

**VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE
PLEASANT PRAIRIE VILLAGE BOARD
PLEASANT PRAIRIE WATER UTILITY
LAKE MICHIGAN SEWER UTILITY DISTRICT
SEWER UTILITY DISTRICT "D"**

**9915 39th Avenue
Pleasant Prairie, WI
September 24, 2007**

Immediately following the 5 p.m. Plan Commission Meeting

A Special Meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Village Board was held on Monday, September 24, 2007. Meeting called to order at 6:40 p.m. Present were Village Board members John Steinbrink, Monica Yuhas, Steve Kumorkiewicz, Clyde Allen and Mike Serpe. Also present were Mike Pollocoff, Village Administrator; Jean Werbie, Community Development Director and Jane Romanowski, Village Clerk.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. ROLL CALL**
- 3. CITIZEN COMMENTS**

John Steinbrink:

Anybody wishing to speak? There's a gentleman.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Alex Tiahnybok, 8757 Lakeshore Drive. Thanks for the compliment of being a gentleman. That was nice.

John Steinbrink:

Is that a Notre Dame hat?

Alex Tiahnybok:

No, it's a school with a better winning record. Not quite good enough, though. A lot has occurred about the strip mall at 91st Street and 22nd Avenue over the course of the last several weeks. I've been monitoring the news as best as I can through newspaper reports. And it's quite clear that quite a few people have addressed concerns about the conversion of that site from what has historically been commercial to residential now. I think one of the agenda items today is the creation of the TIF, and you know how I feel about TIFs in general. This one, though, I think rises to a level that I think is different than any other TIF. One can oppose the concept of a TIF, whether or not it's for commercial purposes to enhance lands so that commercial empties like businesses in LakeView Corporate Park can come in and have improved land to build their businesses but this is different.

Village Board Meeting
September 24, 2007

My primary concern is the structure of the financing. From what I've read in the paper \$715,000 is going to be the figure, the quantity total to finance the restoration of that property environmentally, etc. I'm not opposed to that in any way. I live very close to that site and I drive by it regularly and I think it's looked awful for 15 years so I'm not opposed to that property being fixed. But to me there's a glaring difference between TIF for residential purposes and a TIF for commercial reasons. Commercial entities are profit makers. They certainly don't send kids to schools and this is different.

The structure as I understand it, currently the property is assessed, and I don't know what the pre-blight or pre-TIF valuation of the property is and I'd like to hear that addressed today. It was sold for \$185,000. So if you do the simple math, \$185,000 is going to generate something in the range of \$4,000 of property taxes. That's what the before should be. The after you're going to have 28 units at \$150,000, that's over \$4 million and that should generate something in the range of \$60,000 of property taxes. So what's the benefit to the residents of Pleasant Prairie? They're going to continue getting \$4,000 of taxes on that blighted property, and if I'm wrong please tell me, and the remainder, something like \$50,000 of property taxes is going to go to offset that \$715,000 debt. Whoever is holding it really is irrelevant to me.

But who's going to pay the added costs? This is a vehicle so a private investor, Steve Mills, who created a separate corporation to buy this property, etc., so that this land could be improved, which I'm not opposed, but this is going to be a big money generator. It's going to be a big profit maker. And I believe costs like that are the costs of doing business. He's going to turn around and sell that property, if all the units get sold at \$150,000 for \$4.2 million. Simple math. The Village, the taxpayers have to be on the hook for the next 14 years or so to pay off that amount. Steve, you were on the School Commission. We're going to send how many—what's the average per residence, what's the average number of students sent to Kenosha Unified? Where's that money going to come from? The tuition dollars, they're going to go to pay off somebody's debt, not to fund the schools. Who's going to pick up the pieces? The other existing taxpayers that you claim to be all concerned about all the time. The other existing taxpayers of Somers, the other existing taxpayers of Kenosha are going to essentially subsidize that property. If you inform me of a solution to that quandary, which I think is a serious conflict, let me know.

John Steinbrink:

Anyone else under citizens' comments? Hearing none I'll close citizens' comments.

Mike Serpe:

John, I think the agenda allows us to respond in brief to this? Am I correct?

