

**VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE  
PLEASANT PRAIRIE VILLAGE BOARD  
PLEASANT PRAIRIE WATER UTILITY  
LAKE MICHIGAN SEWER UTILITY DISTRICT  
SEWER UTILITY DISTRICT "D"  
9915 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Pleasant Prairie, WI  
December 5, 2006  
6:30 p.m.**

A Regular Meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Village Board was held on Tuesday, December 5, 2006. Meeting called to order at 6:30 p.m. Present were Village Board members John Steinbrink, Alex Tiahnybok, Steve Kumorkiewicz, Jeff Lauer and Mike Serpe. Also present were Mike Pollocoff, Village Administrator; Jean Werbie, Community Development Director, Kathy Goessl, Finance Director and Jane Romanowski, Village Clerk.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- 3. ROLL CALL**
- 4. MINUTES OF MEETINGS - NOVEMBER 6, 2006**

**TIAHNYBOK MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 6, 2006 VILLAGE BOARD MEETING AS PRESENTED IN THEIR WRITTEN FORM; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

- 5. PRESENTATION OF 2007 BUDGET**

John Steinbrink:

This is the FY 2007 budget presentation, revolving short-term capital needs. The general fund budget being considered tonight for FY 2007 is \$13,469,324, of which is \$7,319,648 generated by property tax dollars. Tonight the presentation, public hearing and final adoption of 2007 general fund budget represents the culmination of many hours of work, deliberation and ultimately the consideration by both the voters of Pleasant Prairie and this Board.

The voters of the Village of Pleasant Prairie spoke very clearly on November 7<sup>th</sup> by saying that they did not want their property taxes increased any farther. I personally place great value on having that input from the citizens of this Village of Pleasant Prairie. The State statutes require that any increase above the levy limits go to referendum and that's what was done, and we fulfilled that obligation to the voters of the Village.

I also believe that the rejection of the referendum was not a mandate to reduce the essential services that this Village provides. The Village of Pleasant Prairie levy and tax rate is already the lowest of any comparable municipality. I think if you look at the screen you're going to see some comparisons there. The Village's proposed levy for 2007 is still lower than comparable municipalities. The Village's mill rate, when compared to area municipalities, reflect that your

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

local tax and total tax is less in Pleasant Prairie. Generally, citizens cannot receive the same level of service in other communities at the price that Pleasant Prairie charges. Our challenge is to maintain that value for our taxpayers.

When you looked at the slide up there comparing different municipalities, you look at our total levy which is probably lower than most other municipalities around us. When you look at Somers which is a Town with Town services, not comparable to the Village, you can see the closeness there.

One of the most important additions to this year's budget is a full-time firemedic in the fire rescue department. The addition of this position improves our response time when a second call for service is received. It enables just one of our fire stations to respond to automobile accidents instead of both stations. This improves response time for those calls that occur when the first fire rescue response unit has already left the station. This budget also continues the essential capital replacement of police cars and computer servers for both the police department and fire rescue.

So now the question before us is how does our Village continue to prosper, promote quality economic development and maintain the quality municipal services that make Pleasant Prairie the attractive community it is while meeting the requirements of its limits. The Village Board has already removed \$93,020 and this is to stay within the levy limits set by the State of Wisconsin. The difficult task before us in the short term is to find a way to fund \$433,722 to purchase an ambulance, rescue equipment, heart monitors and a replacement snowplow. The challenge in managing any budget is to maintain existing levels of service while controlling the expenditures.

One source of savings that became available on November 7<sup>th</sup>, the date of the referendum, is a new contract for health insurance. The Village was able to secure a price from United Health System at a savings of \$163,084. The prices quoted prior to September 18, 2006, when the resolution for the referendum was adopted, represented a 26 percent increase. With the cooperation and concurrence of our employees, the Village oversees health insurance at a cost that is very similar to what we are paying at this time. The Village employees have accepted a plan that has higher deductibles and co-pays than other municipalities. On the board you see comparisons there. Locally the difference is evident when you compare the difference between the Village health plan at \$14,256 per year per employee, and this compares with the City of Kenosha at \$17,100 per year for a family plan. These changes were accomplished by working with our employee unions and other non represented employees, not by blaming them for budgetary concerns.

Another source of revenue to limit the exposure of the existing general property taxpayer is to use funds that have been collected through the Village's impact fee ordinance. This portion of the ordinance that relates to public works has collected \$31,508. These funds were collected specifically for equipment needs due to added roadways in the Village. I am recommending that these funds be applied towards the purchase of a new snowplow.

These two sources have provided \$166,242, but this is still \$267,840 short of what is needed. I have directed staff to prepare an analysis of what would be the lowest level that the Village's fund reserves could be placed at while still being able to provide a solid financial reserve that

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

would maintain the Village's bond rating and provide an emergency reserve. After consultation with our financial advisor and bond counsel, it was determined that the Village can reduce our existing reserve to 15 percent of our general fund revenues, or \$1,544,534. Currently, the Village of Pleasant Prairie has \$2,883,350 in the general fund reserve. Of that amount, \$1,200,000 is reserve for a loan to the sanitary sewer utility leaving an unreserved source of funds at \$1,538,718 which is \$5,816 less than the 15 percent that would be needed. Mike, if you could clarify some of those numbers up there. This is where it may become a little bit confusing.

Mike Pollocoff:

Sure, Mr. President. The Village's fund balance as President Steinbrink indicated is roughly \$2.8 million. Of that \$2.8 million a loan was made to the sanitary sewer utility which enabled them to secure \$1.2 million of money without going out to bonding, by saving the utility the 2 percent issuance fees and the legal costs associated with the bond, and the rate 3% to whatever the rate is, whatever the floating rate is. So that's money that we're able to make available to the sewer utility.

But as part of our fund balance it's reserved. If at any time the Village wanted that money they would direct the sewer utility to issue debt and pay the general fund back which hasn't been necessary. So the unreserved debt, the funds that aren't committed to anything, is \$1,538,718.

Based on advice from our bond counsel and financial advisor, the 15 percent cap on our reserve fund does a couple things. It guarantees the Village's ability to make our payments in the eyes of the underwriters of bonds so that our bond rating, which currently now is A+ and A1 with Moody's and Standard and Poors respectively, would remain in tact.

The other part of that money is just whatever would happen that would require the Village to respond to an emergency that might occur. The most recent example is flooding that occurred in 2004 when we needed to buy pumps, get contractors on line, expend an inordinate amount of overtime, buy materials, and we needed to do that that day. We didn't want to have to go to a bank and borrow the money. And that's money that we held out there for quite a while. In fact, we just received our last reimbursement from FEMA for the portion that they guarantee.

So at 15 percent that brings us to \$1,544,000 which is just under 15 percent. But by allocating out the receivable sewer loan, splitting it between the general fund reserves and the water fund reserves that frees up this number which is \$594,184 that is available for capital improvement purposes. That doesn't mean we're going to spend the entire amount, but that's how that allocation of funds comes about, and it still leaves us well within our bond ratings, well within the solid financial base that the Village has to operate under.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you, Mike. The Village of Pleasant Prairie has developed a fund balance which has grown remarkably as our department heads have especially managed their departments to control expenses and to secure necessary revenues. The Village fund balance has not been used in over ten years and has increased each and every year. The Village has developed a solid financial

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

foundation by entrusting the professionals we have on staff, and this is to manage their departments effectively and efficiently with the concerns of the taxpayers at heart.

Our Village has achieved greater savings by empowering our professionals to find the best way to deliver services at the lowest cost. In the last six years they have set aside \$1,427,210 in the Village. This fund has saved our Village when we have borrowed money for economic development by providing a better interest rate. The Village does not have to borrow on a short-term basis to maintain operations until shared revenues from the State are received, and this is as many municipalities must do now. This accounts even to more savings.

Mike, if you could explain the steps that are going to enable us to fund the referendum items.

Mike Pollocoff:

Thank you, Mr. President. As we indicated, after the transfer of 50 percent of the sanitary sewer loan to the water utility, and I might add that loan doesn't increase the cost for the water utility, it doesn't increase costs for the general fund, and it doesn't increase expenses for the sewer and water utility because that loan has already been in place. After that transfer, the fund balance available in our reserves is \$594,184.

The additional item funds needed to purchase the remaining items that were not approved in referendum was \$235,130. The remaining \$359,054 will remain in the reserve account. That enables us not to be right at 15 percent but we'll have that much spread to bring us over 17 percent so that if something happens during the year we're not already at the bottom. We've got some room to spread. One of the last items, too, is that we've determined that there is a salvage value to the heart monitors and what we have of the Hurst tool of \$4,000 that would also be applied towards the capital program.

So the solution to fund the referendum items is United Insurance proposal of \$163,084, the use of impact fees which have been collected from developers in the amount of \$31,508, the reallocation of our reserve fund at \$235,130, and the sale of used equipment at \$4,000 which brings us to \$433,722 which is the total amount of the items that were placed before the public on the referendum that was turned down. Under this scenario we'd be able to fund those items without having a property tax increase. Kathy, if you want to take off from there.

Kathy Goessl:

I'll begin with an organizational chart showing what budgets are being looked at this evening, what we've looked at before, and what's still remaining in terms of budgets that are the responsible of the Board to approve.

The budgets in yellow or the things in yellow are the ones we're looking at this evening, the major one being the general government. The general government is broken into three separate funds, an operating fund, a capital fund and a debt service fund. These are each separately accounted for in different accounting buckets. We're also going to be looking at the Tax Incremental Districts this evening. We're looking at their debt service and the capital

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

improvements so those are broken into two separate funds there also. And the last smaller area we're looking at is special revenues. That's a very small dollar amount of four different types of funds.

We've already reviewed and approved the Clean Water Utility which are in the orange, and the Solid Waste Utility. In the next month or so we're going to be looking at the Water Utility, the Sewer Utility and also our Lakeview RecPlex. So tonight we're concentrating just on the yellow.

I'm going to start out with looking at the general government and the three different funds. I'm going to start with operating. This is a lot of numbers, but this tells us our revenues and our expenses to operate the general government. On this screen it shows the 2006 budget and also the original 2007 proposed budget. The 2007 proposed budget was a budget that was presented at the October 16<sup>th</sup> working meeting. It included all new programs and program reductions that were discussed at that meeting. It has been on the website. And that budget was also published as a summary in the *Kenosha News*, but it's been on the website since November 13<sup>th</sup> after the referendum.

The dark blue is what has changed since then. Adjustments first of all as you look in the revenue area, we have a minus \$398,215. As John and Mike were talking, there are three separate funds. This is the operating fund and we're talking about the capital fund where the ambulance and the Hurst tools are and the plow trucks. We need to transfer this money, which part of it is fund balance and part of it is health insurance savings, from our operating fund over here over to our capital. So that \$398,215 is taking that tax levy, instead of levying it for operating we're going to be levying it for capital to buy those things that were on referendum. Therefore, it reduces our levy in the general operating and increases our levy the same amount in capital.

The other section, expenses, you can see there's also adjustments in expenses throughout. Those adjustments are the health insurance savings that we're realizing due to our new contract with United Health. Each department has health insurance. They have full-time employees in each of these different areas, and so the health insurance savings was allocated based on these full-time employees in each of these departments.

Then also at our working meeting in October we had set up a contingency for health insurance because we were uncertain of the future of what kind of bids you were going to get, but our bid at that time was a 20 and some percent increase so we had to build that also in because our base budgets only included 10 percent. So we're moving all that health insurance uncertainty, as well as bringing our premiums to our bid price with United, therefore saving the operating fund \$163,085.

At the bottom you can see there's actually a net loss in this fund. That means that we're use fund balance. In the future we've always balanced our budgets and netted that out to zero. The 2006 budget has a slight increase there due to the Clean Water Utility used to be in this budget. It was transferred out. It wasn't exactly balanced to zero for Clean Water so it left a little bit of money here as being unbalanced for 2006. But previous years, the last ten years, it's always been zero balance, therefore not using or putting money into fund balance. So we're looking at \$235,130 of fund balance being used to help fund the referendum items. I go into more detail on the next slide

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

on the detail of the revenue and expenditures. So general government is made up of our operating revenues. These are the operating revenues for the general government. We have the biggest chunk, of course, being property tax accounting for 41 percent of the operating fund of the general government.

The next largest category is intergovernmental revenues at 20 percent. That's our shared revenue and our road grants from the State. That's the major component in that category. The next major category is licenses and permits and that includes building permits and zoning permits is the major category or revenue item in that area. That accounts for 13 percent of our operating general fund revenue.

Other taxes accounts for 8 percent and so does public charges for services. Other taxes the biggest one is our water utility, paying our general government or utility tax equivalent. We look at how much their assets are worth, their fixed assets, and we apply the same taxes as we do to real estate in the Village, and they pay the general government over a half a million dollars in taxes. And then also the mobile home taxes are included in that category also.

Public charges for services include the biggest categories as rescue squad earnings and our engineering department services. We charge out developers for use of our engineers to do review on their development. Then we have other category at 9 percent. The biggest thing there is interest income and also intergovernmental charges. We have contracts to do assessing for other communities. That's included in there, and also we have a police officer that works with the schools, the Unified District and that's included as revenue in that category also. Also we have fines for the municipal court. New programs is a very small percent at 1 percent of our revenue sources for general operating.

This is the change from 2006 and 2007 for each of these sources of revenues. You can see overall we're only increase about \$89,000. There's ups and downs in here. We have new programs in this area and that's the last line that includes the three new fees that we're looking at which includes the franchise fee on cable television to support channel 25. We have parcel creation and record maintenance fee and assessing when parcels are split, a fee to be charged for the additional work that assessing has to do to create those parcels as separate records. And also a fire re-inspection charge. We do have a fire inspection charge, but if they have to go out there again they weren't charging them additional cost. So they'll be charging additional cost if this budget is approved to go out and re-inspect.

So overall a small increase in revenue and some decrease in different categories. You can see each one. You have property tax going down, intergovernmental going up slightly, license and permits going up slightly. Other taxes up a little bit and public charges for services down, other revenues up. These are the changes in general operating, just the one fund, operating fund of the general government.

Expense wise, we break out departments and divisions into five different categories. We have public safety. Public safety includes our police department and our fire and rescue, also inspection and our public safety communication which is our dispatch center and also our Roger Prange Center which houses our police department and our dispatch area. All these departments

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

are personnel service related, so the major cost in all these departments are personnel so most of the increases here are personnel changes in terms of contracts negotiated, raises, steps that people may be in within their year. So the majority of the increase here in these budgets are personnel related. Public works that includes our street department including snowplowing, street maintenance. Also our engineering department is in there and also our street lighting department or division.

Administration is our third category and that includes the support division for the general government including the Village Board. Also, our municipal courts, administration, human resources, information technology, the computers and technology we have at the Village, the finance department, assessing and the Village hall costs. Again, we're service oriented in this area and personnel is one of our major increases in this area and also software maintenance agreements from the IT department accounts for some of the change here.

You can also look at we have community development and parks. They stand on their own in terms of departments as well as groups here. You can see there's a very small increase in both those areas. Contingency that was the contingency we had last year when we were uncertain concerning our health insurance. This year the uncertainty has diminished in terms of what 2007 would look like. We don't know what 2008 will look like, but for now, for 2007, we can remove that contingency from our budget.

