

**VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE
PLEASANT PRAIRIE VILLAGE BOARD
PLEASANT PRAIRIE WATER UTILITY
LAKE MICHIGAN SEWER UTILITY DISTRICT
SEWER UTILITY DISTRICT "D"
9915 39th Avenue
Pleasant Prairie, WI
April 24, 2008
6:30 p.m.**

A Special Meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Village Board was held on Thursday, April 24, 2008. Meeting called to order at 6:40 p.m. Present were Village Board members John Steinbrink, Monica Yuhas, Steve Kumorkiewicz, Clyde Allen and Mike Serpe. Also present were Mike Pollocoff, Village Administrator, John Steinbrink Jr., Public Works Superintendent and Jane Romanowski, Village Clerk.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. ROLL CALL**
- 3. PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETING TO DISCUSS STORM WATER IMPROVEMENTS IN THE CAROL BEACH ESTATES UNIT 2 SUBDIVISION.**

John Steinbrink:

This is a public informational hearing. We had the outline of it already, Mike?

Mike Pollocoff:

As you saw, we had some discussions, and then for the record we have an outline of what we have here to go through. I think we can move through pretty quick since we talked about it. I've prepared a summary of where we've come because not everybody has lived here the whole time or been here before. As I indicated earlier, in 1983 the Army Corps of Engineers defined a skeletal storm system for this area necessary for the urbanized improvements in Unit 2.

In 1985, the Town of Pleasant Prairie, along with other ones, adopted the Chiswaukee Prairie - Carol Beach area land use management plan. The recommended plan envisioned that the study area would be served by all weather streets which is pavement, rural cross-sections which is ditches, culverts and a skeletal storm sewer without curb and gutters and full storm sewer systems.

In July of '95 the Village Board adopted an ordinance to place a moratorium on the issuance of building permits in a portion of the Carol Beach Unit Subdivision. And that moratorium served as a stop point for the Village to be able to go out and prepare some topographical maps to see what the lay of the land was and to see what was draining where.

In March of '96 we completed the initial storm water study with anticipated improvements of \$789,000, of which the Village would pay half and the residents would pay half, with an assessment rate of \$2,070 on a typical lot. That project was a bigger drainage area than this one.

Village Board Meeting
April 24, 2008

In June of '96 the Village Board adopted a resolution to extend the moratorium on issuing building permits in Carol Beach Unit #2. With that we followed another public informational meeting in September. We presented information concerning a storm water management plan in Unit #2. The DNR had not fully approved that one. That was the larger system. In February, we adopted a second resolution to extend the moratorium on issuing building permits while we were doing this work.

In April of '97 a storage alternative plan, and storage alternative is retention basins along with swales and ditches, prepared by the consulting engineer with that mix of improvements and the cost was a little bit less of \$647,000 and required the Village to purchase 18 lots. In April of '97 the staff recommended the Village Board to reconsider an ordinance to create Chapter 33 related to Carol Beach Estates Unit 2 subdivision study area permit requirements for construction. The Village Board authorized the staff to start the process to prepare relocation orders. A relocation order is condemnation. That's to take somebody's property from them for land acquisition in Unit 2 and to firm up the engineering costs in relation to the plan for detention basins.

In May of '97 the Village Board received a petition signed by 45 homeowners who did not want storm sewer retention ponds in Unit 2. In May of '97 the Village Board proceeded to adopt relocation orders for 18 parcels in Unit 2. In July of '97 the Village Board adopted a resolution to end the building moratorium in Carol Beach Estates Unit 2 Subdivision. When you adopt a moratorium where you're not going to allow anybody to build it has to be for a fixed, defined purpose. In this case we were doing it for the preparation of construction detention basins, storm sewers and ditches. To go beyond anything other than that is illegal, and at that point it would constitute a taking and we'd have to purchase the lots outright.

In October of '97 the final design for the basin plan was received from the engineer. In January of '99, and you can see that's a two year period there almost, a year and a half, the DNR denied that plan. In January of '99 the Village adopted a resolution to rescind the relocation orders that were previously approved. In January of '99 letter to residents in Unit 2 indicating no special assessments and no drainage improvements were going to be made due to the denial of the project.

In May of '01 the Village requested a Chapter 30 permit for installation of a storm sewer and outfall on Lake Michigan, and that's that pipe that currently exists that we did construct that goes underneath Lakeshore Drive to ultimately drain the water. In November and December of '02 we constructed that outfall.

In '04 we had another public informational meeting in October, another one in May as people requesting the Village to do something to take care of flooding in the area and poor drainage. In December of 2005 our Village engineer and Bonestroo, Rosene and Anderlik, the engineer that we contracted with with our State grant, undertook a study of the area, undertook an evaluation of proposed ditching plans that were made by residents, and came back with a proposed project which is the one that was on the Board that we talked about tonight at a cost of \$300,000 with the Village paying half and the residents paying half.

Village Board Meeting
April 24, 2008

In December of '05 we received a petition of property owners at a Village Board meeting to request that flooding be addressed but they opposed any storm water improvements that we had proposed. In January of '06 a public hearing was held. The estimated project cost with further refinements came down to \$297,774. The Village would pay half. And that point the Clean Water Utility was in place, and if we waited until 2010 we'd pay half, if it was earlier the residents would have to pay 100 percent of the cost.

And subsequently we're at the point now where we've had more people request that the Village do something concerning the drainage and flooding in the area and we're having another public informational meeting. With that, John Steinbrink, Jr., our Public Works Superintendent and engineer in that department will go through where we are from this point and define the area further.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

The drainage area that drains through Carol Beach Unit 2 as shown up on the map is a combination of a lot of the tributaries from Tobin Creek, the north branch, and also the branch to the south, which drains a very large area pretty much from County Trunk EZ which is 39th Avenue all the way east. And we've identified where Carol Beach Unit 2 is on the map here with the red circle.

The amount of water that's draining through the Tobin Creek Watershed is a very large area. This area on the map that's highlighted in the green shows the amount of drainage area that's actually coming through the Tobin Creek Watershed. The map that we have up here is based off the elevations that we have back from 1995 to 1996. It shows how over the course from the boundary it would be the western end of Carol Beach Unit 2 over by 4th Avenue of about elevation of 592 above sea level down to I believe at the invert of that pipe going underneath is around maybe 585. So you're really only talking a very limited amount of slope in that drainage basin area.

After a lot of studies that have been gone through, also some of the earlier engineering plans by Crispell-Snyder back in the '80s and '90s, and the Bonestroo is part of the storm sewer master plan for the Village of Pleasant Prairie, we took into account the area that the drainage basin has. I guess the best way to explain a drainage area is really like a bowl or a saucer. Mr. Pollocoff had indicated earlier it might be a very small lip around that saucer, but the area that's outlined in black as best defined from our topographical information in 1995/96 we had gone through and defined the drainage area very roughly of what's inside these black lines.

