. So I have that \$156,000 being added in each year. We're recommending the wireless on the vehicles for \$4,000, so at the end of 2006 in the capital area we're looking at a little over \$100,000 to bring forward.

This shows over the years in 2008 we're looking at replacing the used vehicle. We bought a used garbage truck. This is replace that and also adding a leaf collector to our inventory. In 2009 we're looking at replacing the leaf vacs we currently own, the two we own right now. And then in 2011 replacing the four vehicles we have currently operating our garbage and recycling collections. And then in 2013 by that time we figured we'd need one additional brand new vehicle, garbage or recycle truck, and that would be in 2013. So with this \$2 fee being accumulated over the years we'll be able to pay cash for this equipment as they become needed instead of borrowing for this in the future.

We're looking for the approval of the 2006 operating budget with a reduction in the full-time employee's overtime at the compost site on Mondays and Thursdays. And we're also requesting a \$2 per month rate increase. And for capital we're looking for approval for the wireless system on the garbage trucks for 2006 and the seven year capital plan being approved as presented. That's all I have. If there's any questions of myself, Mike or John, Jr. is here.

Jeff Lauer:

I have a question and I don't know if it's for Kathy or Mike. From what I heard in the presentation the \$2 increase is basically for future purchases of capital, correct?

Kathy Goessl:

That's true, yes.

Mike Pollocoff:

You can eliminate that rate increase if you wanted to commit to borrow for the trucks again in 2009.

Jeff Lauer:

But this involves the other categories you mentioned at the beginning, the leaf pickup and equipment? Or, is this strictly for the garbage truck, the \$2?

Kathy Goessl:

The \$2, as the seven year plan showed, there's some stuff to do with the compost site. There's adding of a leaf collector or the replacement of the two leaf collectors we currently have is leaf collection related. In the seven year plan there's nothing to do with the compost site. They have

Village Board Meeting  
November 7, 2005

some stuff at the compost site areas, but there's no replacement of that equipment. It's mainly due to the garbage and recycling trucks. Those are major assets for this utility or this fund.

Jeff Lauer:

Thank you for that, because when I got it and read it I saw it was a 18 percent increase and I had to figure out why, if our costs have gone up in a year, but it's long term you're looking at.

Kathy Goessl:

It's long term, yes. It costs more to borrow. Right now we're paying for the borrowed funds right now, you see that \$50,000 and some that I had in my operating for the interest on that, and we're paying around \$100,000 a year for principal payment for this utility.

Jeff Lauer:

Okay, I appreciate that. I had reservations on it, but the way it's presented it will obviously save for the future. Thanks. Based on the presentation of Kathy's for future savings I'll make a motion to adopt this.

Mike Serpe:

I'll second this.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Jeff and second by Mike. Further discussion?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Just a comment, John. In 1994 I believe it was I used to pay \$13 a month for garbage collection with a private collector without having my leaves picked up. That was without the compost site and everything. That was 11 years ago. I'm going to pay today what I paid then so there's no question. Thank you.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I believe any time that we can demonstrate even at \$13 that the Village can provide the service at a price lower than a private contractor, Onyx was suppose to be \$18 this year had we been with them in '06?

Mike Pollocoff:

They were the low bid. There were some that were higher.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Village Board Meeting  
November 7, 2005

We're \$5 down now. If we can continue to demonstrate that I think the Village citizens will be happy. My concern is it's about a 25 percent error last year or for 2005 in terms of where we thought we'd end up and where we are ending up. We expected \$117,000 to the positive and we're going to be about the same amount to the negative, so we're about a 25 percent error.

Kathy Goessl:

It's mainly due to the startup costs and the fuel.

Alex Tiahnybok:

It looks like those factors won't be there next year so cross your fingers.

John Steinbrink:

That's probably the most popular program we've implemented as far as the public, especially the leaf. You've got to remember there were startup costs. When somebody refused to pick up our garbage and it sat in the street our guys went out there and did it with end loaders and dump trucks and got the job. I don't think you got that from anybody at Onyx. If you take just the level of complaints which have basically disappeared, that alone is worth the \$2 extra. Motion and a second. Any other discussion? Those in favor?

**LAUER MOVED TO ADOPT Resolution No. 05-64 - Resolution Relating to the Approval of the FY 2006 Solid Waste Division Budget; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**F. Consider Ordinance No. 05-52 - Ordinance to Amend Chapter 292 of the Municipal Code Relating to Solid Waste and Recycling Collection Fees.**

**SERPE MOVED TO ADOPT ORDINANCE NO. 05-52 - ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 292 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE RELATING TO SOLID WASTE AND RECYCLING COLLECTION FEES; SECONDED BY TIAHNYBOK; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**G. Consider Resolution No. 05-63 - Resolution Relating to Amendment of the 2005 Budget.**

Kathy Goessl:

Mr. President, most budget amendments are between expenditures within a person's own budget. So if someone is overspending in one area of their expense budget they'll submit a budget amendment to myself, I'll review it, and then forward it to Mike Pollocoff for review. Within their own budget if they find out they're overspending in one area of their expenses, like for example maybe their electric was higher than what was expected, they had to find in their budget a line item that they'll not spend what they had budgeted for, just balancing their own budget so they stay in line there. But what has to come to the Board is any changes between if somebody has to go to a different department and get their money or if they have to increase their revenues

or expenses in a different way. So I have a couple budget amendments which are not within a person's own operating expenditures but they go outside that area.