New program wise, these programs were discussed in great detail during our working sessions and our department presentations, but the new programs include a full-time firemedic as President Steinbrink mentioned. It also includes an increased hours in parks to meet the demand of the RecPlex. But the RecPlex offsets this with a transfer of funds to the general government to provide these services to the RecPlex. Then we also have some PC replacements throughout the Village for a total of \$64,049 for our new programs.

Our program reductions include elimination of our newsletter going more toward web and also channel 25. Also, to reduce we have a contract with CompPysch which provides health evaluations as well as health information and other information on the web for the employees. We have decided to eliminate everything except for the health evaluation part of it saving a little over \$10,000. Also eliminating attorney fees for \$3,000. So we have a total reduction of \$33,328 in our operating expenses of the general government.

So that was just one fund of the Village. That's the operating section. Now I'm going to switch to the capital section. This is where the referendum items were being recommended to be purchased. Here again are the same columns that you saw in the operating section. The budget for last year compared to what we proposed at the working meeting before the referendum was voted on. As you can see, before the referendum we had it actually in here as an item for source of revenue. But as you can see with adjustments we have taken that referendum revenue source out. In its place we transfer that \$398,000 from our operating over to our capital fund. So, therefore, that is the replacement source of revenue for the referendum that failed.

Other revenue sources are, as mentioned earlier in the presentation, is the sale of used equipment as well as the impact fee for the plow trucks. That's the \$35,507 increased in revenue source.

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

Therefore, those are the changes that we made. They net out to zero. We have not changed the capital outlays that we're looking at purchasing. We're still purchasing what we initially needed, the \$600,000 worth of equipment. That specific equipment includes, as was mentioned before, a Hurst tool, replacing heart monitors and defibrillators, also the ambulance, the plow truck with side wings. In addition to those referendum items we initially had proposed in the base levy vehicle replacement for the police department, replacement of vehicles in the inspection, a pickup truck, a parks pickup truck and also a public works pickup truck, and also replacement of servers throughout the Village in terms of general government. That totals \$600,722 of capital expenditures that we're recommending.

We're looking at again in this fund of \$48,000. We had that gain initially planned. Usually we try to break even again on this, but we're looking at future funding so we're putting \$48,000 away for the end loader that was highly recommended during this budget process which we didn't have enough money for at that point. And we'll discuss at the end of this presentation future plans on how to fund other things other than the end loader and how we're going to do that.

Now I'm switching to the third fund. We talked about operating, we talked about capital purchases, and now we're going to switch to our debt service fund. Debt service was also presented during the working meeting. This again shows last year's budget for the debt service and what we propose for 2007. There is no adjustment in the debt service fund. No changes have been made since the presentation in October. We're looking at a tax levy here of a little over \$2.5 million to help us make our debt service payment. Other sources of revenue in this fund are special assessments. So when we do a road or a storm project, this is basically the roads, then the people that chose to pay on a ten year basis this is the special assessment income for that. Then we have interest income on the money we have in this fund. Then the principal and interest payments that are scheduled to be paid - this fund nets out to a zero gain or loss.

So this summarizes all three funds on a summary basis. You can see we are staying within our property tax levy limit of \$7,319,648. Other revenue sources were explained earlier and total a little less than \$6 million to operate the general government in all three funds. And also expenditures as President Steinbrink earlier total \$13,469,324 for a net change actually of \$187,000. That's us using the fund balance in the general government. You can see the \$235,130 being used, being negative, taken out, and the \$48,000 being added to capital to help for future funding of capital purchases.

Below, the bottom half actually summarizes the fund balance in all of our funds. This was presented in our budget booklets as well as I believe during one of our working sessions. But this is the fund balance we have and then we put the unreserved portion in here to show that not everything is available. By the end of the year we have \$3.2 and almost \$3.3 million, but unreserved is only \$1.9 in the operating fund. Debts actually reserved for the future we need to keep some balance in there for that. And capital is reserved for future capital purchases. So overall we have a 14 percent in all three funds, but basically the bond rating agency looks just at the general operating, and you see right now we're over the 15 percent with a 19 percent of operating revenue in this fund.

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

What does the total tax bill look like? This is where the property tax dollars actually go. You can see the breakdown of the mill rate by taxing entity. Kenosha Unified School District is the biggest portion as we know at \$8.24 mill rate per thousand. The next largest one is Kenosha County at \$4.07 per thousand, followed by the Village at \$3.10. Then we have Gateway at \$1.22 and the State of Wisconsin at \$.17. This gives us a total mill rate, there's also the school tax credit that's figured in here that gets minus out of this of \$15.71 per thousand. Last year our mill rate was \$17.55 per thousand for the total tax bill. Therefore, there's a deduction of \$1.84 which we expect. Our assessed values went up, our mill rate will go down, therefore this is what we were expecting. \$1.84 is the decrease we can look at on the property tax bill in terms of the mill rate.

This is the changes on average house. An average house in the Village last year was \$225,200. This year because of the revaluation in the market the average house is \$270,700. That's a 20 percent increase in the average house value. This average house in the Village this is a different tax increases they can expect in the different taxing categories. If you have an average home you'll paid \$268 more to Kenosha Unified, and you'll pay \$44 more to the Village. You can see the other taxing entities will get Kenosha County \$42 and Gateway \$10 and then the State of Wisconsin will get \$2 additional on this average house of \$270,700. This is just the Village mill rate and how we went from \$3.54 in 2005 to \$3.10 in 2006.

The next area which we need approval on tonight is the Tax Incremental District. The Tax Incremental District has revenue and expenditures just like the general government. This summarizes both funds together. Both our capital and our debt service fund for the Tax Incremental District is being presented on one form. The tax increment that we're collecting this year based on a calculation that is given to us by the State of Wisconsin is \$2,689,676, which is an increase of almost \$450,000 over last year's tax increment.

Other revenues in these two funds is special assessment revenue. The Tax Incremental District put in, for example, the water main on 165, and if a property owner connects to the water they need to pay the special assessment back and they pay it back to the Tax Incremental District. This is a revenue source. Also, this fund has aid from the State of Wisconsin for exempt computer equipment for manufacturing entities, and also its interest income on the fund balance they have in this account. So that's the other revenue category which is going up \$104,000. Basically that increase in that area is on interest. Our interest rates have climbed over the last couple years in terms of from like 3 percent a year and a half ago to 5 that we're getting right now.

Last year we have budgeted to sell some property. We have not done this in the 2006 budget. We are looking at selling some property in 2007, but actually the CDA owns the property. It's a separate component unit, and that sale revenue will come back through the financing area, the \$5,910,000, so the line below that the financing includes borrowing and any transfers from the CDA back to the Tax Incremental District on any property they may sell. We're being a little more conservative this year in terms of what we think we're going to sell, and we're budgeting in the CDA to sell a little over \$1 million for one of the properties that we have out in that area. So that money will be transferred back and that's part of the \$5,900,000 that we're budgeting for. The

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

other part of that \$5,900,000 is the borrowing that we're going to do to help us fund capital projects that we'll be doing out in that area.

Capital improvements for this coming year we're budgeting at \$6.9, almost \$7 million. The majority of that is the work on the 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue water, sewer, road and storm which totals a little over \$4.5 million, and also grading south of Highway 165 for a total of a little over \$1.6 million. And then other projects that pull up the amount listed there.

Debt service payments are scheduled out and they're totaling principal payments of \$1.7 million and the rest is an amount being interest payments on the TIF District. You can see again the fund balance that is in this area. Most of the fund balance is accumulated in our borrowing. When we borrow we still have money left over here to start some of these projects I mentioned for 2007. That's basically the money we have available in the TIF District is borrowed funds for future capital.

The last and final area we need to look at, and this is very small revenue wise, is special revenue funds. We actually have four special revenue funds. Fire and rescue, police, federally forfeited, veterans memorial are the four special revenue funds. They're all separately accounted for. The revenue sources on these funds is mainly interest income and donations. Expense wise in the fire association that's fire association costs, and for the police fund it's for our police dog for a total of \$5,200 in expenditures for a net change in these funds of a little less than \$2,000. You can see these funds have a small fund balance in each of them totaling at the end we're predicting of about \$51,000.

That's the end of my presentation. I'd like to turn it back over to President Steinbrink.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you, Kathy. I think as you look at those numbers and you saw the comparisons keep in mind what the Village taxpayer is paying on his property compared to other ones and the service being provided. After looking at all those numbers it probably leaves you wondering what is the Village's financial future. The results of the last referendum clearly indicate that Village residents do not want to have any property taxes levied upon them that are above the Wisconsin levy limits. While Wisconsin law provides for this obligation to request permission to increase the levy, Pleasant Prairie residents have come to expect their Village government to perform their responsibilities within a budget that is smaller than any other comparable government.

As I have indicated earlier, I also believe that the residents of our Village expect the best municipal services that can be provided. During my tenure on this Village Board that has also been our goal, and I believe the financial plan I am presenting tonight will ensure that the Village of Pleasant Prairie does not need to go to a referendum for the next ten years or thereafter, and we will live within Wisconsin levy limits. This plan is dependent upon fiscal discipline our professional staff has shown over the last decade, and a Village Board that will be financially responsible and not succumb to tax freeze and levy freeze gimmicks.

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

If growth in our Village continues at a rate of 3 percent which has been the average rate the last five years, the Village levy will raise approximately \$254,000 a year. This reflects the fact that there will be more newly developed properties paying property taxes, and it also reflects increases in the levy that are associated with inflation up to the cap set by the State of Wisconsin. Of course, this number will vary with decreases and increases in the level of growth in our Village. The money will be used to fund Village operations. I expect Village department heads to continue to work as diligently in the future as they have in the past to remain within the budget and continue as they have to create a surplus at the end of each year.

The other factor that has a significant impact on what we as citizens pay related to growth is the ability to continue the use of impact fees. As you saw earlier in the budget presentation, the collection of a rather modest amount of money from developers for the added demands they place on our community help us fund a snowplow and will help us build a future fire station, a larger police station, and additional public works facilities in the years to come. I encourage the Village staff to complete their ongoing fiscal analysis of new development proposals for decisions on what types of new growth should be permitted in our Village. Their work in this area is groundbreaking and will provide Village residents, Village Commissions and this Board with the most detailed and extensive financial information to base our future development decisions upon.

Five years ago when it became apparent that the State of Wisconsin was in financial trouble, the Village Board's concern was that the revenue we received from the State in the form of shared revenues would end. In 2001 the Village Board determined that no more general fund debt would be placed on the property tax bills of our residents. The Village of Pleasant Prairie over the next four years took advantage of every refinancing that would be advantageous and our debt leveled off. In 2009 the Village will realize a reduction of \$508,000 that will grow each year until 2013 where the fund will have nearly \$2 million a year.

In 2017, there will be no more debt and the Village will have \$2,500,000 a year available for capital projects. The Village can direct this money into the capital fund to fund our current and future capital needs, again, within the mill rate limit established by the State of Wisconsin levy limits. It is critical to this financial plan that savings from the reduction of debt not be used to reduce the tax rate while there are still capital needs to satisfy. When there are no more capital needs in the Village of Pleasant Prairie, then it should be reallocated to the needs that exist at that time. There are several major expenditures in the future that serve many such as a major roadway or a fire station that the Village should consider bonding for. If that is done, however, it would have to be added to the existing levy. Mike, I think you can explain the chart up here on the debt service and how it lays out as we decrease our debt payments and more money allowable for capitals.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, as you indicated, in 2001 when the Board did not issue any additional debt and we refinanced debt as opportunities arose, we flattened out our debt service payments. If you think back to the debt service fund that Kathy had shown earlier, we're paying about out of \$2.5 million nearly \$2 million in principal and about \$500,000 in interest, and that number has been changing as we have less interest and more principal.

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

In 2007 this chart shows that we're actually going to pay \$9,000 in a year more, and then in 2008 \$4,000. 2009 is our first significant reduction in the debt service schedule of \$509,000. If you look to the right column, the money available for capital, that's cumulative. As time goes on that amount grows. You can see we're significant in the beginning, it kind of levels off around \$2 million. At 2016 it's \$2.5 million. As long as the future Village Boards and the community understand that this money is to be used as debt service drops off and it goes into a capital fund, the Village is going to be able to make the capital improvements that are needed, fund equipment that's needed, and fund the road improvement program which hasn't been funded and not have to raise the mill rate within the caps that are established by the State of Wisconsin.

So the tax rate as it is, which is right now as the previous chart showed is the lowest in the State for comparable communities and for comparable communities in Kenosha County, we would still enjoy that level of tax effort, but the funds that are set aside because of the planning of previous Boards would be available to use for the capital that's needed.

The 2000 general fund budget, the revised five year equipment and building plan, we've always had a five year plan that we utilized. This chart is a little bit tough to read, but in 2007 there was capital that was funded outside of the referendum that was funded within the general fund, roughly \$170,000, so there's \$600,000 for the ambulance and rescue equipment and monitors, the computers for IT, truck for parks, replacement police cars, snowplow for public works and a pickup truck and some other minor expenditures of the departments.

In 2008, the plan shows that we're spending \$546,000. Again, we're replacing equipment in the fire department, minor expenditures in IT. The police department is going to replacing their squads. Every two years the police department takes squads out of service because at that point they have 90,000 on them, plus adding an additional squad. Public works will be funding a front end loader which is used to load salt. If you can visualize, if you've been out to public works, that salt shed out there that's how we get the salt in and out of the trucks, as well as working in the gravel yard during the year. And, again, in the other departments minor expenditures.

In 2009 the amount starts growing at \$787,000. Again, more work in updating the IT department, continued expenditures in police and public works. In 2010 \$950,000 is available. The other thing I want to emphasize, the cautionary note, is this just shows what incurring debt would do to kind of undermine this. If we show that we're going to do an addition at the Roger Prange for \$63,000, that amount in our impact fee study is shown at \$1 million. If you wait and fund it through the existing capital fund you won't have to go on top of the existing levy and fund it if you put that out at 2011. But if you fund anything in here that would be out in the future then you wouldn't have to raise the mill rate to do it. But here if you wanted to borrow you would have to incur in these areas. These are all items, the Roger Prange addition, fire station three and redevelopment of Pleasant Prairie Parks are all items that need to be funded in the future. They're also items that are funded in part by impact fees. Not just by homes but by businesses that relocate or build in the Village. When new development is established in the Village they'll pay an impact fee just like someone who is buying a home. That fund will build up to take care of those items.

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

In this area here we have the 2007 general fund budget. We're basically loading everything to 2011. If the Board chooses to do reconstruction work, that would have to be either by a bond or an interfund loan to pick this item up. This item here can be handled within the capital as that grows, but this would be the amount of 80<sup>th</sup> Avenue if we decided to do 80<sup>th</sup>. That would have to be borrowed and spread across all the taxpayers in the Village. We've done our borrowing on a 10 year basis. The State allows us to go 20 but the Village has never borrowed more than 10 for general fund purposes. But we will be able to complete the road maintenance plan if we adopt this program and use the reserve that are brought in by debt reduction and use that money for capital.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you, Mike. The availability of fund reserves as we have seen will help the Village with capital needs until 2009 when debt retirement begins to accelerate. What is different with this and future budgets is the commitment that the reserves are funded first to ensure that they remain above 15 percent of the general fund budget, and that's what we need in order to maintain our bond rating and the low interest rates we pay at the Village level.