Once we go through, if the project does move forward and we do some more detailed topographical information, it might move a little bit east, west, or north or south. But this is definitely a general area of what we have. The green arrows that we have are proposed ditch lines. The red arrows that we have are proposed pipes. And the little red lines that go underneath the road are proposed new storm water culverts that would actually drain water from one side of the road to the other.

Village Board Meeting
April 24, 2008

The wetlands on here are just wetlands that have been staked and identified. The Village does understand that there are other parcels and other properties in here that do contain wetlands but they haven't been staked. And so we only show on this map the parcels of properties that have been staked and identified out there, even though there are other maps that are identified as potential wetland areas.

The reason that we need to have a combination of the pipes and the ditches is, one, we need to be very sensitive not to drain any of the wetland areas. And so if you would go through and put a ditch next to a wetland area where the bottom elevation of that ditch is lower than the wetland, you're actually going to start draining that wetland which is illegal by State statute and DNR. And so to keep the cost as low as we could we tried to keep the amount of ditching to a minimum. We also took a look at the topographical elevation. Any places on this map where we were lower than two or two and a half feet, it's really hard to hold a ditch in the types of sandy soils that we do have in the Carol Beach area.

It's recommended that in sandy soil areas that you have a four to one side slope. So what that means is that for every foot of depth that you go down on each side you need to go four feet of side slope out to the end. And so if you would have a ditch that is four feet deep where the inverts of some of these pipes are, it would have to be for every four feet that you're down it's four feet wide, so it's 16 feet off to the left side, 16 feet off to the right side and a couple of feet in the base which ends up giving you a 34 foot ditch. Which I'm sure the people out in the audience that are shaking their heads going you can't do a ditch of 34 feet that's why we have pipes in these areas because you really can't.

If you would go through and construct a ditch that would be two to one per se where it might not take up as much right of way, the problem you're going to have is you're going to be out there every year with out ditch grading machine excavating that out, reshaping, reseeding, resodding and just doing it over and over again, and then the maintenance becomes very expensive for it.

I had heard somebody say earlier that the pumping is working good. The pumping works good as a temporary fix, but just over the course of April 10th and 11th the Village spend almost \$3,000 just pumping down some areas on 4th Avenue. So it becomes very expensive and very maintenance heavy just to do that pumping. I'm not sure if the Chatmon's are here or not, but that water was right up to their house in that area. So there really are some bad areas that do need to get addressed in here.

Our cost estimate based off that plan that I just had up on the board identified different sizes of pipes and manholes and ditching and restoration, and back in 2005 dollars it was just under \$300,000 for a total. We do understand that prices have gone up since 2005. If the project moves forward we will go through and harden up some of these numbers. We'll get some definite surveying which will go through and define the drainage boundaries and make sure that the locations where we have the inlets for the water carrying into the pipe are the correct locations. Any restoration costs of relocating a mailbox or re-seeding a ditch or re-asphalting a driveway, for example, are all included in that price.

Village Board Meeting
April 24, 2008

The slide that I have up here now - it shows a little bit of what we were talking about of the recommended slopes that you can have for a drainage ditch. It shows where the edge of the road is, where the shoulder is. You can have a slope which is recommended in the sandy soils of four to one, a ditched bottom and then a slope coming up. We take this off out of the AASHTO geometric design of highway and streets. It's the bible that we use for road and drainage design. I guess that's really all that I have as far as the project goes. I'm not sure, Mike, if you want to open it up to any questions.

Mike Pollocoff:

The last thing I'd like to add, as John indicated, we had one storm where we spent \$3,000 to pump and protect the one home from flooding in an area from overwhelming but, again, that's being funded through the Clean Water Utility. Typically in this subdivision it would be \$1 a month or \$12 a year. We're still not into the spring, and if we have a wet spring, at some point we're spending money to effect an emergency solution but it's money that's not spent on solving the problem once and for all. It far exceeds the fees that are charged. In as much as that happens, that's something that the rest of the community is subsidizing an expense for an improvement that doesn't exist in the development.

As I indicated before the meeting, staff and numerous engineers have evaluated this project, and the project that's before you is the only one I believe that's approvable. It is approvable by the State and it's signed off by an engineer that will perform. The other plans that have been presented in good interest and good will to resolve the problem have been identified as not being able to achieve the success we need to solve this problem once and for all. With that, Mr. President, if you'd like to open up the hearing for comments or further questions that people may have.

John Steinbrink:

Once again, this is a public hearing and we're going to open it up for public comment and question. We did have a sign up sheet and Jane will read the names in the order. When you come forward use the microphone and give us your name and address for the record. We're going to go without a time limit. We're going to ask you to keep it within a decent range. If somebody has already given that opinion or comment just breeze over it a little bit because we've probably heard it already. It's 7:15 and I'm sure a lot of folks want to get home earlier rather than later tonight. They are predicting more rain which is not a good thing.

Jane Romanowski:

The first speaker is Don Van Besien.

Don Van Besien:

My name is Don Van Besien. I live at 11107 4th Avenue. The first thing I'd like to say is I would like to thank the Public Works Department. I became very acquainted with them over the last month and half listening to their pumps outside on my road, sometimes 36 hours straight. But the

Village Board Meeting
April 24, 2008

job they did was exemplary. The people there were nice but they don't need to be doing this. We need this problem fixed. It's roughly about \$20.80 a month per lot. Over a ten year period I don't think that's going to tax anybody too much out of their budgets, and I don't want to see tax dollars or waterfront money being spent in overtime the next time this happens or the time after that.

I have been in contact with some legal representation, because I do feel the fact that the Village has allowed more building since 2005 and 2006 which exacerbates the problem by more sump pumps coming into the problem that was there that they pumped out two years ago is an issue, and the legal representation that I have does agree with that. So I do honestly think that the Village needs to step in, get a poll of the people here and make your decision whether it's favorable to the majority or not to get this fixed. Thank you.

Bob Babcock:

Bob Babcock, 11336 Lakeshore Drive. First of all, I'd like to thank the Village for scheduling this meeting, but I had hoped it would be more of an open discussion instead of just another attempt to present this plan to us. Over the last 15 years the Village has presented this and two other grandiose plans to solve our problems, and it's always been complete overkill. I mentioned this before, when I go to a grocery store I don't hire a limousine and get a ten vehicle police escort because that, too, would be considered overkill.

Initially the Village had a very good and simple plan. They had asked a builder to put a swale between two lots and across the back of two lots, and then the Village would carry it the rest of the way into the designated wetland. That's where this water and all has gone before. The builder complied. The Village ran ditches to the swale but they did not extend the swale into the wetlands. The next spring the water flowed in the ditches, down into the swale, and because it couldn't go to the wetlands it just flooded out a number of yards and homes. And one gentleman that lived there for 35 years had his whole backyard and septic field flooded for the first time ever.

