

**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  
October 19, 2005  
7:30 p.m.**

A Special Meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Village Board was held on Wednesday, October 19, 2005. Meeting called to order at 7:30 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; and Kathy Goessl, Finance Director/Treasurer.

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

**2. ROLL CALL**

**3. NEW BUSINESS**

- A. Discuss policy alternative to address the change by the Kenosha County Sheriff's Department on how emergency calls on the Kenosha County Bike Path are dispatched in the Village.**

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, in bringing this item to you this is a recent development where the Kenosha County Sheriff has altered through Joint Dispatch how emergency calls are dispatched along the Kenosha County Bike Path. It creates several issues. It's, again, another unilateral decision made by the Sheriff that we're responding to after the fact.

Brian has had discussions or correspondence with the representatives of the Sheriff's Department. I'd like him to discuss those, and then following that take a look at some alternatives and some things that we can do to address this issue.

Chief Wagner:

Mr. President, gentlemen, good evening. I need to inform you tonight of a procedural change concerning which law enforcement agency will be handling calls and incidents on the Kenosha County Bike Trail within the Village of Pleasant Prairie. And I also want to inform you with respect to how the Sheriff has directed Joint Services Dispatch to dispatch incidents occurring on the bike trail. I was informed yesterday by the Director of Joint Services that the Sheriff has directed that any calls for service on the bike trail be dispatched to Sheriff's cars including 9-1-1 calls. They do indicate that in the case of 9-1-1 calls the closest unit would be sent on a mutual aid basis if it was not a KSD unit. However, they requested if sent we hold the scene and turn the call and any resulting investigation over to the deputies upon their arrival.

October 19, 2005  
Village Board Minutes

In my request for clarification sent yesterday to Chief Deputy Charles Smith, I pointed out that we've always handled calls for service on the bike trail, that I did not understand the need to change that at this time, and I further indicated to the Chief Deputy that I would question and I do question whether or not such a change is in the best interest of the community in providing good law enforcement services. The Chief Deputy reasoned that since the bike trail is a County park, only the Sheriff has police authority or could make arrests there, and therefore must be called to handle any incident there. He apparently relies on a County Corporation Counsel opinion that I have not seen in order to draw that conclusion.

Just as some background, for the past 25 years at least the Pleasant Prairie Police Department has operated under the belief that we have concurrent jurisdiction on the bike trail. We have as a matter of routine handled virtually every incident that has occurred there over the past 16 years. And in view of an ongoing criminal investigation resulting from an incident that occurred on the bike trail recently, I actually called the District Attorney's office and sought an opinion from him on the question of police authority on the bike trail. I spoke with Acting District Attorney Susan Karaskiewicz, and according to her the Pleasant Prairie does have, as we previously understood, concurrent authority on the Kenosha County Bike Trail, and that authority is concurrent with the Sheriff's Department.

That being said, I did inform the Chief Deputy that because this is County land and in the spirit of cooperation that we would acquiesce to their wishes and we would turn over any calls along the bike trail to the Sheriff's Department. I do, however, continue to have doubts regarding whether or not this best serves the law enforcement needs of the community. There are potential operational issues with two agencies trying to provide law enforcement services to one community, and there is also the awkwardness of standing around with victims and witnesses waiting for another police agency to arrive in order to handle the incident. And there are also going to be inevitable questions regarding who will handle what when an incident spills over onto the bike trail from adjacent residents or vice versa. All of this doing nothing but serving to further complicate and confuse a situation that I believe is already complicated enough.

That's the change that we anticipate happening, and I intend to direct my staff to follow that change. With that I'd be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

Mike Serpe:

Brian, I have a few questions for you. The first one is do you know if the Sheriff sent the same memo to Chief Dan Wade of Kenosha Police Department with reference to the bike trail on the north side of Kenosha City?

Chief Wagner:

I know that there were a number of e-mails that were exchange yesterday, and I don't believe that--I guess the short answer to that question is no. I don't know if they have directed Joint Services to dispatch Sheriff cars to the bike trail in the City of Kenosha or not.

Mike Serpe:

With reference to enforcement action on the County parks, the Chief Deputy is right on the money. A Pleasant Prairie police officer cannot enforce a County ordinance violation on a County park. That has to be done by a deputy. So we understand that. But we're not talking about ordinance violations in County parks. We're talking about criminal activity and ordinance violations that affect the Pleasant Prairie residents that happen in the jurisdiction of Pleasant Prairie. The last thing I want to see, and Brian I'm not disagreeing with your telling the Sheriff's Department if they wish to handle the complaints on their part that's fine, I don't disagree with that and I don't have a problem, but the last thing I want to see is the word to get to any police officer in the Village of Pleasant Prairie that they are not to handle calls on the bike trail and for them to not take action when action may be needed to be taken. They have every right in the world to take action when necessary and I would expect that to continue. That cannot change. Again, the worst thing that anybody can do is play political games with peoples' lives. That's dangerous and inexcusable.

Mike, you said you were looking for some suggestions. A couple come to mind. This is the second 9-1-1--if I was a dispatcher in the 9-1-1 center I wouldn't know whether I was coming or going. I question if Joint Services was even involved in this decision, and I don't know that they were or not. If things like this are going to continue, and we don't know when the next one is going to hit us, maybe we should do a little study on what it would take to bring 9-1-1 services right to the dispatch center in Pleasant Prairie. I don't know what that cost would entail. But if things like this are going to--if we are relying on the Pleasant Prairie Police Department to provide services to the public that involve public safety and welfare, then I want to make sure that's being done at its highest level. And with stuff like this going on I don't know that that's happening. We've got cops out there serving our people and every day things change. Not by their involvement but by others. Enough is enough. The political games have to stop when it comes to public safety.

Mike Pollocoff:

I might add Trustee Serpe I agree with you and that's one reason we're bringing this to you tonight. The Kenosha County Sheriff is making these changes and the changes happen without consultation. The Village depends on, just like the City of Kenosha depends on, having coordinated, planned law enforcement activities taking place. As you said this is the second time the Sheriff has made a unilateral decision to change a process. In this case something that's been more than 25 years that Pleasant Prairie has patrolled, arrested, convicted people who have broken the law on that trail and that hasn't been a problem. The only thing I haven't heard is this is a way to address tax equity. That was the next thing I was waiting to hear.

The other thing that Brian brought out and it ties into it is that things do happen on the bike path but then they spill over into the parks on either side. They spill over into the subdivisions on either side. They spill over into the vacant land on either side, or things happen there and they spill over onto the bike path. It's a 40 strip of land that goes from the State Line to 89<sup>th</sup> Street that runs through the middle of the Village that we've taken care of. And now we're going to bring another agency in to deal with that.

October 19, 2005  
Village Board Minutes

One of the things we talked about when I evaluated the proposal for the Sheriff's Department was the response time. What the Chief Deputy is asking the Village to do is get to the bike path if it's an emergency call, detail or hold whatever is going on, and our response time is running about three minutes and their response time is running ten minutes on some things, and we're going to be sitting there hanging onto a situation for a longer period of time so that they can say that they're the agency that responds. In my time here these last three months have been the craziest thing I've ever seen when it comes to delivering public safety service.

I think one other alternative that may help, and we're doing these things and it doesn't make sense, but we're having to respond to somebody that's not making any sense, the other thing to do is to have the Village take over the Kenosha County Bike Path. That's something that Kenosha County Parks has asked us to do for a number of years. I'd always thought it would be nice if you guys took care of at least one park in the Village. But if they're going to use it to run a wedge through the Village then maybe the thing to do is take them up on their offer, we'll take over the bike path and operate and maintain the bike path since it's going to be used for things other than a bike path. It's dysfunctional and doesn't make any sense but that's one way to resolve the issue.

We'll look into moving 9-1-1 over to Village dispatch. One of the things that was an outgrowth of the Virchow Krause study was that there should be a centralized dispatch for the area. The numbers on that didn't quite work for the Village, but the way the institutional relationship is now where Joint Services is going to jump to any scheduled or unscheduled policy change by the Sheriff, it puts the Village in a position where we don't have a reliable source to know that when people call 9-1-1 and they get Pleasant Prairie we can't know that's always going to be dispatched out. That's one of the things we shouldn't have to be wondering about. That's something that the residents shouldn't have to be wondering about what Sheriff's Beth's plans are at any given time if he wants to change how operations work. We'll do that and we can have a report back to you for the next meeting to start that process. Right now we're in a situation where anybody can say we have a reliable 9-1-1 system. It's as reliable as the latest Sheriff's memo.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

A question for Mike. Mike, just one case I know. I think that Junior cleans the part going from the retention pond at the Interstate underneath the bike trail, right?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

So we maintain the bike trail, right, to relieve the storm water?

October 19, 2005  
Village Board Minutes

Mike Pollocoff:

No, those storm sewer crossings should be the Village's to maintain because it's conveying our water from one side of the bike path to the other.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Right, but we're doing that on the bike path?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right, and that's a problem. We maintain culverts underneath the State highway.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

So that should be ours.

Mike Pollocoff:

Kenosha County has been looking to unload it on us for a while and we can take it. The Park Commission is working on the master park plan and the bike trail is an integral part of the park plan. You wouldn't think you'd be moving that into the Village park system to ensure that you don't have police services. That's typically how it doesn't work, but that's one way to take care of that issue.

It's amazing to me that, and Chief Guilbert is here, that he's able to coordinate a mutual aid system with over 40 fire departments, you can have a major incident anywhere, and those departments will come and work and plan and have everything staged and it all happens. And the reason it happens is because there isn't an ego at the top of the food chain directing that. It's all going to be under their watch. The Village of Pleasant Prairie we work with Chief Wade in the City. We work with the City of Winthrop Harbor. We work with those other agencies, the State Patrol, but with the Kenosha County Sheriff, one, it's always a surprise. And, secondly, we need to pay homage to the Sheriff before we begin doing whatever we're going to do. I don't think that's constructive to deliver police services.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I think there's probably a little doubt where I stand politically, but I've stated it before and I'm going to state it again that public safety is no place for politics. And that's from the Sheriff's Department in this direction or from the Village in the direction of the Sheriff's Department. I think accusations could be made in both directions at this point. So I strongly feel it's time to stop and just be objective about things.

Regarding policy, and I don't know if this is something from the State level, or if these are truly things that are--it sounds like, Mike, based on your experience you have a fair amount of background on this, but are things like enforcement as you indicated in a County park, if it's in a municipality, if it's an ordinance of the Village, the Village has no jurisdiction in a County park

October 19, 2005  
Village Board Minutes

but a criminal matter yes? I've got to believe there's got to be protocol already established.

Mike Serpe:

Let's back up. Let's take the bike trail, for example. That's in the jurisdictional boundaries of the Village of Pleasant Prairie. So any police officer or any Sheriff's deputy, any Sheriff's deputy anywhere in Kenosha County has jurisdiction to do what he has to do, but with reference to Pleasant Prairie, anything in the jurisdictional boundaries of the Village can be handled by the Village Police Department. Now, if there's an ordinance violation being committed in a County park that's an ordinance created by the County and that ordinance is being violated, a Village of Pleasant Prairie police officer cannot write a citation on that ordinance violation that was created by Kenosha County. That would have to be done by a Kenosha County deputy or a park employee for that matter if he has that authority.

Alex Tiahnybok:

What about a Village ordinance? A Village ordinance could be?

Mike Serpe:

If a Village ordinance is being violated anywhere in the Village confines of the jurisdiction that can be enforced by a Village police officer.

Alex Tiahnybok:

But if it's criminal all these boundaries go away?

Mike Serpe:

For your information, Alex, if a Village ordinance is being violated in your presence then you have arrest power as well by your power as a Trustee. So if you want to carry my handcuffs and gun go for it.

Alex Tiahnybok:

There's been a lot of bad blood over the course of the last couple of months. I really want this to end and I think we need to do the right thing regardless of politics. There's a lot of room for politics in other things but not here.

Mike Serpe:

Just a little further background if I may. I don't want anybody to think that what Brian and what the Pleasant Prairie Police Department is experiencing is unique. The Sheriff's Department has been somewhat territorial in their patrol duties. Serving with the City for as long as I have we came to an agreement with the Sheriff's Department that they would handle calls at Kemper Center, Brookside, the Courthouse, the Safety Building, anything that the County owns they would handle those calls and that was fine. But I can tell you that they don't always have a

October 19, 2005  
Village Board Minutes

deputy to send when those calls come in because sometimes they have events going on at the west end of the County, and I can tell you I have investigated personally crime occurrence that have taken place at the Kemper Center at weddings or functions or whatever because the Sheriff's Department was maybe short handed or tied up so we took care of the calls.

So it's not something that's new with what the Sheriff wants to do. I can appreciate their stand and I'm not criticizing the Sheriff's Department. They are losing patrol areas. Little by little by little everybody is expanding, expanding, expanding and they feel they're being squeezed out. As an agency they have a pretty good reputation and that's not easy to take sometimes. So I can understand where they're coming from that they want to protect what they have left. Territorial maybe I can understand it. I'm just saying, though, you're not doing anybody any favors by saying we'll take these calls, and I don't want any one of our police officers to feel that when they witness something in a County park that's in the Village of Pleasant Prairie that they can't take action. They very well can take action and I would expect them to take action.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I agree with you absolutely.

John Steinbrink:

And the reason we're here is to address the issue of public safety. Unfortunately we've been here several times doing this. I think several things have been put before the Board here this evening. We're going to look at the 9-1-1 situation. We're going to address possibly the issue of the bike trail and who controls it. The County has asked us to take that over in the past?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes.

John Steinbrink:

As you said it's unfortunate the one parcel in the Village and we have to have disagreement over it. So be it. I think we're willing to look ahead and look at it and see if we can find resolution here. Indecision is very dangerous not only to the officers but to the citizens. We've got to make sure that doesn't happen. So you will report back to us next week?

Mike Pollocoff:

I'll have something back for you next week.

Mike Serpe:

Don't feel pressured to do this in a week or whatever. Take whatever time is necessary to do this, Mike. We're right in the middle of budgets. We're right in the middle of a lot of things. Do this, take your time, bring it back and let's do it. Don't work your 24 hours a day. Do it when you have time. If we don't get it in two weeks or next week we'll wait three or four weeks.

October 19, 2005  
Village Board Minutes

Jeff Lauer:

Just so I understand it, Chief, for example, because I live close to a bike trail. If I notice something going on if I call Pleasant Prairie Police Department from your understanding and what you've been informed does that mean Pleasant Prairie wouldn't be able to come and only the Sheriff, or is this calls pertaining that goes to the Joint Services?

Chief Wagner:

No, the way the directive is going to read is that we're going to respond to calls on the bike trail because I think it's in the best interest of the community that we do that. People call the police and they expect a rapid response and we certainly want to fill that expectation. However, we will also call the Sheriff's Department, and we upon arrival will hold the scene and wait for the Sheriff's Department to arrive so that they can deal with and handle the call. I'm basing that on, as Trustee Serpe mentioned, the precedent that's been set in the City of Kenosha with the Kemper Center and the Job Center and the other County properties in the City.

Essentially my intention is to handle the bike trail the same way that the City handles those properties. So, if you see something occur on the bike trail you can call the Pleasant Prairie Police Department. We will respond. There will be a quick and immediate response. What's going to change, though, is rather than handle that incident ourselves we're going to notify the Sheriff's Department to come out and to take over that incident.

John Steinbrink:

It's rather irresponsible to tie up two departments on a call like that. I think as Trustee Serpe has stated we should be able to work beyond that. If we can't work beyond that, we will make the changes necessary to make sure that doesn't happen. The time of these officers is too valuable. The citizens are not being served when we're playing these little games, and we're going to make sure that doesn't happen.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I have a typical example. In the wintertime you have snowmobiles riding on the bike path. If I walk across the bike trail I get run over. What are you going to do? Wait for the Sheriff to come out and take a look so they can call the ambulance? The first officer on site is going to have to make a decision if . . . from the Sheriff or from our police department.

