

**VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE
PLEASANT PRAIRIE VILLAGE BOARD
PLEASANT PRAIRIE WATER UTILITY
LAKE MICHIGAN SEWER UTILITY DISTRICT
SEWER UTILITY DISTRICT "D"
9915 39th Avenue
Pleasant Prairie, WI
September 2, 2008
6:30 p.m.**

A Regular Meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Village Board was held on Tuesday, September 2, 2008. Meeting called to order at 6:30 p.m. Present were Village Board members John Steinbrink, Monica Yuhas, Steve Kumorkiewicz, Clyde Allen and Mike Serpe. Also present were Michael Pollocoff, Village Administrator; Peggy Herrick, Assistant Village Planner; Tom Shircel, Assistant Village Planner; and Jane Romanowski, Village Clerk.

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

John Steinbrink:

Before we go to Item 4, I'd like to call up Dustin Ellis, one of our Firemedics. Our guys were out there working the streets this weekend dodging traffic out there and did a pretty good job. Dustin, maybe you can explain to us what we have.

Dustin Ellis:

Good evening. My name is Firemedic Dustin Ellis. I work for the Fire and Rescue Department here. Sunday we were all out at two locations, Highway 50 and H and 39th Avenue and 93rd Street. We were out there taking donations for the Muscular Dystrophy Association. Labor Day is the big push for firefighters to take donations and to donate to this organization. We were out there four hours at both locations, 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. with approximately 16 people between the two locations. Collectively in those four hours we managed to get \$10,018.08 to donate to the MDA. We're here tonight to present this check to Cyrus in the Village. Cyrus is the Southeastern Wisconsin Ambassador for the MDA in Wisconsin, so on behalf of us, the Fire and Rescue Department, we are here to present this check to you.

—:

On behalf of Cyrus and the Muscular Dystrophy Association, as his father I'd like to thank all the firefighters for coming out, doing this for the first time in Pleasant Prairie. Cyrus is the State Good Will Ambassador. He has been the local Ambassador for the past two years and the State Ambassador this year. He's traveled all over the State of Wisconsin promoting the Muscular Dystrophy Association. And on behalf of him and all the children that suffer from MDA we couldn't do this without your help, the firefighters' help. They are the number one fundraiser across the country. I just wanted to thank all of them again. Thank you very much.

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

John Steinbrink:

Thank you, Dustin, and all the folks that worked with you and did such a great job. Cyrus, keep up the good work there. Hopefully a check is going to help get things done. Dad, thank you. Let me tell you, that's no easy feat standing out there in traffic holding that boot out there and keeping track of the cars and collecting money at the same time. I think we're all pretty proud of the work these guys do on a regular basis, and this is one of those jobs they do above and beyond. So thank you guys.

4. MINUTES OF MEETINGS - AUGUST 18, 2008

Monica Yuhas:

Move to approve.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

YUHAS MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 18, 2008 VILLAGE BOARD MEETING AS PRESENTED IN THEIR WRITTEN FORM; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

5. CITIZEN COMMENTS

John Braig:

John Braig, 4707 84th Street. Mrs. Yuhas, gentlemen, in the past on rare occasion I would get a contact or maybe a piece of correspondence from someone that had a specific interest in an item that was going to be on the agenda at a Plan Commission meeting. In this past week I've received three contacts from people who are quite disturbed with the action of the Plan Commission on approving the change in the ordinance for recreational vehicles. And with hindsight I see some of their points and I don't know if I would vote the same way that I did.

But I think we're running into quite a bit of concern that we're going to have vehicles sitting in driveways rather in plain view for much if not all of the summer, maybe even more of the year. I wonder if maybe this should be reconsidered, maybe get some public input on it see if there's some other views on what we've got in front of us right now. Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you, John.

