

**VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE
PLEASANT PRAIRIE VILLAGE BOARD
PLEASANT PRAIRIE WATER UTILITY
9915 39th Avenue
Pleasant Prairie, WI
January 17, 2011
6:00 p.m.**

A Regular Meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Village Board was held on Monday, January 17, 2011. Meeting called to order at 6:00 p.m. Present were Village Board members John Steinbrink, Monica Yuhas, Steve Kumorkiewicz, Clyde Allen and Mike Serpe. Also present were Michael Pollocoff, Village Administrator; Tom Shircel, Asst. Village Administrator; Jean Werbie-Harris, Community Development Director; Mike Spence, Village Engineer and Jane Romanowski, Village Clerk. Two citizens attended the meeting.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- 3. ROLL CALL**

John Steinbrink:

In observance of Martin Luther King Day, we're going to have a two minute reading from Mr. King I believe.

(Video Shown)

Mike Pollocoff:

That was his discussion, just for some context, in Memphis in 1968. That was the night before he was assassinated, and he was there addressing Memphis sanitation workers who had been in a dispute with the City. They had called him and he came. Those words became words long after he died, and of course the next day was when he was assassinated.

John Steinbrink:

Oftentimes confused with other events. This was actually in Memphis.

Michael Serpe:

Just a comment similar to what we're talking about on Martin Luther King. Iowa played Missouri in a Bowl game two weeks ago and they won. The last time Iowa played Missouri was 1918 and Iowa lost. And one of the reasons they lost is because they left their best player at home. Their best player was Black. So you talk about coming a long way and still a little ways to go. But that just stuck with me, and it's kind of sad that you would hear something like that, especially hearing it today.

Village Board Meeting
January 17, 2011

4. MINUTES OF MEETINGS - DECEMBER 20, 2010

YUHAS MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 20, 2010 VILLAGE BOARD MEETING AS PRESENTED IN THEIR WRITTEN FORM; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

5. CITIZEN COMMENTS

Jane Romanowski:

No signups tonight, Mr. President.

John Steinbrink:

Anybody wishing to speak under citizen comments?

Clyde Allen:

I don't know if this is proper, but we do have a gentleman who is an assistant Scout master and his son working on his merit badges to become an Eagle Scout and he's with us tonight. He chose not to speak, but I did want to recognize that they were here.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

What troop?

John Steinbrink:

How close are you to the Eagle?

(Inaudible)

John Steinbrink:

They say it's only a small percentage, but in Kenosha we have a large percentage, so congratulations. What is your project?

(Inaudible)

John Steinbrink:

Well, there are always things you can work with with the Village for projects, too. When you get closer let us know and we'll see if we can work with you. Thank you.

Village Board Meeting
January 17, 2011

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

What troop do you belong to?

(Inaudible)

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

My troop. I used to be in that troop 20 years ago.

6. ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

Mike Pollocoff:

I have nothing for this item, Mr. President.

7. NEW BUSINESS

A. Consider the request of Kenosha County for the Village to fund City of Kenosha transit services to the LakeView Corporate Park.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, this has been an issue that's been bouncing around for a few months now. Up until January 1st of this year, there were some routes in the Village of Pleasant Prairie that were part of the City of Kenosha's transit system. You can kind of see on the map there, and I think there's a copy in your packet that's a little bit closer to you, and it shows that the area in green which should show there is the Kenosha Area transit system plan or system area. Over the years we've had some areas in the Village of Pleasant Prairie like the St. Joe's south Kenosha area for bus service that's been in there that predates my knowledge or anybody else I've found around here.

Then in 1990 as LakeView Corporate Park initially started to develop, they arranged with the City of Kenosha to have service come out there four trips a day, two in the morning and two in the afternoon, and they paid a contribution to the Kenosha Transit Authority for \$7,725 a year in addition to whatever fares were in the fare box to provide service out there. We believe the commitment was for transit to begin out there at 6 a.m. so people could be out there for a 6 a.m. start at the workplace, but over time it's been 6:50 a.m. Many employers start at 6 a.m.

On September 24th, the City of Kenosha notified the Village that charges for transit services within the Village would be increasing to a point where the City would now collect \$1.70 per mile for their services for every mile beyond the City limits that they drove in Pleasant Prairie. In the case of LakeView Corporate Park, that's a 14.4 mile round trip. Consequently, the City would need to collect an additional \$35,863 from the Business Association, which is like a homeowners association in the Corporate Park on top of the \$7,725 they already pay. That equated to over a 300 percent increase for services.

Village Board Meeting
January 17, 2011

When we sent that information out to LakeView, the Business Association polled everyone within the association and there was very little demand for this service. It's probably a couple users, and the rest of them said we don't think that's in our budget now, or we've been paying for it and the buses come after we start our workday, so if it ends it doesn't mean anything to us.