Chief Wagner:

As I indicated in my statement I do have reservations, and we've heard a lot of this articulated here tonight with respect to this change. But, once again, I'm going to go ahead and follow their request and respect their wishes. I think it's important to understand that to a certain extent we as municipal police have a duty to cooperate with the Sheriff and we certainly want to do that. This is an effort to do that. So keeping in mind that we have those reservations, I view this as something that isn't going to directly affect public safety because it is my intent to respond to those calls. That being my first concern is maintaining public safety. If that priority goes out the



October 19, 2005  
Village Board Minutes

window then there's really no point in sticking around, is there? That's really what we're all about. So we're going to make certain that that is protected and then we'll acquiesce to the Sheriff's wishes and call them and let them come and deal with whatever there is.

John Steinbrink:

Mike, do you need a motion on this or a directive from the Board here? It probably should be in the form of a motion.

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes, we probably should have a motion.

Mike Serpe:

Since I brought it up I would move that we allow the Administrator and the Chief of Police to research the feasibility of bringing 9-1-1 services to the Village of Pleasant Prairie and to stay at the same level that's being provided by Joint Services presently.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second. Any further discussion?

Jeff Lauer:

I have a question and I don't know if anybody knows the answer. I'm not sure if it was at the Board or not, but I thought it was--can legally a municipality have their own 9-1-1 system? I was always under the impression that had to go to the County and the County farms it out.

Mike Pollocoff:

No, a municipality can have its own. There are a number of municipalities that have their own.

Mike Serpe:

And, Mike, if I could add, and I don't know if it's necessary to add to the motion, just in your research there's a fee charge for 9-1-1 services that's directed to Kenosha County. I would also look to see if that fee could be directed to the Village of Pleasant Prairie instead.

John Steinbrink:

To add it to every phone bill, correct?

October 19, 2005  
Village Board Minutes

Mike Serpe:

Yes.

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion?

Jeff Lauer:

Just one question, I'm sorry. Are we looking at actually changing it or just having Mike look into it?

Mike Serpe:

Just to look at it.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I think looking into things is always a good idea, and I look forward to getting the results.

**SERPE MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE ADMINISTRATOR AND THE CHIEF OF POLICE TO RESEARCH THE FEASIBILITY OF BRINGING 9-1-1 SERVICES TO THE VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE AND TO STAY AT THE SAME LEVEL THAT'S BEING PROVIDED BY JOINT SERVICES PRESENTLY AND IN THE RESEARCH IF THERE'S A FEE CHARGE FOR 9-1-1 SERVICES THAT'S DIRECTED TO KENOSHA COUNTY THAT FEE COULD BE DIRECTED TO THE VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE INSTEAD; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**B. Receive 2006 Budget Submission Reports from the Village Administrator.**

- 1) Assessing Department**
- 2) Community Development**
- 3) Inspection Department**
- 4) Finance Department**

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, tonight we're in round three of our budget reports. The first one tonight is from Rocco Vita, the Village Assessor and head of the Assessing Consortium. I might add before Rocco gets into it, one of the things when the Village received our municipal excellence award the review team was impressed with the level of intergovernmental cooperation that takes place as we do the property assessing for a number of communities. And that happens in a manner that the communities are happy with. We do it at a very good cost, and they thought it was real innovative. Rocco does a good job of balancing the activities of that consortium to the benefit of all the communities that are involved in it.

Rocco Vita:

Good evening. I'm going to present the budget for the Office of Assessment Administration for 2006, and part of this presentation is giving you somewhat of an overview of what the assessor's office does in a community. Ten years when the department was created in the Village there wasn't a lot of insight to what an assessor's office does. And in my conversations with not only the Village Board here but the Village and Town Boards of the communities we serve through those intergovernmental agreements it's pretty evident that a lot of what the assessor does on a day-to-day basis or the goals and objectives of an assessor is kind of fuzzy in the minds of the people that make decisions for those Towns and Villages.

First off, because there was such a lack of real concrete understanding of what the assessor has done, all my budgets contain our mission statement. "The mission of the Office of Assessment Administration is to discover, describe, and value all properties within each of the Assessment Consortium jurisdictions at a legally correct level of value, achieving as much equity and as little variation as is possible with the staff and resources available." This mission statement really is more than just words and letters on a page. This is our credo. This is what we strive to do. Everybody is pretty aware that when they make improvements to the property they get a visit from the assessor and we update our records and a new value is issued. But the portion of this mission statement that we feel is most important is achieving as much equity and as little variation as is possible.

One thing I'm happy about with my staff is in my department, myself and my appraisal staff, we have just about 60 years combined experience, the lion's share of that here in Kenosha County. And Walt, Ed and myself is actually 58 years. What those 20 years have taught us, 20 years of listening to people living in communities throughout Kenosha County, is that we as a department and even the Village Board has very little impact on what the actual tax bill is at the end of every year. As a department head, I have input into my specific budget for budgetary reasons, but as an office I can't control the amount of taxes people pay on a gross amount. And you as a Board have little control about that total tax bill.

As you'll find out, the Village's levy is less than 20 percent of that total tax bill so your control is very limited. If you decide to cut the levy in half, that total tax bill only changes 10 percent. Conversely, if you were to increase the Village levy by 50 percent, the Village tax bill really only changes 10 percent. There are entities outside our control, the School District which controls 50 percent of the tax bill, and the County almost 25 percent of the tax bill that we can't hold much sway over.

But what we have found out in listening to people and understanding their concerns about property taxes over the last 20 years is that our department and you as a Village Board have a great deal of power and authority to try to make the taxes we're burdened with as equitable as possible. From our perspective when people call with concerns about their assessment as we send them out in the mail we debrief them as much as we can. We take into consideration all the concerns they have about their property and their value and we address them as fairly as possible. What we try to do and what our mission is is to be as far as we can possibly be. We can't undervalue somebody because they have a poor financial situation, and we can't over value somebody because of disagreements in position. But what we have to be is as far as we possibly

can be.

Part of this department overview we'll go through a department description including the goals because our goals are related to our annual processes and field work. The property record maintenance fee I'll give you a little report card on that. That's a new program we began last year. The relative cost of assessment services just to give you an indication that an office as unique as ours in the State where do we lie among the other communities in the County, including other full-time assessor's office and the other contractors. Our sources of revenue, the overall level of assessment, and the coefficient of dispersion are actually two numbers. One is a performance number on how our assessments relate to the sales that have occurred. The overall level of assessment is really a result of a comparison of two other numbers, but it does have an impact on the amount of taxes a Village pays and can be misleading at time. And then we'll quickly go through the revaluation activity that we did this year and what's proposed around the table for next year. And then we'll finally get to the budget part of my presentation.

The organization as most of ours have is the Village Board above the Village Administration, and then to the department head. My specific office I have two senior appraisers. They're appraiser II's. I have two relative new personnel; they're new hires new to the position anyway as an appraiser I and an assessment technician. And I also have a receptionist/data entry person.

To give you a better indication of the size of our office relative to the work we do and how this consortium runs, I've put together a table here indicating the communities that we serve, Pleasant Prairie, Salem, Twin Lakes, Randall and Brighton, and the different kinds of property that we're required to value. First off is real estate which is commercial property, swamp and waste land, agricultural property, residential property. Then there's personal property. Personal property is the property that businesses use to conduct their business, their furniture, their fixtures, their equipment. That's itemized separately. That is information that we collect separately and there's a separate personal property assessment roll. In addition there are mobile homes. In the five communities we serve there are 808 mobile homes mostly based here in Pleasant Prairie.

You can see that in each community the number of accounts and parcels we serve begin in Pleasant Prairie with 9,940, and Salem has 7,480. Those two communities make up the bulk of our work really, going down to the Town of Brighton which has 852 properties. You'll see to the right a percent of the total. This is important in the respect that the budget that I create and have already presented to the town pursuant to our agreement by the end of August; each community pays their proportional share of the budget based upon their size relative to the whole. So Pleasant Prairie is responsible here for 41 percent of my budget, whereas Salem pays approximately one-third of my budget and so on and so forth.

You can see in total we have over 22,000 parcels of real estate to manage. When we're talking about managing real estate we're talking about maintaining not just the paper records in the office and now we have electronic records, but in servicing the real estate parcels we look at building permits, any time there's a new home, a new garage or something of that nature we need to go out and field review that, make determinations in the field, annotate our records, bring them back to the department office, enter the data and generate a new value. Personal property is a little shorter season. My appraisers need to in the second or third week in December review all the commercial properties in the locations, find out if there's new businesses in these locations or old businesses. They make those changes or they make the field notes, they bring them in, we treat new accounts, we delete accounts, and then in the last week in December between the holidays we send every business entity that has personal property in each of these communities a form for them to fill out and return to us by March 1<sup>st</sup>. When the forms come back, my receptionist and/or data technician audit the forms and make calls based on discrepancies and that sort of thing. There are 1,200 personal property accounts in these communities.

Mobile homes are not a large portion. They are somewhat time intensive in that personal property and mobile homes have a new value every year. Real estate has a new value when they make changes to the property or the process of a comprehensive review evaluation. Mobile homes and personal property we are required by State law to update the values every year. And on mobile homes as new people come in or as new manufactured housing enters a park, we go out and view it and then create another what's called a parking permit fee. They really aren't paying a property tax, but they're paying a parking permit fee to be in the Village, and that fee is based on the assessed value of the mobile home multiplied by the tax rate similar to real estate only different.

One thing of interest is that when we began the consortium in 1996 these five communities had a parcel count of 21,555 compared to today's 24,137. So 2,600 parcels over ten years. And from all aspects that I can tell, Pleasant Prairie, Salem, Twin Lakes and Randall are going or will continue to grow. The one static community we have is the Town of Brighton.

A staffing comparison just to give the Board some sense of where we lay, in 2002 Wales sent out a survey, Wales Wisconsin Association of Assessing Officers, sent out a survey to assessors throughout the State to get an indication of staffing levels and the amount of work they had to do. I'm kind of beholden to the responses of the surveys, but I tried to give you a sense of our staffing level here at Pleasant Prairie with you'll see at the bottom 24,137 parcels, six staff people, so it's an average of 4,023 parcels or accounts per staff person. These are the categories really that had the larger parcel counts, New Berlin, Wausau, Brookfield, Janesville. You see the bright line is where Pleasant Prairie in this stratification would insert itself. We are in there. We have more parcels than most of the group. We generally have a smaller staff than most of the group. I don't think we're losing anything on that aspect. Most often these municipal assessors' offices will have about the same amount of appraisal staff I have; they'll simply have additional data entry staff and another administrative person. Most commonly here these communities will have a deputy assessor and two data entry persons, where I have myself, four appraisal staff and a data entry person.

The goals I'll quickly go through some of these goals to give you a sense of what we do throughout the year. I think right now it's the third quarter and actually we're into the fourth quarter. Part of what we do every year is review the sales that have occurred, so when we use those sales in the evaluation process we're assured that the information we're using in our correlation analysis is accurate and up to date. Here we try to view half of the sales in the third quarter and the other half in the fourth quarter. Again, in the fourth quarter of next year I'm projecting to do what's called a finished basement living area review as noted up there.

Every year we try to take a component of our database that we feel needs polishing and make an effort to improve the data we have. This instance here I'm looking at all those housing types that were constructed that lends themselves to having a finished basement living area, but as of yet our records don't indicate they do have finished basement living area. One of the reasons I'm doing this is as we review sales going forward and we find that some properties sell for a lot more than our assessment, oftentimes the reason is that they've finished their basement without getting the proper permits, so I made a decision that next year we're going to go and look at all the bi-levels and split levels and any ranches or two stories that we're aware of that have exposed basement and our records don't indicate any basement just to take a look and make sure that part of the database is up to snuff.

In the past we've done this for all homes that we've carried in poor condition. Remember, if you look at one of my records and perhaps I should have brought a record in for everybody to look at, we have a lot of descriptive information about the buildings in each one of these residential properties. Descriptions such as the size of the home, the number of bedrooms, the number of bathrooms, but we also have some relatively subjective conditions such as the physical condition or the quality of construction. And the value is based upon that description to the degree if it's a home in poor condition it garners more depreciation and a lower value. But we know most people don't live in homes in poor condition for a long time . . . properties in poor condition to make sure they're still that way.

The last two years we haven't had the ability to do database polishing because we've been in that data migration and conversion mode coming from the County to here. For 2005 what we're doing is reviewing on site all of the mobile homes and making sure our descriptions are accurate, looking at our measurements and collecting information that we've never collected before.

The third and fourth quarter we look at the prior year and current year building permits. Essentially some building permits are issues half way through the year or later in the year. The homes are partially completed or the additions are partially completed. Sometimes the garages are partially complete, so we have a partial value on that component of the house. The following year, because Wisconsin has a statutory assessment date of January 1<sup>st</sup> and we value what's there at that time, we need to go back out and see that either the home is finished, to what degree the interior finish is, and we try to close it on the first of the year.

Then going into the first quarter of the next year, we try to complete that process, the field review of the building permits, and then we also need to create the new records resulting from all the land divisions, the new subdivisions, people splitting their lots or combining their parcels. So on an average year, and this is pretty much an average year, and the one thing I don't have in here is the sales because you can't get all the sales on a one year so that spills over to the first quarter,

but here is about 5,554 actual stops we need to make in the field and predominantly those are in two quarters when we kind of look down and try to decide do we have the time to do that. In reality I have about 450 assessors' days to accomplish that. So it's about between 12 or 15 or 20 properties a day that they have to attend.

Other goals, this goes to our performance, establishing 2006 assessments. The Village of Twin Lakes and the Village of Pleasant Prairie via our intergovernmental agreements have the ability or the option to have a revaluation done for 2006. The first goal is to have the local assessed value be between 98 percent and 104 percent of the equalized value determined by the Department of Revenue as shown by the 2006 level of assessment. I've always had this as a goal. I'm beginning to wonder really if this is a goal I need to establish since I have really no control over the level of assessment. That's really a calculation done by the Department of Revenue and really bases their value relative to mine.

But the other goal is to complete the Board of Review hearings by July 31<sup>st</sup>. This is an important goal that we always try for. This is kind of a deadline. This is the bright line for a couple of reasons. One thing is that we need to get through the reval process and get all our objection hearings done so we can start the other phases of what we do. Remember, the second quarter, if we just go back one, the second quarter I don't have any field work because we're doing in-house analysis, we're doing revaluations. I'm organizing sending out assessment notices out to five different communities and five different Board of Reviews every year. All those things have their statutory notice dates, statutory meeting dates, statutory up the you know what. So getting back to the revaluation process it's important for us to try to be done by July 31<sup>st</sup> so we can accomplish the rest of the tasks we have to do throughout the year so we can get back into analysis mode by the second quarter of the following year.

The other reason is that in my department no one gets vacation until after the Board of Reviews are done. I have a staff of six and no one gets a week off, no one gets two weeks off for the first seven months. It complicates things a little bit because everybody is taking their time in the last five months of the year.

Revaluation performance, this is based on our goal for what we have done this year. We don't know this performance number until the first quarter of 2006. But it's to demonstrate a level of uniformity in Brighton and Salem, the two communities we did a reval for this year, such that the 2005 coefficient of dispersion for improved residential property is less than 12. It's a goal, and I'm going to be talking about coefficient of dispersion in a little bit and we'll get a better indication of what that is.

Errors and omissions, from an assessor's perspective it's important not to have a lot of errors or omissions. If a property is omitted we have the right to go back one year. It's not that my appraisers are in the field and happen to miss a home. Normally omissions are surrounding processing. An appraiser comes in and looks at a house and that record didn't make it to the data entry clerk's desk. It got put back in our file system and it's discovered the following year. Nobody has ever called our office telling us that we missed the value of their house.

Zero errors. We don't make a lot of errors. In fact in our ten years we've had about three omissions over the time and very few errors. The errors are generally surrounding the personal

property. The personal property can be somewhat convoluted in that we value leased equipment. It's my pejorative to decide if I value it to the property owner or to the lessee or the lessor. I value it to the owner of the real estate, and since another entity might lease this equipment their accountant will report it to me, the owner of the real estate will report it to me. I'll create two separate personal property assessments. They'll get two different bills. They won't contact me when they get their assessment notice, but they generally wait until they get their tax bill and then I have to go through the hoops to make them whole.

