

**VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE
PLEASANT PRAIRIE VILLAGE BOARD
PLEASANT PRAIRIE WATER UTILITY
PLEASANT PRAIRIE SEWER UTILITY
9915 39th Avenue
Pleasant Prairie, WI
March 7, 2011
6:00 p.m.**

A Regular Meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Village Board was held on Monday, March 7, 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. Four citizens attended the meeting.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- 3. ROLL CALL**
- 4. MINUTES OF MEETINGS - FEBRUARY 21, 2011**

Monica Yuhas:

Motion to approve.

Clyde Allen:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Monica, second by Clyde. Any additions or corrections?

YUHAS MOVED TO APPROVED THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 2011 VILLAGE BOARD MEETING AS PRESENTED IN THEIR WRITTEN FORM; SECONDED BY ALLEN; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

- 5. CITIZEN COMMENTS**

Jane Romanowski:

We have two signups tonight so the time limit will be five minutes apiece. The first speaker is Deborah Prijic.

Village Board Meeting
March 7, 2011

John Steinbrink:

We ask that you give us your name and address for the record.

Deborah Prijic:

Hi, I'm Deborah Prijic. I live at 4816 84th Street. May I begin?

John Steinbrink:

Yes.

Deborah Prijic:

I want to thank Mr. Pollocoff for waiving the two week waiting period and the public work staff to allow John and I to be heard tonight. We have a time sensitive matter where urgency is necessary. I am sure that you are all aware that the Senate District 22 is involved in an extremely serious political matter. Our representative republic gives us the remedy for this matter through recall petitions. Petitions, as we all know, fall under the protection of the First Amendment. Although demonstrators in Madison have claimed the government may take away implied rights, the freedom of expression is a guaranteed rate.

John and I request simply the permission to practice this right in a peaceable way at the LakeView RecPlex. We chose that spot first because it is public. Second, it's busy with families coming and going throughout the day. I cannot think of a more appropriate place to give families an opportunity either to participate or to observe the Constitution at work. We are not interested in drawing attention to ourselves other than to allow citizens to approach us to ask a few questions and to add their signatures to a government document. This is very serious activity. John and I intend to act accordingly. Thank you, again, to the Board for your time and consideration and thank God for giving us the wisdom to recognize our natural born rights.

John Prijic:

John Prijic, 4816 84th Street. I'm here to speak on new business Item C, our request to conduct political activity at the LakeView RecPlex and Prairie Springs Park. We are just a couple of ordinary citizens who are trying to exercise our basic and legally protected right to petition our government. We thought by being proactive in notifying Village authorities ahead of time that problems could be avoided by all parties.

Police Lieutenant Paul Ratzke was helpful but was not familiar enough with the proper procedures or exact ordinances when I called and talked to him on the phone. He did mention, however, that we might need to get a permit if we were to petition on RecPlex property which is owned by the Village. All we ask for then and all we ask for tonight is for specific written ordinances, regulations and policies that would allow us to abide by the letter of the law. I even offered to Lieutenant Paul Ratzke to call the police ahead of time so he could roll call so authorities could answer phone calls in an informed way.

Village Board Meeting
March 7, 2011

Our request has nothing to do with political ideology. Our request is merely a series of legal questions to allow us to petition our government in a legal, respectful manner. I only ask that you consider our request for a permit in the same reverence that John Adams in 1789 when he was Vice President of the United States and Senator of the Senate wrote about Americans assembling peacefully and petitioning the government for a redress of grievances.

Today my wife witnessed a woman shaking so badly that she could barely remember her address when she was signing the petition. She was a young mother that probably has never done anything like this before. It is her voice and the voices of many others of your constituents that we are working for. So please make the right decision and represent those voices and approve our permit. Thank you.

Jane Romanowski:

There are no more signups, Mr. President.

John Steinbrink:

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

6. ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

Mike Pollocoff:

I have no report tonight, Mr. President.

7. NEW BUSINESS

A. Consider Agreement for Consulting Services for the Chateau Eau Plaines FEMA Application for Flood Control Assistance and Storm Water Improvements Planning and Design.