Mike Pollocoff:

I believe you can but I think a lot of the allegations can be dealt with under the project plans that really describes it.

Village Board Meeting
September 24, 2007

Mike Serpe:

I agree, but just a couple of statements that were made by Alex that a number of people were objecting to this. Initially when the first public hearing was held that was the case until after the meeting when these same people, and a couple are here tonight, met with the staff and that was put to rest. Matter of fact, the people that were very vocal against it, because they didn't have all the information and we understand that, are very much in favor of this project going forward. So that's one.

The only other comment I'm going to make is if Steve Mills didn't come forward with the money to do this project it would fall on the backs of the taxpayers and the Village eventually because it's going to have to be cleaned up one way or another. If Steve is willing to do that he's more than welcome to make the profit for his investments.

John Steinbrink:

Unfortunately, Alex, you haven't been here for the meetings and you're going by what you've read in the paper which probably doesn't include everything. So hopefully you'll stick around for the items coming up and maybe you'll get a better understanding of what we're doing here. It's not making somebody rich. It's taking care of a real problem that exists in the community, especially for those folks back there and the folks living in the areas that have the pollution in their area and nobody is there to clean it up. Mr. Mills has stepped forward and he's doing that at his cost. Otherwise the taxpayers, you being one of them, would share that responsibility because now that we know about the problem which we didn't know about before, about the pollutants in the soil in that area, the contaminates, we have to take action to make that correct over there. I think we do have folks here representing the company that's going to be doing that work. Anyone else under citizens' comments?

Virginia Mullins:

I'm Virginia Mullins. My husband and I own the property—

Jane Romanowski:

Excuse me, could I have your address please?

Virginia Mullins:

9145 22nd Avenue. We share the southern border of the affected property for the TIF District. I'm just going to say this. We've owned our land for about 16 years now and we've seen that property go from bad to worse to unbearable. It's an eyesore. The thing to keep in mind for us, the biggest issue, is that a number of the individuals that live in this area are on wells and we have no access to City water. So for our own personal safety it's in our best interest to see that cleaned up. Unfortunately the contamination came at a time when there wasn't really any monitoring people—people build businesses out in the county because I've lived in Pleasant Prairie all my life so I'm well aware of that and I've lived on a well all my life.

Village Board Meeting
September 24, 2007

They come out there, they dump wherever they want. They just don't understand the concept of clean, safe groundwater for drinking and that's what happened out there. So if that's what needs to be done to clean it up, it actually impacts everyone else in the area in a positive way because it's going to contribute to a cleaner environmental status for all of us and we'll all get some benefit out of it. So those are our reasons for being in favor of that. There could be a lot of other types of development going into that area such as more commercial districts which there's some pros and cons to that. But if you have something other than residential you're still stuck back in the situation of uncontrolled, unmonitored dumping back there. Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

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

4. NEW BUSINESS

A. Consider Resolution #07-62 - Resolution Approving the Project Plan for Tax Incremental District No. 4 of the Village of Pleasant Prairie, Wisconsin.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, this resolution is the resolution that formally adopts the project plan for this project. The draft of the project plan has been presented to the Pleasant Prairie Plan Commission. The Joint Review Board, which is that entity of overlapping tax districts, Kenosha Unified, Kenosha County, Gateway and the Village have reviewed the draft. We've covered the concept of it. They're the ones that are really going to have the final say on seeing whether or not this development meets the test for being able to use TIF authority. Our attorney has reviewed it and it clearly is a use that's permitted.

The project plan defines the project and the expenses that are going to be made for environmental cleanup, demolition, brownfield site specific infrastructure and the associated costs involved with that so that the developer pays for all the expenses, administrative, legal, anything that goes on with this rather than having that go on the tax roll. The Community Development Authority in September took formal action after a public hearing and adopted a resolution declaring that this site is, in fact, blighted.

The Village is currently undertaking the rezoning and evaluating the site and operational plans for this project to put it into a multifamily zoning district. The project costs are \$715,365 as we have identified it at this point. I guess it was during citizens' comments the comment was made that this is a big money development. It's big money to me and I think it's probably big money to most people, but as far as a residential development goes it's not very big money at all. These are rather modest condominiums between \$150,000 and \$170,000 not probably on a pace with some of the other ones in the area.