The two other areas are Prairie Ridge and St. Catherine's and the City had asked for \$9,270 for those. Now, we found out that the City had entered into a separate agreement with St. Catherine's unbeknownst to us, so there is a route that goes off Highway 50 probably down 94th right to the Hospital and right back out. That route used to go down where the main entrance is to Target, and people would get off the bus there then get off at St. Catherine's and they would go around over to Prairie Ridge Senior Housing and get off there and over by Westwood, but everyone other than the hospital declined to pay for the increase. The Prairie Ridge Shopping Center mall management had declined from the very beginning. Transit was not a critical item for them to pay for.

So come January 1st of this year there is no transit anywhere in the Village other than that piece for St. Catherine's. I met with the Kenosha County Human Services Committee on January 12th who had called a special meeting in order to consider providing payment of \$14,000 to Kenosha Transit to pay for an additional three months of service. It was their feeling that if people lost their jobs that sooner or later those people would end up on the Social Services roll, so they wanted to have a kick at the cat. So that was their recommendation.

Then the members of the committee requested that the City of Kenosha and Pleasant Prairie split the \$39,770 so that the route could operate all year long. The City said they wouldn't do it, and it wouldn't cut the fare for their share. I had indicated I would bring this matter before the Board for their consideration.

It's obvious, and I can see why the City of Kenosha doesn't want to spend their property tax dollars on providing transit service to the Village of Pleasant Prairie. But I really think the issue is a lot more complicated than just that simple equation and it really has some broader public policy impacts for everybody including Pleasant Prairie.

When the City submitted their bill to the Village they took their expenses and their revenues and they added the grants that they received and they subtracted depreciation and the fare revenue they had, and they came up with a net cost per mile that's spread across the entire transit service area and it did make it fairly simple. But I think when they did that, that allocated the expenses and treated each route within the Kenosha transit system the same, so it applied the same amount of federal assistance and state assistance and all their operational expenses and revenues equally to all their routes, whether or not those routes met some state required audit requirements or not.

And it was a little difficult to really get some data to look at this, but I took a look at the Regional Planning Commission's draft findings, and they've been in probably a two and a half to three year process to update the Kenosha County transit plan. There's a draft chapter on evaluating existing transit systems for the Kenosha transit system. The state had performed their last audit in 2007, and I believe 2000 was the last time that the City had updated their mass transit plan. So if

Village Board Meeting
January 17, 2011

you think about the growth that's occurred in this whole area between 2000 and 2010 this is a vastly different community from what we're seeing.

The Southeastern Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) went and identified some—gathered what data they could because the census data in 2000 does not really correlate to what's going on right now. They found that the existing populations that Kenosha Transit serves they served the population well - 97.9 % of the City population is served by transit, 82 % within the transit service area is served, that goes out to Pleasant Prairie and Somers. SEWRPC also indicated that changes that had occurred since 2000 have been significant in growth in Pleasant Prairie of residential areas that do not have access to transit. As this plan evolves they're going to look at should these areas receive service? Maybe some should and some shouldn't.

The employment and activity centers - SEWRPC identified that transit coverage of employment centers within the City of Kenosha is excellent, and outside the City of Kenosha the coverage is rated good. LakeView Corporate Park represents the highest concentration of employment within the entire transit service area. On the overhead and on the maps in your packet if you look at LakeView Corporate Park you do see a cluster of significant employment centers of people where those are larger employers, and that doesn't include Premium Outlets and that doesn't include Uline because those, of course, are later developments. If you look at the other areas that are high employment centers in the City of Kenosha, they're pretty well scattered. In the intervening time since this was prepared there's been some that have actually left.

SEWRPC also found in doing this analysis that transit service does not bring workers to employment centers for a 6 a.m. workday or any other shift work. Activity centers such as shopping, schools and recreation areas are good within the transit area, but there are 13 of the 143 that are outside the transit area that really have no service at all. Again, those are in Pleasant Prairie.

Comparing ridership and service effectiveness - the Regional Plan Commission found that in taking a look at the service that was provided for Kenosha, and then we looked at national comparisons and some Wisconsin comparison among their peers, national Kenosha Transit has fewer riders and provides less vehicle miles than their peer comparables. When you look at Wisconsin they're somewhat comparable.

For service effectiveness - Kenosha Transit performed better than their Wisconsin peers and performed nationally in three of the four performance areas. They rate higher than average because of size of its service area. Population is measured by revenue hours per capita and the Kenosha Transit has had, although it might be modest, an impact on gasoline consumption in the area. We're looking at an annual reduction in gasoline of 940 to 1,120 gallons in a year, and a reduction between 1 and 5 percent car traffic on surface streets in Kenosha.

I think the real key in evaluating the transit, especially in current data, is the analysis SEWRPC prepared for transit operations and making direct comparisons of all the routes in the transit area based on three days in April of 2006. In that analysis there are 7 of 11 routes that perform well. The route to LakeView Corporate Park statistically was the best performing route of all. While it had a low ridership compared to the other routes, when you consider that it was only four trips

Village Board Meeting
January 17, 2011

those trips had a good number of people on the bus, 90 was the number they were looking at, so it had more people per trip than the other ones did. It has the lowest operating cost, required the lowest operating assistance, the lowest operating cost per passenger, \$2.91 per passenger, the lowest operating assistance required which is \$2.61, and the highest fare box recovery rate, a 10 percent recovery rate out of the fare box. Recovering fees out of the fare box in mass transits I won't say it's hopeless, but if 10 percent is good you can see how much support these things need.