Mike Spence:

Mr. President and members of the Board, back on January 17th the Board authorized the Engineering Department to put out a solicitation for qualifications for engineers to assist the Village in addressing the ongoing flooding issues in the Chateau Eau Plaines subdivision area. We did a request for qualifications and received qualification statements from six firms. Then the information that we received was reviewed by staff, and the staff came to a consensus that Crispell-Snyder put forth the best proposal, had the best approach, and it's with that that we would recommend that their contract be approved tonight.

Before you on the board there you can see Phase 1 is what you're approving tonight, actually approving the whole contract, but the fee for Phase 1 which is the initial planning which includes

Village Board Meeting
March 7, 2011

typical planning activities, some modeling, and also looking at some funding mechanisms to help pay for the cost of this program.

Again, this map shows the area. We're going to be looking at this as a regional plan. It will be bounded by State Highway 50 on the north, 104th Avenue on the east, 82nd Street on the south and then 115th Avenue on the west. What we're trying to do is a comprehensive plan for storm water in this area including the developed area as well as the area adjacent to the south side of Highway 50 which has potential for commercial development. So, again, the contract that you have before you is for Crispell-Snyder to, again, begin the preliminary planning to address the storm water issues here. We recommend approval.

Michael Serpe:

Mike, when Phase 2 on Chateau which is going to go north of the present development starts in does this project include—that's going to have storm sewer and curb and gutter if I'm not mistaken, is that correct?

Mike Pollocoff:

Well, that was the original intent was that—in fact, we've had a plan for developing that under an urban profile. But the problem really goes back to 1979 when Chateau Eau Plaines was platted under the Town of Pleasant Prairie. At that time we were under Kenosha County zoning and review. Chateau was built with no storm water improvements. There isn't a basin. There are roadside ditches. So what happens is when you really lay out that second phase of Chateau there's no place for the storm water to go, not to mention the storm water that's coming through the area.

In 1993 the Village completed the study to, again, address some flooding problems that occurred as part of that which involved extending a storm sewer down 107th Avenue to 79th Avenue, then that storm sewer would go down 79th to 115th. And if I'm not mistaken that storm sewer was a 66 inch diameter.

Mike Spence:

That's correct.

Mike Pollocoff:

That was a significant expense. At that time the Village would pay for 75 percent of the costs and the residents would pay for 25 percent and that was overwhelmingly rejected but it didn't solve the problem. So what this study is going to look at is we're requesting the FEMA funds to do really some post-flood and pre-flood improvements. And we're looking, given the cost of what it would take to put that major infrastructure down 79th, bypassing the first phase of Chateau, creating a regional storm water basin in the second phase of Chateau, and then with the remnant piece of Chateau, and we don't know how big that's going to be, replatting that.

Village Board Meeting
March 7, 2011

The other problem that's involved in this is that the original subdivider that owned the property if he owed his accountant some money he gave him a lot. If he owed the landscaper some money he gave them a lot, so he's got some mixed ownerships out there. This is the reason that for 25 years we haven't platted anything unless the money is in place. But that's the thing we're living with.

The second phase of Chateau really even if we don't do this project for some reason won't exist the way you see it's platted because it's sitting at the bottom of the hill. And to put homes in there as it's platted is just asking for a problem. So once we get enough information from the consulting engineer we'll be holding neighborhood meetings with the Chateau residents so they can take a look how this lays out. I know they're all familiar with the flooding problems there and they want some kind of solution for it. And it was obvious the last solution was expensive and a major disruption to the area. So right now we're thinking if we can bypass that whole area and get a basin constructed to the north that might be the best use of the resources available. And there's a significant probability based on the amount of damage that's been done in Chateau to date that FEMA is going to be able to pick up a substantial portion of this.

Michael Serpe:

A floodplain analysis has already been done in that area?

Mike Pollocoff:

Well, the Des Plaines basin has been mapped. We have floodplains but what we really have is inadequate storm water. Just even in a two year event we can't handle a good storm. I'm looking forward to the results of this. I think it will put to rest the longstanding problems we've had with drainage out there.