Village Board Meeting
September 24, 2007

We've taken a look at where we're at now, and right now the increments that are going to be collected are minor. In 2008 the Unified District would get \$4,200 roughly, Kenosha County, \$2,300 and Gateway \$692. This is not going to develop overnight. There's going to be an absorption rate. The developer anticipates that it will take a couple years to build out. We're always a year behind because we establish values at the first of the year each year.

The Wisconsin State statues specifically provided for tax incremental district financing to do a number of things. The one that people in Pleasant Prairie are most familiar with is LakeView Corporate Park. The establishment of a very capital intensive employment center that created a lot of value. It also provides for TIF districts to eliminate blight and that could be in a residential area. It can be in a commercial area. This is a good description of using tax increment financing to eliminate in this case a commercial area that's blighted. This commercial area is very old. It dates back to the early '70s. In fact, the Pleasant Prairie Town offices were in one of the little shops in there for a number of years.

For whatever reason and I think the reasons are primarily the number of rooftops in that area, the traffic flow around that area, it has not been successful in attracting commercial business to that area. One doesn't have to look much farther than going up 22nd Avenue into how commercial businesses have not kept pace with other areas of the community where you go up 22nd north of 89th Street you have the Sunnyside development there. You have the Sentry Foods that went out of business. If you go over to Sheridan Road it's not much better. Right now, given the housing in the area, this is not going to support commercial development. As a matter of fact, I think if it did support commercial development it, in fact, would have happened.

This property was picked up at a fairly low price, \$185,000 for the three parcels. But it carries with it a significant environmental contamination. The Village had some knowledge last year that there was contamination to the extent once the report was released to us, the extent of it, it's significant. To do anything else on this parcel, to take out the existing use, have the developer assume that initial risk of \$715,000 to do that cleanup himself, and then assuming from that point on he would then put up a commercial structure when in fact a commercial structure has not seen any success in that area before, you've taken a risky situation that begins with an ongoing commercial enterprise today and then you lay it on top of that at \$715,000 cost to clean up the problem that's there.

In the Kenosha area, and you don't have to look much farther than the City of Kenosha to see where TIF has been used to eliminate blighted areas, Harbor Park is one example, the Brass site is another example, McWhyte will be another one, for a lot of reasons and a lot of times when you have contamination the private markets are worried about going in and investing private funds in going in and doing that cleanup. In Milwaukee there's hardly any, I can't think of any of the properties in that Third Ward District or south of 794 that have been cleaned up or worked on without TIF funds. It's too much of a risk. On top of it this isn't like a gas station. This is a dry cleaning site which is a lot more expensive than the other sites.

My recommendation to the Board on this is that if we're going to do this there's a couple reasons we should do it. One is that, and I think it's true that if we leave it unto itself it won't redevelop. It won't be cleaned up. I would imagine Mr. Mills will let it go for what he has into it and it will

Village Board Meeting
September 24, 2007

still be there. The groundwater will remain contaminated. The soil will still be contaminated. Nothing gets taken care of. Now the Village is in the position that we know that there's a groundwater contamination there and, in fact, it's contaminating wells. Our next step as a municipality is to go in and start installing municipal water in that area to alleviate that problem. So there's public expense number one that's going to occur.

Public expense number two is if you put public water in there that still does not remove the contamination that exists in the soil over there which will continue to leach out over time until that soil is contaminated. So at some point someone is going to say when are you clean this up and then it becomes, it will fall to the Community Development Authority to acquire the property, so we're going to be faced with an acquisition and dealing with that, and then we're going to be faced with issuing public bonds to take and clean up the site, demolish it and get it back to a normal condition. So then at what point do we go forward from there? Current law is not going to allow us to use adverse possession or a condemnation and then resell it. We can't do that anymore. So it ends up being a park.