Employee safety is to reduce to zero the number of work related injuries. Here again my staff has a great deal of experience. They're cautious in the field considering we're in the field in those three months before and after the first of the year when the weather is rather poor. In our ten years we've had three of these. One myself I stepped on a nail through a board . . . . One of my appraisers got a heavy duty sliver in their finger on a construction site. And most recently one of our appraisers was bitten by a dog while she was reviewing a pole barn with a property owner. The dog kind of snuck up behind her and bit her.

Property record maintenance fee, this is a new program we started last year in an effort to follow up on some of the recommendations that the blue ribbon committee known as the Kettl Commission provided. It's a service fee that really responds to property owners' requests for building permits. As I said before, a part of what we're required to do is maintain records on commercial and residential property. When someone is issued a building permit, we're required to go out to that property, see what the result of that permit is, change our records, bring it back into the office, resketch the home, take a picture of the property and create another value. It's something that's specifically related to an action taken by a property owner.

Service fees were recommended by the Kettl Commission as a means to lessen the property tax burden. I thought about this for a bit and I contacted the Legislative Audit Bureau. I talked to a Don Besruki who is the Director of the Legislative Audit Bureau about what service fees are and what would be appropriate fees. And he thought that based on what assessors are required to do and the fact that this is really a fee responding to the actions of a property owner that it is an appropriate service fee. And what this does is a component of my time, six months my appraisers in the field responding to building permits, and I have an office they've built to be able to respond to all these building permits in the communities that are growing as much as they are. This reduces the property tax person for those that don't apply for building permits. So in other words the fee is coming in from another source other than the property tax levy, we're able to reduce the property tax levy, and then the cost for providing that service is directly issued to those people that require the service from us.

Mike Pollocoff:

The other thing I might point out Rocco is that from the time that Rocco goes out and does that initial inspection and gathers the data, it could be another year or more than that depending on where it falls in the cycle before the town sees tax dollar one. So in that intervening time with the old method the Village had to adjust the levy to compensate for work being done for properties that aren't paying property taxes yet and won't for a while. Then what this does is it ties that direct service that's being applied to somebody for something they'll never need again. The house is up and it's done, and that service fee is done for that house to get established. Now if



they do an addition to the house or modify it then we have to go back again for that one time thing to redefine that property. So it was a good idea on Rocco's part to identify that thing and to take that burden off the levy.

Rocco Vita:

The fees range from \$15 to \$30 to go measure outbuildings and decks. A new home is \$200. It really depends on my time allocation study what it really takes us to be in the field, to deal with the property owner, to do the sketches, verify the dimensions and that sort of thing. For 2005 as projected Pleasant Prairie will collect \$51,250 via the property record maintenance fee. This is money that was not needed in the property tax levy. So I pay taxes to the Village of Pleasant Prairie, everybody here pays taxes in the Village of Pleasant Prairie. Our taxes were actually reduced because of people that needed that specific service from our department, paid for our department to go out and perform that service.

Again, the 20 years of experience I have in this County talking to people in various economic situations and various stages of their life, some of them never ask us to come out because they can't afford a building permit to improve their property, and yet they're funding my department requirement responsibility to perform this work for everybody that can. So from my perspective it's a way to lessen the property tax burden on those that don't use my department to that degree and they're already having a difficult time to afford the taxes that they're paying.

The relative cost of assessment services, and this is prior to the fee, this was part of the Virchow Krause study in Kenosha County on the consolidation of services and what services cost in each of the communities. And it goes back to 2003. You can see in 2003 we invoiced out or actually collected \$17.23 per parcel for each of the communities in the consortium. This compares I think rather favorably with the other communities in Kenosha County. You see there really are only three significant players here. The Town of Somers as a part-time assessor, Mr. Liddicoat, Paddock Lake, Wheatland, Bristol, Wheatland, Paris and Silver Lake contract with a contract assessor out of the City of Appleton. Pleasant Prairie we have our intergovernmental agreements with those communities, and the City of Kenosha has their own office.

With the implementation of the property record maintenance fee, my projection for 2005 is to have a cost per parcel of \$16.47, which really puts the tax burden, the tax levy, the property tax burden lower than what anybody in the County is probably paying today and lower than what anybody paid back in 2003. Actually the \$16.47 that I'm projecting for this year is similar to what we invoiced out in 1998 to the communities.

Revenue sources, 36 percent of my operations is funded through the property tax levy and indirect revenues, while 64 percent is funded through those intergovernmental agreements and the property record maintenance fee.

The overall level of assessment, this is one of the most common known indicators of assessment performance. I guess that's really--I probably stated that incorrectly right off the bat. There really isn't an indicator of assessment performance. What it is is it describes the relationship between the Department of Revenue's estimate of total value and the local assessor or my

assessment of total value in any given year. So the local level of assessment is a result. It's a result of comparing two numbers. The purpose for this is for the equalization process. The equalization process is in place for purpose of apportioning budgets and levies that cross municipal boundaries, and in Wisconsin each municipality has a different level of assessment, because the last time they did the reval it was done at a different date and time.

The example here would be the Kenosha Unified School District and Kenosha County. They divvy up the County's levy based on the equalized value of all the communities, and once that's all apportioned out the community collect it based on the assessed level within the community. The other purpose for equalization that isn't as important but is still there is in the manufacturing valuation process the Department of Revenue values the manufacturing properties within each community. In Pleasant Prairie there are 39 of the. Every year after the department determines the value of the manufacturing properties, they adjust the value to the local level of assessment. So, for instance, this year I believe our local level of assessment will be about 93 percent. Remember last year it was about 104. 93 percent. So if there's a manufacturing facility in the industrial park it's assessment won't be \$10 million. It will be \$9,300,000. And as time goes on as that level of assessment decreases their value decreases also.

The overall level of assessment fails to provide a reliable estimate for any individual property because it's a municipal wide statistic and it's determined in a very gross manner by the Department of Revenue. And the difference is, going back to last year when we were at 104 percent, all that really indicated is that the Department of Revenue's estimate of the total value of the Village was 4 percent from my estimate of the total value of the Village. They came up with a number, I came up with a number, the result was 104 percent. The difference probably goes to the difference in the methods that each one of us uses. The Department of Revenue's method is global in nature. It has very little stratification and actually is not a legal method for myself to use in determining individual property values.

The Department of Revenue says Pleasant Prairie you've got residential property, commercial property, agricultural property, we're going to analyze as best we can some of those sales that have occurred, estimate the amount of new construction, and we feel the value of the residential class is thus. From an assessor's perspective we need to stratify and analyze property sales to a far great degree in order to determine the individual property values. This means that in the Village stratification kind of goes to sorting and sorting of those sorts and sorting of more sorts. While the Department of Revenue feels there's maybe five classes in a community, within the residential class they've got one. They'll take a look at what all the assessments were on all those properties sold and it gives them a sense of appreciation.

What we tend to have to do, what we really need to do and what we actually do is stratify the data in the community as far as possible. We have 14 groups of neighborhoods within Pleasant Prairie that we've identified. Within those 14 different groups we have 88 neighborhoods, and within those 88 neighborhoods we have 322 sub neighborhoods. So when it comes down to really analyzing the sales that have occurred and a relative appreciation and how to adjust those for the forthcoming year, we're making about 322 calculations or 322 different analyses in the Village of Pleasant Prairie. The main purpose of stratification really is to identify property groups which are likely to change in value at nearly equal rates. What the Department of Revenue's method does is says that the Village as a whole you've grown X percent. But we live in the Village and we

understand that different neighborhoods grow at different rates. The stratification process allows us to quantify to a much better degree those different rates.

That kind of brings up how does the Department of Revenue go about determining its appreciation or its economics and applying that. Here is a rather daunting table, but just to let you know there's always numbers behind other numbers. Some of the numbers I've made larger and bolded are more important. I've done the process for all the communities that are in the consortium, but we'll go over Pleasant Prairie as an indication. Remember that I said the total assessed value is my opinion of value done by a specific analysis, and the equalized value is the department's value done by a more global analysis.

In the year following that, this is for the determination of our amount of appreciation or economics for 2005, the Department of Revenue starts with my number. So right off the bat they'll defer to my assessed value last year. They'll look at the aggregate ratio. And the aggregate ratio is as a whole there were 341 sales that occurred in Pleasant Prairie last year. With each sale there's an assessment and a sale price. They add up all the assessments and they add up all the sale prices and the two create a ratio. And that ratio, .941, indicates that the assessments were about 94 percent of what those properties actually sold for. So what they'll do is they'll take that number and they'll adjust the old assessed value, divide it by the .94, to come up with what's projected market value for the Village of Pleasant Prairie and that's the \$1.4 billion.

Then they say this is a realistic number, but they need to adjust their equalized value, and they have to determine how much to adjust their equalized value, so they compare it to their equalized value from the prior year, the 2004 equalized. And when you take the 2005 projected value, you divide it by their old equalized value you come up with an indicated ratio. It's a one point something because that's 111.69 percent. But when you drop the 1 it indicates that the economic factor for Pleasant Prairie for this year 2005 is 11.69 percent. That's the amount they need to adjust their equalized value to hit the projected 2005 value based on the sales that occurred after the last valuation. So it's a lot of sequencing of events.

When we determine the assessed value of the residential class in 2004 to \$1.3 billion, the sales that occurred after that revaluation indicated that they were occurring for about 6 percent above that. So the Department of Revenue has an indicated 2005 econ factor of 11.69 percent. All of this up to now is concrete. It's math. It's very objective. The numbers are out there and used in a specific way.

Now they kind of come up to a point where they need to make a subjective decision. How do they use the 11.69? I know that's what the numbers show us but do we use that? And in this instance for this year it's published in the reports that the Department of Revenue publishes in August they use an econ factor of 9 percent or a difference of 2.69 percent. Last year they undervalued the Village by 4 percent. This year they're undervaluing the Village by two and a half percent or so.

When we look at Twin Lakes, Salem, Randall and Brighton the math is all the same. You can see in Twin Lakes they had an indicated appreciation factor of 12.4 percent, and yet they applied 10 percent. When Salem and Randall had a little less of an indicated factor, 7.5 and 5.5, they were a little more conservative in their 7.5, and yet here in Brighton the indicated factor was 15 percent

and they applied a factor of 9 percent which is a 6 percent difference. How this plays is this year we did revaluations for the Town of Salem and the Town of Brighton. This year our level of assessment in the Town of Salem is 102 percent. Some of it goes to the fact that they underestimated the appreciation or the value of the Town. And in Brighton, similar to Pleasant Prairie last year, our level of assessment is 105 percent indicating that the 12 sales that occurred in 2004, along with the 15 sales that occurred in 2003, to me meant a good indication of where to go with those values in Brighton.

My analysis led me to the same thing that led to them. Remember my analysis is more specific and more detailed, but using the sales evidence in the Town of Brighton to value those properties in the Town of Brighton I came up with an assessed value. They decided not to weight the sales activity as heavily as really should be, and that's the reason the Department of Revenue either underestimates or overestimates relative to the assessor's value.

When we look at the bottom portion, the count of sales, you can see the sales percent of total count we had 341 sales in Pleasant Prairie after the 2004 evaluation. That's 6 percent of the potential base that sold. When I use a two years of sales, that moves up closer, and we incorporate sales of partial construction when we flush them out, usually we're using 15 percent of the total potential sales. On a statistical basis it gives us pretty good numbers to work with. I'm pretty confident with our methods. Any questions on this and the sense of how this relates?

The thing is I'm going to get the calls in Brighton this year from the property owners saying how can you assess me for more than what it's worth? They're looking at their tax bill, that's what the level of assessment is, and their tax bill is going to say that the market value of the property is less than the assessed value. And I'm going to have to try to explain to them that level of assessment is the result of two numbers, and in this instance the Department of Revenue simply under estimated the value of Brighton. And when you look at Brighton you see how, and we don't know why, the Department of Revenue underestimated the Town of Brighton.

The other thing about the overall level of assessment, there's many things in assessing. There are inverse relationships. And a lot of what we do because of these relationships and because we use ratios and numbers and some of them have inverse relationships it's confusing to property owners to a degree. The level of assessment has an inverse relationship to the actual tax rate. Now, a lot of this is pretty straight forward and I'll give an example here of Kenosha County. This is the 2004 equalized tax rate for Kenosha County. Again, remember they determine a levy, they split it up based on the markets or the equalized value of the entire County, and they come up with an equalized rate for each community of \$4.74 per thousand dollars of value. Well, we know because each community had their last revaluation done at different times in history, so their values are a snapshot of this year. They're at different levels of assessment.

If we look at Pleasant Prairie at 104 percent and Somers at 80 percent, exaggerating the differences we'll get a better sense. Here in Pleasant Prairie because the Department of Revenue underestimated the value of the Village, our tax rate was \$4.56 actual on the tax bill. When we look at the Town of Somers, you can see that on their tax bill because they're at 80 percent of value their tax rate was \$5.90. This goes to the purpose of equalization, really the sole purpose of equalization and how much credence I put in that level of assessment. It's to make sure that the County levy is spread as equitably as possible upon the equalized value of the County. Then

once that apportionment is made for each community, it's sent to the local clerk. Here Kathy gets a note from the County saying, Kathy, you need to collect X amount of money for us. Kathy says okay, I have a certain amount of value in the Village, she does the math and it comes out to \$4.56 per thousand dollars of value. Because we're at 104 percent, in Somers they were at 80 percent, they have less assessed value than equalized value so the rate has to be higher to attain that apportioned amount. The math has to come out. Sometimes I think people believe a lot of these numbers we have a ticker tape on our rear end kind of pulling them out.

The other part of the relationship is in a year of a revaluation the level of assessment has an inverse relationship to the amount of property taxes a municipality pays for shared taxes such as school districts or the County levy. Again, the relationship is inverse and it's cloudy at best for a lot of people to understand. But what it means is, essentially, when the Department of Revenue underestimated the value of the Village for 2004 we were apportioned a smaller amount of the County levy and the Kenosha Unified levy than if the Department of Revenue would have estimated a value similar to my assessed value. Because we were apportioned a smaller value than what should have been, we actually were responsible for smaller--Kathy was actually responsible for collecting less money than what we really should have collected, and here's that math to give you a sense.

This table shows the result of the Department of Revenue underestimating the value of the Village. In essence, because the Department of Revenue undervalued the Village of Pleasant Prairie our apportionment to the Kenosha Unified School District was \$522,090 less. Our apportionment to Kenosha County was \$294,592 less. Now, we know the value in the districts. You'll notice the value is a little different in these districts because the Village has land in the Bristol School District as well as the Unified District, whereas Kenosha County is the total Village value.

Because we were apportioned that much less to Unified and Kenosha County, the actual tax rate was less also, 25 cents and 14 cents per thousand dollars of value. In total, Village taxpayers paid at least \$816,682 less than if the Department of Revenue would have accurately valued the Village. And the net impact was 40 cents per thousand dollars of value. Well, big deal, what's 40 cents per thousand? In the Village of Pleasant Prairie where the average tax on a home is \$4,000 because the average of the value of the home is \$228,000, it's \$90 on everybody's tax bill last year at least. On the average home, the person owning the average house in the Village paid \$90 less on their tax bill than if the Department of Revenue would have accurately valued the Village like I have. Does that make sense? Because they underestimated the value of the Village we were apportioned less. Because we were apportioned less we had to pay less. Because we had to pay less that's the result of the tax bill.