Michael Serpe:

I'd move approval of the contract.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I'm going to second that.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Mike, second by Steve. Further discussion?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

One quick question for Mike. If we construct a basin over there to collect the water from that system over there, are you going to go to the river or we're going to go where? We have a new pump station over there on 79th and 115th, right?

Village Board Meeting
March 7, 2011

Mike Pollocoff:

Well, the sanitary sewer is not going to do anything different than what it's doing now. But either way the storm water ends up in Eau Plaines before it goes to the Des Plaines. So a new basin would outfall into the Eau Plaines River. We don't want to change where the sanitary sewers are in that area. Again, without the engineering I really can't say how that will lay out. But our goal is not to have to modify any existing infrastructure if possible.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

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

Mike Spence:

I just wanted to say the other thing, part of the problem and one of the reasons why we're looking at trying to route the storm water to the north is because on existing 79th it is so flat I think the developer ended up building it even flatter than what it was originally designed. So it's a situation where there's no drainage. And to really adequately drain that if you went with ditches you'd have to have huge ditches and there's just not the grade there. So that's why we're trying to do more of a comprehensive plan and bring it to the north and then also consider the drainage from the potential development on Highway 50.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Mike Pollocoff, in that area we have White Caps draining to the south side of Highway 50?

Mike Pollocoff:

Well, White Caps drains in a number of different directions. But you have just a portion of White Caps. Really it's the commercial development and the residential development directly west of White Caps and then also the development north of 50. That all comes south. Not all of it. There's a ridge line where some of it goes north. But this drainage study will take into account whatever is coming into the basin from wherever it's coming.

Mike Spence:

When we do the modeling, the modeling analysis we're aware of the fact that there is some coming in from the north. So we'll take that all into consideration in the model.

Monica Yuhas:

Mike, when do you anticipate task 1 being done?

Village Board Meeting
March 7, 2011

Mike Spence:

We're looking at probably having a preliminary plan probably in July is the schedule at this point. The thing that may impact the schedule is it depends on the grant application, grant cycle. So I don't know yet when that is so that could affect the timing. But at this point we're hoping at least to have the preliminary analysis done by middle of summer.

Monica Yuhas:

Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Further comment or question? Those in favor?

SERPE MOVED TO APPROVE AN AGREEMENT FOR CONSULTING SERVICES WITH CRISPELL-SNYDER FOR THE CHATEAU EAU PLAINES FEMA APPLICATION FOR FLOOD CONTROL ASSISTANCE AND STORM WATER IMPROVEMENTS PLANNING AND DESIGN; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

B. Consider Park Commission recommendation and consider a Chiwaukee Prairie Management Agreement with the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. President and members of the Board, before you you have an agreement from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources and now endorsed by the Village's Park Commission. It relates to some funding that was recently received from a Sustain Our Great Lakes or SOGL Grant to complete a wetland restoration project in the Chiwaukee Prairie project area. The project area includes Village's parkland as noted on the overhead and in your packets. It's the yellow cross-hatched area or hatched area. It's located generally between 98th and 104th Street and between the Chicago Northwestern Railway and 4th Avenue. The parkland is specifically identified as being in the Carol Beach Estates Unit #4 Subdivision. Specifically it's a 9.23 acre piece of land.

The DNR is proposing to restore the wetland area within that parkland to a wet meadow community-type. The area in question has pockets of overgrown woody vegetation and small pockets of herbaceous invasive vegetation. And what they're trying to do is bring it back to the native vegetation for that particular area. This makes their management efforts mainly through controlled burning less effective when they have this other type of species there. Proposed management efforts will involve removing and treating the woody and herbaceous invasive vegetation.