We can't do what we did at I-94 where we acquired blighted properties and reconvert them into taxpaying properties because then we're taking away property owners' rights. So now in this case what we'd be doing is taking a contaminated site, cleaning it up and you know what it's going to be, it's going to be a park because we can't take property, condemn it, and the resell it for a public use. That's where we get. So then I don't know how the taxpayers have been helped in any way. Sure, Mr. Mills is making some money off this. He'll make some profit off it and I don't begrudge anybody that, but Mr. Mills is assuming all of the risk in this. That's the defining line between what's happening here and what happens in other things. The Village isn't assuming any risk.

We're handing that risk off to the developer and in order to make that happen we're saying we're going to allow those tax increments that go from those condominiums as they develop and those will go to pay for that \$715,000. Mr. Mills has to spend whatever money he has to spend to compete with other condominiums in the market, because all we're doing is getting this thing cleaned up to the footing or to the base. That's where he has to go from there. If he doesn't sell them in time he has to pay the shortage. If they just don't move that fast that Mr. Mills' problem and he has to pay for that and the taxpayers don't. If it ends up being more he's got to take care of that.

So we're not assuming any risk, and if we're not going to assume any risk I don't know how we can assume any of the profits off of it. So if we leave this as it is today the tax dollars that Mr. Tiahnybok is talking about who is going to generate those? They won't be there because there won't be any development. We'll be right where we are. That roughly \$6,000 that we're at now that's going to be less. Each successive year Mr. Vita cannot justify assessing a property that's blighted with contaminated soils, contaminated groundwater and saying that value is going to increase over time. So we're going to receive less over time than normal.

I think the Village has done a very good job in using tax incremental financing. And I don't think we put any pressure on the School District at all. Currently the Village provides 25 percent of the operating budget to the Kenosha Unified School District and we provide 12 percent of the

Village Board Meeting
September 24, 2007

children. So if we generate another 18 kids out of this project and we can clean up an environmental mess and we don't use Village taxpayer dollars to do it, I think the public has been well served in the end, and that's really a decision that the Board has to make when they evaluate this project plan. That's a decision that not only the Board but the School District, the County, Gateway and at large citizens are going to make when the Joint Review Board considers this.

I think if the Board is worried that someone might make some money on this, I think the thing they have to think about is the next question is who is going to clean it up if we make it impossible for Mr. Mills or we have some successive developer in there, no matter what, they now have this cleanup cost and there's nothing to say that it's going to be less next month or next year. We now know it's there. We now know we have people that have contaminated water. If at the end of the day we lose 17 to 20 years of that value, it's just like LakeView Corporate Park. We agreed to that. You're banking tax dollars that at some point you're going to get in the future. In this case we're banking tax dollars that we'll get in the future and we're solving an environmental problem at the same time. In the scheme of a \$2 billion Village \$715,000, over 20 years is minor when you look at what we're accomplishing with it.

This is something the statutes authorize. It's something they anticipate. Not every community is able to get the federal government or the State to come in and just totally clean up the site. There's not that much brownfield money and I think this one here is \$150,000 or \$125,000 that the State of Wisconsin is kicking in. That's maybe what we'd get if we decide to jump into this venture and do it ourselves to make sure that Mr. Mills doesn't make any money or any other development makes any money. But that doesn't make the problem go away. It's still there.

Mike Serpe:

The formula that's used to determine the amount of students that come out of any project is the same formula used for condominiums as is for single family homes. I can tell you that I highly doubt that 18 kids are going to be produced for the School District from this project. I'll give an example. I think Prairie Village, the Stanich Development, I believe there are two and possibly three kids coming out of that whole development that attend Unified District and that's a lot of condominium units. Normally they cater to the empty nesters, singles and the retirees for the most part. I don't doubt that a couple kids are going to come out of this project but I don't believe there are going to be 18 as the formula is used to determine that number.

Clyde Allen:

Thank you. Well covered, Mike. I want to look at this as not a win/win situation but a win/win/win situation. If you recall the residents that were opposed to it in the beginning one is now in favor. I have one conversation with Mrs. Blust who isn't here tonight. We had several conversations the least last over an hour and a half. She's pleased with what's happening. I won't speak for her that she's for it but she understands why it needs to be done and what's going on about it.