When the Village was contacted they said they couldn't extend the swale because they were not allowed to touch DNR property. I found that a little hard to accept the fact that the DNR wouldn't want the water to go where Mother Nature had put it for many, many years. I had hoped the DNR would be present here so they could shed a little light on some of these things.

Then the Village came up with that great storm sewer plan. That was their first overkill plan. The citizens didn't like it. And then when the DNR finally found out about it they said it wasn't acceptable. Then this was followed by the great retention pond plan and then this plan. Smaller, alternative plans that were submitted by residents were not even seriously looked at by the Village.

I've got a list of some statements that were made by the Village over the few years. This one relates to what John just said. "Soil conditions in Unit 2 ditches would have to be 30 foot wide. Also, pipe cannot be buried in Unit 2. Ditching will not work. Ditching cannot be done in front of DNR property. The DNR will not allow the Village to do any more ditching. The DNR will

Village Board Meeting
April 24, 2008

not allow pipe to be buried. The DNR will not allow trees to be removed. DNR will not allow storm water to go in Lake Michigan. DNR will not allow storm water to go in Tobin Creek. And the Village is not in the business of buying lots. If you build in Unit 2 you should expect to have water problems. We have spent a lot of time and money devising plans that are not acceptable to the property owners and since all of our plans are not acceptable we should wash our hands and not pursue it any further.” And, finally, “Don’t ask the Village to pay for any of the Unit 2 water problems, they knew the situation before they built there.” I just wonder if any of these statements apply to this plan we’ve got for tonight.

I had devised a small ditching plan that would address the water into the designated wetlands. I presented it first to the DNR. Their engineers looked it over and said it’s not the best plan in the world but it would work. The Village response was it would be too costly to maintain a ditch and they didn’t even consider it.

Our water problem will never be solved completely, however by putting together the collective heads of the property owners and the Village and the DNR we can alleviate this situation and come to a somewhat more acceptable solution. The DNR has great expertise in these matters and would be an extremely valuable partner in this endeavor. A couple of small projects will more than likely lessen the need for anything larger. My feeling is if we do a couple of these little projects that’s going to eliminate the need for some of these larger projects.

If some of the water is diverted in a couple of areas it’s not going to be going to the other areas and causing all sorts of problems. And by putting our heads together, and by together I mean side by side, all looking in the same direction, we can get something done. In the past when we put our heads together it was nose to nose and you can see that nothing has happened because of that. Thank you.

Keith Larsen:

Keith Larsen, 152 113th Street. I’ve been a resident here for 14 or 15 years. We’ve been addressing this problem before I got here. Any plan let’s get rid of the drainage. I pump a lot of water. Bob gets it. It all goes somewhere. It’s gotten worse over time. People want to live down there. It’s a nice neighborhood. After the water goes away it’s not bad. Is this going to be Gus Hauser approved? Have a nice day.

Bob Babcock:

I have some pictures I can show you. These were taken today. Bob Babcock, 11253 3rd Avenue. The lighting wasn’t good. There’s a lot of water and that but it’s kind of hard to see. But this is a picture of a lot in Unit 2 that is for sale. It shows there is still a lot of standing water in front of the lot as well as water still standing on the adjacent lot. I understand the Village has already approved this lot as buildable and I know that it can’t be changed now, however it does illustrate a problem with the way building is approved on there.

The DNR allowed the landowner to fill a portion of this lot to allow driveway access to the buildable area. The Board then approved building on this lot due to the DNR ruling. The

Village Board Meeting
April 24, 2008

problem is the DNR and the Village Board do not have the same job. The main job of the DNR is to ensure the overall well being of the wetland in the area. I'm sure the Village is concerned about the wetland, but the main job of the Village Board is to make sure the lot is suitable for building and that whatever is built is suitable for the neighborhood. On both accounts this lot is not.

I can almost guarantee that at some point whoever lives in the house built on this lot is going to want to fill in the wetland that is his front yard. The owner of this home is going to have a wet, smelly swamp that is more suitable for ducks and frogs than somebody's front lawn. When this person is told it's illegal to fill in a protected wetland it will be reasonable for him to say why did the Village allow a home to be built here then? I'm sure the current owner of this property will be as forthright as he's legally obligated to, but if this property is sold during the time when the wetland is dry it's not reasonable to tell the new owner he should have known there were going to be water problems there. So this new home has automatic water problems from the get-go.

Criteria number two for the Village Board is, is the new home suitable for the neighborhood? The answer, again, is no. This particular lot holds water in the area that is wetland, but also for a shorter time holds water in the nonwetland area. All of this water is now going to be displaced rapidly. We already are getting water running across the road during high water times. This water will only be worse with a new home there. Also, most current homeowners take pride in the appearance of their front yards. In this new home the owner has no choice but to leave theirs alone. This is an instance where the DNR held up their responsibility but that shouldn't have been all the Village Board looked at when they approved the building.

With every new home that is built it seems there is new water problem to be dealt with. I hope the Board will take a closer look at new construction so at the very least the problems don't keep getting worse. With all due respect to the DNR their decisions shouldn't be rubber stamped by the Board. You are ruling in separate issues. While stricter guidelines will stop these problems from becoming worse, we need to come up with a reasonable solution for our current problems as well. I don't really understand how these problems became so bad when we are surrounded by two creeks and a lake that is six feet below normal pool. We also are bordered by prairie wetland areas that are not only normally dry but also the area where a lot of the water traditionally had drained. My suggestion would be to try some simple ditching to these areas and see what happens. The Village's plan may work but it seems like an awful lot of money to pay for something that would cover a five year rain event. I hope the Village will take the citizens' input seriously this time and come up with a reasonable solution that satisfies the residents of Unit 2.

Aslam Saiyed:

Aslam, Saiyed, 11361 Lakeshore Drive. I have been a resident over there for over ten years. Throughout the meetings and today all I heard DNR, DNR. I don't see anybody from DNR here . . . telling us . . . they can always point a finger that they're telling us to do this but there's nobody from there telling us why and they aren't here to talk about it. Another gentleman mentioned \$20 a month. Well, \$20 is okay when you're living on the west side of the lake. When you're living on the lake I'm already paying 200 times more on that side just for the land. So let's not keep on talking about assessment going up for no reason. And let's not just keep on shaking our heads

Village Board Meeting
April 24, 2008

out there . . . listen . . . shaking their heads doesn't make any sense over here. You're here to listen to the citizens of this city over here. Let's just not do that. It's not professional and it's not right and it's not appropriate. If you do not understand my accent ask me. I will go over this again because I don't think that was asked for.

I haven't got any water on my property but anybody across from me in that area. You're talking about the corner on 113th Street and Lakeshore Drive. When that big eyesore was built, that \$2 million one which was approved, that shouldn't be approved by DNR either because of the ordinary high water mark. That has a basement in it. Since the house has been built it has been flooded so many times they had to redo the basement so many times. So I'm not sure if the building department is talking to the DNR or who is talking to whom. It appears the left hand isn't talking to the right hand.