As we go on and the budget grows reserve funds need to grow with it. The Village Board must commit to funding the reserve fund before operations and capital. We must also continue to rely on our professionals to manage their budgets as they have in the past to place whatever surpluses into reserves until it is funded at 15 percent of the general fund. This financial plan for the future of Pleasant Prairie maintains a levy and mill rate that is the lowest in the State of Wisconsin for comparable communities. It does not rely on future tax referendums and will fully fund the Village's future capital needs including roads.

I again want to thank our Village employees whose cooperation and sacrifice help us secure a contract for health insurance savings of \$163,000. That was not anticipated when the referendum date was established. I also want to thank our Village professionals for managing their budgets in a manner that has created reserves that will enable this new financial plan for our future to become a reality.

As I think we've seen here with the services we receive and at the costs we receive them the Village employees play a big part in what we do and have in this Village. I think it's important. They're the main reason their participation, they're part of the healthcare plan, they're doing the best they could, making sacrifices have made this available to us. Our commitment to reserve the 15 percent first is going to make sure that we meet our commitments to our bonding and make sure we maintain the levels we need.

As a growing community the Village has low taxes and I think impact fees on new development are going to insure that we maintain those low taxes. People get confused here. They hear the word impact tax. It's not a tax on existing residents. It's a tax on new development to make sure that they pay their fair share and we preserve the quality of life we have in the Village without incurring new taxes. So I want to thank everybody that had part in this budget tonight. There's a lot of information here. I think we tried to present it as clearly as we could. So at this time I will open it up to the public hearing.

**6. PUBLIC HEARING**

**A. Proposed 2007 Budget Hearing**  
**1) Citizen Comments**

Jane Romanowski:

Our first speaker is Sherri Chmielecki.

Sherri Chmielecki:

Sherri Chmielecki, 11009 122<sup>nd</sup> Street. Before I even start I love your speech and I appreciate all the fine work you're doing for the residents of Pleasant Prairie, but I've lived here 20 years. I pay my taxes. Ten years ago you doubled the taxes. We don't have cable. We can't get channel 25. You don't plow our roads. We don't need a front end loader for salt. You don't repair our roads. That's all County. So we don't need new trucks. All that money you've been collecting from 15 houses on 122<sup>nd</sup> Street I don't think you need all this other stuff or to have referendums. You're taking our hard earned money and say you're giving us all these high tech things and all this good stuff, we don't get anything.

The next thing is the Clean Water Act and that will be the next one. Anyway, I just handed you papers that was in the *Kenosha News* today. I did it all by myself and I didn't have anybody charge me any money. This is kind of what I'm talking about here. If you charged a flat fee for the first bag, can, pound or square inch of garbage, and an additional charge for anything above that, you would make more money for budgeting. Residents would be more aware of what they throw away each month and the landfills wouldn't fill up so fast.

I also think we should have a day when they pick up bigger items like other towns and village's that's free to all of us. Call it a clean up day. And in that article at the bottom I believe they do say something about cleaning up their yard and they don't charge you for it. Okay, here, those occasions when a resident cleans out the garage or basement and has a larger garbage output, that pickup would be included in the bulk item pickup at no extra charge. I think that was a very fair—it has what they charge for the cans. I don't know if anybody behind me has read that, but what they're charging for a 90 gallon tote would be \$130 annually. That would be the biggest one. I think it comes out of their taxes. A 60 gallon tote would be \$124.80, and a 30 gallon tote would be \$118.80.

You kind of have to read the whole item to see what it is but I think that's a fair way to do it. I'm one person and I have a quarter of a bag of garbage a week. Now, somebody else who has four kids or two kids or something they're going to have twice as much garbage. Why are we paying \$13? They're going to be paying like \$10 and then the more garbage the more you pay and I think that's a fair way to do it. Thank you very much. Anybody have any questions? The last time I walked away.

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

John Steinbrink:

I think they'll respond afterwards. Thank you.

Gus Hauser:

Gus Hauser, 143 113<sup>th</sup> Street. I was very impressed with the presentation and the Village Board and the Administrator. The only thing is I'm quite, well, let's say somewhat skeptical about the truthfulness of the presentation. I know you guys are pretty smart. You're hard working, but some of you are quite deceptive and not quite truthful with it.

One thing what I would like to find out and that was the . . . is the debt service included in the mill rate or not? I don't expect an answer right now, but my further comment is based upon that it is not included. I cannot understand why items that come up on a continual basis like police department cars have to be replaced, trucks have to be replaced, those things citizens understand they have to be done on a continual basis that should not be in the capital improvement project. That should be an item on each department. That might raise our mill rate, but at the same time if it would have raised the mill rate we would get a bigger State aid and we would have not the pickle that we are in right now. Maybe I'm wrong on that one. I'm quite sure somebody will clarify it anyway for me.

Another subject, I know a lot of people won't like to hear about it, but the police department costs us about \$3 million a year. Pleasant Prairie when it changed from a Township to a Village chose or elected to have its own police department. But we had the same services for free practically because we pay the County taxes. We got the service from the Sheriff. Now we are paying out of our property taxes \$3 million, \$2.7 plus whatever it costs us for replacing on a continual basis all the cars all the time.

I am a firm believer in the regional services. Don't get me wrong, I have the highest respect for our police department. Chief Brian Wagner does an outstanding job. I don't know the Sheriff. I've never met him personally so nobody can accuse me that I'm a friend of the Sheriff or something, but I believe the protective services should be done on a regional basis that would be a lot more cost effective and it would cost the Village a lot less money. I don't know if it's true that the \$1 million it would save us, but I would like to see a study done from an independent group, not from our Administrator or from somebody in the Village, but an independent group should give us an answer if it would be cheaper or better for having protective services County wise.

Is it true that big emergency, I know we have agreements between intergovernmental agreements, but if we have one protective service they could throw a heck of a lot more manpower into one spot if it is necessary than what we can do alone, especially since we are at odds with the Sheriff all the time. I don't know if it's true with the other governmental bodies or not, but I know the Sheriff and Pleasant Prairie cannot get along and I think that's a tragedy. Because if something or an emergency comes up that never should be, and I know Mr. Pollocoff you're looking already at your watch. I will cut my comments short.

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

One thing I would like to mention is the street department did an outstanding job with the last storm. I had to go down to bring my wife to the airport in Chicago and the roads in Illinois were as rotten as they can be. It was night and day between the Illinois border and Wisconsin. And I thank the street department for it. Thank you.

Craig Simpkins:

Craig Simpkins, 8719 50<sup>th</sup> Avenue. First of all, I'd like to compliment the administration and the Board for the great job that they've done with developing, building and maintaining the Village. It's a great place to live and raise a family so good job on that.

One thing I do disagree with you a little bit on, President Steinbrink, is that I don't think the Village residents were necessarily against increasing the State tax levy. I think the problem that they had was you didn't exhibit that you sharpened your pencil enough before the referendum came to fruition on November 7<sup>th</sup>. I think if you would have had that in place it would have had a higher probability of passing.

I've been in the corporate world for 15 years and upper management for 4 years, and one of the things that we have to do every day is how can we work smarter and not harder, how can we do more with less. That's this day and age. That's how we have to operate. You need to exhibit that to the residents and I think you have did better in the referendum if you did that.

The last thing before I conclude is, once again, I'd like to compliment the superintendent of streets as well for the fine job that they did for plowing the roads on Friday. It took me two and a half hours to get to work in Milwaukee on Friday morning, and the roads in Pleasant Prairie were clean but other roads weren't.

Once again, now and moving forward I would just ask that your pencil's sharp, you're analyzing stuff to the gnat's tail when you're looking at the budget. Think about how you can work smarter and not harder and do more with less and prove to the citizens that you're doing that.

Jane Romanowski:

There are no more signups, Mr. President.

John Steinbrink:

Anyone else wishing to speak on the budget?

Dick Ginkowski:

Dick Ginkowski, 7022 51<sup>st</sup> Avenue. First, thank you for the stewardship that was demonstrated and the cooperation and the creativity. That's what makes things work. I think that the Board and the Village staff and the employees deserve appreciation for that. It's unfortunate that perhaps our Unified School District does not exhibit the same restraint, because as we looked at the numbers you saw where the biggest bulk, and that's going to be one heck of an increase that

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

we're going to get on our tax bills coming from that direction. I thought as I saw that maybe it's time that we give our School Commission something to do. I suggest that the Board might direct the School Commission to take the message to the Unified School Board that the Village expects the same level of restraint, creativity and stewardship out of the Unified School District. I think that's an appropriate use for the School Commission.

I do wish to address some points brought by Mr. Hauser. And my background, by the way, in addition to being an attorney, prior to that is in criminal justice and public management. The idea being floated around that we can contract out municipal services and always save money is ridiculous. It's absolutely ridiculous, and particularly as it applies to the police department. Currently the Pleasant Prairie Police Department is operating at the lowest staffing level of any comparable community in the State and among the nation. It's lower than the City. It's lower than Twin Lakes. It is at absolute bare bottom. And, in fact, that's a matter of some concern.

The Village has grown considerably since the Sheriff provided service. The Sheriff is a good person and he has a good department. When he brought his plan to this community, though, it was a lowball figure. It was not comparable services. We have 27 officers, including the Chief, out patrolling the streets, doing work in Pleasant Prairie. Now, we weren't presented with that comparable plan. We were presented with 15 Sheriff's deputies and then reallocating five additional positions and using existing staff somehow to fill in the gaps of investigation and supervision, even though the rest of the County is growing exponentially and the Sheriff hasn't had added services. There are people on the County Board who are saying, my goodness, they're saying we're strapped already.

One of the problems with that is if the Sheriff came in and said, look, I'm going to give you 27 deputies and gave you a real figure, say we're going to operate them out of 8500 Green Bay Road, then it would be apples and apples. We'd be looking at something that's comparable, but that wasn't what was presented. And not only was it a lowball figure it's deceptive in a way because of the fact that anyone looking at that once that contract is in place no subsequent Sheriff would necessarily have to carry it on. So if some other Sheriff comes through the door and says, hey, guess what, my goodness, Pleasant Prairie is only paying us a pittance and look at all the work we're doing there, this is ridiculous. Pleasant Prairie if you want me to keep doing it you're going to cough up more money or start your own police department again. And you want to know how much that's going to cost?

The model for metropolitan consolidation of services in intergovernmental cooperation for many years has been the Indianapolis/Marion County Unigov. That was the granddaddy. You know what, those public safety services were specifically exempt and there are a number of reasons for it, because those people are accountable to the individual communities. They meet individual needs within individual communities. That doesn't mean that you can't collaborate together. They should. That doesn't mean they shouldn't work together. They should and they should do a better job of it. But it does mean that we have to be realistic, and to suggest that this plan that was presented would somehow represent savings is absolutely absurd. It didn't need study and the reason why it didn't need study is that it was bogus on delivery.

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

Now, if you want to put apples to apples and say how much would that cost, then I think you're talking about something that's worth taking a look at, but not what you were presented, not something that was a Trojan horse. I have the greatest respect for the Sheriff and he certainly wasn't treated very well when he came into this Village Board chamber, but he still presented a proposal that was faulty. It was not a comparable level of service. If he wants to come back and come in and talk apples to apples, then I think we ought to be looking at that and saying is it a better deal and can we protect our people and do we protect the people that we have working for us now who have dedicated their lives to this community? Then I think it's something that we can look at, but so far we haven't been given anything to look at.

And, more importantly, that particular situation, it's a lowball coming in the door. If somebody down the road were to pull the plug the cost of re-instituting the police department from the ground up, if you're in Silver Lake and you're talking four officers that's not a lot. When you're talking 27, and by the time that happens the need might be greater, maybe around 30 officers, that is not a cheap proposition. Penny wise, pound foolish consolidation is not all that it's cooked up to be. Sometimes it's far more expensive to look in that direction. It's not always the cheapest when you cede the local control and accountability.

We sit down here and we look at minor figures on that board, dollars, a \$4,000 savings. The larger the entity gets they look at that and say \$4,000 that's nothing. The point is that we have more accountability. You saw the accountability because you can look down to the absolute dollar that's being spent and that's the type of accountability we want. So to suggest that somehow or another this is going to save us money, I highly doubt it. Because you're going to take the salaries, if you want to be real, does it cost the County any less money for 27 police officers? Do they get their squad cars any cheaper? Ask yourself those questions and then you're going to realize no. Apples to apples at best it could be a wash and then you still would not have local control and local accountability and that's in the best case scenario. Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you. Anyone else wishing to speak on tonight's budget?

Andrea Rode:

Good evening. My name is Andrea Rode and I had no intention of coming up here and saying anything at all tonight. In fact, I almost didn't make it to the meeting. But, yes, I do want to also thank the street department for the fabulous job they did on our streets. My daughter lives in the City of Kenosha and her streets weren't plowed until Friday night. I just compliment Mr. Steinbrink and his staff for the fabulous job that they did. Nice to live in Illinois and I thought we did a pretty good job, but you guys did a fabulous job. Thank you.

I also want to commend the Board and the Village staff for the great job they did at bringing forth this budget plan tonight. I had no idea what to expect tonight, but I really thank you for doing whatever it took to get us to this point. I'm very proud of you as a Village.

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

The other thing is that it's too bad that the average resident in the Village is not aware of the piece of the pie that you showed tonight, the very small portion that the Village gets out of the whole tax bill that the residents pay. I thank you for the job that you guys do. You do, again, a great job. I moved here from Illinois because I was watching this Village. I was watching it grow. I was watching the way the Village was managed and I was involved in Village government. I can say that I am very glad I moved here. I'm glad to see what you guys are doing on the Board. I'd like to see a little more cohesiveness with people getting along and everyone agreeing on let's get together for the good of the Village, and I think everyone at heart has that in mind, but I think we can get a lot more accomplished with people putting a little more effort in that.

The other thing is I would like to see the *Kenosha News* put forth maybe some positive articles about some of the positive things that the Village does. When I read the *Kenosha News* all I see is negative articles. How can we bring down the Village? Maybe it sells more papers and I'll bet it does. But, you know what, we live in a great Village. There are a lot of good people doing a lot of work and we need to see some positive stuff instead of all the negative. But it seems it's only the negative stuff that gets out. What I've seen tonight I'm very happy with and I hope we see some good, positive comments out of the newspaper.

I do want to commend the *Prairie Sun News* because they seem to report with no spin. I mean they report what they see and I compliment them for that. I'm very proud of the banner that sits behind you on that wall. That didn't just get there by accident. That got there from wonderful leadership, hard working people, and there's a reason that people are moving up here and that's the reason. And I would like to see the Village maintain the excellence that it has shown us. Thank you very much.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you.

**2) Closing of Budget Hearing**

John Steinbrink:

Anyone else wishing to speak on the budget this evening? Hearing none, I'll close the budget hearing and open it up to Board comments or questions.

**3) Board of Trustees Comments**

Jeff Lauer:

I just have a couple of comments or questions to start with and I may have more after the staff talk or Board members talk. Mike, could you reiterate one item that was talked about, the \$600,000 of the existing \$1.2 million sanitary sewer loan with the water utility in the general fund and how that works again just so I understand it?