So the neighbors get a make over on the neighborhood which definitely needs it. We solve some contamination problems, the wells in the areas. A developer wins by sure he'll make out if

Village Board Meeting
September 24, 2007

everything goes to plan, but the Village wins more than just what you identified. Included in there is almost \$60,000, \$59,000 of uncollected special assessments in the past that we don't have a chance of collecting. That's built into it so we will get that right up front that we wouldn't have gotten. There's delinquent property taxes of \$15,000. Before the project even starts we collect the property taxes up front. So that's two of them right there that the Village wins on.

Now that the Village is aware of the contamination we don't have, as you mentioned, not to be redundant, but we don't have the burden of cleaning up this because it was confidential and we didn't know. Now that we know about it we have a burden on us. So you get to make a choice. So all three parties really win here.

The other part is the \$715,000, and correct me if I'm wrong, is going to get about \$150,000 in grant money from the State which lowers the \$715,000 as to what the future tax payments will actually pay back towards this project. So in reality if the \$150,000 comes through it's not really \$715,000 anymore. Is that correct?

Mike Pollocoff:

That's right.

(Inaudible)

John Steinbrink:

If you could come up and give us your name and address for the record.

D.J. Burns:

D.J. Burns, Project Director with Drake Environmental. I'm at N105W7585 Chatham in Cedarburg, Wisconsin.

Mike Pollocoff:

You can describe the grant process.

D.J. Burns:

Speaking to the grant process, the Wisconsin Department of Commerce has released what's known as a brownfield redevelopment grant for the project here BFU II. That's contingent upon the creation of the 28 unit condominium complex that will basically have a net assessed value at the end of this project of about \$5 million. The State of Wisconsin saw fit to support the local community in its efforts to create economic redevelopment on blighted sites. This is a competitive process in terms of issuing the grants by the State. So in working with the staff and the client we were able to put together a package that the State saw merit in as far as a redevelopment proposal for the site.

Village Board Meeting
September 24, 2007

Upon the receipt of this \$150,000 brownfield grant, it's basically an effort to—what will happen is as the developer goes through and incurs these eligible costs, many of which are included in the TID project plan, any of those costs that total up to \$150,000 can be reviewed and reimbursed by the Wisconsin Department of Commerce. By doing so you can actually effectively reduce the total amount of interest that accrues on the project plan costs that are set out in the TID District #4 proposal. So it has the net effect if we did it without the grant it might take 18 years let's say to repay the TID. With the inclusion of the \$150,000 from the Department of Commerce, it might only take 15 years. In effect, then, the Village gets that revenue much quicker. So we've been able to leverage this \$150,000 from the State, but it has that local impact to the community in terms of earlier retirement of the TIF.

Mike Pollocoff:

The other thing, too, is the construction of it is going to be based on actual costs, so whatever is spent on there up to a limit if the project costs come in less that's going to be less. It is their money that's going out for use on this and they have every incentive to make sure that they get their project down as soon as possible so they have less exposure on the repayment.

Clyde Allen:

Kind of another statement that was made at another meeting, to be clear the borrowings are not the borrowings of the Village. We are not on the hook for any part of it whatsoever. It's not our responsibility to pay it. It doesn't go against the Village debt, and the Village certainly would not be on the hook if anything goes wrong on the project. It will completely be the developer's risk. So the burden is completely on the developer so it doesn't go against our capacity to borrow anything like that so it's unlike other TIDs in that respect where we carry the bonding.

The other part is if you look on any Wisconsin sites very successful how the developer's TID when it's developed how good it's been to a lot of good areas. It's really been beneficial in the Milwaukee area. I encourage anybody to look on some of the sites because that is important. But I see it as a win/win/win and, like I say, the risk is completely on the developer and I think this is really good for us.

Mike Serpe:

John, I'd move approval of 07-62.

Clyde Allen:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion and a second for approval. Motion by Mike Serpe, second by Clyde Allen for adoption of 07-62. Further discussion on this item?

Village Board Meeting
September 24, 2007

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

One question for Mike, John. What was the property tax in that area for the last six years? Six years in which no taxes were paid, right? I'm going to page 9.