I don't know how well this can be seen out in the audience, but this is a table that shows a comparison of the transit routes that the City of Kenosha has. Route 35 is the route that goes to LakeView Corporate Park and you can see for the revenue vehicle hours it's the lowest, and the vehicle miles traveled it's the lowest. Total passengers is 90 which is low, but again you have to factor in the fact that's only four trips a day. Passengers per revenue vehicle hour they're getting 36 when you group those four trips together and the passengers per revenue mile is 1.6. It's right up there.

The operating cost is \$262. It's the lowest of all their routes. The operating assistance required, again, is \$235. So the operating cost per passenger is the lowest of all their routes at \$2.91. The operating assistance required per passengers is \$2.61. Again, the fare box recovery is 10.4. If you look at route 1 it doesn't nearly approach that. That's probably one of the worst routes. That's the route that comes out from City center and goes up to Parkside. Now, from my understanding I know Parkside is in Somers but I don't believe there's a charge to the Town of Somers for the use of the Parkside route. The City limits go pretty far north, and I think the difference between the City limits and Parkside is pretty small. But nonetheless that's not part of the evaluation.

From a graphical standpoint when you look at the service effectiveness measures for transit routes, on this next graph you can see, again, the number 35, the number of passengers is low, way below the system average, but it's providing a service to people who are getting out to work and getting home and you have to take that into context. These are trips going on every day.

On the next one - the passengers per revenue vehicle hour - you can see how much impact route 35 has compared to the other routes. The average is 25 in the system and this is clicking along probably just under 36. The next one is passengers - again, per revenue hour, route 35 the LakeView route is way ahead of all the other routes. Route 35 for boarding passengers per revenue vehicle mile it's their third highest, still above the state average and still well above the 20 percent average that's identified.

If you look at the final graph - average weekday passenger activity on Kenosha Area Transit - it's a little difficult to read, but route 35 is fifth from the top. So if you gross that up you can see how much farther ahead it is than anything else with that fifth line. Then you go down and you can see the least productive one. So this is well within the most productive route they have.

So what this I guess leads me to as far as some conclusions, the LakeView Business Association made a significant contribution to Kenosha Transit for the last almost 25 years, 26 years of \$7,725. The 316 increase in charges is punitive on the customers that use that bus as well as the association. Consequently, that subsidy is gone now.

Village Board Meeting
January 17, 2011

Since transit service does not service those employers that begin their daily work at 6 a.m., the \$7,725 is really more of a donation that was made by the Business Association to Kenosha Transit since it really didn't address the majority of the businesses' times out there. At the January 12th meeting of the Kenosha County Human Services Committee, the City Administrator indicated that he had heard the complaints about the lack of 6 a.m. service, and so Kenosha Transit tried providing that 6 a.m. service for three months. They didn't see many riders so they discontinued it. Transit routes and times require consistency for the users to become comfortable and view the service as reliable. You can't just start it and end it. Businesses at LakeView have learned to select personnel that have their transportation to work rather than relying on Kenosha Transit. Not only do the later starting times affect the occasional rider, it ensures that new employees seeking to work at LakeView will not have the opportunity if they must rely on Kenosha Transit. There is more long-term damage done to those potential employees that would use transit to get them back and forth the work.

If you're going to assume that one of the primary purposes for transit - I mean there's times when gas prices go up and people ride it - but primarily the people riding transit can't afford a car or don't have a car and they need one. LakeView ends up being a place where they really can't work because for the simple matter the bus won't get out there earlier. So you never do create that base of people that rely on the transit and you never do get that influx of people who could probably benefit from employment at LakeView because they can't get out there.

The members of the Human Services Committee on the 12th indicated that Pleasant Prairie has a lot of money from the Corporate Park and we should pay for the service. It was a rather unusual statement from a government that collects more tax dollars from the Village than the Village government collects for itself. The fact is that much of the LakeView Corporate Park is in a Tax Increment District (TID) and their property tax dollars are going to pay for the infrastructure improvements that were necessary to provide for companies to relocate here, build buildings and provide jobs. Thus neither the Village nor Kenosha County are collecting a lot of money for governmental operations.

The Village has spent just south of \$50 million to create LakeView Corporate Park. I don't think the Village needs to apologize for any taxes we've collected because most of those taxes are going to pay that debt service. Without the work that the Village over the years, the Board has authorized to undertake, we would not have a LakeView Corporate Park that has the potential for jobs out there that we do.

From a policy perspective, if the Village were to assume the subsidy of Kenosha Transit operations to LakeView Corporate Park, Village residents would not be able to take advantage of the bus service unless they drove their car to Southport Plaza in the City to catch the LakeView Corporate Park bus back into the Village. This makes using the Pleasant Prairie property tax dollars a direct subsidy to the City since the bus service serves solely the City of Kenosha residents who in turn support the transit system with their property tax dollars.