Mike Pollocoff:

This is an important point because I'm sure Trustees have had people say to them you guys are screwing me for 4 percent more than what the value is and you're making me pay more. Every year you're really paying less. The higher that number is over the assessed value is actually bringing your school and your County taxes down. Rocco doesn't have any control over that because that's the State's number. So as we do our reval next year, who knows what it's going to be because it's not planned because of that one equation that Rocco showed where they . . . factor

October 19, 2005  
Village Board Minutes

that's their plug. That's the numbers they come up with. That's what will get you to that point where you have a spread. Rocco is required to create that value based on that stratification and doing all that detailed information. He's prohibited legally from using the State's system the way they do it. They just kind of run it across the entire community. So if you compare that finite method to, and I won't say the State's using its best guess, but it's just a gross number and you have that separate.

So every time that happens people that's exactly what they think. I've been listening to this for 20 years and you explain it to people and it really means you're paying less. But the bill if it's over 100 percent they're convinced they're paying more than 100 percent.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Are you saying the mill rate on our tax bill, the thing that we get from Kathy, is a calculated number? It's not the number that the taxing body dictates?

Rocco Vita:

It's a summation of all the other tax rates and it is a calculated rate based on--maybe Kathy could speak to this better because I'm just a country appraiser and she's really a financial analyst, but she's required to collect X amount of money and she has so much value to spread that burden across.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I understand that.

Rocco Vita:

So if she was asked to collect a little less in reality it gets spread a little less.

Mike Pollocoff:

They don't give us their mill rate. They give us their budget, their apportionment of the budget.

Alex Tiahnybok:

They gave you that Pleasant Prairie load of the entire budget, and then the mill rate that appears on our tax bills is basically the budget load divided by the valuation of our part of the district as a result?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes. That's why that last column, those actual rates every single one of them is different. You can't use that County tax rate across our County because in actual--

Rocco Vita:

And the only time you see those equalized rates is when school districts talk about how it affects the rate. They can't give you an actual rate because they're really not sure of the level assessment in each community. So the school districts out in Salem where there are six of them, they talk in terms of equalized rates. Well, they can say the equalized rate is the same or the equalized rate is going up marginally, but peoples' assessments haven't gone up at all. So they're saying it's \$4.74, but when the Department of Revenue increased the equalized value of the County by 10 percent in a year, there was 10 percent more taxes. So really we're allocated 10 percent more. It comes back to Kathy. The assessed values haven't changed so the actual rate goes up.

Alex Tiahnybok:

And what number, since Kenosha Unified is the biggest chunk of our bills, what number does Kenosha Unified use to determine Pleasant Prairie's share of the entire property tax levy?

Rocco Vita:

They use the equalized value of the value less the . . . . Is that what you were getting to?

Alex Tiahnybok:

I think so.

Rocco Vita:

But the recent articles indicated that their actual levy was going up four and a half or five percent which is better than last year which went up almost 10 percent. Last year when it went up 10 percent they are 50 percent of our bill, so we saw 5 percent increase out of your control and out of my control.

Coefficient of dispersion is something that's more important and it really goes back to our mission. This gives us a sense after revaluation of how well our values performed on a parcel by parcel basis when a community is not as homogenous and uniform as you'd like it to be. Village of Pleasant Prairie is a very diverse community. The Town of Salem is a very diverse community. It's accepted as one of the more important measures of assessment performance, and it's a measure of essential tendency or gauging the amount of variance around an average or a median. A low coefficient of dispersion correlates to a low variance. It means there's a high degree of uniformity and equity between property values and resultant property taxes.

This is a very simple statistic. Every time we do a revaluation the sales that occur after the revaluation is the proof of what we've done. Really we analyze that to see how we've performed. In the year after revaluation it's very common, as is in this case especially, in these markets that homes will sell for more than their assessed value. Well, how much more do they sell and how does that relate to the average throughout a community?

The International Association of Assessing Officers and the Department of revenue adhere to a performance schedule of a range of coefficient of dispersion. Zero to 10 is excellent, 10 to 15 is good, 15 to 20 is fair and 20 to 35 is poor. I apologize for the brightness. The beyond 35 percent is unacceptable.

You can in the lower left table these are the 2004 performance ratings for the work we've done in the communities in the consortium. Brighton, Randall, Pleasant and Twin Lakes were excellent, and the Town of Salem has a good rating. Now, the significant thing about this is that this measures the two revaluations we did in 2004 for Twin Lakes and Pleasant Prairie both having an 8.3 and 8.2 which is in that excellent range, and it measures Brighton, Randall and Salem. Those sales were two years removed from the prior revaluation. Even thus, because of our method of stratification and going through all the detail, we're able to provide assessments from this perspective that retain an excellent relationship.

But what does this mean? . . . the last numbers I have are from 2002 in the States of Wisconsin. The average coefficient of dispersion for towns is 21.21 which garners a poor rating. The benefit of our methods and the benefit of the consortium is that we're able to provide high quality assessment services for those three towns and they're able to obtain an equity rating or tax fairness or tax uniformity rating in that excellent and good performance.

Statewide Villages was a 16.68 rating which was fair. Cities were on the cusp of 15.04 as fair, and the State as a whole, because there's an awful lot of towns in the State, has a rating of 19.32 which is fair. I think a lot of the reason the towns have poor ratings is because they're contract assessors, they have limited resources, and they simply do a less of a job in my estimation.

Mike Pollocoff:

I think there's also in the towns, and I hear that when we used to go to the towns meetings, there's the prevailing thought that you're doing the townfolk a service by not assessing them. So when you do do your assessment you end up with more opportunity for—

Rocco Vita:

I'll give you an example. Everybody is tied into the assessment ratio because that's pretty easy to understand. My home is assessed for \$80,000 and it sells for \$100,000 and that's 80 percent. That gives us a level or ratio of something to work with. If we look at a community, the one thing bad about that kind of a ratio is, for instance, I have a whole group of homes that sell for 20 percent or more over their assessment and a whole group of homes that sells for 20 percent less than their assessment, when you add up the sale price and the assessment that ratio is going to be 100 percent so the assessor has done a good job even though there's a huge amount of dispersion between the variances. So statistically the level of assessment was 100 percent, but in reality he did a poor job in estimating any one value in that community.

The coefficient of dispersion an analogy would be a target where the average is in the middle and each sale is somewhat near that average. The closer everything is clustered together the less dispersion there is. If you have a big scatter plan that means the methods you're using in the assessment process just really weren't effective enough to provide equitable assessments for



everybody. The fact that he under assessed a whole group and over assessed another whole group means that one group paid a lot more than they should have in taxes and the other group paid a lot less than they should have in taxes. What he should have done is the sort of analysis that brings everybody together so everybody is paying their fair share.

The Constitution of the State guarantees tax uniformity and the one thing we do hear in the last 20 years is I don't mind taxes. Nobody likes paying taxes, but if I have to pay taxes is my fair share and that's really what they want to get to. They want to be guaranteed that what they're paying is fair relationship to other people and other values. And this coefficient of dispersion indicates that in our instances the work that my staff does garners a really good rating relative to most of the communities in the State of Wisconsin going to the methods that we employ which are time intensive but they're for the betterment of the community.

Going forward we have revaluation activities. Last year I mentioned we valued the Town of Brighton 852 parcels increased 21.57 percent. The Town of Salem 7,480 parcels increased 19.16 percent. In 2006 I eluded our intergovernmental agreements. When the consortium was created, the people in these communities that we assess wanted the ability to have a revaluation on a timely basis if they request it. We couldn't do it on an annual basis because it would have been a little more expensive and a little more time consuming. But we were able to fit in a schedule in which we value the towns one year and the villages the next and when that time comes up they have their opportunity. Pleasant Prairie is 9,940 parcels and Twin Lakes 3,819 parcels.

That leads into what a community does to make that determination whether a revaluation is warranted or not. Remember I said before if the level of assessment or the ratios were the same across all different property taxes in the community and the coefficient of dispersion was pretty tight, it was a good indication that taxes are still equitable within the community.

Here I've shown another daunting table of the sales activity that has occurred in Pleasant Prairie as of September of 2005. Remember, these are essentially a year to a year and nine months removed from the last revaluation. We know in this market housing prices don't remain constant. They appreciate. We also know that in a community of this type there's a disparity between the desirability of the different types of neighborhoods in the community. I've drawn

some bright lines on here. Bright lines we kind of use similar to walking into a block wall. You know something is there and something needs to be addressed. Then I've given a color to each of the different groups.

Thus far we've had 249 sales in all the Village of Pleasant Prairie. Total assessment on those sales are \$55 million, the total sale price is \$64 million and what we have is an overall or aggregate ratio, simply this divided by this is 86.26. What does that mean on a broad basis? In terms that most people understand the inverse column again. We take a look and say if we're at 86.26 percent what does it take to get to 100 percent? It takes just about 16 percent. If you invest in stocks you'll understand in 2001 when we lost 25 percent of our value it was pretty tough to take. But it's even tougher to take when you realize to go from 75 back to 100 we had to increase our value 33 percent. And that's really a good understanding of the relationship between 100 and 75, 75 is 25 percent less than 100, 100 is 33 percent more than 75. So when we're at 80 percent of the value it doesn't take 20 percent to get to 100. It takes 25 percent to get to 100.

So overall here it says 16 percent. Where does 16 percent--maybe I should go to this neighborhood group on the left-hand side. These are 12 neighborhood groups in the Village that have had sales evidence this year. A neighborhood group is a combination of neighborhoods. For instance, the neighborhood group that showed the least amount of appreciation in the last 21 months is modern subs 1. That's just our moniker, modern subs 1. It's not that straight forward. But modern subs number one would include neighborhoods behind the Village Hall here, Rolling Meadows, Hill and Dale, it includes Chateau Eau Plaines, River Oaks, Rambling Trails, Electric Station and Prairie Lane Heights. Essentially it includes the modern platted subdivisions beginning in the '50s that occurred prior to Tuckaway's platting that's not associated with the City. Those subdivisions that were platted beginning with Tuckaway until now are modern subs 2. And those older subdivisions associated with the City, essentially 85<sup>th</sup> and Cooper Road are the City associated.

The purpose for creating neighborhood groups is to identify like environments that garner the same kind of desirability for analysis purposes. Remember, inside one of these neighborhood groups we have a number of neighborhoods. Another one on the nonaligned subs is something that's not straightforward. The nonaligned subs is really a culmination of three small subdivisions on the south side of Pleasant Prairie that don't fit into most of the surroundings. That would be Timber Ridge, Green Tree and Pleasant Homes. Generally modest housing stock surrounding by areas of better housing. We don't want to analyze different residential property types into one.

I guess the basis for this, though, and I'm making a short story rather long, is that overall Pleasant Prairie is 16 percent below market value. 16 percent resides right about here. From this point down these people are paying on an equitable basis more taxes than they constitutionally deserve to pay or have a right to pay. These properties that are appreciating faster beginning in South Kenosha and going up have appreciated more than the average of the Village and are paying less than the constitution requires them to pay.

October 19, 2005  
Village Board Minutes

It goes back to our mission statement about tax equity. It goes back to my control as a department head trying to make taxes as equitable as possible in a community, and it goes back to one of your controls as a Village Board making a determination. You can't control a great portion of the tax rate, but you have ultimate control over the equity issue involved in a community. We can decide not to do a revaluation. It doesn't bother me. It's one less step I have to do, but I think it really depends on which side of the fence you're sitting. People down here we don't do a revaluation they're going to continue to pay more in taxes than if we had done a revaluation, and the people on the top side here, Carol Beach East, the Lakefront, the Rural Character they're going to have a tax shift to them because they have appreciated more. Going back to the constitution, uniformity in taxes, you have a responsibility to pay taxes based on the value of your real estate. The constitution guarantees uniformity and equity, the Legislature has decided that market value is the benchmark or at least a close or tighter relationship anyways.

Jeff Lauer:

I have a question. This is a good class. I don't know if we'll get to the other departments tonight.

Rocco Vita:

I know, I'm almost done.

Jeff Lauer:

I have many questions but I'll stick with this one right now. Is the goal to get 100 percent? I see the total assessment and total sales, it shows the total assessment being less than the total sales so—

Rocco Vita:

What the accomplishment of revaluation would be is in this area here since they're appreciating a little they're going to have smaller adjustments to get assessments that reflect their market value. This portion up here will have larger adjustments, but after the revaluation when the sales occur they'll all occur at a closer percentage to what the actual value of the property is. As time goes on the appreciation is affecting properties differently in the Village.

Jeff Lauer:

So the lower half more or less won't see the jump as the upper half?

Rocco Vita:

They won't see nearly as much of an increase. This isn't the end all analysis. I have subdivisions or neighborhoods in here that we're going to analyze on their own and determine independently. And within that modern subs neighborhood I think I listed off eight or ten neighborhoods and within each one of those there's sub neighborhood groups that we analyze separately. But it gives you an overall indication of whether a revaluation could be done, should be done and what the ramifications are. Generally you find that people want to pay taxes to the degree that they're

assured that it's at least fair.

Mike Pollocoff:

And that's really the important thing on this chart that a lot of people forget about is the purpose for doing the reval at the time you need to do it is to re-establish equity and level the playing field. So what you're saying, Jeff, is that they're going to have smaller increases down in the bottom, smaller adjustments in their tax rates, but in that inverse relationship they're paying more in taxes because the value of their property hasn't grown as great, where somebody who has a greater increase in value is paying less in taxes. So the purpose of that is to identify that equity issue. It's not just what's my increase in assessed value. The number tells you how far off the sale you are as far as paying your fair share of taxes.

Rocco Vita:

And maybe this table goes to give you a better indication. The much maligned revaluation from 2004 actually reduced taxes to 29 percent of the property owners in the Village. The average residential increase was 24 or 25 percent if I recall. That aside, almost a third of the Village had a decrease in taxes. In Twin Lakes where the average increase was 30 percent, 58 percent of the property owners had a decrease in their taxes from year to year. That was because of a tax shift. There were a lot of properties that were valued a lot more than their sale prices, or not a lot more but some properties were valued a lot less than what they were valued for and some less.

In Twin Lakes it's a pretty good example again. It's a lot of numbers. Wilmot High School is the high school in Twin Lakes. Last year Wilmot High School increased their tax levy 60 percent. Now, Wilmot High School is 25 percent of the total tax levy. So them increasing their levy 60 percent meant that the actual levy or the tax rate in Twin Lakes in the Lakewood School District increased 15 percent. Even that aside, there was a 58 percent decrease in taxes. And had Wilmot High School not increased their levy by 15 percent, you would have seen 75 percent of the properties in Twin Lakes have a lower tax.

Twin Lakes is a really good case study of the reasons to have neighborhood groups. They have clearly defined neighborhood groups in that you have two lakes with waterfront properties. You have around both lakes properties associated with the water might have lake rights and so forth, benefit from being in proximity to the water. And then there's a highway and outside that highway are properties that have absolutely no relationship to the lake. I kind of skipped over this, but when you look you can see here Twin Lakes will decide to have a revaluation this year. These three neighborhoods are the residential properties disassociated from the lake and this is their appreciation. You can see Twin Lakes as a whole as appreciated more than Pleasant Prairie. But the Lakefront neighborhood, Lake Associated and the Superior Site those are generally properties across the road from the lake that really have been appreciating more. If you look here these are pretty tight, and you can see that away from the lake appreciation really has been 15 or 16 percent, but as a whole it's 21 percent, but those associated with the lake are more like 25 percent.

Going back to the Village, you can see this orange group here is pretty tight. There's 2 percent that separate 85.7 to 87.66. These are not performing quite as well. There's not appreciation

October 19, 2005  
Village Board Minutes

whereas these in Wisconsin in the last number of years sites associated with water have increased greater than any other property type. Questions on that sort of department overview? Now I'm about to delve into the budget so we're almost done. I'm in my office a lot. People can call me anytime and they do. There's no reason the Board couldn't either.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I have a question, Rocco. What happened to machinery tax? They used to do a machinery tax--

Rocco Vita:

Manufacturing tax?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Yes.