Mike Pollocoff:

There's been taxes paid by that property but they're delinquent. You've got to remember when that property owner has the tax liability and they don't make that payment the County absorbs that liability for the taxes and that's paid off to the governments. So each government, the schools, Gateway and us we need to operate our budget so the County absorbs that and then they get the penalty for it when they collect it. So there's nothing for us to forgive in a sense because we've already received that money back in 2002, '03, '04 and those years and spent it. But what the County doesn't do is they don't pay for the special assessments that have been levied on the property, and each government and typically it's the municipals absorb those special assessment payments then we build the interest up and charge that on as time goes. So even though they haven't paid their taxes that's a liability of the County that has accrued.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

That means that now . . . owning the property the taxes are going to be paid on the property, not the improvements. That means that the School District is going to keep receiving the money for that property basically off the original assessment.

Mike Pollocoff:

The School District already received their money. What they're going to get in the TIF plan, and the TIF law requires that they continue to get the money today in the future that they get once this is established. A misnomer on TIF financing is that school districts are harmed. It's only harmed if you think that development would occur otherwise. If it would occur otherwise then we shouldn't create the district, and that's the policy question that the Board decides is if we don't do anything here will these condos just show up anyway or will another commercial development just show up anyway? And if that's really the case, if we think that will really develop, then we shouldn't use TIF financing. But if when we do do TIF financing, unlike anybody else, the school districts are further held harmless so that when their school aid is calculated, what they receive from the State, the TIF districts are not considered. It's not considered as part of their value, what that true value is. That was adopted and changed when LakeView Corporate Park went in because that's a big district, so the school districts are not harmed in their revenue formula. That does affect the County and the Village to a smaller extent, a lot smaller than with the School District. So we're going to require that the taxes be paid as part of this development because we won't allow that improvement to take place without the taxes being caught up and trued up so the County will get their money back.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

So we . . . rely on the County to pay for the taxes.

Village Board Meeting
September 24, 2007

Mike Pollocoff:

No, the County was subsidizing us.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Okay, I mean it in reverse.

Mike Pollocoff:

As they do with everybody who doesn't pay their taxes the County still pays all the jurisdictions that are owed money, and if the property doesn't pay the bill then the County takes the property, which again describes how challenged this property is that it wouldn't be developed anyway because this property is contaminated the County wouldn't even take it for taxes. They didn't want to assume the liability of the contamination. The bank that owned it wouldn't foreclose on the mortgage because they didn't want to take the risk with the property. So they had access or knowledge of the contamination going back and we didn't, but knowing that contamination they wouldn't even foreclose it or take it for back taxes. So it's not a mildly challenged property. It's significantly challenged.

SERPE MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION #07-62 - RESOLUTION APPROVING THE PROJECT PLAN FOR TAX INCREMENTAL DISTRICT NO. 4 OF THE VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE, WISCONSIN; SECONDED BY ALLEN; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

B. Consider Resolution #07-63 -Resolution Creating Tax Incremental District No. 4 of the Village of Pleasant Prairie, Wisconsin.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, this resolution indicates that up to this point the Village has adopted resolutions and taken certain steps in determining the property is blighted, that we do have the power to create a tax incremental district for the specific use of eliminating blight. The Plan Commission had conducted a public hearing inviting all interested parties to express their opinions and learn about the project. The Plan Commission has designated boundaries of the tax district that was recommended in the project plan and is hereby submitting it to the Village Board. The Village Board has adopted a project plan from the previous resolution. So now we're creating the tax incremental district and implementation of the project plan which will eliminate the blight.

So this resolution is the creation of the tax incremental district. It establishes the boundaries of the district. It names the district which is Tax Increment District #4, and it establishes findings with respect to the district, and the Village Board makes the following findings with respect to the district:

a) Not less than 50 percent by the area of the real property within the district is blighted within the meaning of Section 66.1105(2)(a) of the Wisconsin Statutes. As indicated in

Village Board Meeting
September 24, 2007

the project plan and detailed on Maps 4 and 5 of the project plan, the properties included within these boundaries are affected by soil and water contamination and are therefore contaminated by environmental pollution as defined in Section 11.1106 of the Wisconsin State Statutes.