If Kenosha County were to pay for the transit subsidy, the Village property tax payers would be paying 21 percent of that expense since that is their portion of County property tax dollars. There

Village Board Meeting
January 17, 2011

is also no contractual or institutional method to deal with future expenses and how they are going to be allocated from the City of Kenosha. The Village would be agreeing to an open-end demand for payment which on an annual basis would be a disruption for the users of the services.

My closest comparison of this is what we have for sanitary sewer. We basically get the bill from them, they supply us with here's what your increase is going to be and we deal with it. We can go to court or we can go to the Public Service Commission, but there really isn't an institutional framework to handle that and by and large that's because under the statutes transit is left up to municipal governments. Almost anywhere else in the country there are transit districts because transit doesn't follow municipal boundaries. In Wisconsin it's pretty old and it's not nearly up with the times but that's what it is. So there isn't a framework to deal with inter-jurisdictional charges.

LakeView Corporate Park represents the highest center of concentrated employment opportunities in the transit service area. It has yet to be a location for mass transit access because of the inadequate routing schedules and will continue to attract workers who provide their own transportation.

The 35 route for LakeView Corporate Park is currently the best performing route under the standards set forth by the State of Wisconsin. The method by which the City of Kenosha allocates expenses shifts the benefit of high performing routes, which is lower expenses and higher revenues, to low performing routes. Consequently, the charges proposed would essentially help Kenosha Transit fund routes that are not performing as well in the City of Kenosha. The City of Kenosha's requirement for additional contributions as resulted in the loss of the original subsidy for the Corporate Park as well as the fare box revenues riders pay for service. The people being penalized because of the new charges are residents of the City of Kenosha that rely on Kenosha Transit to transport them to employment centers in the transit service area.

I think if there was ever a good bright line as to what happens when you have a governmental operation from a function and a business operation of a function this is it. If a business had an activity they were providing, if this was a cab service and they weren't getting any calls from one part of town, they would quit driving there. They wouldn't keep a cab in that part of town. If they had a lot of calls in a certain area they would keep cabs ready for that use. So what Kenosha has done, and this happens in every City, it's an outgrowth of an aldermanic system where they cover every single ward, whether they provide service there or not. What happens is the routes that don't perform continue not to perform and they don't cover their expenses. The routes that do perform help subsidize the ones that don't. So in some cases some of those areas just are cut loose because maybe the median income is higher, people don't want to use the bus, they don't need to use the bus but they've got a bus there nonetheless.

A regional transit system operator would be the preferred solution to this problem as well as many other transit-related problems. A separate governing body whose sole obligation would be to provide as much mass transit as required, not wanted but required, for the lowest possible cost irrespective of municipal boundaries would be the most efficient operation. Wisconsin is one of the few states that leave transit responsibilities to local governments. There have been a number of local governments that have held advisory referendums to object to regional transportation

Village Board Meeting
January 17, 2011

systems, and given the current fiscal climate for governments, mass transit may be one of the services that are curtailed or eliminated.

Given the fact that we're dealing with levy limits that will soon be frozen, the question that we face and Kenosha probably faces themselves, to what extent do you cut into essential services to provide for transit? To provide for transit at the level for all the areas that Pleasant Prairie is doing we'd either have to squeeze out those larger areas of Village operations which is public safety or conduct a referendum to see if people would be willing to have their property taxes raised to bring transit into the area. Even if that was the case, my recommendation would be we not do that. I think we should notify the Kenosha County Human Services Committee that their request for us to subsidize transit subsidies be denied.

Michael Serpe:

Mike, great report. Before I just give my comments I don't see the *Kenosha News* here tonight. I certainly hope that this report comes in their hands sooner than later. My feeling is as long as the federal government is going to continue to subsidize transit in municipalities that need public transportation, that they do so with the understanding that it becomes a regional transit authority and not just a municipal benefit where applicable. Kenosha, Somers, Pleasant Prairie would be a perfect example of creating a regional transit authority. I realize that that's not going to happen overnight and it's not going to happen any time soon if at all. But it would be up to the federal government if they're going to allocate these grants to subsidize a transit authority to make sure that it's a regional transit authority and not an individual run government operation.

I'm going to guess that the City did their homework as you did with the cost of the routes that they run and then to come up and say now we're going to eliminate the only one that's going to make us the most money and the most cost effective to the transit authority is somewhat ridiculous. But, again, not surprising when you see the City try to lay on a 316 percent increase to the users and to the Corporate Park and to Prime Outlets. Just kind of reminds me that it's no different than the water service that we're getting from the City and the sewer service that they're trying to use Pleasant Prairie to subsidize some of their own projects. I see it. And I will say this, when they came up with a 316 percent increase for this service there's certainly no shortage of arrogance on whoever proposed this kind of rate increase. I agree with you, this bus service does not benefit many people if any in the Village. I would move to—not move, I would support your recommendation, Mike. I think I better quiet down.