Rocco Vita:

A part of my budget in a portion of it is in the increase the amount the Village pays to the Department of Revenue to value manufacturing properties. Manufacturing properties are valued by the Department of Revenue in Wisconsin. And a couple of years ago they created I guess you'd call it a service fee that communities pay 50 percent of the cost of operating the manufacturing division in the Department of Revenue. Pleasant Prairie pays a pretty large portion. In fact, Pleasant Prairie is the fifth highest manufacturing tax in the State, which means Pleasant Prairie has the fifth largest base of manufacturing properties in the State. The only ones higher are the obviously ones, Milwaukee first, then Madison, then Green Bay, then Menominee Falls, then Pleasant Prairie.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Another question is before the State used to do the manufacturing tax and then we used to pay the State.

Rocco Vita:

The State used to do the manufacturing class and it was paid for through other revenue sources.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

So now we have to do it and we still have to pay to the State.

October 19, 2005  
Village Board Minutes

Rocco Vita:

No, we don't do it. They do it and we pay 50 percent of their costs.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Okay.

Rocco Vita:

Budget summary. 2005-2006 it's pretty brief. Personnel services increased 4.9 percent due predominantly to two items. Two of my staff are not at the top of their salary range. They're really at the beginning in conjunction with every community's evil, the health insurance. Contractual services declined just a hair. Supplies and maintenance declined a great deal. Predominantly there's a reduction this year--not a reduction but last year I needed to replace equipment. That's why last year's \$19,000 was somewhat inflated. Other consortium expenses here the consortium in this group pays for the space we use at the Village Hall, utilities, depreciation expense. And this is predominantly increase in equipment depreciation.

The Village expense, and this portion is expense borne just by the Village because it serves either just the Village's portion of my budget which would be legal expenses for Board of review, and this is impacted because for the most part an increase in the manufacturing assessment fee and Board of Revenue expenses, as well as potential consultants as needed. To prepare for next year not knowing if we're going to have a revaluation or not, I have to increase the amount I need to hold the Board of Review. It might be three or four days so it's an extra \$1,000 one year versus the other year it's \$100 or \$150 or something. It's not that significant.

But overall total expenses for my department will increase 3.8 percent this year as proposed. The revenue, the assessment agreements are increased 3.58 percent. The property record maintenance fee increases 26 percent. Total revenues increase 10 percent, which means the net cost to the Village's outlay is reduced 5.5 percent give or take.

Again, a nice redundant screen, 36 percent through the tax levy and indirect revenue, 64 percent through those intergovernmental agreements and the property record maintenance fee. Proposed reduction, my department really doesn't have a lot of programs to begin with. Everything we do is statutorily bound, but we are required as department heads to offer up some sort of proposal every year for program reduction. In this instance I'm proposing to make my receptionist and data entry clerk 50 percent time. The fiscal impact to the Village is a negative or a benefit, whichever way you look at it of \$11,200. Remember we're only paying a certain part of the whole cost. The majority of the cost is paid by the consortium.

Impact to operations, my plan would be that she would be there in the mornings and not in the afternoons. It would shift some of her tasks to the appraisal staff and myself, predominantly answering phones, returning phone calls, providing information and data entry. Reduces time available to perform fieldwork, appraisal tasks and valuation analysis by the staff taking over what she does. It pushes our operational timetable further into the year and compromises to a degree our ability to meet stated goals, statutory deadlines, and complete year-end processes for

timely processing of property tax bills. That's probably the most important, complete year-end processes for timely processing of property tax bills. If you ever want to get other governments really p.o.'d at you hold up that taxation process. The County gets angry, the towns get angry, the treasurers everywhere get angry when things aren't in on time because it's all a certain chain of events that needs to occur from the Department of Revenue, from the local to the Department of Revenue, back to the local, over to the County in order to process tax bills. And we'll probably necessitate overtime for nonexempt staff. Three of my staff are exempt. My senior appraisers and myself are on salary. We do whatever it takes, but some of this has to be done by nonexempt staff so overtime would be involved.

Proposed capital items first I'll talk about the appraisal vehicle. The appraisal vehicles that we're using now they're parked in the parking lot. They're the two poorest looking vans out there. One is probably the poorest vehicle of the Village. It continually fails on my appraiser on a regular basis. She's either stalling in traffic or it's just not starting after she stops and tries to start. It really is in my perspective in need of replacement. And if it goes on me the depreciation, the fuel, the maintenance and the insurance is \$800 to \$900 per year less than the mileage reimbursement for a private vehicle. I have four staff. I have three vehicles. One is a good vehicle. One is iffy and one is rather poor. If this goes on me I don't have another vehicle and I'll be paying mileage for her to use her car. That's the cost of today's fuel prices. At least at the Village we get it at the wholesale price and it's our depreciation and our maintenance which we can control. The indicated cost is \$13,000. Like everybody else in the Village we got to the auto auction and try to buy whatever affordable white vehicle is out there. And the Village portion of that being 41 percent of the consortium is \$5,330.

The other capital proposal is the assessment management database upgrade which is a big phrase meaning migrating from access to sequel. The cost is \$11,000, the Village portion \$4,510. It complies with the IT's proposal to standardize database management using consolidated skill sets and support to support the system. And, furthermore, it facilitates the integration of Village-wide program to provide interdepartmental data access, presentation and future publication. This is associated rather strongly with the data warehouse project that the Village IT staff wants to go forth with. It has its basis on the fact that there are departments in the Village that need to serve the public. I know we may not be a very large community but we are a service industry, and a service industry that serves 18,000 people and associated businesses throughout Southeastern Wisconsin, whether they be developers in some instances but a lot of realtors, appraisers, from my position lenders. Credit agencies throughout the country call for information.

Since we serve the people, we serve them better if we have in place in the Village a data environment that allows the departments to view and retrieve data. This would be one of those components. My department probably has the greatest set of data for each specific property in the Village, and oftentimes other departments are in need of looking at that data, and not all departments are here at the Village Hall. Sometimes those departments that aren't here at the Village Hall need to respond to property owners looking for information. It really serves the property owners better if they have the ability to look at my data in a data warehouse environment. Sometimes it's easier for us, and in fact, it's easier for us to serve the public if we can serve ourselves better. Any other questions?

Alex Tiahnybok:

That was a good education, Rocco. I'm going to take you up on that offer of sitting down because I have, wouldn't you know it, a million questions, so I'm going to take you up on that offer. But I do have one question that maybe we can answer tonight. The revaluation process, is that by order of the Board or is that an automatic process every two years? How is that determined?

Rocco Vita:

No, it's not an automatic process. Normally I visit with the communities. I present them with the same information I presented you. This past year I went to the Towns of Randall, Brighton and Salem. In fact, every year I've gone out everybody has wanted a revaluation. Randall there was political undercurrents and they decided not to have a revaluation from their perspective. But from my perspective Randall was a pretty tight community. They were at 88 or 89 percent, but all the neighborhood groups were there. They were only a little aside one way or the other.

The Town of Salem had a relationship similar to what you saw here. Their waterfront associated properties of nine lakes and one river and a lot of channels in Salem were in that mid 70s range. Whereas the old unincorporated villages like Trevor, Wilmot and Salem they were in that 92 or 93 percent range. They wanted a revaluation and the Town of Brighton did also.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Who is the they?

Rocco Vita:

The Board. I present it to the Town Board and they make a determination. Usually I present and they make a determination, mull it over until the next meeting and come back and talk about it again and they make the decision.

Alex Tiahnybok:

And when will we be talking about this?

Mike Pollocoff:

You're basically talking about it tonight.

Rocco Vita:

You can, but we can talk about it further. My process is once the Board of Review is over I need to start the new year on my system on these communities that we have the potential for reval. We can pull it back. Last year we pulled it back rather successful in Randall. It's not a big issue.

Mike Serpe:



Rocco, what are the advantages or revaluating every two years as opposed to every five years?

Rocco Vita:

It really depends on how your community changes and how your community appreciates. If we looked at something today that said all those neighborhood groups were at a similar ratio, let's say 88 percent, we'd know equity had been achieved because everybody is at 88 percent of value. I could go to a revaluation, update everybody to 100 percent and then cut their assessment in half to 50 percent. But as long as everybody is at 50 percent of value it's still equitable, it's just that the tax rate would be double. Now, we do have to deal with some legislative law that indicates that your level of assessment for any major class has to be plus or minus 10 percent of market value at least one year in any five year period. So what will happen is we'll be at 93 percent this year for 2005, we'll go out of compliance for next year, and then we'll have four years to get back in. Excuse me, actually the 2005 assessment will be 93 percent. January of 2006 we'll fall below that.

Alex Tiahnybok:

So we could go four years.

Rocco Vita:

The sales I'm showing would be at 86 percent or so, so as of 2006 it would be at 86 percent, and then we'd have another four years to get back to plus or minus 10.

Mike Pollocoff:

The real question, though, is there's two different things. That regulation that regulates a community from not doing it, the question that the Board has asked themselves is how comfortable are you in having a wide disparity in the assessed values of homes? How much equity do you want to achieve? How important is that to say, okay, we have a big spread across the table, and that one table showed it pretty well where you have some properties that are 40 percent undervalued and you have some that are eight percent, so how much of that tax shift are you willing to live with across the entire Village? In a perfect world if everybody was at 90 percent who cares? And if it stayed that way for 20 years who cares? That's the value of . . . is and that's what it is. So the question isn't what will the State let us get away with. I guess that's one way of looking at it, but the real question is how much inequity in property taxes is the Village willing to live with, right?

Mike Serpe:

So as long as we're all over the boards—

Rocco Vita:

There are constituents that live in the condominiums and constituents that live in the modern subs, and even the people in those nonaligned subs which would be Green Tree, Timber Ridge

October 19, 2005  
Village Board Minutes

and Pleasant Homes, they're paying right now taxes on an inequitable basis when it should be relative to the market value of the property compared to everybody else. If we were to readjust and say let's create the market value, those in the yellow would go up a smaller portion than those in the orange and then those in the blue. So we know essentially how much more they're paying and how much less they're paying by this relative inverse relationship. If this is our benchmark, these people are overpaying by kind of the relative difference between these two.

Mike Serpe:

So as I understand it then as long as we're all over the boards as we are, the best thing we can do—

Rocco Vita:

Whoa, whoa, we aren't all over the board.

Mike Serpe:

But we have a disparity.

Rocco Vita:

But we're reaching a point where we have to consider how fair is it to those people. Now, you look at the right hand side and you can see the average sale price in those communities. Unaligned subs and the condominiums are your two least expensive neighborhoods and they're paying a disproportionate share.

Mike Serpe:

I didn't mean all over the board.

Rocco Vita:

Thank you.

Mike Serpe:

But we have a certain disparity between the top and the bottom here. As long as that exists you're recommending that we reevaluate every two years.

October 19, 2005  
Village Board Minutes

Rocco Vita:

We have a disparity that draws out two bright lines and, yes, we have to consider how long do we want to keep it unfair to the people in the yellow to the benefit of the people in the blue.

Mike Serpe:

And you're recommending to address that is to do this every two years.

Rocco Vita:

My recommendation is to take a look at it every two years. If we go into a flat market where appreciation is modest at best year to year, you're not going to see this great disparity. There's always economic cycles that impact these properties. Whether it's the lakefront here or the lakefront out west, there's been cold water put on those lakefront properties at certain times where their values are kept flat and everybody else is going up and the tax shift goes the other way. It's the result of certain economics that impact these neighborhoods, the decisions made to pay what people pay.

John Steinbrink:

What happens on a lakefront property, and you see more and more of that throughout the County, where people buy a property with an older structure on it basically just to tear down the structure, but that assessed value was the property and the structure and now you just have the property left that they pay a higher price for than what it was assessed at.

Rocco Vita:

They paid for the structure. It had some utility. They paid for it. We can't ignore it. If they tear down the building we can't say it had no value. People are tearing down perfectly good buildings that might have been built in the '50s. It would be a bad correlation if I were to say that total purchase price just represented the land value. It's very difficult to correlate that through. Because every home that had a dwelling home like that I have to then put that value at zero, otherwise my land analysis would show too high of a land value.

Here the lakefront shows a 41 percent increase, but keep in mind this is a gross look at it. There are only six sales in the lakefront group. I don't know exactly what the sales were last year off hand. And the lakefront is different. There's a north and there's a south. We look at what happened last year in the Village of Pleasant Prairie, the last time we did a revaluation, some neighborhoods increased a great deal. Tobin Creek had an average increase of 157 percent. Trillium an average 175 percent, developing subdivisions.

The lakefronts we call that water fronts north of the LUSA District had an average increase of 31 percent, and the water front south of LUSA an average increase of 75 percent. The disparity in the increases goes back to what the current sales indicated relative to the old assessment. For a long time those properties at the north end had value, retained value, displayed value based on the sale prices. Prior to that the sales from the south region south of LUSA different kind of home.

October 19, 2005  
Village Board Minutes

The sales didn't indicate much of a value increase in much of a value at all. In the last four years it's increased rather dramatically. Where now some of the properties for sale had their highest asking prices at the south end. So really the line has been blurred.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Is it fair to say in my case I've got a small house . . . in Pleasant Homes which is in the bottom part right there. And somebody in the lakefront was a million dollars right now in value. That house by the lakefront is going to increase in value faster and higher than my house, right? Mine is 8 percent or 10 percent.

Rocco Vita:

Since the last reval they have, but that doesn't mean it's going to continue that way. It waxes and wanes and it's different for each neighborhood.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

In two years I'm going to pay the fair portion of my taxes. But if I have to do it every four years or five years, those five years my taxes are going to go up actually higher in portion than those on the lakefront. That's the way I look at it. . . . subsidize the guy who has the bigger house if you go every five years.

Rocco Vita:

In the years we don't do a revaluation everybody's taxes go up because they're the same. For 2005 we didn't do one and everybody's taxes are going to go up this year. You do a revaluation the reaction is mixed because of the tax shift from those communities that are not appreciating as fast as those that are. That's the result. That's the purpose of it. It doesn't occur like this out of luck. This is the design of the State's Constitution and the intent of the Legislature to try to make taxes as equitable as possible. That's the mission of my office to do that when I can and be as specific and as detail oriented as possible to make things as far as possible.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I understand it's more fair to do it every two years than every four years or five years.

Rocco Vita:

In this kind of market you can say that, but that's not always the case. It really depends on the actual sales. We're beholden to the sales. We can't make things up.

Alex Tiahnybok:

This is a real slippery slope. I believe if you take a snapshot in any year probably those two top categories are probably always going to be on top. And on the sales through 2005 those two top categories are probably always going to be on top. The number of parcels are probably always going to be smaller because there's less individual residences you could argue in those communities. And Steve's comment about subsidizing somebody there is a matter of percentage and then there's also just an absolute dollar amount. You should maybe take a look at Carol Beach because there's an awful lot of what at one time would have been classified as more modest residences that people are selling and getting the hell out because their taxes are climbing more rapidly. If you do this revaluation concept every two years, their actual tax dollars, if you make this adjustment to account for that inverse column, are going to climb quicker than anywhere else in Pleasant Prairie. I'm not debating the fact that the property values are increasing also, but in terms of fairness you're asking people, and many of them that have been in the neighborhood for a long time, to subsidize you on the contrary.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I've been 42 years in that neighborhood.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Okay, so if your tax bill . . . what is your tax bill?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

\$1,800.

Alex Tiahnybok:

And if somebody is paying \$12,000 a year how are you subsidizing them, Steve? What are you paying for?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Okay, if I sell my house today, maybe I sell it for \$110,000 if I'm lucky.

John Steinbrink:

This could be a discussion for a different day. We have three more presentations this evening and these poor girls have to go to work tomorrow.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Okay.

October 19, 2005  
Village Board Minutes

John Steinbrink:

As Rocco said his door is always open.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Well, we'll be having that conversation.

Mike Serpe:

Rocco, very, very nice job. I'm very impressed with what you presented to us.

John Steinbrink:

It's very confusing.

Mike Serpe:

How we'll understand it all I don't know, but the man has the knowledge of his department. He has the knowledge of his job and I'm very impressed and I'm glad we have him on board. How we come to a resolution on who is subsidizing who that's we'll discuss—

Mike Pollocoff:

Maybe just to hopefully end it subsidizing is the wrong word.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I didn't say it.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Maybe it's the wrong word.