- b) The improvement of the blighted area in the district is likely to enhance significantly the value of substantially all other real property in the district.
- c) Project costs from the project plan for the district directly serve to eliminate blight in the Village.
- d) The aggregate equalized value of the taxable property of the district, plus the value increment of all existing tax incremental districts in the Village does not exceed 12 percent of the total equalized value of taxable property within the Village.

This district is declared to be a blighted area. The identification and classification of the property included is in the district. There is no property within the district that was recently annexed. And there's an attachment and a legal description defining the district.

With this, Mr. Chairman, I'd request that a roll call vote with a super majority be required.

Clyde Allen:

I make a motion to approve.

Mike Serpe:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion by Clyde, second by Mike. Further discussion on this item?

Mike Serpe:

I have one question. Do we know how close we are to getting the Mullins their water today than we did last week?

Mike Pollocoff:

Based on discussions that we've had with the Mullins and I went out to their property and viewed it with Rocco Vita who has done a ton of work on this project for me, he's visited with them, we've gotten the easement on the preliminary plat and it will be on the final plat to convey water across the southern property area of this easement to the property line. The engineering plans are going to detail a water tap to be placed on the main. The main that's going in the project is a public water main. That will be tapped and brought to their property line. My recommendation

Village Board Meeting
September 24, 2007

is, again, this is an inch and a half service, it's not sized significant, is to bore from that hole where they make the tap in the street underneath the woods. There's a section of woods that Jean's delineated for them to preserve. Get it over to their property which is directly south and then they can tap it into their house.

We've also, through President Steinbrink's office in Madison, the legislature, identified some residential grant funds to help clean up their private well problem and get them connected and abandon the well should they choose to abandon that. I think there's going to be a gray area in there that they do want to keep that well monitored to the extent to see how long once the contaminated soil is taken out how long it will take the groundwater to clean up. Our recommendation is to abandon this so nobody gets into it. So that's where we're at. They should be all set.

The first thing to happen on this project is going to be razing the building and then digging out the contaminated soils. Shortly thereafter after the site is brought to the finished grade then the underground utilities are put in. So hopefully we can get them connected as soon as possible. We're going to be in discussions with the property owner directly to the east to connect to municipal water and that water main is in front of their property.

John Steinbrink:

Further comments or questions? We need a roll call vote this time.

ALLEN MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION #07-63 -RESOLUTION CREATING TAX INCREMENTAL DISTRICT NO. 4 OF THE VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE, WISCONSIN; SECONDED BY SERPE; ROLLE CALL VOTE – STEINBRINK – YES; YUHAS - YES; KUMORKIEWICZ – YES; ALLEN – YES; SERPE – YES; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

5. VILLAGE BOARD COMMENTS

Monica Yuhas:

I had the opportunity last Friday to spend a day on public works. I rode a garbage truck, I did recycling, I threw trash, and I picked up trash. I also worked a front end loader, dug a few holes, worked a bulldozer, and filled a dump truck. It was quite interesting to see what goes on in the Village and to meet everyone who works in public works. They're really a great group of people, and they were more than willing to share any comments, questions, concerns. Anything I brought up they were more than willing to answer. It was a very busy day. I was in bed by seven o'clock Friday night I was so tired. But it was a great experience. I'm really grateful for the opportunity to be able to do something like that. So thank you to John Steinbrink and his group of people.

John Steinbrink:

We got a report back, they said you did very well, and they want you to fill in whenever somebody is not around. Mostly they're thankful for the donuts. They loved the donuts.

Village Board Meeting
September 24, 2007

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I think we have to commend Monica what she's doing trying to learn what's going on in the Village in her way. I'd like to say that. Clyde is doing that, too. It's great because, as I said before, a Trustee doesn't just mean to be sitting here. It's being over there and being with the people that work in the Village and know what they're doing. That's exactly what you're doing which is great.

Monica Yuhas:

Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

I think when people call you, you really have an understanding of what they're talking about.

Monica Yuhas:

I'm beginning to have a greater understanding.

John Steinbrink:

We give you a lot of credit for that.

Monica Yuhas:

Thank you.

6. ADJOURNMENT

SERPE MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING; SECONDED BY ALLEN; MOTION CARRIED AND MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:30 P.M.