Clyde Allen:

I want to start by reading an e-mail I received from a regular meeting attendee. Bob Babcock sent me an e-mail. He can't be here tonight. He's sick. He obviously would like to speak on this item. I'll make it brief. He says, obviously Kenosha feels it is a money losing operation - 99 percent of all governments that run transit authorities are major money losing operations. Why should the taxpaying citizens of Pleasant Prairie subsidize Kenosha and the Industrial Park.

Mike, reiterate just a little bit. Mike, you hit the nail right on the head when you have a very inexpensive route to run and you apply the equal federal and state monies toward that, the

Village Board Meeting
January 17, 2011

contribution lacking thereof is very, very minimal. I'm kind of offended, it's not unexpected, but offended that they would try to hit Pleasant Prairie to subsidize their own venture. That's kind of a sore spot right now and I probably should drop it at that. Another point is they were charging 33 cents a mile up until this year. Well, if their crack accounting group chooses to charge 33 cents a mile up until now and finds that it's really \$1.70, shame on them. Why should we get hit with a bill like that and them to try to force it down our throat.

Question for you or maybe John, Jr. would have to answer this. I'm not positive on the answer on buses, but it seems to me that a charge for 20 percent for buses that means a vehicle is only in operation for five years? Is that—

Mike Pollocoff:

It seems a little unusual for buses. I mean they're diesel vehicles, and assuming that you're not playing bumper cars with them the engine will last quite a while and you'll be able to make a lot of trips with it. If you go to any transit system around you're going to see typically a lot of old buses on the road because they do last a long time.

Clyde Allen:

That's another, I'm going to say it, sorry, insult to be charging us 20 percent rate depreciation on this fee. I just find this ludicrous. The last thing I want to end up with is that the County back in—I was on a committee before Y2K was being planned. There was a committee to put into place a system to get people to work without having to use their cars and the County was heavily involved. I don't know what happened to that committee, but the lack thereof of their willingness to take on this project shows that they just completely abandoned that idea that they should be doing any part of that which was their original thought back in planning for Y2K. So again, they dropped the ball somewhere and down don't want any part of it. I don't think that's quite right either. I guess I'll just leave it at that.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I'm watching here the . . . new percent to us. We got 32 areas that are less productive. You can get figure 5-3 please?

Mike Pollocoff:

The vertical bar chart.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

You can see in red how many are there that are not productive at all. I just wonder is the trolley counted as a route here?

Village Board Meeting
January 17, 2011

Mike Pollocoff:

No, it's not. It's excluded from the evaluation.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

But still it's part of the Transit Authority, right?

Mike Pollocoff:

It's part of their budget, but—

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

So the riders of the other routes are paying subsidizing the trolley.

Mike Pollocoff:

Yeah, I think that's probably a fair statement. The City doesn't disclose those numbers, but given that it's a seasonal transit mode I'd be surprised—it's almost certain—everything is subsidized, it's just a matter to what extent.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I cannot understand how the City cannot make those numbers public what they spend on the trolley because I think that the residents have a right to know what they're paying for, the people who ride those . . . money to provide money for transit for the people that live in the City wherever they work at because it's a productive route, in this case going to LakeView and the shopping center. So I don't see—in no way can I support this request from the City because there's no way Now, is Kenosha County providing services to any sector of the County?

Mike Pollocoff:

Kenosha County has I believe a 90 or 95 percent grant to provide rural transit to Kenosha County west of the Interstate. It's administered by the Kenosha Achievement Center (KAC), the one who drives it along with their caravan services. That's been in place probably three years, maybe four.

Clyde Allen:

At least four.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

What do they do? Where are they taking the people from, where to where?

Village Board Meeting
January 17, 2011

Mike Pollocoff:

It's a point to point service. You call and you make arrangements. They'll go to individual houses, take somebody to the doctor, they'll go to a senior center, take the people shopping. Like I say it's point to point so whatever they come up with you have to make your reservation for a day and time and then they'll-

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

. . . provided to more people out of the County?

Mike Pollocoff:

They do. They will take people out of the County.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

So they are providing service for people to go out of the County but they cannot pay for service to be provided in the County. So we're paying taxes actually, the 21 percent of the taxes we pay to the County to go to subsidize a service that doesn't help the community at all. That's one area where we could see our taxes at work I have a big problem with that.

John Steinbrink:

I think somebody hit it on the head when they said the news isn't here. That's unfortunate because they're going to report on it and they're going to editorialize it but they haven't listened to the facts. Hopefully they'll get a copy of the minutes and they'll inquire. The fact that we present an agenda and they know that it's here and they know that it's an issue that everybody is talking about. The one thing is the half percent sales tax. When you talk to the County half a percent sales tax goes to the County. The bulk of that money comes from Prairie Ridge which is Penny's, Target, Prime Outlets is another one. What is the total amount of sales tax to the County and what is the Village portion?

Mike Pollocoff:

I believe the total is around \$8 million a year that they receive. And I got to be honest with you I can't remember what the Village portion is.