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

Mike Pollocoff:

We can zoom back to that. Mr. Lauer, if you look at the spreadsheet on the wall, the total fund balance for 2006/2007 is \$1,883,350. A while back the Sewer Utility needed funds, so rather than going to the market and borrowing those, as you can look back at that total fund balance back to 2004, there was less money but still enough to handle it, we had the general fund loan that money to the Sewer Utility and the Sewer Utility pays it back. So it's part of our fund balance. It's money we have access to if for some reason we wanted that money. If you go to 2005 we have \$1.3 million roughly of unreserved funds. Unreserved funds means funds you can do what you want with them and there's no tag to it. We said we needed more than that and I would fully expect the Utility Commissioners, which is the same people at the Board, would have the sewer fund secure outside financing, pay the Village general fund it's \$1.2 million and we would have that \$2.8 million.

The Water Utility also has a reserve fund. The reason we're taking that sewer loan that already is out there, it doesn't change the taxes anybody pays because it doesn't affect taxes. It doesn't affect water bills because the rate is already set for water, and it doesn't affect sewer bills because this is already built into the sewer rates.

With that sewer loan in there, and if we want to maintain 15 percent as the bottom of what our fund reserve is going to be, if we had that whole \$1.2 million in there, we wouldn't be able to use any of the reserves. This spreadsheet shows it would be \$5,816 short. By taking half of that sewer loan, allocating it out to the Water Utility, because they have the fund balance to be able to handle it, and have the Village general fund have half of it, when the sewer fund makes their payments they're going to make half to general fund and half to water fund, and that frees up \$600,000 in undesignated funds that we have access to.

It's still a good deal for the sewer fund no matter how you cut it, but what it does is it frees up some reserves that we had that were spoken for. Those reservations of that fund balance were set and it moved it into undesignated status so that was just one way of looking at that and having the Water Utility fund carry half that note in receivable and the general fund carry the other half of it.

Jeff Lauer:

The second question I noted was I know the impact fees for the public works is going to be used. Using all those funds is that going to affect something else that they could have used it for rather than other equipment? Is that going to hamper them in any way?

Mike Pollocoff:

Is the use of impact fees for the truck going to diminish public works in another way?

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

Jeff Lauer:

Not diminish it, but from the document here it says they had \$31,508 for public works equipment needs. Now, is using all that money for one particular item is that going to hamper other equipment needs that they were going to use that money for?

Mike Pollocoff:

Well, that fund will have zero money in it. Now, the Plan Commission has advised people who were submitting plats at this point, as the slide shows, the State of Wisconsin determined that putting an impact fee for in this case public works equipment would not be allowed anymore. Well, we're a community that's growing and with growth is more roads, and we either tax ourselves for that or we ask the developers that are developing, we have to tell them we can't afford to under levy limits pay for our roads that we're already plowing and your roads that you're adding onto it without having more money because the caps freeze it.

So the Plan Commission has advised every developer that comes in that we can't levy an impact fee, but if we don't have a donation equal to that we're not going to be able to approve your development. We're at the point we have to keep the levy limits the way they are, so if somebody wants to build a subdivision here they need to contribute their proportionate share based on the needs analysis we did for public works equipment. Now, that could be used for a grader, public works equipment is public works equipment.

Our most pressing need is for a snowplow. We've added on in the last couple years almost seven miles of new road. That seven miles that when we're plowing roads that we have to—seven more miles with no more additional people that we have to get to it. John's crew, I thank the people that showed their appreciation to them because they did I thought a very good job like they usually do. They get out and get after it. But if we're not going to grow that fleet to correspond with the growth of the community, then we won't have the same road service that we have.

There's another component that wasn't disallowed and that's for public works facilities. So over time as we add on more trucks or equipment we're collecting a fee to make the public works barn, the garage, bigger to put this stuff in there. That's still permitted. I'm not saying we're being cute with it. We're being realistic with it. If somebody wants to develop in Pleasant Prairie, the State says we can't make them do it but we don't have to let them do it.

The question that this community is going to face in the fiscal analysis the staff is doing is if we are going to have growth it's got to be something that's not going to diminish our capability to provide service to existing residents, and they're going to have to make a contribution. If they don't, my recommendation to the Board is we say no. No, thank you, we can't afford your development. Tell them that up front rather than diminish the services to our residents and provide that new development services that aren't equal to what it was before they came.

Jeff Lauer:

Okay, that's all for now.

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

John Steinbrink:

Other comments or questions?

Mike Serpe:

Mike, again, you've proved your value to this Village, you and your staff and department heads by this presentation tonight. This Village has created a quality of life for its residents that is second to none. Our crime rate is low because our Chief of Police and his department does an outstanding job. Our fire loss of life and property is outstanding because our Fire Chief and his department does an outstanding job. Our Village infrastructure, planning and zoning is laid out because Jean Werbie and her staff do a fantastic job. Our recreational facilities are as good as anywhere in the nation because Cathi Klaver, Tom Patrizzi do their jobs.

I have to agree with Andrea Rode, if you read the paper there's not too much positive that comes out of this. We have a lot to be proud of in our leadership and our tax structure and the services that we provide. Mike, again, I think you've done a fantastic job, you and Cathi and the staff. Job well done. Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Other comments or questions?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

First, I want to repeat Mike Serpe's statements. Very much I concur with him 100 percent. Since 1974, I've seen this community grow from a 6,000 population, 6,300 or 6,400 to where we are today, see what was accomplished today. It's commendable. We can brag about what we're doing right here. One of the main points I want to mention is the fact that we don't have political appointees in the staff. They are all professionals. There are only six elected positions, President, four Trustees and a Municipal Judge. The rest are all professionals that were very well screened. They have been working in the Village for years and every chance that we can we commend the job that they are doing because that's what makes this Village so good.

Mr. Ginkowski, as a member of the School Commission I took note of what you said and I will move properly. It is ironic to say that I remember in past years the School Board used to be a mess. The interruptions in the School Board meetings were unbelievable. I hear many times from members of the School Board, boy I wish we could run the School Board the same way that you guys run Pleasant Prairie. It's a point well taken. Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Other comments or questions from Board members?

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

Alex Tiahnybok:

I've got a lot of comments to make. I'm going to try and be as positive as possible. So that I don't get left out of the congratulations I also want to thank the public works department for a good job on Friday. It was impressive and I think everyone benefited from it. The presentation tonight, both the President's presentation and the PowerPoint were very good. I want to commend Village management for bringing some creativity to the process, something I've been talking about all along.

Some of the items particular kudos to the human resources department, the unexpected healthcare savings. I think that's fantastic. I would advise, though, for the future that items like this that can have significant impact on the budget and our ability to forecast spending for operating costs and capital items I'd like to see issues like this settled before the budget process, change the fiscal year for that, whatever we need to do to get off cycle so that we're not waiting for significant impact items like this to come as a surprise after we go through rounds of budgets.

Again, getting back to creativity, the capital fund, if we follow the plan as presented we're actually going to have a \$48,000 surplus at the end which plans for the future, another thing I've been harping about and I'm glad to see that's happening. Related to the healthcare savings, though, of course that's unexpected. I guess nobody knew that was going to happen and it couldn't have come at a better time considering what the citizens told us on November 7<sup>th</sup>.

The use of the impact fees, and I think Jeff touched on a valuable aspect, and that is the impact fees, whether they be for public works or for recreation or whatever they're designated for certain uses. And whether or not buying a snowplow is consistent with that kind of concept I don't know and I'm not sure it is. But it needs to be noted that that impact fee is going to be exhausted to help balance things out.

One comment that Andrea Rode made that I think probably applies to me perfectly in this case is, and I quote, "I had no idea what to expect." Looking at the information that was provided to the Board as of yesterday, the source of funding for some of the items that were turned down by the referendum were called fund balance and I don't think we had an item like that before, and suddenly we have fund balance that's providing \$284,000 of spending. I looked at that number and I thought what the heck is a fund balance. Now I know what the fund balance is. It's a transfer from another fund to make this work out.

Again, from the creativity perspective I think it's a good thing that we're looking at things that way. Maybe we don't need that much money in the other fund, but it also leads me to the question if you're going to go to the citizens for a referendum and ask them to voluntarily pay more taxes, I would like to think that we would have already figured something like that out, that we would have recognized that that was something we could have done and not had to go through the painful process I think for many people of the referendum. So it's not like the money fell from heaven. It was taken from another fund that is depleted now. Whether or not is should be depleted I guess is a matter for debate, but the money came from somewhere.

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

I have I guess some reservations about the reserve fund balance by going down to 15 percent. I don't know what the number was before, but we're going to be at something like 17 percent now. Frankly, as the operating expenses and budget of the Village grow, I imagine the need for a high percentage reserve fund is probably not as important as when the operations are small, because any unexpected shock like the flooding issues, etc., should naturally take a smaller percentage of our operating fund to take care of if they're unexpected. So that kind of makes sense.

But, again, in order to pay for items that we thought or hoped would come from the referendum, we raided another account. It concerns me. I'm not saying it's a bad idea. Again, it's consistent with my request for creativity. Again, should have been thought of before I believe and we ignored it or didn't choose to look at it. Now, when there was no choice we're looking at it.

The other thing is some of the items brought up in the President's comments and the Administrator's comments were things I brought up over the course of the last meetings, and I said what about this and what about that. I specifically referred to the debt service. This is the piece of paper, the spreadsheet, that I was criticized for not sharing in advance. The red block here is exactly what I was talking about in terms of getting past the tough spot. The Village still has a couple years of approximately \$2.6 million debt service expenditures and then it gets a lot easier. It goes down \$500,000 and that positions us to be able to handle some of those capital issues that have been put off.

It's been expressed to me by a lot of people that all this is great but still no money being spent on roads besides what developers are doing which I think is a concern to everyone. Again, trying to stay positive, I was criticized very heavily in the press for not sharing this. I never saw this presentation. I never saw this letter. The packet only became available to us yesterday contains very minimal information. Some of it really not consistent with what was shown today. It's got to be a two-way street, gentlemen. If you want sharing in one direction it's got to be two ways and that didn't happen unfortunately again.

Again, creativity is a good thing. I'd like to believe that everything that was put up there is honest and fair and all that sort of stuff. But, again, the handout that the President read was handed to us at 6:28. The PowerPoint which had a lot of information on it not contained anywhere else isn't available to us. I see Mr. Pollocoff has a copy. I would have liked to have looked at it. Thank you. I think that's it for now.

By the way, Mr. Hauser's and Mr. Ginkowski's debate about the Sheriff's thing I didn't expect tonight to be a debate about the Sheriff's proposal, but we never got to apples and apples. I absolutely agree with that. I think that was the goal but that was short circuited. It didn't happen. One other thing that was brought up which I think is very much worthy of further work and review, and it was stated pretty clearly when you looked at that one chart showing where our tax dollars go from our property tax bill, by far the majority goes to Kenosha Unified. The second largest amount goes to the County and the third largest amount goes to the Village and so on. I think paying for duplication of services is nuts. If we're paying a full load just like any other municipality in Kenosha County to the County then we should be getting those services and we're not. We're paying for something. I hear a lot of talk about subsidizing people with taxes and all that sort of stuff around here, but the Village is providing a huge subsidy to somebody

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

else. If the consolidation of police services if it's not a good idea I'm willing to sign onto that and say forget about it. It's a bad idea. The economies of scale should only work in our favor as the Village grows. I'm certainly willing to buy into that concept. It should become less and less costly to provide that extra increment of police service. I'm totally fine with that.

But then we've got to say what the heck are we paying the County for? They're the number two largest part of our property tax bill. What are we getting from the County? I know that the Wisconsin League of Municipalities has addressed this issue and is I think petitioning the State Assembly to review the double taxation aspect. My goal from day one was to efficiently spend dollars. Whether it's here in the Village or with the County, all that matters to me is that we're efficiently spending the money. If we're paying twice for the same service or some version of that we need to get behind a program to eliminate that and forget about the partisanship. It should be something that we shouldn't be paying. We have a State Assemblyman sitting on our Board that I would like to see him spearhead that effort.

John Steinbrink:

Actually, those efforts are going on in Madison. Unfortunately the parties that are in the majority refuse to bring those up.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Then they're wrong.

John Steinbrink:

That's exactly right. And I think we're going to see that come up this time. We have more of a cooperative group up there where each are going to work together hopefully to bring more forward to the taxpayers. Craig, I want to thank you for your comments. You mentioned the word sharp pencil. Andrea mentioned working together. That kind of reminds me of the past where I sat up here with Board members and worked with Board members on budgets. Let me tell you those folks had sharp pencils. That's why the Village is where it's at today is because of the work we did and working together to make that happen. We have those reserves that we can use today because of the department heads and the sharp pencils. That's played a big part. You look at where our standing is in the County on taxes, the State on taxes and we have used sharp pencils.

Trustee Tiahnybok refers back to his plan there, but I think if you compare this plan of fiscal management with the proposals that were presented by himself and Trustee Lauer those would have eliminated the police department. They think that was a savings. Unfortunately, they would have eliminated the paramedic training and reduced the emergency call lines into dispatch which hampers public safety. But that's not in this budget we presented tonight. It would have eliminated essential computer replacements and software agreements and created structural deficits in next year's budget by not replacing police cars, trucks or other computer equipment. That proposal would have sought to penalize the very professionals that have worked to create the financial reserves we have here and that we rely on.

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

So I mean it's a matter of doing your homework and working together. I had that luxury in the past and I hope we can do that in the future because that's what makes the budgets work around here and that's what keeps taxes low and services high. We provide those Cadillac services with the Chevy taxes. It's not an easy thing and that's why we keep going back and we keep thanking the employees and the department heads because they're the guys that make it happen. They're the guys that treat their jobs like they're working for themselves. They make sure things happen in this community. Those are the guys we really need to take our hat off to. Mike, maybe you can correct some of the other comments during the presentation.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, there's a couple questions that were asked under the public hearing. Sherri Chmielecki talked about the bulk pickup and volume charges for services. We've already adopted the solid waste budget, but John Steinbrink, Jr. And I have been working on a concept in the coming years, in a couple years when we get some more fund balance built into that utility where we'd be able to offer the residents the opportunity to have a different size waste bin that would carry with it a different charge. So if somebody didn't generate a lot of waste they would have a waste bin that would be smaller that could be lifted into the truck. If they had a bigger one and wanted more bigger ones they could do that.

Right now the Village, unlike Twin Lakes, Silver Lake, City of Kenosha there is no limit on the amount of solid waste somebody can put out. We limit the weight of it. And the reason we limit the weight of it is that someone in public works is going to have to lift that into the truck and we don't want to be incurring a lot of future health issues and costs and paying for guys to have bad backs or hernias or whatever. So it's 50 pounds. You can put as many 50 pound items as you want to put out on your lawn and we'll pick them up. So there is no limit. That's one reason we charge \$13 compared to other communities because you can put out as much as you want.

We encourage everybody to use as much recycling as possible because that saves us money. But as far as bulk pickup, we can have all the bulk pickups we want, we just need to adjust the rate to compensate for going out and picking it up.

Mr. Hauser raised a question is debt included in the mill rate. It is. By resolution and ordinance when we incur debt we have to pay it off and that's paid for through the mill rate and that is debt that is for the general fund. And comments as far as capital not being in the CIP, the reason that the Village has a capital improvement program or capital improvement fund is in times when budgets are tight the priority has been, and this is a change in this budget, the priority has been that operations have to be maintained first so we have enough police officers, snowplow operators, firemen and paramedics to carry on the day-to-day services. And if we have to make a change and not buy something one year then that's what we do, and by identifying that within the capital improvement program that enables us to focus on the cost of operations separately from the cost of capital.