Work on the parkland is part of, again, a larger project that the DNR has in this south area of Chiwaukee Prairie. Most of the work will be conducted on State owned land. Under the project their objectives would be to brush and treat 95 acres of woody vegetation, to control and burn 42

Village Board Meeting
March 7, 2011

acres and to treat 40 acres of wetland invasive species. Again, this was a matter that was before the Village Park Commission at their last meeting. They recommended approval of the referenced agreement between the Wisconsin DNR and the Village.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I have a question. Jean, I read in here that they are going to be burning to control the problem we got there. Now, we are right there in a residential area. In the . . . no problem burning. Now, being this is all in residential areas will this cause us any problem? Are they going to notify properly? Are they going to relocate residents that suffer respiratory problems?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Marty Johnson from the Wisconsin DNR, he's a wildlife biologist, he was at the Park Commission meeting at their last meeting, and he specifically indicated a number of things. First of all, they go around and put hangers on the doors of every individual within several blocks of where they're intending to do any type of controlled burn activity. Notices went out to individuals a few weeks or a month before that, and we actually have also put information in our community newsletter with respect to it. The residents down in Carol Beach understand that one of the methods that has been accepted to maintain the prairie is a controlled burn. And they're given ample notice and opportunity to not be at home if they choose not to be during the time that those activities are being carried out. Again, controlled burning is just one of the activities that they use.

As I indicated they treat with different types of chemicals I assume to get rid of this vegetation, but they also do a great deal of brushing and cutting activities as well and hauling of that material. So they use multiple different types of means to maintain the prairie, and they notify the residents on a regular basis because, again, this is not just a one-time event. They do this in the spring and the fall, and various areas of the Chiwaukee Prairie are done at different times of the year over a five year time period. So, again, this happens to be a specific project in a specific area that they received that Sustain Our Great Lakes Grant for, so they have a great number of volunteers that will be part of this project and part of achieving the goals of this prairie for them.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Okay, that answers my question very well. Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

We need a motion.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

So moved.

Village Board Meeting
March 7, 2011

Monica Yuhas:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Steve, second by Monica. Is there any further discussion?

KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PARK COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND APPROVE A CHIWAUKEE PRAIRIE MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT WITH THE WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES; SECONDED BY YUHAS; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

C. Consider the request of John & Deborah Prijic to conduct political activity at the LakeView RecPlex and Prairie Springs Park.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, we received a permit application from the Prijics last week for the purpose of being able to engage in political activity at LakeView RecPlex, as well as the Village Hall during normal business hours, the Roger Prange Municipal Center during normal hours and the compost site during hours that are available there. At that time I had indicated to them that all those public facilities other than LakeView RecPlex that they could secure petitions and signatures at those sites as those are existing public sites that have conditionally been used for all sorts of civic or political activity and that was acceptable as long as no disturbances were caused. At the compost site I'd encourage them to work with the Public Works Director to make sure they're in a safe location at the compost site so that they're not in the way of people pulling in or backing out or the equipment that's out there.

LakeView RecPlex is the major issue and what you see in your files and it's on the map there is the part of Prairie Springs Park that is usable, not so much not all of it's being used, but over half that park is wetlands and floodplains. We over the last ten years have restricted political activity at LakeView RecPlex for a number of reasons. One is that the RecPlex is a membership facility. It's not supported by property tax dollars. The people that use it pay for that privilege of using it so that it's not a place where anybody has to go. If they want to get a municipal service they don't have to go there. You go there by choice.

We have had instances over the years; in fact we had some this last week where members were going into the facility and soliciting signatures for in this case the recall, but in other cases it's been for nominating papers or other things. People get upset when that happens because they're there to recreate, be with their kids, to work out, and the most recent cases were on the fitness floor where people were working out and somebody was approaching them to sign recall petitions.

We don't allow that when we find out about it. It has to be permitted and it hasn't been permitted to date. We don't allow people to sell goods and services in there. If someone has got a side

Village Board Meeting
March 7, 2011

business and they're a RecPlex member and they want to sell vitamin supplements or personal training or gear or things like that, the purpose of the RecPlex is for people that pay their membership fees to be able to go there and engage in whatever kind of recreation it is and that's it.