John Steinbrink:

See, those numbers never come into play when they talk about budgets or anything else. And I believe they were used to pay off-supposedly go to building debt at one time but that was many, many years ago and it's continued for that. And to look at the source of revenue and the fact that if they want to increase that source of revenue maybe they need to get riders out to Prairie Ridge and to Prime Outlets and to job where they actually turn money back in and create money. But it

Village Board Meeting
January 17, 2011

is a frustrating thing when you've read it in the paper and you see what's put out there and it doesn't match up with the numbers or the facts.

Michael Serpe:

What really troubles me about this and a couple other things is that right now Kenosha County sits in a real nice position. When big corporations look at a municipality, whether it be Bristol, Somers, the City or Pleasant Prairie, they're looking at the total picture. And when they see things like this happening it doesn't make us look very attractive. And when they see the water rates as they are it doesn't make us look very attractive. I guess I have a problem with just me attitude, and if we can't get it nobody is going to have it. Then we're not looking for the best things for the region. We're looking for the best things for ourselves.

This Board and administration has never taken that attitude, and I think that's part of the reason why we are as successful as we are because we offer a good product and we try to offer reasonable services at reasonable prices. But when we rely on others for some of those services to be supplied and this is the treatment that we get we're not very attractive and that's not good for the region. Right now Wisconsin is looking good. But when you see stuff like this happening it's just a red mark against this area and it's not right, and it's because of the "me only" attitude and that's a problem.

John Steinbrink:

I think we all feel better now. A good Scout project here to figure out how we're going to do buses.

Clyde Allen:

I'll make a motion to deny payment for transit subsidies.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Clyde, second by Steve. Further discussion?

ALLEN MOVED TO DENY THE REQUEST OF KENOSHA COUNTY FOR THE VILLAGE TO FUND CITY OF KENOSHA TRANSIT SERVICES TO THE LAKEVIEW CORPORATE PARK; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

Village Board Meeting
January 17, 2011

John Steinbrink:

Motion carries for denial. And I believe you will be forwarding this and other information to interested parties.

B. Consider Resolution #11-01 to initiate a zoning text amendment to create stipulated conservancy permit requirements for woodland conservation and restoration within the C-2, Upland Resource Conservancy District.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. President and members of the Board, this is Village Board Resolution 11-01, and it's a resolution to initiate a zoning text amendment. The Village Board may initiate a petition for an amendment of the zoning ordinance which could include rezoning of property, change in zoning district boundaries or changes in the text of the zoning ordinance. Currently, the Village zoning ordinance provides requirements for stipulated conservancy permits that would be either issued in a C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District, or a C-3, Natural and Scientific Area Resource Conservancy District.

Well, it's been brought to the Village's staff's attention that there have been some recent requests, and we have been working with property owners to do some work within the Upland Resource Conservancy District or the C-2 District. And that C-2 District is intended to preserve, protect, enhance and restore all significant woodlands and related scenic areas of the Village.

The Village, because of these inquiries, would like to put together some more detailed regulations, direction and some kind of step-by-step procedures as to what it would take to restore and obtain provisions to make some modifications of woodland areas within the Village, specifically a woodland restoration plan would be set forth in the C-2 District. And because there's no clear information at this time within the zoning district, we've been having to work kind of day-to-day and based on recommendations and concepts from various consultants. What we'd like to do is develop these stipulated regulations and include them in the C-2 District, so when a business or an individual would like to do a woodland restoration program within a designated woodland area they'll have some direction to follow.

The Village Board hereby initiates and petitions to amend the zoning ordinance as it pertains to this matter for the Village staff to draft regulations for the Board and the Plan Commission to consider. The proposed changes in the text are just being referred to the staff at this time for further study and review. The Village Board is not by this resolution making any type of determination regarding the merits of the proposed changes, but is really just initiating and beginning that process for the staff to draft the regulations for them to be considered by the Village Plan Commission for a public hearing and then brought back to the Village Board for their consideration. Staff recommends approval as presented of Resolution 11-01.

Village Board Meeting
January 17, 2011

John Steinbrink:

So this would work if a Scout wanted to do a woodland restoration in the C-2 area. He could come forward and get that permit and then he could go ahead with his project, right?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

That's correct.

Michael Serpe:

We'll get him started with Resolution 11-01 for approval.

Clyde Allen:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Mike, second by Clyde. Further discussion?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Yes, a question for Jean. Jean do you have a time frame to accomplish this in which I imagine there is . . . request of changes, should we stop any changes when . . . to start this project?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

We are currently working with two different companies right now, businesses in the Village. And because there are no specific regulations set forth in the ordinance, we're working with them and their consultants to kind of develop a plan, a step-by-step plan as to what it's going to take to restore the woodland oak savannah to its original condition. So they're actually helping us with their consultants to develop such a plan which we will then hopefully after review incorporate into the ordinance as really this is the best way to do it. Because we have a number of consultants that do have expertise in this area, and we would like to use that experience and expertise to help develop the ordinance. So we're not stopping the process with respect to the businesses we're working with. But we are taking it step-by-step and making sure everybody understands what's going on as we go through the process.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Okay, thank you, Jean.