I just want to make sure that—Trustee Tiahnybok brought up a couple questions. I think they were questions. With respect to impact fees is the snowplow consistent with I believe you mean the

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

law. It's consistent both with the ordinance we have in place and the law that was adopted and repealed. We define public works equipment as trucks, motor graders, back hoes, front end loaders, and all we've collected to this point is \$31,508. That part of the impact fee no longer has any money in it. If the Village Board follows my recommendation and continues to require developers to pay for the expansion in this case of roads, then there will be more money in that fund.

We're not able to, and I won't recommend or put my signature on a transfer that moves money from the recreation fund into public works or from fire into public works or recreation into fire. We specifically established segregated funds for each item that we were charging developers for. If we're not going to do that then we need to give the money by statute and ordinance back to the developer that gave it to us. Not to the property owner but back to the developer. That's the person who paid the bill. It wasn't anybody else. It was the developer.

I know some members of the Board are considering giving back the pool impact fee. That's fine. We need to create an ordinance and a resolution to give those developers back the money they paid to the Village to allow their development to go forward. So, is that fund empty? Today it is. We didn't raid it. We made a conscious decision to say we could take \$31,508 out of that fund and apply it towards a dump truck which we need because we have had additional growth.

I don't want anyone to leave tonight, and especially the Trustees, thinking that we raided funds. We took as realistic a look at the reserves that we had to determine what was the minimum we could have and not go down to the minimum in this budget and we're at 19 percent. We didn't try to use every dollar that was made available out of that adjustment. It's not a raiding of a fund. I guess it's how you want to present it to the public, but my hope is that, and President Steinbrink's presentation, is that finding the most appropriate use for the funds we have and still maintain more than responsible balances in the reserve fund to do what we have to do. That reserve fund is not going down to zero. It's not going to 15 percent.

I've been here a long time and probably longer than some of you wish I was here, but I can tell you that in the time I've been here the staff is here and they sharpen their pencils not at budget time but they sharpen them every single day. Every single purchase order that comes to me has got options on it where they price things out. That is the only way you develop the savings at the end of the year that we're able to put in the reserves. Financial planning doesn't happen once. It happens every day of the year as the management team that we've assembled here works together. I can tell you that that management team has a common vision and that's to provide the best services we can to this community and they all believe in doing it at the lowest possible cost.

In the budget books that you've been provided over the last month, and in the budget books that you were provided last year, and in the budgets of previous years, I know I provided Trustees Tiahnybok and Lauer I think two or three years previous, and you Board members have your budget books, every single year the department heads have turned money back. They haven't spent every dime they had just because it was available. They've done what they've had to do and they've saved money and they've given it back to the Village. That's responsible spending. That's responsible planning of the dollars they have to spend. That responsibility is what gave us a reserve that we can do some creative things with. It's an entirely different way of approaching

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

the budget. It's going to be a lot more rigorous. We're going to have to look at it even closer but they're up to it and I know they are. I think that's a lot more effective way to manage the budget using professionals we've hired rather than picking at accounts once during the budget cycle.

I'm glad that Trustee Tiahnybok agrees with the findings on debt. I think that was something that I remember in 2001 we sat up here and looked at. How can we take and minimize our exposure to future financial difficulties by reducing our debt? That decision was made in 2001, 2002, 2003, every year, and we're seeing the fruits of it. I'm glad Trustee Tiahnybok saw that along with us. I think that's a good vision.

I'm troubled by comments that we haven't shared information. Well, there's nothing that's in this document that we presented tonight that wasn't in anybody's budget books that they've had access to. Granted, we redid the wheel a little bit and made it spin a little different, but I think that's what the taxpayers expected us to do. We've been working on this steadily. We've been making refinements right up until the end of the day because this is an important plan. This is going to govern how we do our finances in the Village for the next ten years.

I said I'd been here a while and I want to thank President Steinbrink for pushing me on this. I got a lot of nice comments tonight and I appreciate those and I thank you for it, but the work that he did with me and what we were able to collaborate on and think about getting this thing done really did get us outside the box. It's good to get that constructive criticism and the challenge and the opportunity to do some different things. I appreciate that and I know the other department heads do, too.

I think this is a good budget and I think it will serve the public well. I think it's going to accomplish the things that they want which is maintaining a great tax rate and it will provide the services that aren't interrupted. At the end of the day that's the most important thing we do is provide the services to the people that need us. If we're done we need to adopt a resolution that formalizes the things that we've talked about because they're important, and this document is going to guide us as we move forward into the future. That would be Resolution 06-56.

**B. Resolution #06-56 - Resolution Relating to Adoption of 2007 Budget, Capital Improvement Program, Property Tax Levy, Reserve Balances and Debt Service Fund.**

Mike Serpe:

Move approval.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second. Further discussion or comment?

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

Jeff Lauer:

I just have one or two I made a note here to bring up. The second most concern, citizens calls, see them in the stores or whatever, that is pressing on their mind is the roads in the Village. Looking at the budget here it looks like the first major construction would be in 2008 for it appears to be construction on 80<sup>th</sup>. I assume it's 80<sup>th</sup> and Cooper if I got that right. Then there's nothing until 2010. I know obviously tonight we can't hash out the road maintenance thing, but I really think we need to look at moving this up. I know since I've been here it's been put off every single year. That is really the number two issue I get from the residents. The things that I have told them as of late anyways is we are working on it and it's supposed to be in the plan coming up that we're looking at and there's options available. So we might have to maybe at later Board meetings look at if we can revise it, great.

The other couple items it would be good if the Village would not need to go to referendum for the next ten years for issues given what's been said tonight. The concern I have looking at what was presented tonight is it's taking money from one and putting it in the other so that it balances out. I guess trying to think apples to apples real quick, but I'm concerned about that because it's just moving funds. I've had enough accounting classes to know it's just the way you move funds around. Americans do that in a great way with credit cards. They get in debt, they can't pay this off, they borrow from this credit card to try to pay off that one hoping it will subside but eventually it catches up.

Andrea talks about everybody getting along. Well, I didn't take the first shot tonight. And I think if residents want nothing but yes people up here all the time they have that great opportunity next April. I have disagreements with my wife. It doesn't mean I'm going to divorce her. We just have disagreements, we work it out, we talk about it, and I think it can be done in a good, polite way. I know I myself since being on this Board have offered different things. And I believe, I could be wrong, but I believe all of them got voted against.

Since this is an item tonight on this 2007 budget, the one major concern I have, I brought it up at other--well, there's a motion on the board, I have a huge, huge concern with that 1 percent franchise fees for people who have cable. I guarantee you if that passes when residents start paying that they're going to be highly upset. I know I am. I have cable and I think I already pay too much. But I wish the Board would reconsider not doing that. I don't think it's fair to pay for somebody else's wants, period. And I would like to see that removed from the budget. It's wrong. It's not fair. We talked about equitable stuff. That is not fair. There's already a motion on the board so I don't know if we can amend it. I'll stop at that.

John Steinbrink:

Other comments or questions?

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

Alex Tiahnybok:

I thought I was done but follow up comments are necessary now. The suggestion was made that nothing presented tonight after 6:30 is different than what we've had presented to us for prior review. Well, unless I'm missing something and I forgot how to read English I don't see anything about transferring anything from any other fund to pay for the referendum items that didn't pass. So to suggest that nothing is different, that all the information was available I can't buy that. I'm sorry.

When I started my comments I said I'd try to remain positive. It's very easy not to remain positive around here. I was hoping that would be reciprocated but I guess that's too much to wish for. When I referred to the suggestions I made, of course, reference was made to those same suggestions after I made my comments. The term eliminating the police, again, like some kind of mantra hoping that it's going to sink in and to label me anti police nothing is further from the truth. It's an absolute intentional misinterpretation of my position. I think I made it pretty clear. I don't really care how we get our police service. We need good police service. All I recommended in my recommendations, and they were strictly talking points, I never positioned them as the end all, be all that would ultimately save \$190,000. I said these are some ideas. Of course, as soon as I say I'm there they're gospel or something like that and subject to whatever reviews. But all I suggested is we delay \$25,000, one of the squad cars. That's all I said. Suddenly that turned into eliminate the police department. This is the environment we live in.

It was also explained that I'm against the firemedics and I don't want them to get any training. Yes, one of my recommendations was questioning a \$19,000 increase in our conferences and seminars budget item in fire and rescue. Maybe during the budget presentations the application of that additional \$19,000 maybe that was addressed, and if I missed it I'm prepared to apologize for missing it. But, once again, I brought it up as a recommendation. Chief Paul Guilbert addressed the matter at the meeting. Said that that \$18,925 additional was to fund training for firemedics, and as soon as I found out it was as justified of an application as that I rescinded it. But it's not going away. So, anyway, I'm willing to admit mistakes, bad recommendations. I think that's part of being progressive to throw out ideas. Some of them stick and some of the don't. A lot of them stuck, though.

I wasn't planning on focusing on this, but Mr. Hauser brought up debt service and he's been provided the answer that it is part of the levy. But I think it's important for the taxpayers to realize it's a third of every dollar you pay to the Village goes to pay for debt. Now, the 2001 Board we were informed tonight did an excellent job of recognizing we shouldn't do that anymore and decided not to borrow any more money. Again, getting back to the data that I initially addressed and then was brought up gain today as a game plan for the future, I said, yeah, it's going to diminish and by 2017 it will be zero which can't come quickly enough.

The 2001 Board did a good job. They sharpened their pencils, however we want to refer to it, and recognized that this thing is going to grow out of control and it's going to create a two and a half million dollar a year service for all the taxpayers of Pleasant prairie and they're probably not going to like it and maybe we should stop doing it. So the 2001 Board did I think in my opinion a great job of stopping to issue additional debt. But there was a 2000 Board. There was a 1999

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

Board. There was a 1998 Board, 1997 and so on and so on. I know somewhere in the records it shows when the debt was issued and how much was issued at those times.

The bottom line is whatever we bought back pre-2001 we're still paying for. I would like a concrete explanation from our administration as to what we're paying for today that we bought in 2001 and passed that we're still paying \$2.5 million a year. That's a lot of money and that's a third of every tax dollar that we collect in Pleasant Prairie. We're paying for something that was done by those great old Boards that did really good work.

Lastly, again getting back to the old Boards, sharpening their pencils, I didn't see any pencil sharpening from the Board this year. I made some recommendations that were very quickly ripped apart and all that kind of stuff. And I'm willing to admit I'm not exactly 100 percent informed on all these matters. I was willing to accept where I made a mistake and said maybe that's not a good idea and accepted it. But the old Boards, and Mr. Steinbrink said it tonight, old Boards sure sharpened their pencils and figured everything out and those are the good old days. And now we're just a rancorous bunch of, and I'll include myself in the goons category. But those are the old Boards. The good old days.

Today, where's the pencil sharpening? Was there pencil sharpening? After the referendum failed did the Board get together to try to decide how we're going to fix this and where the money is going to come from and what fund we're going to borrow money from and transfer money from? Did that happen? I wasn't invited to it. So if Mr. Steinbrink and Mr. Serpe and Mr. Kumorkiewicz and Mr. Lauer were involved in the pencil sharpening meeting I'd like to know about it because I never heard of such a thing. I'd like an answer to that.

Mike Serpe:

I have an answer.

John Steinbrink:

I don't want to head in this direction. I think we'll have Mr. Pollocoff answer the debt question we had on the 2001 debt and he can explain that to Mr. Tiahnybok. Then I hope we can move on with this budget because it is a sound budget and it has been presented this evening. Mike?

Mike Pollocoff:

I don't have it in mind specifically, but I can tell you debt prior to 2000 that was issued, the larger amounts were the construction of the Prange Center. We moved the public works from the potato barn on Highway 50 and the police department from 900 square feet over on H. The addition to the Village Hall. It wasn't a large one. That was a half million. We did some work out in Prairie Springs Park as far as stabilizing the shoreline at Prairie Springs Park. We had the construction of 85<sup>th</sup> Street between Cooper Road and 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue and the construction of a detention basin off of 85<sup>th</sup> Street. We had the construction of a detention basin in Pleasant Home Subdivision. We had some road improvements that were more significant. We hadn't bonded for asphalt overlays,

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

but road improvements that the other part of 80<sup>th</sup> between Highway 31 and roughly 60<sup>th</sup>. Probably roads.

The equipment I think that was borrowed for was probably one fire truck at about a half million dollars. Those are the biggest things. And I think if you look at—if you had to kind of lump it together the Village was going through some significant growth in the late '90s, and, again, without impact fees at that time that's a classic example if you go back to the taxpayers and say, gee, we need more space because we have more cops because we have more people. We need more space for our trucks because they have more miles of road to plow and we've got to put them someplace and all this new development isn't covering it.

We have storm water needs that we have to take care of. We have a street that—I'm not sure if anybody remembers what 85<sup>th</sup> Street was like between 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Cooper Road, but there was more than one kid that got clipped off a bike riding down that street because it was too narrow. So we had the reconstruction of Cooper Road and Highway 50. That might be a little bit farther back. I'll give you a full accounting of what we spend with that bond money.

But at that point in 2001 it was obvious that at some point in the future and nobody knew when, we knew that Governor McCallum was saying that there should be no more State aid coming back to the Village, that the money we received from the Power Plant should go away. There were some significant issues that we were dealing with and that was at that point the Board decided we needed to get as much principal paid off on our debt as we can and not incur any more for the general fund. And actually with the restructuring of our debt we could have had lower debt payments for a longer period of time, but we took on more debt and restructured our debt to get the principal paid off sooner. We could have had less and extended out the period that the debt was out there but it wasn't. We decided to pay off as much as we could.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you, Mike.

Mike Pollocoff:

I have one more comment. I think it's critical that everybody understand this and especially Jeff. What we're doing with bond funds, you said it's like a credit card where you borrow from one to the other, it's the exact opposite. The Village is the bank to the Sewer Utility and the Sewer Utility is paying the Village back and all we're doing is splitting that receivable between the general reserve fund of the Village and the Water Utility. No one is borrowing any money. We're just redefining who the bank is and the Village is only half the bank and the water utility is the other half. So it's not a borrowing. It's not credit. It's not taking money that we don't have. It's just redefining what the receivable is.

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion and a second.

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

Alex Tiahnybok:

It's a little fuzzy math, but I'm just going back to whatever records I have and then extending it out towards 2016 which is when the last payment gets made. It looks like about \$38 million give or take a million here or a million there. That's how much debt service we're paying over the life of the debts that were incurred before 2001. Again, the description that you made, Mike, is at least we're going in the right direction. \$38 million is a lot of money to pay over it looks like about 20 years. And 1998 is the oldest number I have, through 2016 \$38 million. Of course, a part of that is interest that all of us are paying. But those are for spending that occurred prior to 2001. And, again, that's a third of every tax dollar that you pay to the Village. That's a lot of money. Again, I'm glad the 2001 Board decided not to spend any more money because that \$2.6 million that we're paying this year would be bigger. So thank goodness they did that. But it's a lot of money and I think the people need to know that a third of their tax dollars goes towards paying debt. It's not insignificant, \$38 million.

John Steinbrink:

Just a suggestion, you may want to look at other communities' budgets and financials to see what they have for debt and what they have. You may find some comparables there. And, also, the Administrator's door I believe is always open if you have a question. Once again, the question is on the floor.