I think when you put it all on one page stay away from the assessment . . . keep on passing the buck because we talk about that monthly bill. Yes, I get that monthly bill. What do I get? There is no sewer, there's no water where I am. The closest fire hydrant is close to five miles from my house and I'm still paying for that. But why? Better for the whole community? But I don't see any results of that. Thank you.

Christopher Delgado:

Good afternoon. My name is Chris Delgado. I live at 11166 3rd Avenue. My question to you is I'd like to know a little bit more about the contractor that you have chosen to do this project, and if we're going to be paying for half of the costs of this contractor, is there an opportunity that this can go to the public for there to be a bid on this project? I believe that if it gets out to the public maybe we can reduce some of the costs for this project. Nobody has answer to that?

Mike Pollocoff:

You want me to answer it now or at the end?

John Steinbrink:

Usually we take all the questions.

Christopher Delgado:

Alright, you have that question. Also, as far as the water that's out there right now it's pretty stagnant and it's only going to get worse. As the spring approaches we've got the opportunity of an outbreak of mosquitoes and West Nile virus. What is the Village going to do about that?

And, lastly, I'd like to know, Michael, if you're in charge of that project right there on the corner of Sheridan and where the drive-in theater is? No? Is that part of Pleasant Prairie?

Village Board Meeting
April 24, 2008

Mike Pollocoff:

County.

Christopher Delgado:

Because that project doesn't seem to be going very well.

Lenny Swaney:

Lenny Swaney. I live at 11233 3rd Avenue in Pleasant Prairie. My problem is if the lot across from me fills with water, the vacant that Mr. Bob Babcock, Jr., was talking about where they're going to put a house is right there that pushes the water over to my land. There's a culvert built sloped from a wetland to my yard. If you build that culvert 20 feet towards the lake it would have drained into a natural wetland. So whoever built it in the first place didn't know what they were doing because now it drains right into my ditch so I get the water from across the ditch, across the road pushing into my yard, and my yard doesn't dry. My ditch doesn't dry all summer. It stays wet because it's draining.

I've got three kids that play out in my yard all the time and stuff like that, and if they go in that water, and my daughter did it last year, I had to take her and get three shots because the water was stagnant and dangerous to her. She rode her bike and she fell in the water. If some kid gets hurt down there or something like that whose responsibility is that? Even if the parents are watching it can happen very quickly. Now that's a responsibility that the Village is not looking at is the safety of the children of the area. The kids love water. They see that water standing there and they think they can go out there, they can play in it, they can do whatever. But because the Village didn't design this area properly for drainage and do what they were supposed to do when they developed the area clear back in the 1980s and early '90s we have this problem, and that's on this Village Board. It's not on the residents. It's on this Village Board for not properly doing the proper inner structure of that area. You can say what you want to about it but that's where it lies with you guys and the people that were here at that time to make sure that things didn't happen the way they should have.

John Barry:

John Barry, 11114 Lakeshore Drive. I've prepared some written remarks, but I'd like to agree with that gentleman who was just up here that the Village Board bears the responsibility for this problem. Mike, for you to just say you have no responsibility in the issuing of permits, that you cannot deny a permit, even though by building a building on that land you're causing problems for the surrounding residents, that's just a copout from the Village's responsibility. The Village is responsible, that's why you issue permits. If everything is just two feet above the road just have a rule two feet above the road. When I want to fill my yard I have to submit a plan, one that you guys approve and say yes it will work. I don't understand how you can sit there and tell me that it's not your job to scrutinize these building projects. You have the power to do permits and you're required by the law that gave you that power to exercise it in a judicious manner.

Village Board Meeting
April 24, 2008

I do oppose this project because, after seeing several proposals from the Village regarding these problems, each proposal has been defeated or postponed, and I expect the same thing will happen this time. To use outdated 2005 and even I believe you said 1987 the basin was established, or whenever the boundaries of that basin were established, it was years and years ago, there's been so many changed down there, the picture I see down there doesn't even contain all the structures that are in that area at this time. So to come up with a proposal that's based on this old data seems unconscionable to me.

I don't see anything from a qualified surveyor that reflects the current conditions. I just don't see it. And I don't see how you can come up with a plan without the drainage information that's necessary to make that plan. I hope the Board sees that that way. This work is very expensive, and it's really caused by the building of houses in the swamp. It's a swamp down there, let's face it, and the Village got a permit from the DNR to allow building down there and then they just let people go nuts.

You allowed people to use non granular fill in the building of their houses, and this is a large part of why the land no longer drains. The permit that was issued by the DNR required the use of granular fill. And, as you know, when I was a member of the Concerned Citizens of Pleasant Prairie that opposed the last one, our lawyer told you guys that by using non granular fill you violated that permit and there was no contention to that I don't think.

If you guys had adhered to the building permit process and enforced it, we would not have this problem right now. So I feel that the Board, if anything, because the Village is liable for this it should come from the general fund. Draining that area that I saw from 39th Avenue all the way down to the lake that's what's going to be benefitted from this as well as our immediate area.

I also feel that this whole thing with ditching, which I see this proposed ditches which you've told us have to be 34 feet wide and won't work, I don't understand how you can propose it then. Why is ditching part of the job if it doesn't work in sandy soil and there's not enough width to accomplish it. So I would encourage you to simply abandon this process and let the people who live down in the swamp run their pumps or come up with a solution that's economically feasible. And I do have copies of my written comments.

Tim Roszkowiak:

Tim Roszkowiak, 11283 3rd Avenue.

Jane Romanowski:

Could you spell your last name please?

Tim Roszkowiak:

R-O-S-Z-K-O-W-I-A-K. A couple notes here. I'd like to say that we've had the water problem outside of five years every year. There's been apparent flooding every year. I'm concerned, too, with the stagnant water there as well with the mosquitoes. I was wondering if we could do what

Village Board Meeting
April 24, 2008

Chicago did, get mosquito tablets and disburse them in there or spray. The other thing is we need to address the water problem. If we go ahead with the plan is there going to be any annual inspections for piping that is cracked? The one thing that concerns me is we did pay for an assessment when I moved here for the road and our road hasn't been maintained since I've been there, probably once in the last ten years and it's kind of cracked up, too, as well. So I just want to make sure that is taken care of if we go forward with this plan.

Aesthetics is important, too, if this plan goes through, that the land is restored properly. Sump pumps, we all have sump pumps. If the electricity goes out it's a big problem. There's potential flooding with bad storms. So I want to make sure we address the plan with sump pumps, that they feed into the system if this goes through. I think the area should be look at expanded because there is flooding on 115th and second that is outside of the proposed area.

A lot of us wouldn't be here if building permits weren't issued. So if we didn't have any building permits, I'm not saying if the right grade is there, but if we didn't have building permits a lot of us wouldn't be able to enjoy where we're at. We'd just have to fix the water.