Village Board Meeting
January 17, 2011

John Steinbrink:

Mike, the newly acquired area where the sewer runs from Sewer D to Lake Andrea, those are some of the areas that would apply for this also, some of that oak area we acquired?

Mike Pollocoff:

There is a piece of it as you get closer to Prairie Spring Park where we could restore an oak savannah in that area.

John Steinbrink:

How does that apply to a village versus a private entity?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

I would think that you'd want to go through a similar process. We don't want to make it overly burdensome, but we do want to provide the appropriate steps. And for that reason we are working with at least three different consultants now that are consultants to these different corporations that are going to help give us some expertise and information as to are you looking at a three year process, a five year process, this is what you need to accomplish at a minimum. If you're seeking this goal then you can take it to the next level. But, again, we want to put some minimum requirements together so that you know what it would take in order to restore something back to its original condition.

John Steinbrink:

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

SERPE MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION #11-01 TO INITIATE A ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT TO CREATE STIPULATED CONSERVANCY PERMIT REQUIREMENTS FOR WOODLAND CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION WITHIN THE C-2, UPLAND RESOURCE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT; SECONDED BY ALLEN; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

C. Consider a one-year extension of the Village Green Heights Phase 5 Preliminary Condominium Plat.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. President and members of the Board, this is a request of Preston Kendall, agent for Laddie Investments, LLC. Their group is formerly known as the Village Green Development, LLC. They're requesting a one year extension of the preliminary condominium plat for the Village Green Heights Townhomes North. This is a property that's located generally north of 47th Avenue to the west of the Village Green Center and just north of Main Street.

Village Board Meeting
January 17, 2011

This is a project that was first initiated and brought to the Village's attention for approval back in 2003. At that time the Board conditionally approved a preliminary condominium plat for the Village Green Heights Townhomes North. At that time the developer was really focused on the single family portion of this development and moved forward with the single family Phases 1 and 2, and so the condominium portion kind of just sat and waited. Then unfortunately another couple years went by and then the economy started to struggle and the project was put on hold.

We have granted approvals two years at a time since March of 2005 to allow them to still have an active plat for this particular area. They are requesting, again, a one year extension as noted in the staff comments to then expire on February 5, 2012. But they are requesting to seek that approval but it would be subject to the conditions, comments, modifications of any ordinances that may come into play, any policies or regulations that are in effect at the time that they finally move forward with respect to the final condominium development. The staff recommends approval as presented.

Michael Serpe:

So moved, Mr. Chairman.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Mike, second by Steve. Any further discussion?

SERPE MOVED TO GRANT A ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF THE VILLAGE GREEN HEIGHTS PHASE 5 PRELIMINARY CONDOMINIUM PLAT TO FEBRUARY 5, 2012; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

D. Consider Amendment No. 1 to the Agreement for Professional Consulting Services for Planning and Design Services with Crispell-Snyder for the CDBG-EAP Funding for flood recovery projects.

Mike Spence:

Mr. President and members of the Board, the Village received a grant from the Community Development Block Grant and Emergency Assistance Program last year. Back in July the Village awarded a contract to Crispell-Snyder to help with the preliminary work associated with the grant project, specifically the south Kenosha storm water area which is the area adjacent to the former Manu-tronics property.

The scope for this work was included in the original contract, however a fee could not be estimated until they did the preliminary engineering. At this point, Crispell-Snyder has done preliminary engineering to look at storm water in this area which is the map that you see here.

Village Board Meeting
January 17, 2011

And this particular amendment would include detailed engineering to prepare construction plans and specifications to construct a storm water system in the area adjacent to the future Springbrook Innovation Center. The estimated fee is reasonable based on the scope and I recommend that the Board approve it.

Monica Yuhas:

Mike, there aren't any I guess neighborhood meetings or any meetings with Crispell to sit down with the residents after they come up with a plan. Is that something that we're going to see later on?

Mike Spence:

Yes, it is our intent to have another public involvement meeting to discuss what we're planning to do, and then also just to confirm our plans within the area of the Springbrook Innovation Center because at some point we will be needing to work with the residents. Because the area is so flat we're proposing to put some easements and some inlets in backyards, otherwise the storm water is never going to get to the street because it's so flat. So we will have to work with the public and would have a public involvement meeting. And if it isn't in here it might have been in the original one, we just haven't done it yet.

Mike Pollocoff:

This will give us engineering information specifics so that we can actually talk to the residents of the area and have some solid data to say on a parcel by parcel basis here's what we've laid out, this is what we're looking to accomplish. And then at that point if they've got something that we didn't catch or we don't know about or whatever that will be their opportunity to say here's what we have and here's what's going on as it relates to where the storm sewer line is going.

One of the things we're going to be looking for as Mike indicated is storm sewer easements along with some temporary construction easements. This was a good grant we received, but it's still an expensive project. And what we're going to be looking for residents is to donate those easements to them. We'll get them restored back to their original condition, but this project really isn't helping anybody else other than those people, and goodness knows they need some help because they've had a lot of flooding. But if we have to ratchet in paying for all these we're not going to be able to do the project.