Kathy Goessl:

I'm not sure if you added the dollar amounts that were in the budget showing how much the amount was initially issued. So the amounts are the amounts of the total bond issue which is spread between different funds. That's not what was totally borrowed by the general fund. So if you're just adding those dollar amounts up that are shown in the one column will not give you the total debt. It's less than that. It's actually what's issued across all of our funds.

Mike Pollocoff:

I think the Village general fund debt is \$13 million.

Kathy Goessl:

We never issued \$38 million in the last years just in the general fund.

Mike Pollocoff:

But, again, I'll be more than glad to provide that information to you.

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion on the floor and I would like to move on with the budget. Motion and a second. Those in favor? Do we need a roll call vote on this?

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

Jane Romanowski:

I think we should.

John Steinbrink:

I think we should have a roll call vote. Aye.

Alex Tiahnybok:

No.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Yes.

Jeff Lauer:

No.

Mike Serpe:

Aye.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I'm not surprised.

**SERPE MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION #06-56 - RESOLUTION RELATING TO ADOPTION OF 2007 BUDGET, CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, PROPERTY TAX LEVY, RESERVE BALANCES AND DEBT SERVICE FUND; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; ROLL CALL VOTE TAKEN – STEINBRINK – YES; TIAHNYBOK – NO; KUMORKIEWICZ – YES; LAUER – NO; SERPE – YES; MOTION CARRIED WITH TIAHNYBOK AND LAUER DISSENTING.**

John Steinbrink:

Let the record show that the motion passes 3-2 with Trustees Tiahnybok and Lauer in the negative. I want to thank you for coming tonight and looking at the budget and expressing your viewpoints with us.

**7. CITIZEN COMMENTS**

Sherri Chmielecki:

As you know this is on my property. I did give you each a copy of an article I cut out of the paper from the *Bargainer* from March 14, 2006. It talks about how good growing trees and grass and everything is. Green for the Cleaner Environment. Growing a thick healthy lawn returns oxygen into the atmosphere. Placement and maintenance of trees for shade and shelter can reduce ag temperatures as just as 40 percent. I'm just going through this real fast because I don't want to be here much longer either. A patch of lawn just 50 feet square can produce enough oxygen for a family of four. When your turf is thick and healthy that's like a . . . water that absorbs into the soil. The plant roots . . .and reducing the likelihood of groundwater pollution. I have Conservancy. So I just wanted to tell you. You're telling me I should do other things and I can't do this and water isn't good and I don't have ponds. You're the ones that said seeping. You said my ponds aren't ponds because they're seeping, but actually they are.

When John, Jr. was at the house the Wednesday before Thanksgiving, the paper I had in my had I was going by the chart for the percentage of people who pay zero to \$2 and \$2 to \$10 and \$10 and on up. So the format was different. The chart was what you already have because I heard nobody had that paper, but I believe Herb gave it to you. So I'm apologizing for having it—I liked it because it had color and the one that Herb had was black and white.

Okay, the Board and citizens of Pleasant Prairie know where I stand on the matter of the clean water fees. After going over the options from 2004, I did check and I have the thing right here what the—where is it at? Okay, Wisconsin Managed Forest, I called them to see what I could do with my trees, and they don't even want my trees because of the way my land is and it's a wetland and stuff like that. After going over the options from the 2004 Wisconsin Managed Forest laws and what you gave me and living here for 20 years, the only one I haven't done is cattle. The cost of new safe fencing, feed, vet bills and not being ag, you set me up not to cooperate with you.

I believe the Clean Water Utility fee I pay has too many flaws. With an aerial view and two engineers having to come out and all I get is anyone can run water on my land and into my ponds and create even though through culverts, and I have no right even to have you test the water in question. I have questions about the water that's being run into my property from 94 and also from my neighbor who—my water leaves my property through a natural waterway. And when somebody next door can culvert water onto my property from a business I don't think that's correct. So I do want to find out how to get a copy of your Village ordinance on neighbors and land, people who live here, what your neighbor can do and I'm sure they can't do that.

Also, the engineers told me they can make me pay more. One reason my driveway is longer than 750 feet. Let's get it right boys. I'm in the minority that's paying 18 percent of the fee structure of \$10 and up, and I'm west of the Des Plaines River Watershed. We are already paying for all your state of the art and high tech equipment that you advertise about, which you do, you advertise how wonderful Pleasant Prairie is. I've lived here 20 years so I mean it's not all bad,

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

but I haven't complained about everything going up and up until this water fee which is my main concern.

When I asked John, Jr. what we were paying for on 122<sup>nd</sup> Street, two items came back to his mind, zoning and appraisal. I think I pay a lot of money and \$28 going to \$84 plus dollars come January 31<sup>st</sup>. I'm sorry, that is not acceptable. We're just going to have to—I'm not going to go any farther because John, Jr. said he would have the results of whatever he's doing on the January 31<sup>st</sup> bill that comes out for the Clean Water Act.

So I've got a lot more research that I'm trying to do and I have more people that I need to contact. We'll see what the bill is in January and do a little bit more discussion on it and we'll run it from there. But I will tell you now I will not pay \$84 a month without something happening. Thank you very much.

Dan Murphy:

I'm not sure this is the appropriate time, but I'm here this evening as the managing partner for the 9201 property. I appeared in front of the Plan Commission a few weeks ago.

John Steinbrink:

Dan, I'll just need your name and address for the record.

Dan Murphy:

9201 Wilmot Road, Pleasant Prairie. We appeared in front of the Plan Commission over an expansion of the property and various things were brought up in that presentation. One, when we purchased the property we were told it was zoned M-2, although under the Comprehensive Plan that would be adopted in 2010 according to the Smart Growth plan in the State of Wisconsin we would become retail zoning at that location. That's a 40 acre site. However, as long as the building remained occupied we would maintain our zoning under the M-2. In either case that happened before we purchased the property. We were very happy with it if it was zoned M-2, and actually much happier if it was zoned retail and it worked as retail.

After we closed on the property we had a feasibility study commissioned. It was presented to the Village or to staff I should say in October of 2005. Basically the feasibility study says that the site is conducive to 10,000 to 30,000 feet of retail, possibly some office use. The report addressed the traffic counts today, the traffic counts and the density in 2010. The site does not meet the requirements to be developed as a 40 acre tract. A 40 acre tract of retail would hold about 400,000 feet of retail. That is comparable to, rather than just use a number, it's comparable to Route 31 and Route 50 where you've got Jewel, I believe it's Kohl's, Target and I think Lowe's Lumber. That's 400,000 feet.

The rooftops, the density, it was brought up that maybe it will take 15 years. There are some improvements being done on 94 and the four-way interchange there. Maybe it will be 15 years and this will be a retail site. So we have since commissioned the feasibility study people to

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

expand the report and also to look at the other retail that's being built in Pleasant Prairie today and how that will impact this site.

All I'm asking for this evening is for some direction from the Board to help me with this property. The citizens got up after I spoke last time. They were very concerned about the truck traffic that's existing there. Since that time we've contacted Rust-Oleum. I believe the Village, Mr. Pollocoff and Ms. Werbie have received copies of that letter stating that no truck traffic was to exit onto Highway C. In addition to that, the plan that we presented that evening all traffic was to go out onto 88<sup>th</sup> Street.

My concern with the property is this. We've presented a manufacturing tenant to staff. They were turned down. They were turned down because they might be noisy, they might create sanitary sewer problems or they might discharge a smell into the air. I believe you've got ordinances that cover those things. But rather than right city hall, as they say, we went on and we talked about the possibility of down zoning and using the property as warehousing, down zoning it to warehousing and light assembly.

Shortly after that Rust-Oleum came to us and they said they'd like to expand at the site. They'd like to do about 600,000 feet on the site. They are still willing to go to the site, however this use was rejected by staff based on the volatility of the product being stored there, the fact that the plant would be across from the school and also across from housing. We can buy into that. There is nothing more important than life safety. We understand that. Doubling the amount of product stored there might not be the best use. The feasibility study says that retail isn't the best use.

So now we're at a little bit of an impasse. We don't want warehousing, we don't want manufacturing there, retail will not work there. Where do I go? I asked about buffering this, putting up some residential possibly to buffer the building. I'm looking for some help here, some direction, and I'm not sure how to go about it or what to do. What we're trying to do is create a productive property that would create income for the owners, jobs for the community, real estate taxes for the Village, increase retail sales, services and housing which would also create more jobs in the community.

Going back to traffic. I want those citizens that commented about the truck traffic and expanding this facility as a warehouse facility to think about the traffic that you have at 50 and 31. That's 35,000 or 40,000 cars a day. 35,000 to 40,000 cars a day would be required for a shopping center to be developed at this property. Think about that traffic on C and think about that traffic on 88<sup>th</sup> Street. How many of your neighbors would like to see those cars? So, again, I'm looking for some direction and I'm not sure where to go but thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you.

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

Bob Babcock:

Bob Babcock, 11336 Lakeshore Drive. What I wanted to bring up tonight has been brought up by a number of people very eloquently, and that is to commend the Village for the snow removal they did. I've been coming up here for a dozen years getting in your hair, complaining about things, but I think I've always said that the Village of Pleasant Prairie has the best snow removal crew and they keep getting better every year.

A few years back I even suggested that maybe we could contract out and do some plowing for some of the other things like the County, for example, but that's not that good of an idea. Then I thought maybe we could have some seminars and teach some of the people in the other communities how to do it but that's not really a good idea. It's not hands on. So maybe we could get a rid along plan, on the job training, where somebody from the County rides along and learns how to do the thing the right way. We could charge for that service. The County alone they've improved quite a bit over the past few years, but just the training they would need we'd probably make enough money to buy a Hurst tool.

Then if we look south of the border, our good friends down south, they need a lot of training down there, too, but we may have a problem doing it across State lines. So that leaves us with our good friends to the north, the City of Kenosha. I want you to know that our unpaved roads were in better condition than a lot of the City of Kenosha's major roads were. So with the amount of training that they're obviously going to need there we could make enough money to buy a new plow, new ambulance and the whole bit. That's about it.

The budget was passed. And Mr. Serpe is the one who passed it. You were the deciding vote. That's what you get for being Trustee Number 4. Thank you.

Dick Ginkowski:

Good evening. Dick Ginkowski, 7022 51<sup>st</sup> Avenue. I think Mr. Lauer a couple quick hits. Trustee Lauer has got, to extrapolate his point, maybe a good one. If we're going to be paying the cable TV franchise fee perhaps some of that money could go to have a video feed of the Village Board meeting in real time. It seems only appropriate to do that.

Before I get down to something a little more whimsical, along the lines of what Mr. Babcock said, we talk about what the County does and how much the County raids the money. The County also provides to every citizen of the County services such as criminal justice courts, the jail, House of Correct, disaster management, emergency government, social services, Brookside, public assistance, the Medical Examiner, the Health Department, the Health Department County Laboratory, restaurant inspections, immunizations, Brookside, County golf course and parks, Historical Museum, County Clerk, election, Register of Deeds, Vital Records and a whole list that goes on. Now, whether we're getting our bang for the buck is another issue. But sometimes there's an impression that the County does nothing but collect money.

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

Maybe our School Commission ought to be reformulated to be an intergovernmental relations commission to look at this a little more carefully. Quite frankly, there are concerns that are raised, but the County does do some things and they do them quite well across the Board.

Now, Mr. Babcock stole some of the thunder I was going to say, because quite frankly we did a great job, a very good job on the roads during this blizzard. I've seen worse over the years in terms of snow but it was the worst we've had in a long time. And we did it with our fleet of equipment that included our 1988 plow held together, we saw the pictures, essentially with chewing gum and tin foil. So now that we're getting our new plow, maybe we ought to take that old plow, bring it down to the City, put a bow on it and say, you know what, here, you can have it and we'll train you how to use it, because the reprehensible job that the City did on its roads maybe they need some help.

And while we're down there at the City Council meeting, the whole Village Board ought to make a field trip of it, because I've watched those meetings for 40 years, and there's one thing that the City does very well. The City Council has an excellent meeting. They do. There's some very, very tough, heated controversies that get aired at those City Council meetings. Everybody gets a chance to be heard. The meetings are controlled. The citizens get a chance to be heard. The citizens' comments at those meetings come at the beginning of the meeting, and immediately thereafter the Council gets to work on the agenda taking up the peoples' business. Aldermens' comments those are at the end of the meeting. And there is some control over the sniping that goes on at each other. It doesn't go on.

Here we seem to have an excessive amount of unrestrained interaction which sometimes interferes with getting down to the peoples' business. We complain about the length of the meeting, when you take the time that's being taken to go back and forth on issues that are not on the agenda. And, speaking of the agenda, with regard to that we might take a look at how the City does its agenda as well. For example, the recommendations it doesn't just say receive Plan Commission recommendation. It gives you an idea of what that recommendation is. It doesn't just say approve bartender licenses on file, it tells you who the applicants are.

By the way, if somebody came to me officially and asked me about that I might render an opinion that says this agenda needs to be a little more detailed. Communications and reports and things that are submitted are done in advance. They're in the packet that go out ahead of the meeting. So we might learn a few things from the City when we deliver that snowplow, and one of them is the conduct of the meeting. Because it seems that we might be able to exercise time a little more efficiently. If you want to take the end of the meeting and argue with each other, hey, go for it. But let's get down to the agenda as soon as possible. The City seems to be able to make it work and they've done it for at least the 40 years I've watched those meetings. So we might learn a few things from them. And on top of that it gives us a good chance to get rid of that 1988 plow.

Gus Hauser:

Gus Hauser, 143 113<sup>th</sup> Street. First of all, I would like to thank Mr. Pollocoff for enlightening me about what that debt is for because for the last seven years or so while I was one of the very few that shows up at the budget hearings I asked the same question and basically I got always why

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

don't you go away. I never could get a straight answer in all of those years what the debt was for, and I asked the same question many, many times.

On another thing that was just like the speaker before me about the sniping between the Board and so on, it would be about time I think if the administration and the rest of the Trustees don't treat the two newcomers like Martians, treat them like manure and keep them in the dark. Thank you.

Jane Romanowski:

That's all the signups I had, Mr. President.

John Steinbrink:

Anyone else wishing to speak under citizens' comments?

Larry Matson:

Larry Matson, 8550 122<sup>nd</sup> Street. I want to start off with a disclaimer. I know no developers. I take no dinners, no lunches, I do nothing with developers. I think the Village should get what's equitable from the developers. So if you're getting something from them that's not been approved by the State good for the Village. I am concerned with what I did hear, though, on that issue and that's that we're up front. We tell them that if you don't give us the money we're not going to do it. I don't know what word to use. Coercion comes to mind and I hope that's inaccurate. So I'd like to have this addressed please and give me a better description of what it is that we are doing. Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Anyone else wishing to speak?

John Braig:

John Braig, 4707 84<sup>th</sup> Street. Because my comment has a little bit of a negative ring I want to make sure that you realize I'm not directing it to any one person. There have been comments in the past efforts to make the Board meeting more appealing to the public to get the citizens here to see what's going on. There's been talk about how long these meetings last. It's a shame we don't videotape these meetings, because I really think that if you Board members critically reviewed your participation in the meetings you'd realize that we've got over two and a half hours in so far, and granted the budget presentation was maybe an hour plus, but the rest of it has been political rhetoric and self-aggrandizement to a degree that really isn't necessary. If you cut it out and get on with the peoples' business you'd make the meeting shorter and people might be more willing to come. Thank you.