Mike Pollocoff:

I think the issue is that what you're talking about is a constitutional issue. It's not a Village issue. The constitution says you're going to pay based on the market value of your property. That gets to be tough. On the other hand, when the people sold they didn't sell at a loss. That would be the worst of all worlds. If it was valued so high, if it was valued higher than what they could sell it at, that's really unfair.

October 19, 2005  
Village Board Minutes

John Steinbrink:

And every time the State sells a tax break to some group or thing, somewhere there's a shift that usually ends up down at the taxpayer on the local level. That's the unfortunate part.

Mike Serpe:

But I think when you look at this you have to look at the entire Village and not just your own little neighborhood. You have to be fair to everybody.

Alex Tiahnybok:

And likewise in the other direction. I think the balance of the bigger portion of the burden—

John Steinbrink:

Thank you for leaving us with more questions that we had when you started.

Mike Pollocoff:

Can we have a washroom break before we start?

John Steinbrink:

Five minute break.

(Break)

## **2) Community Development**

Jean Werbie:

I promise to give an enthusiastic as a budget presentation that Rocco just gave. It's very clear that Rocco loves what he does and so do I. So I will try to go through this as briefly as I can, but if I need to move along just let me know. 2006 Community Development Department budget proposal. I'm going to begin with our organizational chart. Unique to my department and some of the other departments in the Village, I included a number of other aspects to our organizational chart, not just myself as the Director, Village Planner and Zoning Administrator with two Assistant Zoning Administrators and Planners and a Secretary and a part-time File Clerk, but we do a lot of reporting every week not only to the Village Administrator but to the Village Plan Commission, the Village Board, the Zoning Board of Appeals, and we have two subcommittees that we also do reporting for. So on a weekly basis we are in this auditorium making presentations to one board or another, and we also do provide some assistance to the Park Commission as well. So we're multifaceted in that we report to a lot of different committees and boards in our department.

The Community Development Department overview. The Village of Pleasant Prairie Community

Development Department efforts focus on coordinating development and permits through land use planning, zoning and enforcing of regulations. The general purpose of planning and zoning activities is to encourage and regulate the use of land, waters and structures in a planned and orderly manner so as to promote the public health, safety, convenience and general welfare of our community. As such, the activities of our department have a significant impact on the existing and future development needs of the Village.

When I was hired by the Village 17 years ago, one of the things that I think Roger Prange and Mike Pollocoff and Don Wruck were focused in on is creating a common shared vision for our community. What direction we were going and how we were going to get there. And one of the main questions that Mike Pollocoff asked me, and I still remember it, is how will they know that you were here? How will we know that you made a difference? So in my presentation this evening you'll see through all of the various procedures, steps and policies that we've implemented over the last 17 years it's a result of wanting to share a common vision and to create a great place to live, work and play for our community.

The CD department's activities can be divided into five different categories as listed. The first is new development reviews. Many of you have seen our presentations as a result of these reviews. We coordinate the review of residential and commercial development activities, including comprehensive plan amendments, neighborhood plans, conceptual plans, preliminary and final plats, lot line adjustments, certified survey maps, site and operational plans, conditional uses, variances, temporary use permits, zoning amendments, planned developments and planned unit developments. So that covers a lot of different types of new development reviews.

The second type is zoning permit reviews. That really is the review that we do for residential as well as commercial permits for compliance with the zoning ordinance. And through my presentation when I refer to commercial I'm not just referring to a commercial building. I'm also referring to industrial buildings as commercial, commercial, government and institutional, so I'm trying to break it down simplistically into two categories, residential and commercial, for the purpose of the presentation.

The next is inquiries. We receive multiple inquiries from residents, realtors, developers, government officials, bankers, anybody who is requesting any type of information about the Village and primarily specifically about their particular properties.

Next is code violations and litigation activities. This primarily focuses on junk and debris complaints, zoning complaints and litigation that we've been involved in in the community.

And then finally special projects. A special project is an interesting category in that it's unique to the community who is growing and developing in a very dynamic way. We have many special projects that we've been working on that I'd like to talk about that don't just affect one neighborhood or one subdivision. They are broad sweeping across the entire community.

Now a little bit about some of the specifics. Under new development and reviews, the 2005 land use plan is a component of the Village's comprehensive plan. It's the cornerstone for all land use and zoning decisions in the Village. It's a land use plan element and it consists of recommendations concerning the type, the amount and spatial locations of various land uses



within the community, and a specific focus on protection of environmental features within the community, wetlands, floodplains, woodlands, environmental corridors, isolated natural areas. It really focuses on those areas we'd like to protect in the community. It's a guide. It's not the law but it is a guide that is used by the Plan Commission and the Village Board in making and deciding development decisions within the community.

Our comprehensive plan is dynamic. Some communities when they adopt one it sits on a shelf. Ours does not. It's the guide we use in making the development decisions and the rezoning changes in this community. Our most recent comprehensive update was completed in 1996 as part of the comprehensive wide update east of I-94, but in our community we have been updating it every year. When we have been updating our zoning ordinance we have been updating our land use plan so that they work together. In a few minutes I'll be explaining a little bit about Smart Growth, but the importance of having an updated land use plan is critical to our zoning and development decisions, and it will be even more important after 2010.

Also under development reviews are neighborhood plans. Many of you know that neighborhood planning is a very strategic planning tool that is used in order to detail your comprehensive plan in a community. large communities like Pleasant Prairie, we're almost 35 square miles, would be very difficult to plan if we could not break it down into smaller planning units. I worked at SEWRPC for a number of years and I was a very strong proponent up there for neighborhood planning, so I brought that with me down here. It's a very easy and manageable way to take a look at how development will occur when and if it does occur.

Our community is divided up into approximately 22 different neighborhoods. Some of these overlap into the City of Kenosha. Again, these aren't subdivisions but they're neighborhood units that are approximately a mile or a mile and a half square area in size typically bounded by major arterials, water bodies, railroads or interstates. In the neighborhood plans slide that you have before you, we have been very busy in the last couple of years. Between January of 2004 and October of 2005 we approved neighborhood plans for Pleasant Homes, Lakewood and Prairie Ridge. Currently we're working on South Carol Beach, Village Green and Highpoint. Some of the neighborhoods we did earlier in the process but now we're updating them with new and better information, more refined environmental detailed information, and a lot more input from the residents and the community as a whole.

This is just an example of the Pleasant Homes Neighborhood Plan. All of our plans now are in a digital format and we work very closely with the IT department. Rich Robinson who has been a Godsend to us has been wonderful to work with, and he has been someone that has moved us from hand drafting and coloring all these maps over the years to a computerized format that can easily be adjusted, amended and corrected prior to the next meeting if that information has been worked out. So it's very important that these neighborhood plans be put together. They establish the frameworks. They put together probable land use patterns, road layouts, lot layouts, interconnections. They identify where public facilities are to be located, community facilities

such as schools. It identifies a lot of information for not only the Village but departments within the Village as well as Kenosha Unified School District, State and County planning agencies and everyone who is working to plan and grow the community with us.

Under new development reviews the staff is working on a number of projects. When I refer to that it's projects that are in the development pipeline. That means that they're in some stage or phase of the review process. A number of residents, even some tonight, had indicated to me that they feel like this is all just popping up overnight. Well, it doesn't pop up overnight. We have projects that we work on that can take anywhere from three to six years to get through the process once they've gone through that full planning process. And it's because we don't want to develop on a hodgepodge manner. We want to make sure our infrastructure is up to speed. We want to make sure that our roads are in the right location, access points are properly located. So there are so many elements that go into land use planning that are critical for us to know in the early stages before all that development starts to occur.

With respect to this particular map and, again, GIS has been wonderful in assisting us to put things like this together, conceptual plans since 2004 include King's Cove, Edgewood, Arbor Ridge Condominiums, Prairie Ridge Senior Campus Apartments, South Shore, Woodfield Estates, Westfield Heights, Creekside Hill LLC, Bain Station Crossing Condos and Ashbury Creek. Additional conceptual plans that will be brought to you later this year include Devonshire and Settlement at Bain Station Crossing. Preliminary plats include Hideaway Homes, Lighthouse Point, Woodfield Estates, Westfield Heights, Arbor Ridge, Meadowdale Estates Addition 1, King's Cove. And additional preliminary plats later this year will be Bain Station Crossing, Savannah Trails and Nob Hill at Bain Station Crossing.

So you can see we've got a great deal of development in the pipeline. It's not all going to happen at one time, but we will review them sequentially as they come to the Village and they're all at different stages depending on the developer and depending on how many additional elements of review that need to be completed. For example, if it's adjacent to a State highway they also need to do traffic studies for the State. If it's adjacent to the bike trail, we may need to do some additional analysis with Kenosha County regarding the bike trail. So because of that the don't all hit at the same time. They don't all get platted at the same time. They plat throughout the year. This is just a map that again shows some of the subdivisions that I was referring to that have been platted through October of 2005.

Under new development reviews, another area we look at is commercial projects. Prior to any new commercial building being constructed, detailed site and operational plans are required to be approved by the Plan Commission. This is an example of four recent projects that have gone through the Plan Commission's process: Walgreens up on Highway 50, Pepsi Cola in the LakeView Corporate Park, Famous Dave's up on Highway 50 as well in the Prairie Ridge development and LakeView Spec X which is on 88<sup>th</sup> Avenue in the Corporate Park.

In 2004 24 site and operational plans were submitted and reviewed by the staff and considered by the Plan Commission. What I'd like to clarify is it's not my department alone that reviews these site and operational plans. We've developed a pretty coordinated review process over the years in that each of the departments receives a copy of the plans and the documents and the drawings and has an opportunity to review those as to how it impacts their department, how it will affect

their services in the future, and how they'll be able to continue to do business as usual in the Village. So whether it's the police department, fire department, engineering, public works, administration, everyone gets an opportunity early in the process to see what we're doing, how we're doing it, and could it be designed or done a little bit differently in order to make their lives easier once they have to service it. Because planning and zoning does do a lot of servicing other than general inquiries once the project is completed. Then all the other departments have to take over with respect to providing services.

As a summary of new development reviews, all of the detailed comprehensive plan elements, land uses, neighborhood plans, they all set the foundation and the framework for the implementation tools for the property owners to develop their land. Just to clarify, as part of that entire process my staff is involved with meetings with developers, preparing staff memorandums, preparing detailed written staff reports and PowerPoint presentations to all the commissions and the boards, preparing and sending written notifications to adjacent property owners and interested persons, preparing and posting notices in public places, publishing the notices in the newspaper and meetings with the adjacent landowners.

In 2004 we prepared for 24 Plan Commission meetings and had 138 items on the agendas. We had two Zoning Board of Appeals meetings with two variances, we had 21 Village Board meetings with 86 related planning and zoning items, and to date we've had 16 Plan Commission meetings, three Board of Appeals meetings, 16 Village Board meetings and two Village Green Technical Advisory meetings.

The second area of review for our department is zoning permit reviews. Briefly, our staff reviews residential, commercial related permit applications to ensure compliance with the zoning ordinance. In 2004, 768 zoning permits were reviewed by the department, and in the first six months of 2005 467 zoning permits were reviewed. This includes not just for new structures but for accessory structures, additions to buildings, fences, decks, sheds, all type of new construction.

Zoning permit revenues collected, as you've seen my budget reflects typically an 18 month time period whenever I've presented, because I give everyone the whole previous year plus what's happening in the first six months of the year. For last year and the first six months of this year there were 910 single family zoning permits issued and \$41,371 collected; 14 two family zoning permits with \$1,030 in zoning fees collected; 10 multifamily zoning permits with \$855 collected; 102 commercial zoning permits with \$7,950 collected; and 199 miscellaneous permits with \$11,758 collected.

The next big area for us is inquiries. The department provides technical information and other assistance to local, county, state and federal officials, we respond to owners, businesses, lending agencies, title companies, realtors, developers and just about anyone who has a question. Our information we provide primarily revolves around community development issues, but oftentimes we're providing responses to many general inquiries that come to the Village that revolve around the Village as a whole.

The next area for us is code violations and litigation activities. In 2004 the planning and zoning staff followed up on 67 new junk and debris and zoning code violations. A total of 21 new junk and debris and zoning code violations were filed in the first half of 2005. One of the things I'm

going to be talking about later with respect to our goals is because we have been so busy with so many other activities within the department oftentimes code violations is something that doesn't get the first priority. So we're going to try to make some adjustments with respect to that. What's happening is a lot of new residents and new things are happening in the community, and what's happening is it's kind of uncovering some older areas and some areas that, as you can see by the photographs, have been neglected. They're areas that maybe didn't generate as much concern before, but now that there are more open areas and areas that are being observed a little more closer in the growing areas it's getting our attention. We don't go out looking for zoning code violations. They are brought to us, and it's through written code complaints that we receive these.

The second part of this activity is litigation activities. Mr. Pollocoff indicated to you that a great deal of his time this past year has been spent with various types of litigation revolving around activities that are going on in the Village. Our department provides support to administration, and we have been involved in our fair share of different types of activities such as the adult use bookstore relations, the razing of an abandoned and dilapidated tavern property, the 74<sup>th</sup> Street public improvements litigation, noise related issues, fire sprinkler related issues for the utility generating facility and power station, grading, top of foundation and drainage issues in an older subdivision. It's often difficult for us to plan when something is going to happen, when something pops up, when someone is going to file some type of litigation. We have some indication with some of the newer things, but we never know if something is going to pop up or if someone is going to be unhappy about something or if something has been stewing. So this is something in the last year we've been very, very busy with and it's taken up a great deal of staff time.

The fifth area of our activities is special projects. What I mentioned earlier is this is an area that has the most variety for our department, but I think it affects the most residents because they're Village wide issues that are of great importance, and they're very important to most of the departments because they affected different departments in different ways. This particular special project is transportation planning. This afternoon we had a three hour meeting and it was the State Trunk Highway 165 corridor study. I think all of you were here. I bet we had about 350 residents that came in over that three or three and a half hour time period. On the wall on either side what you have are three alternative plans that were put together for Highway 165. While the staff has been working with the DOT to provide them information over the past year, this was our first opportunity to see what their recommendations were for preserving the 165 corridor as growth and development occurs.

I think it was clear by the comments that I hear this afternoon as well as the concerns that the staff has that this plan has a lot of work to go yet, and there are some major concerns that we have as a staff. As a Village we will need to respond no different than the residents within 30 days. We intend to put together a memorandum that the Board takes a look at and can support so that we can bring it back to the DOT. This was the first in three public informational meetings that we held today. And we need to make sure that our concerns are heard because I think the plan that was presented today is very difficult to swallow in its current form. That was one special transportation project.

The other is State Trunk Highway 50 access management plan. This is actually an update to the

'87 plan. This is just a brief slide on the mainline basic lane requirements. This illustration was in the report from 1998 and then repeated again this year. It's an interesting highway because it has a great deal of traffic, but it's one of our gateways to our community. We've been working on this plan with the City of Kenosha, Kenosha County, the DOT and everyone for quite some time. I don't believe there's any resolve yet to exactly what's going to happen or what access is going to be restricted, so we've been working with them for a long period of time and we'll continue to work with them.

The final area of planning is the Village's transportation plan. The Village's engineering department, public works, parks and CD has been working in putting together a transportation plan. Obviously, everything that we're doing with respect to these corridor studies is linked and will be included in the Village's transportation plan when we get things wrapped up.

Another special project that we have provided some assistance with is park and trail planning. Park and trail planning, and actually the park plan when it's completed will be one of those elements that gets included in the Village's master or comprehensive plan. My staff assistant, Peggy in particular, was very cooperative and worked many hours with John Steinbrink, Jr., in putting together this park overview plan that helped us to organize and kind of divide up where park impact fees would be going within the community once they were collected. Since a neighborhood park, community park and a major park or multiuse park is not going to be located in every single neighborhood, we needed to help create larger neighborhood units so that the most number of people could benefit by a park within a particular area.