Now, they have asked for also permission to be in the RecPlex at least at the parking lot. The south lot is gated to members. Again, they pay for the parking out there, the maintenance of the parking. That's a part of their membership package. There's a circle drive there and, again, that's members that are going in and out of RecPlex, are picking up their kids from programs or what have you, and on any given time that's a fairly active spot where there's people coming and going, backing in and out of the ten minute parking, stopping off letting people out, stopping off getting people in their cars. There's enough congestion there as it is.

The same thing with the north lot by the ice arenas. We control that parking lot not with gates, but we control that parking lot for the primary reason is we have a lot of young kids that are carrying big hockey bags. Some of these bags are as big as the kids, and we don't want them lugging them for any longer distance than necessary. So we discourage anything else going on in there.

The map there shows that the hatched area which is the parking area, the RecPlex site that RecPlex operates and maintains, is an area that would be prohibited from gaining signatures or having somebody engage in political activity. That being said, if they want to park their cars at the ball field lot across from RecPlex, on the street, at any one of the lots around that area or the streets, or if they want to walk the path outside of the RecPlex area I wouldn't have a problem recommending that a permit be granted for those purposes. But even if the existing members aren't permitted to do that, and when it does happen just as we did this last week we get a flurry of complaints for the very reason people say, listen, I joined up to be here to go work out, I didn't join up to be bothered by somebody circulating a petition.

It doesn't have anything to do with the issue at hand whether it's Senator Wirch, if they were going to do a recall on the Governor, if they were going to sign nominating papers for somebody running for an office. There's a lot of public places that we offer where people can do that, and there's a lot of places that the County and the City offer. But what's different about RecPlex is people go there by choice and they have to pay a fee to go there. People has property taxpayers paying sales tax or whatever those funds are not used for that facility. It's a self-sustaining facility. So as long as that's the way we operate then that's the rules that we go with. If you have any questions, that would be my recommendation that I be authorized to direct the public works director to issue that permit out for the park.

Clyde Allen:

Thank you, Mike. Good explanation. I want to preface everything by saying this has nothing to do with the issue at hand. My opinion is, one, to go a little bit deeper than you did, the RecPlex was founded with a TID District, Tax Incremental District, the bonding being paid off by revenues, fees, all the funds that they go through the memberships to the RecPlex. So at no times, that's not true, that the taxpayers have to pay for that.

Village Board Meeting
March 7, 2011

Mike Pollocoff:

No, it's not through a TID District.

Clyde Allen:

That was not a TID District to start?

Mike Pollocoff:

Well, there's a TIF District but there's no revenues from the TIF District that go to the RecPlex. The fact that it's physically within the TIF District doesn't transfer any economic status to the RecPlex.

Clyde Allen:

Okay, yes. Thank you for that clarification, that's correct. That taxpayer money has not gone into the RecPlex. It has?

Mike Pollocoff:

It never has.

Clyde Allen:

That's what I'm saying. It has never gone in there from the beginning.

Mike Pollocoff:

Right.

Clyde Allen:

So that being said one of the points being made was the RecPlex is a public facility. It is not a public facility. No taxpayer's dollars have never gone in there so I just want to correct that. We're municipally owned but we're operated through revenues being memberships, sponsorships and fees and such.

In the granting of permits there's three items in there I have an issue with. First one, proposed activity or use of the park area will not unreasonably interfere or detract from the general enjoyment of the park. I did not get one phone call that said they liked having somebody there with putting pressure on them feeling like they are being inundated with being overwhelmed with people there to sign a petition. They're there to have fun, to enjoy and they're paying a good fee to do so. They did not like that and it detracted from their membership. (Paragraph) B is essentially the same thing; they can't enjoy their recreation with that. The last one, the area

Village Board Meeting
March 7, 2011

requested is in compliance with the areas designated by the Village for the type of use requested. That's never been done and it shouldn't be done because it's not a public facility. So I certainly cannot support a petition. I just want to make that clear.

Michael Serpe:

I don't think anybody on this stage is objecting to what the Prijics are trying to accomplish. I understand what they're doing. Whether I agree or disagree with their efforts it makes no difference. Unfortunately the political climate in this country is nothing to be proud of right now. I suppose we can argue that for a while. But when I go to the RecPlex as I occasionally do and see the activity there and to know that everybody goes there for a reason and that's to enjoy themselves, to work out, to have their kids in daycare, it's just a beautiful, safe facility.