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

Tim Bryan:

My name is Tim Bryan. I'm at 6100 Springbrook Road so I'm just down the street. I recently built my home here. We had an existing home and we had it torn down and built a new house because we wanted to live in Pleasant Prairie. Part of my concern is I hear a lot of people saying impact fees for developers. Aren't the developers building new homes and drawing in new taxpayers to help spread out the burden, to help increase the services? It seems to me we're giving the negative connotation to people that want to come here and want to be our neighbors and I don't think that's the way to go. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Anyone else?

**8. VILLAGE BOARD COMMENTS**

Jeff Lauer:

Just a couple quick comments. Sherri, I know you're passionate about the Clean Water Utility and it's very frustrating to me that governments on high do that and expect hard working people to pay for it. What I'll do tomorrow, and I'll call you later or you call me, I will contact Congressman Paul Ryan, because this came from on high. Now, what he can do, I don't know, up there to try to change it. Maybe nothing given the circumstances in Washington surrounded by reality. So maybe we can look at other ways to have legislation introduced to maybe make some adjustments to this because they're always making adjustments for everything else so I'll do that tomorrow. I'll talk to you later because with your permission if they want your phone number, which I know they will, I'll talk to you later about giving it to them.

The other comment I had is Mr. Braig you made me think of something when you said videotape the Board meetings. I never really knew where I stood on it. But I think that's a good idea. I say this with all due respect and kindness. If we can find \$433,722 to do everything that . . . would only have been an additional \$21,000 we'd have to find. It came up to me when you said that and I think that's a good idea. Maybe there's another \$21,000 somewhere. So I'll throw that out. If the residents really want that and the Board wants that. There's gotta be \$21,000 somewhere.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I think those that have been following these Board meetings know how I feel about that exact same issue, and I do thank Mr. Braig and Mr. Ginkowski for bringing that up again. I don't think it necessarily needs to be live. I think, as a matter of fact, a fair number of people have expressed interest and said, boy, I wish I was at that meeting because I read about it in the paper on Tuesday morning and there were a lot of important things discussed, and I really would have liked to have seen how that thing went.

So live is technically challenging. Obviously we're here. The insertion point I guess into channel 25 is at the RecPlex, and whatever transmission would need to occur between here and there would be probably complex and expensive, etc. I don't think live is necessarily critical, but this

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

thing could be, and Jeff referred to \$21,000 which is the number that was thrown out to facilitate videotaping the meetings. Personally, I think a \$600 camcorder in the back of the room, turn on channel 20, watch a KUSD meeting. The County meetings I guess are a little bit more exciting from a technical perspective, but what we need is just honest to goodness unadulterated tape. No editing, no cutting, nothing edited out, nothing edited in.

For the citizen on 9 p.m. on Wednesday night if they read in the paper that something of interest to them was covered in the Board meeting, they can turn on the TV at 9 o'clock on Wednesday or 7 o'clock on Thursday night or 9 a.m. on Saturday morning and reliably be able to find out what happened at their Village Hall on Monday night. That's a cheap solution. I think that any criticism that Mr. Lauer has made of channel 25 and any similar criticism that I've made of channel 25 would go away in a heartbeat because that would really serve the public.

The strongest arguments I've heard for channel 25 so far have been that people have learned how to orient their recycling bins. Or, a much more valuable one was it has given people incentive to join our paid on call. And I think those are great things, but should a cable subscriber pay for those things? It's a service to the entire Village. To create a franchise fee to pay for that which ultimately winds up benefiting the Village to me doesn't work. Now, if our meetings were available I think that would be a service. Everyone could watch the Board meetings at their convenience in their underwear if they want on Saturday night. It's up to them.

Anyone that's sitting here right now I commend you for being here. It's two hours and forty-five minutes. The comment was made that these things go unnecessarily long they do. I know I add to it sometimes so I apologize for that. So I'm still in favor of that. The budget has passed. We're paying for channel 25. So I don't think it would—I'll contribute to the camcorder fund. I think it's relatively insignificant.

Mr. Matson brought up a point, and whatever term you want to use, I've heard it, too, and it bothers me. The Legislature says you can't assess impact fees for certain things. To me it sounds like a little heavy handed arm twisting. You either do it or we may not support your plan. I think we're walking on thin ice with that so I understand what Mr. Matson is saying and I think it's risky, whatever you want to call it.

Mr. Bryan, the whole concept of impact fees, I think some impact fees are absolutely justified. If it's an impact fee to build a new police station because the Village grew, the impact fee for the police station is required because it's the new citizens that caused that growth to occur, caused the need for that police station. I don't think impact fees should be used to buy a squad car. Although it's a capital expense, it belongs in the operating expense bucket. Those things get turned around in a couple of years and I don't think that's a classic capital expense such as building a structure like this and funding it because of growth.

And I think the Legislature, I criticized them a while ago for not having a way out of paying a certain part of County taxes and I'll applaud them for doing what they did. I think removing operating-ish type expenses from impact fees is appropriate. One thing I wish the Legislature would do is implement impact fees for schools. If there ever was an item that impact the community just look at your tax bills. It's schools. And if residential growth causes us to need

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

more schools and somebody has to pay for it they should pay for it. Your concept that eventually the growth will start paying the bills, operating expenses no doubt, but everyone shouldn't pay for the new stuff that needs to be built but not a police car or a fire truck or an inspection vehicle. None of those things I don't think. Those are operating expenses. That covers it.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

One short comment. Alex, we used to have school impact fees and they were removed May 1, 1995 by Governor Thompson. We used to have it and it was removed.

—:

We can't hear you.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I'm sorry. We used to have impact fees for schools here. We turned over \$122,000 to the Unified School District. When they were removed by the Legislators May 1, 1995, Governor Thompson signed that that we don't have school impact fees, but we used to have it. That money was given to the School District. The parking lot in Prairie Lane School was built. It was also used for the . . . at the time. So we used to have it but they removed it. A lot of pressure from the builders, the developers and realtors to remove that and they got the money and we don't . . . . That's all I have to say.

Mike Serpe:

One comment on the impact fees. I think it's appropriate that when a developer comes to the Village to do a job or a development in the Village that he's told up front exactly what's going to be happening and why it's happening and if he wishes to continue this is what it's going to take. We're not coming in at the eleventh hour and saying oh, by the way, it's going to cost you X number of dollars to finish this project. If they're willing to do that up front, and we're telling them that if it's not done we may not be able to approve the project because there's just no money to provide the services, if they're more than willing to do it I don't have a problem with that. With reference to videotaping the meetings I've said it before and I'll say it again. Some people like to see themselves in the paper, some people like to see themselves on TV. Some people like to see their name in the paper all the time. I'm not one of those people. Come here, do the job, do what you're supposed to do, do it right and the people will recognize that. And if we are going to videotape these meetings or broadcast these meetings then do it right. Do it so people can hear it, people can see it, people can understand it. If you're not going to do it right don't do it at all.

And I'm still trying to figure out the 3-2 vote.

John Steinbrink:

You did the right thing.

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

Mike Pollocoff:

I want to answer Larry Matson's question, and maybe it's Trustee Tiahnybok's question as well. I don't know what word you want to use that we're telling developers, but the staff is doing it and I thought we had Board support or probably just majority of support, but if we're going to have new development and we're going to stay with a frozen levy and nobody wants to raise taxes, you're going to pick up new miles of road. You're going to pick up more police officers because there's a direct correlation between how many people are in the community and how many police officers you need. You're going to pick up new fire stations. You're going to add to the community and some of those things we can't charge for under and impact fee. We can't have it.

So I think we owe it to ourselves and owe it to the residents to say we're considering a 200 parcel subdivision that's going to add six miles of roads into the Village, and they're not going to pay us any more to plow those roads. They're not going to pay us any more to do anything with those roads other than what comes off the property taxes. If we think back to the chart that was on the Board before and the budget we have, we collect 60 percent basically of our budget as property taxes. So the average taxpayer isn't paying, no taxpayer in this community until you get to that point where you're living in a very expensive home, is paying for 100 percent of the cost. The \$200,000 home is paying \$600 a year to have police protection, fire protection, snow plowing, the staff here, everything that happens. It just doesn't happen when people pay their taxes.

So we either have to recognize the community and say we're going to take on these new subdivisions, take on new retail development and not tell ourselves and not tell the developer how much it's going to cost to take it. Now, when we present a number to you and we say a subdivision is going to cause a differential shift between services that we provide now and the services in the future and that development is so important to you that you want to have it, then approve the development and spread our existing resources out even farther. And if you don't want to have a developer pay for their part of it then they don't have to pay for it.

All I'm saying is if you want to approve development and what that fiscal analysis is going to show is what it's going to cost to take care of it, that's one of your little exercises to sharpen your pencil as you go through the year and say whether or not you can afford it. I think if the City had done that when Whitecaps went in you probably wouldn't see Whitecaps there. Unified still hasn't recovered from the impact of 1,000 homes in two years. That's the roll out of that in some of those subdivisions. We haven't had it that bad, but I'm not holding anybody hostage, but I'm saying that I think we owe it to ourselves and the community to say what is this going to cost us? And if we can't afford it we owe it to the guy who is going to spend the money on the developer to say we don't think we can afford it. If we can afford it then we should be willing to accept as much good development that's going to contribute to the tax base as we can reasonably afford. It's not coercion. I'm not doing anything illegal and neither is Jean Werbie. We're facing up to facts of what it costs to handle development.

**9. NEW BUSINESS**

- A. Receive Plan Commission Recommendation and Consider a Conceptual Plan for Daniel J. Murphy of Wilmot Road East & West LLC (American Heritage Corp.), owner, on behalf of the Rust-Oleum Corp., for consideration of a proposed approximate 300,000 square foot building addition to the existing 346,450 square foot building to allow for a Midwest warehouse and distribution center for Rust-Oleum for paint and paint related products.**

Jean Werbie:

Mr. President and members of the Board, the owner/petitioner, in his application is requesting a conceptual plan approval this evening for a proposed approximately 300,000 square foot building addition to an existing M-2 zoned manufacturing property. That existing building is 346,450 square feet. So essentially he is proposing to double the size of a manufacturing building for a property located at 9201 Wilmot Road. It's identified as Tax parcel Numbers 91-4-122-084-0101 and 91-4-122-084-0102.

As you can see on the slide, the location of the property is kind of centered between County Trunk Highway H, which is 88<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and Wilmot Road, which is County Trunk Highway C. It's north of Bain Station Road. It's a manufacturing building that was set there back in the late '70s. At that time the Town of Pleasant Prairie was looking to create an industrial park in this particular area. Sometime after that, by the mid to late '80s, a lot of the planning that was done by the Town of Pleasant Prairie turned when WE Energies, at that time Wisconsin Electric, had approached the Village of Pleasant Prairie to create an industrial park south of this area kind of more centrally located in the south center part of the Village between approximately 95<sup>th</sup> Street or 89<sup>th</sup> Street and 122<sup>nd</sup>.

This is an area where a large industrial building was constructed at that time by Alfa Laval or Tri-Clover, and there were a lot of manufacturing jobs at this particular location. Over the years the jobs started to dry up. The plant moved away and relocated. Some of it relocated to the industrial park at Lakeview. But eventually there was some planning and forward thinking by the Plan Commission, by SEWRPC and by those that were working on the regional planning efforts to update the comprehensive plan by Kenosha Unified and the Village east of I-94 where this particular property they had identified, and the Plan Commission agreed, that this is an area probably that wasn't so well suited for manufacturing as we started to go into the future.

At that time we laid out a number of residential developments completely surrounding this particular property. So the forward thinking back in 1996 to the present was that there were some amendments to the Village's Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Again, that was originally adopted in June of 1996, and there was some neighborhood planning that was done for this particular square mile area known as the Prairie Ridge Neighborhood Plan. Both of those plans, the Comprehensive Plan and subsequent detailed neighborhood plan, did show a change in land use in this particular property. It did identify this property as more of a community commercial area, or what the zoning would be reflective of is a B-2, Community Business District. That doesn't mean that it just would be a retail site. In fact, there's hundreds of uses. It's the most permissive

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

business district that we do have in the Village. It's a B-2. It encompasses many, many uses, not just retail. So future looking uses through this Comprehensive Planning effort had identified a number of potential business uses but it really wouldn't be ready until well after 2010.

As Mr. Murphy indicated, the Smart Growth plan that the Village is working on with Kenosha County is going to be re-examining land uses within the Village, but our Comprehensive Plan currently in place will be a starting point. Each of the uses will be examined to determine whether or not they are appropriate and then following a guide or framework that the Plan Commission and the Village Board want to see for this community.

So in the staff comments as were presented to the Plan Commission, there is some very detailed discussion on the Comprehensive Plan for Pleasant Prairie, what we've done up to date, and what we presented for future uses for this particular property. And what we find is that the Comprehensive Plan says one thing and the zoning of the property says something else and there is a conflict.

We have set precedent in this Village and established some policies at both the Plan Commission level and the Village Board level that we don't rezone land and we don't approve projects that are in conflict with our Village's Comprehensive Plan or detailed neighborhood plans that have been prepared for a particular area. So, based on that the conceptual plan that was presented for a potential expansion of Rust-Oleum at this location was actually denied by the Village Plan Commission at our last meeting on November 27<sup>th</sup>.

What the staff comments that were presented at the Plan Commission go on to talk about is some background information, as I mentioned earlier, with respect to the existing manufacturing at this location. It identifies that there are approximately six different areas of the Village that are still zoned manufacturing that probably would not be suitable for manufacturing today. When we did our comprehensive wide zoning updates and remapping of all the business districts back in 2002, there was some significant discussion by the Plan Commission and the Board that the next districts that we would look at would be the manufacturing districts.

So resolutions were adopted to initiate that process to re-look at the manufacturing districts. As I mentioned there were approximately six properties that remain as manufacturing zoning tucked into residential areas, tucked in agricultural areas and some that are up in this area of the Village which are surrounded almost entirely on three sides by future or existing residential uses. And the Village does need to as part of this Smart Growth planning effort re-examine what makes sense for this community and the surrounding land uses that we've recently approved for this particular area.

The manufacturing zoning, as you know, primarily for the Village is centered around the Lakeview Corporate Park and lands immediately surrounding the corporate park, as well as lands west of the Interstate at approximately 165 and Highway Q. And we made some very conscious decisions about where the manufacturing would be located in that the types of heavy manufacturing uses would not be in close proximity to residential land uses due to the various things that could be present with respect to those types of land uses.

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

I did have a number of conversations with Mr. Murphy and the broker and a number of other individuals during the time frame that this property was up for sale. At that time there was some significant discussion that there were some conflicts and that it would be difficult for the staff, and I believed at that time the Plan Commission, to make any recommendations to expansion of manufacturing at this location. Existing manufacturing is permitted under the zoning. Even with the changes after 2010 with respect to land use changes, the manufacturing uses would still be permitted as nonconforming uses. But, again, as part of the Smart Growth planning program that the Village was undertaking with the County and on our own, we indicated that we needed to re-look at everything, and there was a possibility of manufacturing not being a suitable location and use at this site.