Through the work that John has done with the consultant and with Peggy, we have been able to identify the general nature of the types of improvements and where the park impact fees would be placed and how it could best benefit each area so that the improvements could be made in a timely manner. Again, this is one of the maps that was put together as a result of that.

Another special project is the Village Green Center planning project. This is actually a project that we initiated as a staff with an intern from UW-Milwaukee back in 1991. We worked with it with the community and a technical advisory committee for about five years. We came up with a plan. It was never felt that it was quite right, but it just sat on the books for a few years. And the developer who has acquired a lot of the land within the planning area came back to us within the year and said we'd like to resurrect this, we'd like to move forward, we'd like to create this community center downtown area that you've been looking for.

So we have reconvened our technical advisory committee. We've had a couple of meetings so far, and the focus of the Village Green Technical Advisory Committee is to create that dynamic great place to live, work and play. We've got a long way to go. We've got a lot of exciting ideas, and every day someone tells me that we need a grocery store, we need a gas station, we need this or we need this. There are a lot of things that I think we need, but I think it would be great for us to get together on the same page with a shared common vision and lay out exactly what it should look like. We're going to get once chance to do this, and once it's built I don't want the community to have any regrets.

We want to lay this out so it benefits everyone, and it's going to be something that we're going to want people to come to because it's just one of those great destination places. So we're very

early in the process at this point. In fact, this next month we're actually going to start touring places, great liveable spaces within 50 miles of the Village that people when they go there they say, oh, I wish we had this or we wish we had one of these in our community that we could go to. So that's where we are in the planning process. I envision that we're going to get into the real details of the conceptual planning sometime in the spring of next year.

Finally, some other special projects that we've worked on. First is updated the Village's flood insurance rate maps. We've worked very hard with the Village's engineering department, administration. As you know, we updated the floodplain and floodway maps for the Des Plaines River Watershed back in 1998, and since that time, and it's been a long time, eight years, FEMA has been working with us to prepare the FIRM maps, Federal Insurance Rate Maps for the Village of Pleasant Prairie. They have done that. We now have the draft maps. We now have 90 days to respond to those maps and that's what we're working on right now. Those will be the official maps that are used in the evaluation of properties to determine for flood insurance purposes are they in, are they out. So it's a very significant process for us and it's going to be coming to you very shortly.

The next are archeological studies. We have not yet completed the archeological study for the Nitto America site. We are nearing completion, and hopefully there will be a publication of the report within the year.

We research, write and process all the ordinance amendments as it relates to the zoning ordinance. We also assist with municipal code in other areas. We have codified the Village zoning ordinance. We've been rewriting sections of that ordinance over the last several years. We just completed the codification in the spring of this year. In 2004 we had 21 zoning map amendments, 7 land division and development control amendments, 3 municipal ordinance amendments, 12 text amendments, so we have periodically been amending the ordinance as needed based on modifications that are made, rewrites, or re-evaluations based on attorneys' reviews.

Then update permitting system with the IT department. My staff has been working with the inspection department and the IT department in order to try and put together an updated user friendly permitting system for the Village that will be able to be used for inspection and community development with respect to issuing permits and receipts.

A few more special projects that we've been working on. I know that this was a question that Alex had had at one point. Does the Unified School District know what's going on here? Well, every three months they ask me to update our reports on tracking new housing development data, on tracking new single family housing permits when they come in, and I track whose building, where they're building, where they came from, how many bedrooms. And then once I have that information they can track it back to their Unified database and they can find out you had two children, you moved from the City, you moved to the Village, you still have two children, so it's not a net gain to the district but it's a relocation of those students to another location.

So that's why in the last about two years they have been really close with respect to their data projections at least for Pleasant Prairie because of the constant meetings they have in order to give them that information so they can track it. What they used to do is say, well, last year we

had this many kids, next year we'll have that many kids and then we'll add 2 percent. That wasn't good enough because the growth in the area, the City, Somers and Pleasant Prairie has been greater than that and they've been kind of caught. So we're in a little bit of a crunch and that's why we have a referendum coming up next month.

Other special projects are providing assistance to the Community Development Authority related to redevelopment area #1. Prepare and review the Bristol/Pleasant Prairie Cooperative Plan. By statute and by our cooperative agreement with Bristol we are bound to put together a cooperative plan. Mike and I have been working on that, and hopefully later this year we will be presenting a cooperative plan. Primarily that encompasses the Village's supervised drainage basin, town service area, village growth area. There's very little Bristol area left that hasn't annexed into the Village. So most of the cooperative plan area incorporates a supervised drainage basin area that's going to stay in the Town of Bristol. I'm not sure if you understand what all that meant, but I can go into more detail at another time if you need me to.

And then the final element is that we are required by our cooperative agreement that whenever Bristol has a land division, a development or they do some type of activity within a supervised drainage basin area that's contiguous to the Village of Pleasant Prairie, we have to provide a drainage review based on the information that they provide to us. I have been doing those up to this year, and this year Bob and I have been cooperatively doing those reviews for their engineers and their residents that want to develop.

Last year we did some special event planning cooperatively with the recreation department. That included assistance with respect to the triathlons, the Danskin, Pleasant Prairie International and Kid's Triathlons, Prairie Family Days, and we coordinated the Expo. As of 2005, RecPlex has a special events coordinator, so we have graciously bowed out from that activity and they have taken over all special event activities along with the Parks Department.

Community Development how our time is spent, approximately 45 percent is spent on new development review, 10 percent is spent on zoning permit reviews, special projects 15 percent, code violations 5 percent and inquiries 25 percent.

Goals for Community Development, six goals. The first goal is to update and rewrite sections of the Village zoning ordinance. In 1989 when the Village incorporated, one of our goals was to completely rewrite the Village zoning ordinance and bring it up to speed as a municipal code ordinance. With the recodification we made a lot of drastic changes and we updated a number of things, but we didn't rewrite sections from 1983 when it was a County ordinance. The remaining sections we have to rewrite if we choose to, or at least to re-evaluated residential, agricultural,

park and recreational, Village Center business which is relatively new, overlay districts and planned development and temporary uses. So those are the areas we'd really like to start focusing in on.

The second goal is to continue to update the Village's comprehensive plan. This is actually a three year goal because it's going to take three years to update the comprehensive plan, 2006, 2007 and 2008. The Village under new law, 1999/2000 bi-annual budget, Governor Thompson signed in the new Smart Growth legislation. Basically what that states is that anyone who participates in planning, any community over 10,000 in population, will need to update their comprehensive plan to not only include the elements that we currently have but some new elements, specifically that relate to cooperative agreements and intergovernmental cooperation, economic development, housing, public participation. Most of the elements are in our comprehensive plan, but there are new elements that they have introduced. So it's going to be our job to update the comprehensive plan to a new design year, which will be at least 2025 and incorporate these new elements.

The big concern that we have is that the most important element of the Smart Growth law that affects Pleasant Prairie is that the zoning map and the comprehensive land use plan map need to be identical by January 1, 2010 per this new law. What that means is that we have to prezone all of our land in Pleasant Prairie, and we have a lot of vacant land, to meet what eventually is going to happen. That's not what we do today. We don't prezone land. We have a plan in place that tells everyone how we want to see it develop when and if it happens, but we don't prezone it in advance. So it's not prezoned into a multifamily district.

Our community has felt that that takes away too much of the local village's control with respect to good development/bad development, how it's going to happen/how it's not going to happen. So that's the only element that we have some big concerns with with respect to the Smart Growth law. With respect to the comprehensive plan update we think it's a great thing and we hope that the community continues to support it so they know what's going to happen into the future. This just outlines the steps that I would be taking in 2006 if this goal is achieved and a new program is funded.

The next goal, and I think Rich Robinson or Ruth might have referred to this on Monday, is to learn further GIS tools and techniques to obtain training on Arc View and related applications so that we can become more proficient with the GIS capabilities . . . but what we'd like to be able to do is to manipulate some information on the GIS system. We'd like to be able to prepare more maps, overlays, make modifications to neighborhood plans. We'd like to be able to analyze the data. We'd like to be able to do more than we can currently do. And our training, which we proposed would happen in the first quarter of 2006 will greatly enhance our presentations and lessen the workload hopefully of IT.

The next goal is to limit work related accidents and injuries to zero. Last year we had a situation where we had a lot of filing that had started building up because we didn't have the staff time and someone was off part-time on maternity leave, so we did not get filing done. So we had about three to four months worth of filing that the staff did and she reserved one week to do it. Unfortunately she hurt her back because all she was doing for eight hours a day for a week was filing. So while my department doesn't do a lot of outside inspections other than zoning and



we're not fire fighters or policeman we don't have a lot of work related injuries. But our goal this next year is to make sure we have no work related accidents.

We have taken some special precautions since we've had some near misses that a lot of the drawers that come out with all the big map files we've had some near misses, and I think one person actually got injured when she ran into it and hit her head into it, hit her eye. So we just need to make and take more precautions with respect to what we do inside the building.

The next goal is to follow up and resolve code violations in a timely manner. I had mentioned this previously. Here I have examples of what it looked like and then we have it resolved. Two goals, investigate 50 percent of the code violations within 30 days of the complaint being filed, and secondly resolve 50 percent of the code violations within 90 days of when they've been filed.

Proposed new programs. We have one and it's one that I just referenced, and that is update the comprehensive plan. One important note is that the Southeast Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission last year applied with Kenosha County for a grant to fund the comprehensive plan for our area. it was not funded. They've reapplied for the grant, and we feel that that could likely get funded for 2006, 2007 and 2008. If it does get funded, then this program does not need to be funded, because the only monies, if you will, that will need to be provided by the community are the in-kind services of our staff time as well as printing of documents and attending meetings and things like that. So we will not have to spend any out of pocket costs. If we don't get the grant, we've got until 2010 to come up with \$75,000 and do it ourselves.

Program reductions, my department is similar to Rocco's department in that I don't have a lot of extra activities that we do other than personnel responding to reviews, inquiries and activities. And so my reduction is to reduce the number of Village newsletters sent from four to two per year and to distribute the newsletter in the *Sun Times* and that would be for a total reduction of \$12,450. The impact on basic operations is that we'll have two less means of getting the word out to the public on what's going on, but this year alone the Village has now completed and is up and operating one of the best websites I think that most communities have for general government, RecPlex and IcePlex. We have two Village newspapers covering us, *Sun Times* and *Kenosha News*. We have the Village public meetings, and soon we'll have Channel 25 which will provide current and timely updates of information to the residents.

Proposed capital improvements. Again, I do not have a capital intensive department, but I love maps. And my 2006 capital improvement is to update the 1999 wall mosaic in the conference room with 2005 aerial Ortho photographs. That huge photograph that is in the conference room is invaluable. There are meetings; there are times that whole departments can use that conference room, developers, property owners. The Village can see the entire community at a glance. We can look at land use changes, transportation changes. I think it's very valuable to have the entire photograph of the Village at a glance for everybody to see and what has been changing. I would recommend that since the aerial is flown by SEWRPC every five years we get the information the following year, that this is something that we look at every five years. There are no capital improvements then in 2007, 2008 or 2009. And in 2010 I am proposing that we again obtain the aerial photo information as flown by Aerometrics for SEWRPC and then in 2011 I would recommend that we get that aerial again. I'm only hoping that as technology improves that maybe the cost might continue to go down.

Development projections. This is one portion of my budget that's in my annual report and I provide to most departments actually back at the end of summer. It's critically important for most departments to get this information because they need to know how to plan and project for increased services based on new development that's occurring in the Village. So I do development projections. The development projections are based on developments that are in that pipeline that I talked about earlier this evening. Based on a three year look see as to what stage that someone is in the process. Again, it takes about three years for someone to get through the process from neighborhood planning all the way to when they've completed their subdivision and homes are under construction.

In 2006 and 2007 I'm proposing 200 single family homes, in 2008, 147 single family homes. In 2006 I'm proposing 42 single two family homes, in 2007, 38 two family, and in 2008, 84 two family. For 2006 multifamily this is a jump. We have not had this much multifamily for a very long time in the Village. This reflects all condominiums. No apartments but condominiums. There are two's, three's, four's, eight's and twelve's, 256 proposed in 2006, 286 in 2007 and 155 in 2008. Again, this information gets provided to the departments and administration for their projections as well.

I also provide everyone information on commercial projection. Again, this is based on what I know now and what they've provided and different types of plans that are in some phase of that pipeline. We've got some restaurants, a lodge building, grocery store, bank, big box retail center, convenience store and some manufacturing warehouses in the LakeView Corporate Park.

In 2007 and 2008 we're adding another smaller grocery store, a restaurant, some retail buildings. Really in 2007 I think is where the Village Center is going to start to take off, some retail buildings in Prairie Ridge and at 165 and 31. In 2008 I can see continued commercial growth at my three commercial centers, the Village Center, Prairie Ridge and 165 and Highway 31.

Summary of proposed 2006 revenues compared to 2005. 2006 revenue projections, my department collects revenues beginning in the process when predevelopment agreements are signed all the way through the permitting process. Application fees we're projecting at \$80,000; development fees at \$80,000, single family permit fees at \$40,000; two family zoning permit fees at \$2,500; multifamily at \$5,000; commercial/industrial zoning permit fees at \$6,000; and miscellaneous zoning permit fees at \$8,000 for about \$221,000 in revenues projected. Projected revenue sources to fund the department direct revenues is 41 percent, what I just referred to, and indirect and levy revenues 59 percent at \$320,542.

Summary of proposed expenses in 2006 compared to 2005, personnel services \$399,695, up slightly; contractual services \$116,114; supplies and maintenance at \$21,133; property and liability insurance at \$5,100 for a department subtotal of \$542,042. The new program request if funded would be \$25,000 in 2006. Again, there's a really good chance that we'll get the grant

October 19, 2005  
Village Board Minutes

funding, so the new program would not be needed if in fact we got that grant funding. There's no new personnel being requested, and the program reduction with respect to the newsletters is \$12,450. Any questions?

John Steinbrink:

Smart Growth, Jean, where do you see the funding there?

Jean Werbie:

The funding has been renewed by the Governor for this year, and so there's just between \$2 and \$3 million at the State right now to fund comprehensive plans and Smart Growth plans. SEWRPC, as well as Kenosha County, feels that we get a good shot at getting that funding. One thing I just would like to mention with respect to the grant program, the Village through that agreement that was prepared and sent to SEWRPC, that if we receive the funding, use the funding, we need to adopt the comprehensive plan. If we don't we have to give them the money back.

John Steinbrink:

Questions for Jean or comments?

Jeff Lauer:

Just one, Jean. I think the Village Green Center is a good idea. I know I've been waiting for it for years as many of the lot of folks in the Village. I don't know if you can say yet, but do you already have a couple sites or possibilities where that would be?

Jean Werbie:

Yes. The Village Green site will be that entire area that is across from the Village Hall. It's an area that extends from Meadowdale Estates south to Highway 165, that's the planning area anyway, from approximately 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue west to the Village Green Heights development. So we have looked at this extensively, but we still need to do our research because things are different than they were 15 years ago. Feelings have changed. The opportunities that we've created is to get as much community input throughout the process. So we will hold our nominal group meetings and public meetings and surveys. We want to get the peoples' input because we want to know what people are looking for. This was part of the site analysis.

The developer this time around at the Village's request hired a consulting firm out of Madison to work with the Village and to work with them to help see a bigger picture and to think outside the box. So far we've developed and have had a really good working relationship with them, and they've done other community down towns, so they kind of have an idea of what we're looking for.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you, Jean.

### **3) Inspection Department**

Jeff Sorensen:

As exciting as building inspection is for all of you I'm sure, I'm going to give you just a brief description of items this evening. I can't go into everything. It's getting late, so if you ever have any questions we're here everyday. Please stop in, call, e-mail, whatever you need.

I'm going to give you the budget presentation for proposals for 2006. The general purpose of the building inspection department is to promote the public health, safety, convenience and general welfare of the citizens of the community. As such, the activities of the building inspection department have a significant impact on existing and future construction activities of the Village of Pleasant Prairie.