The first one is with the police department. They received a DOT grant for the purchase of four moving radar units. That was not anticipated when we did the budget a year ago. So we did receive revenue from the State for \$6,530. So this budget amendment would increase the revenue that we were expecting, so increased revenue of \$6,530, but then in the police department expenditures we need to also increase minor equipment expense to cover the cost of the radar units themselves. So we're making two budget amendments to offset each other, so in total we're not affecting the general fund budget increasing or taking any surpluses. We're just moving the money from when we actually received the money, the grant was received in revenue, and then minor equipment was purchased in police expenditures.

The next area was in the engineering department. We actually changed the way we account for engineering that the engineers in our department do for internal projects. In the past, in 2004 and the way we budgeted for 2005, was that if Bob or Dave worked on an internal project like a water project, or the project we talked about with the special assessment hearing, if that project would have gone forward and Dave and Bob worked on that, their salary and benefits would be directly posted to that project. But starting in 2005 when an engineer works on a project, instead of charging it to that project directly and when they get paid during the payroll cycle, we charge it to the engineering budget, and then there's a charge out rate for Bob and for Dave. Right now Bob is at \$100 an hour and Dave is at \$75 an hour. Those rates include overheads for the department as well as their salary and benefit levels. The project then gets billed out for the \$100 and \$75 instead of just the salary and benefits for Bob and Dave.

So we didn't need to change the budget. Right now the wages and benefits within the engineering department were budgeted at the lower level because the wages and benefits of the project were going to be billed to the projects. But now they're being billed to engineering wages and benefits, therefore that's up so we need to increase the budget for that. But then we're billing that out which in the past was not included in the revenue area, so to offset the increase in wages and benefits in engineering, we up the revenue. So this is offset revenue/expense just similar to the police for \$81,000. So it's about \$81,000 worth of project work by our engineering department on our own internal projects.

The last budget amendment is between, again, revenue and expenditures. We had an increase in commercial electrical inspections. Therefore, we need to do a budget amendment for \$9,500 to increase our revenue in commercial electrical permits, which currently is up and over the budget, but then also our contractual services expenses are also up and over the budget for paying the contractual inspector that we have hired. So we're looking at a budget amendment for \$9,500.

None of these budget amendments use fund balance. It's just moving between revenues and expenditures for all three of these departments. So I'd like to have approval to have these budget amendments made to these revenue and expense accounts for these three departments.

**IAHNYBOK MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 05-63 - RESOLUTION  
RELATING TO ANDMENT OF THE 2005 BUDGET; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ;**

**MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**H. Consider Rejecting Bids Received for Water Main Materials for the East Frontage Road and West Frontage Road Projects.**

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, on October 25<sup>th</sup> at 2 p.m. sealed bids were opened in response to a request for bids for a 12 inch water main with appurtenances on the East Frontage Road in the TIF District. One bid was received in the amount of \$38,431, and I believe this bid was 58 percent over our budget, what we had budgeted for pipe. So the Superintendent of Utilities, Ron Kammerzelt, and myself are recommending we reject this bid and we bid it out at a later date. We'll still be securing a smaller amount of pipe to do what we have to do, but it's our feeling it might be more advantageous to wait out the market a little bit and see if we can wait for prices to go down rather than pay 58 percent.

**SERPE MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE UTILITY SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATION TO REJECT THE ONE BID RECEIVED FOR THE WATER MAIN MATERIALS FOR THE EAST AND WEST FRONTAGE ROAD PROJECTS; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**I. Consider Award of Contract for Engineering Consultant Services for the Stanich 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue CSM Development.**

Bob Martin:

Mr. President and Board members, before you tonight is a professional services agreement with Clark Dietz which is a local engineering firm to do staking and inspection to do the as built drawings for the Stanich CSM which is located north of 116<sup>th</sup> on 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue. It's a very small project, three lots. Typically or recently I should say on smaller projects we've worked together with the engineering firm, different ones, to do the staking and we'll take over the inspection. If that doesn't work out, the contract amount is we have an agreement with that and it's an hourly agreement, so it's only on a per hour basis, whatever they spend out there even though it's estimated at \$11,500 I believe. But that would be the total amount and that's within a reasonable range.

Typically most of the firms' hourly rates are pretty close so it's really the amount of time you spend. This particular firm has one or two advantages. One, they're real close so their mobilization time is a lot less than typically and they have a one man survey crew. So they do provide some advantages on the jobs. We have worked with them in the past and they have performed well.

Village Board Meeting  
November 7, 2005

The CSM and final documents are scheduled to go on the Planning Commission agenda on the 14<sup>th</sup> of this month, and this is one of those documents that go into those approvals. Then the Board would get the entire package back on the 21<sup>st</sup> of this month.

Jeff Lauer:

Based on your recommendation and the answer to my question that they've worked with them before and they're good, I would move to approve this.

Mike Serpe:

Second.

**LAUER MOVED TO AWARD A CONTRACT TO CLARK DIETZ for Engineering Consultant Services for the Stanich 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue CSM Development; SECONDED BY SERPE; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**J. Consent Agenda**

- 1) Approve Bartender License Applications on File.
- 2) Approve Christmas License for Ace Hardware.
- 3) Approve Letter of Credit Reduction for Tobin Creek North.
- 4) Approve Letter of Credit Reduction for Tobin Creek Addition No. 1.
- 5) Approve Letter of Credit Reduction for Springbrook Meadows.
- 6) Approve Letter of Credit for Arbor Ridge.

**KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS 1-6 AS PRESENTED; SECONDED BY SERPE; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

**LAUER MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING; SECONDED BY TIAHNYBOK; MOTION CARRIED 5-0 AND MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10:00 P.M.**