What I also said is that there may be some possibilities for warehousing, but in my mind it was never discussed that there would be expansion of additional manufacturing or warehousing at this site. It's something that I don't believe that this Board can discuss and make a decision on tonight given the fact that the Plan Commission has already denied the Comprehensive Plan change and they denied any change to the neighborhood plan, and at this point the statutes are very clear that the Plan Commission is the one that sets policy with respect to master planning in the community. After 2010 it flips to the Village Board. It changes. So there would be some conflict if the Village Board did approve a concept plan to expand a manufacturing use which is in conflict with the Comprehensive Plan and the neighborhood plan for this particular property.

I would like to say I have had a very good working relationship with Mr. Murphy since he has purchased this property. He's been a good community and business for the Village of Pleasant Prairie. If there have been issues he has addressed them. There have been times where we were concerned about traffic on Highway C and they promptly sent letters out. We were concerned with storm water management and they are addressing those issues. We were concerned with driveways aligning on Highway C. They've addressed those as they've started to build out their tenant base inside the existing building. But at this point the staff and the Plan Commission cannot recommend an expansion of an existing manufacturing use that's in conflict with our Comprehensive Planning efforts.

It is true that there were some residents that came and spoke at the Plan Commission meeting that were opposed to the expansion of the manufacturing facility. The concern is it's maybe warehousing today but what will it be tomorrow. There's concern with respect to the manufacturing of paint at this location could create some pretty significant issues and problems for the Village in the long term. Again, the way the Village's manufacturing districts are structured today is that warehousing is a permitted use in our manufacturing district, but it's what you're storing inside the warehouses that makes the difference as to whether or not it's an M-1 use, an M-2 use, a conditional use or if it's not permitted at all. So there are some issues with respect to some rewriting of the manufacturing districts that we would need to do in order to secure this site for any type of future use or expansion with any certainty for this Village. And the staff cannot recommend a concept plan that is too general at this point.

I heard Mr. Murphy indicate tonight that there's a possibility that Rust-Oleum still may be considering this location. We had a meeting back in mid November where they were no longer considering. So I've not had a conversation with him to determine whether or not they would still

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

like to be here or not like to be here. But the fact of the matter is what direction is the Plan Commission and Board going to be going with respect to this property, knowing that a preliminary plat was just approved for all the land immediately kind of south to the southwest for a brand new subdivision. So if the case was that we were looking to expand the manufacturing at this location, I don't know that I would have continued to support single family houses less than a couple hundred feet away, 90 or 100 of them to be exact.

I read in detail some recommendations into the record that were presented at the Plan Commission meeting. The Plan Commission and the staff did recommend denial of this particular concept plan. We certainly do want to continue discussions with Mr. Murphy. One thing I do want to mention is that there was a marketing study that he had commissioned that had evaluated this property for retail commercial business uses. That was done in 2005.

Things are constantly changing in this community and elsewhere, and with the new interchange proposed at Highway C in 2009, it will be completed in 2010, there will be a lot of things that are changing in the Village. Again, our land use plan, the current one, has a design year of 2010. The one we're working on now has a design year of 2035. Do we want to be short sighted and just look at the immediate uses in the Village or do we want to be forward thinking and say, well, maybe that land isn't ready for its ultimate land use, but do we want to take slower steps as to what those land uses should be in the interim. Because we do have a school adjacent to this property. We do have a number of residents with a manufactured housing community and an apartment complex and a couple of single family housing and a condo project in Prairie Ridge that was recently approved.

So it's a difficult decision and it warrants a significant amount of research and study before a decision can be made. I know that he's looking for direction but I'm not sure that I have the answers for you tonight and I don't know that you have enough information to make a decision to approve a concept plan this evening.

The Plan Commission and the staff did recommend denial. First of all, according to the Comprehensive Plan and the neighborhood plan this conflicts with both of those plans that are on file and adopted by this community. Predominant land uses surrounding this site are non industrial. Do we want to try to create an industrial pocket that is surrounded by residential land uses. There was great thought back in the early 1970s by Wisconsin Electric, and then the Town people at that time, to help centralize manufacturing and industrial land uses in an area of the Village and that was something that was looked at very closely, and I thought that that would be the direction we were heading.

The current property owner did purchase the property. He understood what the concerns were and those concerns still move into the future. I don't know if he's suggesting restrictive covenants that he's willing to put on the property. I'm not sure if he's suggesting some type of conditional zoning which could be placed on the property, but we can't contract zone on the property. That's illegal. So we would need to have significant more discussion as to what an appropriate use would be that will not negatively impact their surrounding land uses.

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

We have permitted by conditional use some Rust-Oleum land uses inside that building for storage of aerosols and paint related products. No manufacturing. There is limited amount of truck traffic that does come with respect to that, but if you double the building size, over 600,000, you will be increasing the truck traffic and we'll need to study and make sure that the adjacent streets and intersections can handle that type of traffic depending on what direction that they go and how many trucks are going and the intersections close to this particular site.

The final thing is there were some discussions that we had with another manufacturing use that had contemplated coming to this particular location. Our concern is that it was full blown manufacturing. We had concerns with respect to some of their existing operations where they were coming from. They indicated that they were not going to have that same operation in the Village. Again, the initial discussion was this was just going to be possibly a warehousing site, and now bringing full blown manufacturing will and could present some standard issues. I can honestly say that the performance standards, and if you've seen our zoning ordinance, were written pre-'83, and they certainly are in need of some significant updating in order to be effective in this community and to guarantee that we don't have issue with respect to noise, odors, runoff, vibrations, a number of different things. So that's something that as a staff we are continuing to look at and work at with our Village attorneys to guarantee that there will not be issues here or elsewhere in the Village.

With that, you have a full packet of information that was presented regarding this particular project. Again, the staff and the Plan Commission feel that at this point without further discussion that it just is not warranted and it could create some potential problems for this community.

John Steinbrink:

Jean, Mr. Murphy indicated he's looking for direction tonight. At the Plan Commission they were pretty point blank clear I guess you'd call it, and the neighbors were equally clear I guess. He has a very unique situation here in the fact that this was a former manufacturing. In fact, it was the only manufacturing in the Village at one time, but as you can see the evolution and the houses and the housing around it. There are difficult choices here. But I encourage him to keep working with the Village. Maybe we can find somewhere in there to match these together. It was discussed on the commercial aspect of it and the fact that it's not quite ready yet for that. We see a lot of volume of traffic go by 88<sup>th</sup> Avenue right now, but whether that would be a stopping point I'm not sure. So retail and commercial is one of them there. The comparison was made to 31 and 50. I don't think you're going to get a 31 and 50 there. Hopefully we're not going to get a 31 and 50 there. It makes life interesting on a little two lane road. I encourage that working together there yet on it.

Mike Serpe:

John, I have to agree with that and I have to concur with the Plan Commission's recommendation. If that were a vacant piece of property that was being farmed and that proposal came in to site that building on there with today's makeup of that area that would not be approved. But the building is there and I agree that Mr. Murphy should work with the staff. One question, Jean.

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

Anything to be done with that future of that site would that involve any environmental concerns that would have to be addressed?

Jean Werbie:

The Village is aware that there are some environmental issues underneath the building as well as in some proximity to that building as a result of some monitoring that was done. My understanding is that insofar as the fact that if they don't remove that building and they don't put certain types of land uses there that the environmental issues are not as significant. I mean maybe Mr. Murphy could respond to that, but my understanding is that as long as the building slab in the certain area stays there then environmental cleanup would not be an issue. If the building is removed, then some environmental cleanup would be needed.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Jean, Mr. President, my biggest concern is the school. We've got a school with 700 kids and about 80 people and staff. Any type of manufacturing close to the school, if it's a warehouse where they have paint or whatever I think I'd have to have a very hard look at that, because I don't want anything, any type of operation that due to an accident could cause any hazard to those kids in the school or the subdivision southwest of that building.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I've been in the chemical industry for over 20 years and I've been to the Rust-Oleum plant numerous times, and I can tell you that there are times you can walk into that facility and not know there's any chemical manufacturing. I think it's an outstanding organization. Yeah, you hear on the news things occasionally happen and no chemical site is immune to that, but considering the location of the school I think manufacturing probably would be a risky thing just to avoid any possibility. Warehousing, though, there's chemicals stored in all kinds of strange places that unless you're in the fire protection business, etc., you probably don't know about.

But the questions I have are, and I think it was implied in Jean's comments, the transfer of ownership to Murphy was relatively recent?

Jean Werbie:

Yes, within the last two years.

Alex Tiahnybok:

So it was purchased with the full knowledge of the zoning, the potential residential development, the fact that the school is obviously there already for years. Those are all pre-existing conditions. For the attorneys in the group I think there's a legal thing, something about let the buyer beware. You have to be aware of the circumstances when you acquire something. But I'm also guessing he probably paid a manufacturing price for the facility unless he got a real steal on it. So he paid for some value because of the zoning. We all know about rezoning property from one direction

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

to the other and the impact it has on the its value. So I'm sure he paid a manufacturing price for a structure that's existing. Whether or not it's permanently subject to enhancements or expansions I guess we could argue about forever.

But he paid for something and I think we're pretty diligent about protecting peoples' property rights to use their property. It sounds like right now based on his comments he's in no man's land. He bought some property and now he's sort of stuck and has no idea what he can do with it. For the sake of fairness it seems kind of questionable.

I think Tri-Clover closed before I lived in Pleasant Prairie. What did they do with that site?

Jean Werbie:

What did they do?

Alex Tiahnybok:

Yes, it was manufacturing, correct? What was it?

Mike Pollocoff:

They manufactured equipment for the food processing industry, stainless steel.

Alex Tiahnybok:

And the reason I'm asking that is if there was any residential development that occurred in that area or the school was built with the knowledge that that plant was manufacturing something. But it sounds like it was pretty inert stuff anyway so there was probably not an awful lot to worry about. It sounds like everyone is doing the right thing. I certainly welcome the opportunity to be involved in helping Mr. Murphy come to some kind of conclusion that's going to be fair to everyone. But I think the Plan Commission's recommendation to this point are correct. Because we're asking the site to be useful for something else other than it was originally intended for and there are concerns and risks around it. I'm not writing off the idea of spray paint or finished paint warehousing, but there's a lot of bridges to cross yet.

Mike Pollocoff:

I think also from the staff's perspective what I want everybody to understand is that you get a couple different issues running here. One is Mr. Murphy needs some guidance on his existing building and he does need to be able to use that building to get a return on it. Staff agrees with that and we need to work with him to make sure he can get a return on that that he's entitled to. That is a manufacturing use and we've got to work within the confines and the restraints that we have within the ordinance to do that.

The second issue is the proposed addition. I think what we're saying is that expands a use that's already in conflict, and short of a rewrite of the Comp. Plan I'm not sure how that goes any

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

farther. He did some good work for us that showed us how you could turn that building into a commercial site somewhere down the road, but none of us including him, and he doesn't pretend to say when that would happen, knows when that would occur. The zoning laws in Wisconsin are not speculative where you're going to say I don't know what I'm going to give you, I don't know what it's going to be, but let me have what I want now as a property owner, and then if it works out later to be okay I'll do that, too. It just doesn't flow that way.

But I think, one, we need to make sure he can use that existing building as profitably as he can without being in conflict with the plan, but I think the direction he's seeking is there really isn't, to the extent Rust-Oleum may or may not be the tenant with this proposed building, the worst thing we can do is let him get farther down the road towards constructing something that's going to be not in compliance with the plan. For the plan to have any validity I don't know how we do that, but we need to make sure that the existing building can be used.

Mike Serpe:

I move to concur with Plan Commission's recommendation and also encourage Mr. Murphy to continue to work with staff.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

**SERPE MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND REJECT A CONCEPTUAL PLAN FOR DANIEL J. MURPHY OF WILMOT ROAD EAST & WEST LLC (AMERICAN HERITAGE CORP.), OWNER, ON BEHALF OF THE RUST-OLEUM CORP., FOR CONSIDERATION OF A PROPOSED APPROXIMATE 300,000 SQUARE FOOT BUILDING ADDITION TO THE EXISTING 346,450 SQUARE FOOT BUILDING TO ALLOW FOR A MIDWEST WAREHOUSE AND DISTRIBUTION CENTER FOR RUST-OLEUM FOR PAINT AND PAINT RELATED PRODUCTS; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

- B. Receive Plan Commission Recommendation and Consider a Zoning Map Amendment (Ord. #06-58) to correct the Zoning Map and rezone the non-wetlands on a portion of the property generally located on the west side of 115th Avenue at 79th Street in the area of the proposed Village sanitary sewer lift station from the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District to the C-2, Upland Resource Conservancy District; and to rezone a portion of the property in the area of the proposed lift station that are wetlands from the C-2, Upland Resource Conservancy District to C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District.**

Jean Werbie:

Mr. President and members of the Board, at the request of the Village, on August 21, 2006, Dave Meyer with Wetland & Waterway Consulting, LLC delineated the wetlands on a portion of a property which located on the west side of 115<sup>th</sup> Avenue at 79<sup>th</sup> Street which is just west of the

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

Chateau Eau Plaines Subdivision. A portion of that property is identified as Tax Parcel Number 91-4-122-072-0142. The area was delineated by the biologist in order to ensure that a proposed Village sanitary sewer lift station could be located in a non-wetland area of the portion of land owned by the Village.

On October 31, 2006, the Village received a letter dated October 27, 2006 from the Wisconsin DNR that concurred with the wetland staking and the report that was submitted by Dave Meyer with Wetland & Waterway Consulting.

As a result of the wetland staking being completed and approved by the DNR, a zoning map amendment is in order to correct the zoning map and to rezone the wetlands on the portion of the property that is proposed for the Village's sanitary sewer lift station. Again, the property would be zoned so that only the wetland portion is zoned C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District, and the upland portion would be placed into the C-2, Upland Resource Conservancy District which would allow for the lift station. The area within the Floodplain Overlay District will remain unchanged on the property.

On November 27, 2006 the Plan Commission held a public hearing and recommended that the Village Board approve the zoning map amendment as presented. And tonight this is Ordinance #06-58.

**TIAHNYBOK MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND ADOPT A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT (ORD. #06-58) TO CORRECT THE ZONING MAP AND REZONE THE NON-WETLANDS ON A PORTION OF THE PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF 115TH AVENUE AT 79TH STREET IN THE AREA OF THE PROPOSED VILLAGE SANITARY SEWER LIFT STATION FROM THE C-1, LOWLAND RESOURCE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT TO THE C-2, UPLAND RESOURCE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT; AND TO REZONE A PORTION OF THE PROPERTY IN THE AREA OF THE PROPOSED LIFT STATION THAT ARE WETLANDS FROM THE C-2, UPLAND RESOURCE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT TO C-1, LOWLAND RESOURCE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**C. Consent Agenda**

- 1) **Approve Bartender Licenses on File.**
- 2) **Approve Letter of Credit Reduction for Meadowdale Estates Addition #1.**
- 3) **Approve Letter of Credit Reduction for Village Green Heights Subdivision.**
- 4) **Approve the request of VK Development, property owner, for a Certified Survey Map to subdivide Tax Parcel Number 91-4-122-182-0135, located within the Prairie Ridge commercial area, into three (3) lots and one (1) outlot.**

Alex Tiahnybok:

I just want to say thank you to the Administrator for sort of following my request to have certain items that are subject to being moved to the consent agenda. I do appreciate it.

Village Board Meeting  
December 5, 2006

**KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS 1-4 AS PRESENTED; SECONDED BY LAUER; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

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