I also disagree with the previous plan that was brought up, maybe three plans ago, with the builder. I believe Buddy Blanford building a swale in between two lands which happens to be my land, my yard and all the water going there, I have enough problem and the soil is already saturated enough where I don't think my pumps could handle it if that was to happen. And I believe it came up just because he built four, five, six of the house that were on 4th, 3rd and 2nd and he's not even there anymore.

Going back there is a house, 11280 3rd Avenue, that does look that the grade is about two feet. I would like to have that checked out. There's no gutters. It's very poor appearance in the front, and since that house has been built I know my sump pumps have been on 24/7 as well. The lay of the land has changed, so I would like to see an updated survey as well because the land has changed with the new houses, new structures, and I don't think that map reflects it as well. I believe that's all I have.

Jane Romanowski:

The next sign up says Dave but there's no address.

Dave Holden:

Dave Holden, 11220 3rd Avenue. I don't have a written speech. I'm not one to write things down. I go from the hip. But I'm very disappointed with the Village with the people we've got sitting here. We've got a problem for ten years. Some of the problem we've got I thought was done with two years ago, walked away with it, live with the water, move on, everybody is happy. The house was built that's next to me. I've been told we're not in the business of buying lots, but then again we're going to build a London style four way highway with a bike . . . on 165 and buy a whole bunch of houses which I think is wrong. I think we need to address the problems.

Village Board Meeting
April 24, 2008

Now, with the ditches, like you said, the sand and soil, I've got a PVC pipe that goes from my house to the road that I buried that addresses the water problem that you guys wouldn't address ten years ago. I brought in lots of dirt, timber, and a flower box that keeps the water from a pond in my front yard. The water works. The water runs to the wetlands to the right of me. What they're talking about, I haven't seen one person walk down there, walk the land and look at what's going on down there. I've been there ten years now and I have not seen one of you guys down there.

The water that I had—I've taken care of a lot of the problem. The water across the street on 3rd Avenue that they're talking about was solved for a short time before we had that house there, but you guys came out with a truck and I was told that you guys were allowed access to this, took a root of my tree out with an ax and made the water run to sit in front of my house to run across the road. The water used to sit in that land, the guy's house three houses down to the south of me because it's higher elevated. Now you've got all that water coming that way and that's why we've got water across the street again.

Now, we have not seen anybody come down and put caution signs on 3rd. The water across there has been kind of treacherous. I think this is a waste of money. I think if you look at it it just washes away. The sandy soil, as I said, the PVC pipe that goes from my house to the ditch now I had to replace probably twice now in the last six years. It's sandy soil. With the cold, with the soil and with as much rain as we've got it cracks that pipe. I can prove it if you want to come down and look at my yard now. I replaced it three years ago and it's now leaking up when the sump pump goes down. Recently I think what burst it is because all the water that sat in front of the house with all the rain we had.

I think ditching is the way to go. It's a simple solution. If you walk down there, the water that we had running, you guys went down there, it took a guy all of an hour to shovel and ax and the water started flowing. It flows. There's certain ways to flow it. I hear a lot of bellyaching about \$3,000 for some pumping that needed to be done. Those people up there have a bad situation but that's what we pay taxes for. I think \$3,000 is nothing to take care of the problem.

The good points of this Village right now, I have to say the garbage disposal we're happy about that and the snow plowing this year was real good. Hands off for that. But I still think this water situation, underground it's going to be a mess just like it was on Sheridan Road. I think if you go down there, a few people get together, knock their heads together, make a few ditches and a few culverts, they get that water to go to the lake over there, 116th over there, I think it will take care of all the problem we've got and this will be over with. A lot less stress for everybody here. Thank you.

Traci Roszkowiak:

Traci Roszkowiak, R-O-S-Z-K-O-W-I-A-K. I live at 11283 3rd Avenue. My husband and I aren't even in the assessment area actually, so the money doesn't matter to us. I love living in the area. There's a lot of new homes that are built. I think the City should trash this and have it re-evaluated, this whole process. There's homes, they just built a brand new home in front of my house. There is no culvert for this guy's water to go at all. It's straight, his house goes straight.

Village Board Meeting
April 24, 2008

The whole backyard is wetlands. He can't do anything with those wetlands at all except the front yard. So where is his sump pump going? Right into my front yard. There is no culvert, no nothing. I don't understand how the City could allow that. There is a culvert where his driveway goes but no ditch. So where is his water going? There's nowhere for it to go.

And, also, we just purchased the lot right next to us to hopefully help our situation. I think that a lot of people like my other neighbors have fixed their own problem. We fixed our problem . . . our flooding in the front yard. A few years ago we started shoveling a ditch and drain it somewhere where it's going to be . . . they haven't done anything for 15 years. They're not going to do it for another 15, and I might be retired on a pension living in my house and not be able to afford the \$3 million project I think that the City is responsible. I don't think they should allow any more building in this area. What else can I say about this? I really don't think I particularly want a pipe in between my two properties, which I know you guys own a little bit of property there, but I will fight that tooth and nail. I will probably get an attorney.

Secondly, has the DNR approved this project? I see the pipe would go right next to the DNR land. Wouldn't that then drain the DNR land which is DNR's whole purpose. Lastly, there was something else I wanted to say, but thank you.

Jane Romanowski:

I don't have any more sign ups, Mr. President.

John Steinbrink:

That's all the names we had on the sign up sheet. Is there anyone else wishing to speak? Anyone else? We're going to try and answer some of the questions that were presented here this evening.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, Chris Delgado brought up the question who is the contractor. We don't know because it hasn't been designed yet.

Chris Delgado:

You just said that you had an

John Steinbrink:

Sir.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. Delgado, let me finish.

Village Board Meeting
April 24, 2008

John Steinbrink:

Maybe he can answer your question if we pay attention and listen.

Mike Pollocoff:

What we have now is an engineer that laid this out. And until the Board authorized more money to be spent to have an engineer go out and, as I indicated earlier, go out with survey instruments and locate all the exact points, the base lines, the elevations, and then once that's done then they'll know where to put everything and size it and come up with a cost, have a plan that's designed, and then put that—all the work we do unless we're doing it with our own crews, is put out to public bid by law. So everything is bid, and the bid is granted to the lowest, most responsible bidder who is qualified, has the financial wherewithal to finish the job that they start. So it is a public bid. Everything is bid publically.

With respect to mosquitoes, the Village does every year drop bags in the standing water, whether it's in the catch basin or pools of water for West Nile to control that. But nowhere in the Village do we spray or put anything out for the mosquitoes over the area. Carol Beach is a wet area, there are a lot of areas of the Village that are wet, and mosquitoes do tend to congregate in those areas and the wind will blow them if they're close by.