This is an overview of commercial that has been done in the past year. You saw some photographs from Jean's presentation. The Pepsi facility is open. The Iris addition has been completed. St. Catherine's Hospital is in a constant remodel/finish out of the second floor offices. The Honada Sushi Restaurant is open. Spec X is a building being done by WisPark currently in the construction phase and should be complete by the end of the year. And Hospira is doing a controlled storage facility in a building that they lease.

Some of the items that the plans will be approved and will be under construction, Famous Dave's is under construction. Dr. Johnson has approved plans. He's going to go right over here behind the saloon on Springbrook Road and 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue. And Prime Outlets should begin their 150,000 square foot expansion. As you see, it says as of September 30<sup>th</sup> all plans have been approved and permits issued. That is except for the Prime Outlets. All that has been issued for Prime Outlets is an early start footing and foundation permit. They have not completed all their requirements to be allowed to get a building permit in the Village.

During the past 12 months the inspection department has reviewed 131 single family homes, 5 new two family, 9 new manufactured housing units, 2 multifamily buildings, 108 residential remodels and additions, 35 swimming pools, 179 decks, 164 attached and detached garages and 25 sheds. This is a slide you might recognize from Bob Martin's presentation. I thought I'd throw it in. Even with the inspections that we're doing now in Village Green and throughout the rest of the Village, it reinforces that there are continuing to be more subdivisions that are going to come on line which are going to take more and more inspections in order to keep this pipeline running.

In 2004, 5,752 inspections were completed averaging 480 inspections a month. Thus far in 2005, approximately 4,000 inspections have been completed averaging 444 inspections. These numbers do not include other inspections conducted by the department such as liquor license inspections, drainage and grading inspections and other special inspections requested by property owners.

I would like to point out that from October of 2004 to May of 2005 there were only two building inspectors that were fully certified by the State of Wisconsin to do inspections in the Village. Also, in 2004 the inspection superintendent and the senior building inspector became certified as commercial plumbing inspectors. We also maintain our status as a certified municipality which allows the Village to do certain State reviews to a certain size as prescribed by State statute.

In 2005, the Village building inspection department was audited by the ISO which is the Insurance Services Office. They do this once every six to ten years. In 1999 was the last time the Village was audited and our ranking was a five for residential and a five for commercial. This ranking is based on one to ten with one being the best, ten being the worst. There are no number ones in the State of Wisconsin. In 2005 we now are rated as a number three in residential and a number three in commercial.

This is the department organizational chart. I'd like to point out that the senior building inspector is Ken Robers, the building inspector that you see up there is Ralph Nichols. Ralph came to us and became certified in his first certification from the State in March of 2005. Elaine is the clerk analyst and also the Board of Appeals Secretary. Elaine is the person that takes all the phone calls, good, bad and otherwise that come into the Village Hall for inspections, complaints or information. Anna is the part-time file clerk which is shared 50/50 with the Community Development Department. And a little shaded out is the part-time commercial electrical inspector that I'll talk about a little further in the new program request.

I'll now show you a chart of the proposed revenues to expenditures for 2006. The green box is the revenues. The blue box is the expenses. The revenues indicate \$867,772, and the expenses of the department of \$380,094. This would be to the advantage of the Village for the general fund of \$487,678. In comparison to 2005 it will generate more money toward the general fund next year than this year. If you have any questions as we're going just jump in. I know you're wild about this.

This is a pie chart just showing how the department expenses are divided up, personnel, property insurance, contractual services and supplies.

I'll briefly go through the proposed goals and objectives. It's always a goal of the building inspection department to provide plan review. We're mandated by State statute to provide a plan review of a one and two family dwelling within ten working days of the time it's presented to us. We also have that same obligation for commercial. And even though there's nothing in the State statute in our Village building code, we also maintain that for all other permits. Even though we take it on a first come first serve, most of the time it does not take ten days.

Our next obligation is to provide the inspections. State statutes say we must provide the inspection within 48 hours of the time someone calls. If we do not provide that inspection within 48 hours, the contractor can continue work without the inspection happening. We've been fortunate to not have that happen in the Village thus far.

Another one of our goals is to maintain our certifications and to train the new inspector. It's a requirement in order to maintain your inspection certifications that you have continuing

education. The State used to base that upon every two years. Last year they changed that to four year increments. You're required to have six hours of continuing education for each certification that you hold. Currently the inspection superintendent and the senior building inspector hold certifications in UDS, which is Uniform Dwelling Code, construction, HDAC, plumbing and electric and also commercial building and commercial plumbing. In order to get the certification every four years you have to take these classes every year. You cannot skip.

The goals of the building inspection department are to effectively and efficiently provide building inspection services in a timely, efficient and friendly manner to the public. Sometimes it's hard to be friendly. Sometimes they're not talking to us nice but we try to talk to them nice. We also need to complete this computerized permitting system that we've been working on for years now. Ruth is on board along with Jean in order to get this permitting system up and running 100 percent. Currently we're only able to use it for the review of one and two family dwellings. We need to get this permitting system to be able to handle all of our permits as well as all of our reports and the scheduling.

In 2001 the Village required that all electrical work done in the Village be completed by Village licensed electrical contractor, and that all commercial projects obtain electrical permits from the Village. We were in discussion with the commercial electrical inspectors who helped us write the Village electrical code that's in combination with our building code so as to ensure that we could cover all of the electrical types of inspections and requirements. What was happening was in the Village people used to be able to do their own electric work. Then when they would have an electrical inspection they'd find out how miserably they failed. They would waste a lot of money, there would be a lot of heartache and a lot of arguing. So while commercial electrical contractors are required for most projects, we also allow a homeowner, if he lives in his home, to do certain electrical work himself. That's not to say he can do it in a rental property. And he's also restricted that he cannot do electrical services. He cannot do swimming pools or hot tubs.

For new programs I would propose that the developers be charged the department consultation services at \$65 an hour. This dollar amount is consistent with what the community development department charges developers currently. Building inspection has no charge for developers. We provide all our service for free which includes site and operational plan review, preliminary and final plat review, and the most time consuming of all the review of master grading plans for subdivisions.

Several years ago and continuing even today we've been refining how master grading plans are approved in the Village. A master grading plans in a new subdivision takes away the possibility of someone grading their lot to cause inconvenience, flooding or a nuisance to their adjacent property owners. You would be surprised how much time is spent on grading and drainage complaints.

Another new program which you saw in the organization chart is to hire a part-time commercial electrical inspector. Currently the Village contracts with independent inspections to provide the Village with a commercial electrical inspector. This contract requires the Village to give independent inspections 90 percent of the permit fee in order for them to send a commercial electrical inspector down here. If we were able to hire a part-time commercial electrical inspector, I have it calculated as 10 hours per week at \$35 an hour, the Village would be able to at

minimum break even and more than likely make money on the permits instead of us giving it to independent inspections. This calculation is based upon the current fee schedule we use for commercial electrical permits. We would not change anything and it would have no impact to the general fund budget.

For a program reduction I propose to eliminate the attorney fees that are listed in our budget for obtaining enforcement orders for a reduction of \$3,000. Currently that's in our budget and has been used in the past to go to court to try to enforce razing orders on buildings in the Village. We have never, never been successful in going to court to raze a building in this frame. This is completely different than the Community Development Authority's jurisdiction and the type of work they do.

I have one capital request which is part of the five year capital plan which is to replace one of the inspection vehicles for \$16,000. As Rocco had previously told you, we do not in the Village purchase new vehicles at any time. All our vehicles are purchased through the auction on I-94. So when we get a vehicle we get a used vehicle. And the vehicle I'm proposing to get rid of is a 1998 vehicle that was used at 30,000 and some miles in 1998. So in order to keep our expenses down to keep these vehicles in repair, it's to our advantage to rotate them through. I might also add that this vehicle that I'm proposing to replace is a two wheel drive vehicle, a rear wheel drive pickup truck which is not very useful in subdivisions that do not have paved roads and also when we're going out there in the wintertime through marginally snowplowed roads because really nobody is living there, and we're traveling over uneven ground at all times. A van or a little two wheel drive pickup truck we do more damage to the truck than anything. Any questions?

Mike Pollocoff:

Before you start questions, one of the things I'd like to push up on the agenda for Jeff's budget is to accept his proposal for his new program for an electrical inspector for a couple of reasons. One is that as he indicated and you can see in your budget books it's a net revenue item to not contract out that service anymore and to hire a part-time inspector to do the work for us and we would keep those revenues.

We have one big permit that we're facing right now and that would be the Prime Outlet site. If you think back to when Jeff was working on his budget, it looks like that one was going to be something that will happen in fiscal year 2006 and it will happen in 2005. By taking the opportunity to do that in house it will bring in about \$4,800, far more than we get. Now what we had before, just refresh what Jeff described, it's a tough inspection job to use because not very many people are licensed or certified to be a commercial inspector. As much experience as Jeff has, and he has a ton of experience, he's not an electrician, and Independent Inspections was the company that did it before us and they did it for a lot of communities. Basically to do the work for you they want all your permit money. So you get like 5 percent is what we keep and they get everything else. And the individual we'd be looking to hire lives in the Village, worked for Independent Inspections as an inspector. He didn't?

Jeff Sorensen:

He did not. He was an electrical contractor.

October 19, 2005  
Village Board Minutes

Mike Pollocoff:

Anyway, I would recommend we accept that program impact this year and place it in the budget as an amendment to this year's budget and pull it out of the 2006 budget as a proposed new program and make it a funded program.

Jeff Sorensen:

Just to add a little bit of something so you guys know, all of the other certifications that you can get to do inspecting in the State of Wisconsin can be had through education and testing. Commercial electrical inspection is not one of them. You cannot take education and substitute it from being an electrician in order to obtain a master electrician's license in the State of Wisconsin which is required that you have this master electrician's license in order to be a commercial electrical inspector.

Alex Tiahnybok:

And this particular guy has that?

Jeff Sorensen:

Absolutely.

Mike Pollocoff:

There's not a lot of them around.

Jeff Sorensen:

This particular guy I'm thinking of is a licensed master electrician and also is certified in commercial electric inspection. And fortunately he does no commercial electrical work in the Village which is a main concern so there would be no conflict of interest.

Alex Tiahnybok:

And we need to jump on this now otherwise we may lose the opportunity?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right. It would short us \$4,000 in revenues for next year.

Alex Tiahnybok:

That needs to be a motion?

Mike Pollocoff:



October 19, 2005  
Village Board Minutes

Yes.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I motion that we move forward on the hiring of this individual in budget year 2005 and take it out of the 2006.

Mike Serpe:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second. Any further discussion?

Jeff Lauer:

Can you tell the person's name/

Jeff Sorensen:

Sure. The guy I'm thinking of his name is Hans Peter Langenstroer. He lives right down here on 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue. He just built a house and moved in this past spring right on top of the hill. He's got a beautiful five acre parcel, all trees.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Is his wife Linda?

Jeff Sorensen:

I don't know the fraulein, no.

Alex Tiahnybok:

She works for Kenosha Unified I think.

Jeff Sorensen:

No, his wife really is the one who ran the business from the old house.

Mike Serpe:

We have to vote on that motion.

October 19, 2005  
Village Board Minutes

**TIAHNYBOK MOVED TO HIRE A PART TIME ELECTRICAL INSPECTOR IN BUDGET YEAR 2005 AND TAKE IT OUT OF FY 2006; SECONDED BY SERPE; MOTION CARRIED; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

Mike Pollocoff:

We started late tonight with the DOT and then the issues with the Sheriff. We have a relatively light Plan Commission agenda on Monday night in which we'll be following up with public safety dispatch, fire and sanitation and utilities. So if you want we can keep running tonight, or if you want to move finance to Monday night we can do that.

John Steinbrink:

It's up to Kathy what you'd like to do.

Kathy Goessl:

It doesn't matter to me.

Mike Serpe:

We start at five o'clock on Monday so I think Monday would be more appropriate myself. But I have one comment on Jeff's budget. Jeff, you want to charge the \$65 an hour for reviewing and I think that's a great idea. Could there be a mechanism put in place that when you give final inspection on, for example, drainage plans that everything was according to the plan and working, and then something happen in the next year where this person may have brought in fill or done something to change that drainage plan so it's not working as it was originally inspected. Many times you and Bob have to go out and look this thing over, it takes a lot of time and you have a lot of meetings. If at all possible I think we should put a fee in place that recovers the Village engineer's and the Village inspector's time when a property owner deliberately changes something that was proved to work in the first place and now it doesn't. These things are coming up more and more often. It's causing neighborhood problems. It's causing problems between neighbors and it's taking up a lot a lot of time that we don't have to spend when somebody deliberately does something to change something that's been approved to work in the first place.

Mike Pollocoff:

The Board can establish a charge for services that in this case are peculiar to somebody because they've done something that causes us to take care of them individually and basically they've violated the grading plan that's been adopted by the Village Plan Commission and the Board to make sure that subdivision works. And when they modify that then the engineering isn't sound anymore and we have to get them back into compliance. You might want to run it by an attorney. Some of them are going to say take them to court and sue them for your expenses and make them fix it. But typically what happens in the real world is Jeff and Bob spend a ton of time going out there giving those guys religion and getting surveys done and convincing them which way water runs. It is a time tedious prospect, and it's almost always because someone has gone away from a design or an engineered drainage plan.

Mike Serpe:

That could be put into place at any time. We don't have to do it right now. I don't know what the feeling of the rest of the Board is on this, but I think it's worth looking into. I've seen Bob and Jeff get tied up for hours and hours and hours on end on one project that somebody deliberately changed because they didn't like what the original inspection gave.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

We have a project right here in Prairie Village with Stanich.

Mike Pollocoff:

That was more with just incompetence. But it is if somebody has a slope in their yard and they don't like it and they want it flat so they fill it up flat and it doesn't drain anymore, and then you've got water drainage problems throughout the subdivision and you've got to go back. It's one of those things where everybody is an engineer that gets involved in it.

Mike Serpe:

I don't know that it would hurt to look into the feasibility of bringing this forward at least to look at it a little further down the road. I think I'd like to feel that we can give Mike that direction, not tomorrow or the next day, but to look at it sometime in the near future to see if it's worth bringing forward.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I think that's a good idea. Because if somebody . . . get flooded . . . change it without authorization.

John Steinbrink:

October 19, 2005  
Village Board Minutes

Thanks, Jeff. I guess a home or a business is probably the biggest investment most people make in their life. I guess a lot of them don't realize that you're actually out there protecting their investment by making sure it's put together right and somewhere down the road there's not going to be a liability issue because something was done haphazardly. So I've seen first hand your knowledge and it's kind of remarkable. You're actually doing better than most of my classmates out of school, some of those doctors and lawyers.

Mike Serpe:

I guess to be conforming to the agenda I would move that we hear the finance report on Monday after the Plan Commission.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I second.

**SERPE MOVED TO MOVE THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT'S BUDGET PRESENTATION TO THE SPECIAL MEETING SCHEDULED OCTOBER 24, 2005; SECONDED BY TIAHNYBOK; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

Jeff Lauer:

I have one question for Jeff. Jeff, so I understand right, the \$65 inspection service is that above and beyond the call of duty, meaning--

Jeff Sorensen:

No, that's factored in. That dollar amount was given to me by the finance department. That happens to be precisely the same dollar amount that Jean Werbie charges for her developers when she charges. So it's all in line.

Mike Pollocoff:

It's not something that someone is taking and paying for in a permit. Typically what that is is when they haven't gotten their building permits yet but they're having Jeff perform some kind of review, whether it's a grading review or whatever, that we don't collect a permit on that, over and above.

Jeff Sorensen:

And this is not me charging an individual permit for a single family home for me to review their drainage plan. No, I won't be doing that. This is the overall development.

October 19, 2005  
Village Board Minutes

**4. ADJOURNMENT**

**SERPE MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ;  
MOTION CARRIED 5-0 AND MEETING ADJOURNED AT 11:15 P.M.**