I can't see granting this permit right now and then having to think about what may come in the future because of its popularity, and it's a very, very popular place. I don't blame the Prijics for asking for it because everything they need is right there. I only had two phone calls on this when they saw the agenda today and both says I hope you don't approve this because this is not what we want to see come into the place. Just two people called me. I'm going to honor that request and I feel strongly about it myself that it's not a place that we should have political activity.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

At 4:30 in the morning you see a lot of cars over there, people that go work out, take a shower, carry their suits and go out to work. That's what the parking lot is. And I don't believe the people are going to appreciate somebody being over there anyway doing any political activity. I am a big supporter of the Constitution, believe me. . . . I know the Constitution better than many people. I studied for 13 years to become a citizen. But I know also while the Supreme Court says . . . we have to respect because we have rights and obligations and you mentioned that, too. So our rights . . . when somebody is Consequently in this case rights and obligations . . . and I don't believe in this case I approve of this request concerning the RecPlex is appropriate. I can't support that.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, I might add just to expand on why there's a difference, if you look at the map the lots for the ball fields are directly across the street from the RecPlex, and those are lots that are part of the park. They were built with property tax dollars; they're maintained with property tax dollars. We allow anybody to go in there and park and use those lots, and there's a lot of traffic by there. I think if the Prijics wanted to park a vehicle there with a sign with their mission people could swing in or swing by or stop by and accomplish the same thing. But technically RecPlex is a public facility because it's owned by a public entity but it's an enterprise. It's operated like a business, and that's how it functions. And it's not one of those government businesses like sewer and water where you have no choice for the sewer and water. You have to have the sewer and water.

Village Board Meeting
March 7, 2011

This is a business where you do have a choice. We don't require anybody to be a member. That's a choice they have and they invest their money if it's \$700 a month or if they're there for a program they pay individually for. That's an economic choice they make to be there for that purpose. That's the basis for my recommendation.

Monica Yuhas:

I just want to state that I did receive a handful of phone calls from members throughout the week about the solicitations of signatures that were brought upon members. The members were not happy about that. They felt that when they go to the RecPlex they go to an environment where they're there to work out and do what they need to do. They want to de-stress from what's going on, and that's the purpose of why they go. This compromise with having parking for you with the ball fields it's a large area. It's heavily traveled. There's traffic. It would allow you to continue to get your signatures. I cannot support having people inside the RecPlex and I will not support that tonight.

Mike Pollocoff:

I might add the complaints we received this last week were not the Prijics. They weren't in there, but there was other people that identify with their cause that are members that were in there and that's wherein the problem came. They were going up to people while they were recreating and trying to get them to sign the petitions. That's when we started getting the flurry of complaints. It's not just this issue. We've had over time, like I said, there's been other political issues where people feel passionate about it, and when they want people to feel the same passion that they do not everybody is going to sign on to that. That's where the problems occur. Like I say, we've never permitted it knowingly and when we find out about it we make sure it stops.

Michael Serpe:

John, I would make a motion to deny the permit as requested for the use of the RecPlex and its grounds for the purpose of political activity.

Clyde Allen:

Second.

Michael Serpe:

And I would add that the permitted uses that we have identified on the map are adequate for this purpose.

Clyde Allen:

Second.

Village Board Meeting
March 7, 2011

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Mike, second by Clyde. Further discussion on this item?

SERPE MOVED TO DENY THE PERMIT APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY DEBORAH AND JOHN PRIJIC TO USE THE RECPLEX FOR POLITICAL ACITIVITY AND PERMIT THAT USE ONLY IN PRAIRIE SPRINGS PARK AS DISCUSSED AND IN THE AREAS DELINEATED ON THE MAP; SECONDED BY ALLEN; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

8. VILLAGE BOARD COMMENTS

9. ADJOURNMENT

YUHAS MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0 AND MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:40 P.M.