Mr. Swaney brought up the point about the safety for the drainage. And I heard a number of comments from people about there isn't a ditch or the ditch that goes someplace to take water to another lot, and now that water has been built upon. I think to me it speaks to the problem that we have in this area and that is two factors. One, there isn't a drainage plan that was developed for the area when it was platted in the '40s. There wasn't one that was built. The parcels were at that time in the Town of Pleasant Prairie under Kenosha County zoning, the first house out there, whatever that house is, was permitted to be constructed on a plat which is just a picture on a map with a gravel road. As time has gone on it's proceeded from there.

We can't address—this problem will not be successfully addressed with addressing drainage problems on a lot by lot basis. It can't be addressed on when a new house goes in have that person modify their drainage to get it taken away. It has to be an entire system of drainage to get it conveyed from one point to another to get the water out. The engineers and the best engineers we could hire have laid out a system that's going to eliminate standing water, have laid out a system that's going to convey water efficiently. It's going to convey water at the lowest possible cost with a mix of pipes and storm sewers.

The frustration that people have with water coming here to their parcel from another parcel or the drainage problems that occur is because there is no drainage plan. There hasn't been a plan that's been developed and been constructed. If you look at any other subdivision in the Village they don't have those problems because we've had a drainage plan to enforce and we have a plan that we can require a builder to build to and that's been adopted by the Village Board by the force of law and we can require that to happen, that doesn't exist in Carol Beach Unit 2, and it doesn't exist in almost all of Carol Beach.

Village Board Meeting
April 24, 2008

What we do have is a land use plan that was completed by a number of agencies that designated undeveloped areas that could be developed with urban services. The Village has had a policy, even when we had it as a town, that any urban improvements that are required have to be paid for by the initial property owners in the first instance, and then from that time forward the Village has to maintain it, whether it's a storm sewer, a street, a water line, a sewer line. This improvement if it was to proceed would be no different.

With respect to the power of permits, the Village of Pleasant Prairie like every other City in the State of Wisconsin is required to issue permits under the State's Uniform Dwelling Code. There is not a Pleasant Prairie building code. There's not a Kenosha building code. There's a State of Wisconsin Uniform Building Code and that's the code we issue. If the land is zoned properly and the builder meets the code for the State that person gets their permit. I do not have the power to deny somebody a permit if they meet those requirements. The law of the State assumes, I believe, that there would be improvements put in this area and there should have been improvements put in this area over time. The longer we put off putting in those improvements the more we're going to have a patchwork of fixes to solve it.

The proposal when we say it's based on old data, I indicated earlier on in the meeting this was not a design. It was based on information that existed in 2005, and before we would do any building, whether it happens now or it happens two years from now or five years from now, a surveyor and an engineering team has to go out and establish what the topography is at that point in time, because topography changes. People landscape their yards. People fill. People do all sorts of things, put buildings up. You can't do a storm water drainage plan until you go out and survey what the conditions are at the time when you're going to construct and we haven't proceeded there. The Board at our last meeting has said that there isn't enough consensus to proceed and nothing has been done.

The DNR permit for non granular fill was not violated. There was no DNR permit. The permit that was granted for filling from 1983 until 1991 was an Army Corps of Engineers' permit, and that permit that we were required to administer required filling. That was the permit we lived under. That permit has since changed. Now the DNR permit does have different standards than the Army Corps. The Village does not establish the standards. The Village lives with the standards that are given to us by the regulatory agencies.

Mr. Barry, I agree with you. You're talking about we have a whole drainage basin. This basin that we've defined is in and of itself a basin. We can't move water from this basin to 116th Street because that's in another basin. The basin differences are subtle but they're different drainage basins. That's why water doesn't drain out of Unit 2. It stays within that area. It doesn't drain naturally to 116th Street. The time that there would be a ditch that would be 34 feet wide is when the ditch would be four feet deep. We don't want to dig a ditch that's four feet deep. We don't want to do it. We won't do it. I won't allow Public Works to do it because it's not in anybody's interest. That's why ditches aren't done because as you proceed and you're trying to maintain a half of one percent grade to get the ditch going you have to make that ditch deeper. As you go farther the ditch gets deeper. As you cut through the little ridges the ditch gets deeper. That's why ditches don't proceed any farther because we don't have enough grade.

Village Board Meeting
April 24, 2008

You can't design a storm sewer system by eyeballing it and taking a look at a topographic map and laying it out. You have to use some sound engineering principles that will measure the velocity of the water, will apply the friction loss of a storm sewer pipe and apply the friction loss of a ditch when you design this water. Storm water engineering is one of the most difficult disciplines of a civil engineer. It's not something that you wing. The stakes are incredibly high. You're going to hurt somebody. You're going to flood somebody's house. You're going to create a situation where somebody is going to be in deep water. So that's why no engineer has been willing to sign the plans and put a seal on a set of plans that call for this kind of modified ditching plan because you have no control over it and you can't achieve the velocity of drainage that you need to drain in an area. I know it's less expensive and I think it might work but it's not going to happen. I won't recommend it to the Board. You haven't had an engineer recommend it to the Board. You haven't had an engineer recommend a full ditching system since 1983.

With respect to Mr. Roszkowiak's question, I don't know if I said that right, storm sewers in the Village are cleaned with a flushing truck on an annual basis. We don't want to reditch or regrade ditches unless we have to. Typically some ditches if you get the grades shallow enough you don't ever have to do it. If you can get it grassed so you can mow your ditch that turf will establish that bank, it will stay that way and it will be good. When you start getting into a ditch and you start cutting away at it, that's when the slope of the ditch starts getting away and you get silt in the ditches. It's the same as the ditches I described at 116th. You can't clean those ditches. So pipes are graded.

As far as your asphalt road - roads are redone - the life of an asphalt road is 20 years. In 15 years we may be looking at putting a minor paving overlay on it or some kind of treatment to fill up the voids in there. But the life of a road is 20 years and it gets milled up and then you repave it. So at the end of its life it does start looking at little ragged. But the Village has made a commitment that those roads get resurfaced and repaved.

The grading plan that you talked of is the one I'm familiar with, the one that was mentioned by other people in the audience to just kind of cut through a certain area. It doesn't work. Once that work was done by a developer, at that point it became obvious. That's when it was painfully obvious to the Village that at that point we were digging a ditch that was deeper than anybody wanted, and the comments that the DNR would allow us to do it in the right of way, sure they would, but there would be no right of way left. It would be a ditch that nobody would want. You're ditching to a tributary to Lake Michigan, and when it fills up and when that doesn't work, the water doesn't get out. Or, in the worse case scenario, which is what an engineer is going to design to, the water comes back from Lake Michigan up the ditchway. The water needs to be released for your safety out of a controlled structure that wills top high water from coming back into your subdivision because your subdivision is low in elevation. It's equal to the high level of the lake.