Monica Yuhas:

Okay, and when do you anticipate Phase 2 starting?

Mike Spence:

Phase 2 is starting as soon as this is approved. They have to do some detailed survey, and unfortunately with the snow that might get pushed back a little bit, but as soon as the conditions are appropriate they'll get out there and do the detailed survey.

Village Board Meeting
January 17, 2011

Monica Yuhas:

Thank you.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I have one last question for Mike. Mike, you're talking about going to the property . . . the flood . . . catch basins over there?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes.

Mike Spence:

Yes. It will be a combination of catch basins. As I had indicated, Steve, there would be some inlets in areas of properties that are lower so that would be connected to the storm sewer.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

The question I've got there is the elevation of these catch basins are we going to have to have piping, too, or just ditches? Is it going to be enough to

Mike Spence:

A good share of the system will be piping. It's similar to the situation that we ran into in Carol Beach Unit 2 where there's very little grade. And to try to ditch this it wouldn't be technically feasible.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Okay, thank you, Mike.

Monica Yuhas:

With that I move for approval of Amendment Number 1 to the agreement for professional consulting services for the planning and design services with Crispell-Snyder for the CDBG-EAG funding for flood recovery projects.

Clyde Allen:

Second.

Village Board Meeting
January 17, 2011

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Monica, second by Clyde. Further discussion?

YUHAS MOVED TO APPROVE AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO THE AGREEMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL CONSULTING SERVICES FOR PLANNING AND DESIGN SERVICES WITH CRISPELL-SNYDER FOR THE CDBG-EAP FUNDING FOR FLOOD RECOVERY PROJECTS; SECONDED BY ALLEN; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

- E. Consider authorizing the Village Engineer to prepare a Request for Qualifications to submit a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) application for flood control in the Eau Plaines Basin and the Chateau Eau Plaines Subdivision.**

Mike Spence:

Mr. President and members of the Board, as we're all aware there's been longstanding flooding issues in the Chateau area. This item would allow me to put together a request for qualifications to hire a consultant to work with me to evaluate and hopefully secure some funding to develop a storm water management system for this area. The qualifications statement would also be inclusive as far as in addition to putting together an application for a grant. It would also look at qualifications, again, for consultants to help with the overall design of a storm water system for the area.

It's anticipated that this storm water system would be, again, a combination of ditches, piping, some storage area. We intend to look at the area to the north of 79th Street in some of that area that's currently vacant for storage. So that's kind of the plan. So my intent would be to put out a request for qualifications to get a consultant to work with me.

Monica Yuhas:

So moved.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion my Monica, second by Steve. Any further discussion? I think as you can see one of our biggest issues always is dealing with flood water and drainage. And a lot of times we solve it with new projects, new subdivisions, but other times we have to go back into old ones and design a system that's going to carry the water away. That's what you've heard in the last two motions here to find some relief for folks and a way to do it. We depend on a lot on grants for the money and sometimes participation from the residents also. Generally, we try and do it in the least expensive way but we want to make sure it works. That's why we put proposals out for engineers to make sure it's done properly.

Village Board Meeting
January 17, 2011

Oftentimes we get into a neighborhood and a lot of the neighbors feel they have the qualifications to tell us how it's done. But when it comes to storm water and flooding and the damages we want to make sure it's done by qualified people. So with that we have a motion, we have a second. Those in favor?

YUAHS MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE VILLAGE ENGINEER TO PREPARE A REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS TO SUBMIT A FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY (FEMA) APPLICATION FOR FLOOD CONTROL IN THE EAU PLAINES BASIN AND THE CHATEAU EAU PLAINES SUBDIVISION; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

F. Consider a Bartender License Application for Ibrahim Ajmeri.

Michael Serpe:

Move approval.

Monica Yuhas:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Mike, second by Monica. Further discussion?

SERPE MOVED TO APPROVE THE BARTENDER LICENSE FOR IBRAHIM AJMERI; SECONDED BY YUHAS; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

8. VILLAGE BOARD COMMENTS

Clyde Allen:

Mr. President, I have an e-mail, and we all get e-mails and calls on things that are not right, things that are not good and we share them when we know that. But it's kind of nice to receive kudos at times. I did get an e-mail from Mr. Renner regarding snow plowing. He says we would just to thank the Village plow drivers for doing such a great job in our neighborhood and around the Village. We've lived in our house for nearly 12 years, and this is the first year that the drivers have been plowing right up to the curb and up to our mailbox. In the past because we are on a slight curve they would be up to two feet away from the curve and we'd have to shovel out the plowed area and back to our mailbox. This year has been much better and we appreciate the efforts.

John Steinbrink:

John will pass that on I believe?

Village Board Meeting
January 17, 2011

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I will.

John Steinbrink:

Any other Board comments?

9. ADJOURNMENT

SERPE MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING; SECONDED BY YUHAS; MOTION CARRIED 5-0 AND MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:10 P.M.