Dave Holden, he's indicated on 3rd Avenue the water crossing is dangerous and, again, you're focusing on lot-to-lot differences where water is coming from one lot to another. The reason to put in the storm sewer to convey the water out of there is so you don't have water crossing the road. And until we look at being able to get the water from this area out to a controlled outlet that will drain the water, we are going to have lot-to-lot problems. The area needs to have a storm

Village Board Meeting
April 24, 2008

sewer constructed in it. It needs to have a storm sewer and ditches constructed in order to maintain that system. Otherwise, I've told the Board and engineers have told the Board, and we've told you and I know it's news you don't want to hear, but that's what's going to take care of the water problems in the area. Anything else is going to be as described by some of the people, just try to ditch it and just move it on a little bit, move it on away from my house, but it's always going to go to someone else's property. And when it doesn't work it's going to back up to yours. The way to take care of this is to get the system designed, get it put in and be done with it.

Anything else, I think that's where we've come to this point before where no one likes paying for a special assessment. I've never heard of anybody that was excited about it. But at some point Carol Beach Unit 2 is an urbanized area and it needs to have this level of urbanized improvement otherwise the drainage in that area is not going to function to the level you want, to the level that you would expect.

Mike Serpe:

Mike, has this lot that Mr. Babcock told us has been wetland staked do we know?

Mike Pollocoff:

That lot was wetland staked. It's a unique lot in the sense that DNR did say they could have access across the wetland in order to build on the parcel. The Village--I guess I take exception with Mr. Babcock's statement that we should be looking at only what the residents want in the area. Because, again, if the DNR certifies that lot as buildable that property owner has rights on that lot and they're able to build on it. The Village Board, the Plan Commission, is charged with the authority under DNR rules to comply with DNR regulations. If that means somebody can't build you're required to enforce that. That means if somebody is given a permit to be able to do that you are required to enforce that, too. You can't take away that unless, again, the Village is willing to buy the lot.

So if every regulation says that someone can build on it--and you've got to remember what's different here than any other part of the Village - the lots are determined to be buildable only because the wetlands are not significant. The DNR is not addressing the ability of these lots to convey water away from the lot. They're not looking at anything else. What has determined buildability in Carol Beach under the Chiwaukee Prairie Plan is whether or not the wetlands are significant. It's probably the single greatest flaw with that land use plan, but that's the plan that's in place. That's why, in the case of Unit 2, the Army Corps of Engineers said in 1983 in this area if it's going to be built it needs a skeletal storm sewer system because it won't work. And until that's put in, and until we deal with that, it's still not going to work.

That's going to be a difficult lot to live on and it's going to be a difficult lot to live next to, but I guess it represents what happens when you take wetland stakings to its ultimate conclusion. The staff recommended to DNR not to certify that as buildable but they did.

Village Board Meeting
April 24, 2008

John Steinbrink:

I've closed the public hearing but I'll allow questions. Ma'am, I'll need you to come to the microphone and give us your name and address.

Pauline Chlebek:

Pauline Chlebek, 11360 Lakeshore Drive. Did the DNR come out to see that lot before they said okay?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes. The staking was done by a biologist and a surveyor.

Pauline Chlebek:

Were they blind?

Mike Pollocoff:

The staking was done by a biologist and a surveyor.

Pauline Chlebek:

They should come out and see it now.

Mike Pollocoff:

And then after that staking is done then the DNR comes out and makes a determination, and at that point they indicated that wetland could be broached in the front to go to that. Jean Werbie opposed that determination. It held up for a while. The Plan Commission held it up for a while, but at the end of the discussion the DNR still made the determination that that crossing would be allowed to be able to build on the lot.

Pauline Chlebek:

Because I remember, I'll be here 15 years come November, and I remember if you had small wetland on your property you couldn't build on it. Now you've got this whole big giant lake there and it's okay?

Mike Pollocoff:

Wetland regulations evolve. You're right, at one point if there was any wetlands on it you couldn't touch it and that's changed.

Village Board Meeting
April 24, 2008

Pauline Chlebek:

Even though people are getting slaughtered on 3rd and 4th because of that kind of situation?

Mike Pollocoff:

The DNR's feeling is, to be honest with you, is that they were opposed to the development, the urbanization of Unit 2, and this is part of the price that has to be paid. They opposed it and you look at the proceedings from the Chiwaukee Land Use Plan, they said that you'll have these problems and this area shouldn't be developed. And the only reason it's developed is because the wetlands aren't as significant. When a subdivision is designed today or even 20 years ago, one of the things that the Village looks at is what's the suitability of the soils, what's the drainage plan, a grading plan has to be established. All these things that you're being frustrated with for a long time have been requirements, but none of that exists in your subdivision. Consequently the lots were less expensive when they were built on because there were no improvements. That's why this area as far as zoning is identified as a Limited Urban Service Area.

Pauline Chlebek:

We're the losers down on—

Mike Pollocoff:

We're limited in the urban services we can provide.

Pauline Chlebek:

Okay, this has not been approved, correct?

Mike Pollocoff:

No.

Pauline Chlebek:

And you have to get an engineer to come out and do surveys and all that stuff, correct?

Mike Pollocoff:

If we were to proceed with this the Village Board would conduct another hearing where they would send a letter to the residents notifying that they're going to, it's called a resolution of intent to levy special assessments. If they adopted that resolution, then we would at that point say that we are going to levy a special assessment. We'd give the estimated amount of what that would be, and based on that and the commitment that the Village is going to do the work, surveying would be identifying everything that we would need to be able to build the storm sewer, design it, define the exact boundaries of the drainage basin, all those things, and then put it out to

Village Board Meeting
April 24, 2008

bid. When the project comes in– the estimate we have here is an estimate. When we levy the assessment it's based on what the actuals are, what the actual basin is, what the actual expenses are.

Pauline Chlebek:

Now, this engineer will probably cost \$30,000 or \$40,000. Could you use that money to ditch 3rd and 4th Avenue to see if it would work?

Mike Pollocoff:

My recommendation to the Village Board is not to do that because they've already had good engineers tell them it will not work.

Pauline Chlebek:

But if you walk down 3rd and 4th one house would have a ditch and culvert, the next house would have nothing. And then two houses down you'd have a culvert, a ditch, a culvert, a culvert a ditch, a culvert and then two more houses wouldn't have anything.

Mike Pollocoff:

We've looked at that. The Village constructs ditches all the time. We have engineers design them. We can't design one that works there. That's why there isn't anything there.

John Steinbrink:

I think Mr. Barry said it best when he said he opposes the project but he wants a solution. Right now the only viable solution the Village has is the project or the plan you're looking at tonight. That's the only one any engineer will put his name on or his stamp of approval. And we want guidelines for the new houses to follow but we need guidelines for him to follow. And the project that's before you that could be approved tonight provides those guidelines. So it's a catch 22 here. We're not going to go out and dig a ditch that no engineer will put his name on and say it's going to work because–

Pauline Chlebek:

That lady right there she does her own ditch and it's fine and it's working for her.

John Steinbrink:

So she needs to design it for the Village and put her name on it, and if it doesn't work then we all have to go visit her and get our money back. That's how it works. Ma'am I can't have a back and forth here.

Village Board Meeting
April 24, 2008

Pauline Chlebek:

Okay, one more thing. It says right in the letter here the proposed storm sewer system plan would not alleviate local flooding during major storm events. So that means if this is done and it doesn't work so we're spending money for naught?

Mike Pollocoff:

No. What it means is that during a major event—

Pauline Chlebek:

A major event.

Mike Pollocoff:

It's going to work - it will take a while to drain because we can't install a typical system in that area. So that's why this is a smaller system. So it will always get away. So instead of getting away in six or seven days or four days, it will get away in six hours or seven hours. That's the difference. You're not talking about it not working at all. It just doesn't work as fast as a regular storm sewer system.

Pauline Chlebek:

And if it doesn't work at all?

Mike Pollocoff:

If it doesn't work at all then at that point the Village Board goes back to the engineer that designed this and put his seal on it and initiates a legal action saying that you designed this, you said it was going to work, you're liable for it and you have to make it work. I can't do that with Babcock and say, okay, Bob, it didn't work, what are you going to do? I can't find an engineer that's willing to take his idea and say, yeah, I'll put my seal on it and I'll assume the liability for that design.

Pauline Chlebek:

It just seems to me like everybody was conformed with the swale or ditch and the culvert, that it would work. Everything would kind of flow instead of just stop at one spot. That's all. Thank you.

Mike Serpe:

Somebody, a couple, accused the Village of not doing their job someplace. And to a point maybe you're right. In 1985 it was recommended that a storm sewer system be put in this area and it wasn't done. And every time this has come forward, ever since I've been on the Board since

Village Board Meeting
April 24, 2008

1989, the residents objected to the cost involved with the project. So we went with the residents' request not to do the project. And just as sure as I'm sitting here tonight we'll all be back here again next year if we don't get this done. At some point in time we have to get together, bite the bullet, get this project done so we can stop these annual meetings where we're screaming at each other because that's not going to accomplish anything.

(Inaudible)

Mike Serpe:

And we appreciate that and it's the same thing every year. Mike, you didn't bring the stack of engineering studies in the room tonight, but there is an astronomical amount of study and money and data compiled on what's going to make this project work. It's the best we have to offer, and as Mike just said if it fails the engineer becomes responsible to make it work. But I think two things. If we're going to move this on to a public hearing to adopt the resolution, I strongly suggest because of the sensitivity of this and with respect to everybody that has to come here again, that we schedule it as we did tonight, just a by itself meeting. I don't want to include it with an agenda that's going to be two or three hours long and then we're going to get to this. I think we should do this as a special meeting. And I seriously think, people, we just have to get this done. It has to happen and that's the only thing that's going to stop us from these confrontational annual meetings that we have about drainage in Carol Beach. Let's just do it.

Monica Yuhas:

I'd like to thank everyone for coming out tonight. This is my first term on the Board, and I do want you to know I have been out there four or five times within the last year looking at water issues. I met with Mr. Swaney last year. I met with Bob. I've driven during heavy rainfalls. I've also met with Mike and I went through files reading studies, reading engineering plans, meeting with public works, meeting with the superintendent and engineers, having them explain to me what it's going to take to solve this water issue problem in Carol Beach Unit 2.

As an elected official you face a hard decision. You have to do what's in the best interest of the Village and its residents. And moving forward with this plan is that next step. So I don't want anyone to leave here thinking that we haven't investigated, we haven't read, we haven't done our homework. I know I have and this isn't a decision that I have processed taking lightly. It's been an ongoing decision, an ongoing situation for a long time. It's something I've been thinking very long and hard about, but it's something that does need to be done.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I would like to answer Mr. Saiyed. I do have an accent, too, and everybody here knows that. I kind of resent when you make implications about my behavior . . . when I was shaking my head I was listening to what you said about the assessment, high assessment due to the project. And I was thinking right there is Rocco right at the end of the room is the one who makes the assessment. Furthermore, I have been at Lakeshore many, many times. Mr. Babcock and . . . a lot of people here saw me go to Unit 2 many, many times in the 14 years I have been at this table.

Village Board Meeting
April 24, 2008

Always I have been respectful and always I listen to the people. And if you call me I will go to your house same as I did other times. So it was not my intention to be disrespectful. So, sir, in that instance you were wrong . . . I never did that and I never will.

Aslam Saiyed:

(Inaudible)

John Steinbrink:

Sir, if you want to discuss this with Steve later that will be fine. We've closed the public hearing. You can comment to us after the meeting. We're going to be here afterwards and you can talk to us. The comment was made people haven't seen Board members down there. I think we've all been down there. We've gone through whether it's a road issue, a lake issue. For some of us it starts way back in the beginning with the Chiwaukee Prairie agreement. If you remember back when 1st Avenue was under water when the lake used to be high, we were there and we were making sure the road was protected. We get calls from different residents down there, we respond and we go down there. Unfortunately, if we're there when you're not home we apologize for that. But give me a call and tell me when it's dinnertime and I'll show up.

Clyde Allen:

Thank you everybody that did come tonight. I know it's getting late and people are leaving and do have a place to go. Probably after thinking about this for quite a while now, listening to some of the residents one on one, listening to what you had to say tonight, the number one thing that really, really strikes me is that those that want ditching if you can't get an engineer to sign the document to allow a ditching project what are you going to do? It means you're going to come back again next year, just as Mike brought up and I'm not going to bring up what others have talked about.

But we're in a situation where something does need to be done and I agree. And I certainly do not like the thought that a majority of people don't like something, and assessing money to people is not a fun thing to do, and I certainly do not want to do it if you didn't have to. I really wish everybody would take this home, think about it. Ditching would be fine if it would work, if you could get an engineer to do something and sign off on it. But if they won't what do we do? Think about it and I really wish you'd really put some thought into this project.

John Steinbrink:

If there are no further Board comments that would conclude the public informational hearing and we'd move for adjournment. Members will be here after the meeting if you wish to talk with them or exchange other ideas.

Village Board Meeting
April 24, 2008

Mike Serpe:

John, I think we need a motion to authorize the Administrator to bring this forward and set a public hearing.

Mike Pollocoff:

To adopt the initial resolution to have a public hearing.

Mike Serpe:

And, again, I would give strong consideration to keeping this a by itself meeting, no other items on the agenda except that.

Monica Yuhas:

I'll second.

John Steinbrink:

A motion by Mike, second by Monica.

SERPE MOVED TO DIRECT STAFF TO PREPARE AN INITIAL RESOLUTION AND TO SCHEDULE A STORM WATER IMPROVEMENT HEARING FOR THE CAROL BEACH ESTATES UNIT 2 AREA; SECONDED BY YUHAS; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

4. ADJOURNMENT.

YUHS MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0 AND MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:20 P.M.