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

Bonita Patterson:

My name is Bonita Patterson. I live at 4410 Beverly Lane. I am one of the people that have been, here's my notice. I had to move my travel trailer. I bought this brand new last year. It's a beautiful trailer. I have a 65 foot driveway. My trailer is only 30 feet long. It does not go anywhere near the roadway. It is not in violation of any kind of ordinance. We don't use it. It's not plugged in. We do not have the feet down. This is the first thing I've ever owned. I've used my mother's little inheritance she gave me to buy this and I cannot keep it on my property 24/7 to watch over it now.

This paper said that if I leave it there I get a \$666 a day fine for leaving it there if I didn't move it by a certain date. I think that's kind of high. I'm on a forced income. My husband and I are retired. This is another additional expense I have to pay now which is burdening us to have it stored somewhere where I can't have it in my possession. I worry about it daily because storage spaces aren't as safe. This is my kitchen. This is my home when I'm not here. It's a beautiful trailer. This is my dining room which is also in the trailer and the living area. And I have a TV and entertainment area, swivel chair. I mean it's just my home away from home. It's everything I've invested my money in. I feel that because I am not in violation I have 35 feet in front of my trailer between my trailer and the road and nobody around me complained. I asked neighbors on either side of me and across the street from me and none of said that it bothered them. Why somebody had to complain and do this I don't know, but it just worries the daylight out of me leaving it somewhere else. I think if the amendment is done and the ordinance is changed I would feel a lot better having my property back on my personal property of my home. Thank you.

Gerri Mayew:

I'm Gerri Mayew. My husband is Don Mayew. He was not able to be here this evening, but we share the same point of view with respect to changing the zoning ordinance for recreational vehicles. We are opposed to it. The zoning ordinance currently states that parking of recreational vehicles is permitted outside in the side yard or near yard provided it's no closer than five feet to the lot line. Such vehicles shall be screened from adjacent properties and public view with a solid six foot high wooden fence per number 420-81 of this chapter. This has not been done in the past not only by the people who live across the street from us, but up the street at the corner of 47th Street and Beverly Lane there has been frequently parked a semi trailer, just the front of it, but it's a large, high vehicle in the driveway. With respect to our neighbor's camper, it's 30 feet but it's also several feet high. It's very visible when I look at my front window. Instead of seeing beautiful trees that's what I see.

But, anyway, the ordinance also states that these recreational vehicles shall not be parked in the driveway in the street yard. So that is a violation of the ordinance. Now, what's wrong with the present ordinance? Why should neighbors be subjected to looking at ugly, huge recreational vehicles when we're living in a residential area? Just because a prior candidate made the ticketing of such vehicles a political issue in a campaign, is this new proposal good public policy

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

for the majority of Pleasant Prairie citizens? Is this, rather, a knee jerk reaction to a past issue raised by a questionable candidate? Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you. I know Don couldn't be here tonight but he got hold of me and filled me in.

Bob Ramsdell:

My name is Bob Ramsdell. I live at 8305 43rd Avenue in Beverly Woods. Gerri is . . . but I have to say this, I don't know why this is being pushed so rapidly. You come out with an article in the *Kenosha News* on Saturday and during the holiday where many people have not even read the paper. Now, why has this got to be pushed through tonight? And if there is any action taken I would propose it be laid over until a different meeting. Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you, Bob. Anyone else wishing to speak under citizens' comments?

Bud DeBoer:

Bud DeBoer. I own property at 2401 Springbrook. We come in Pleasant Prairie occasionally with our motor home for a few weeks or whatever and visit our kids in town and then we're gone. Where I've parked I have my property and I haven't had any complaints on it. We have a sewer dump right along the building. If we do fill up which normally we don't we pull it over there and dump it into the sewer dump so I see no reason. First of all, I don't understand what the old ordinance really said. I got a call this afternoon over in Watertown where we spend the summer normally, and they said, Bud, you better get to Pleasant Prairie because they've got something on tonight about RV's and boats and motors and snowmobiles and you name it.

So I don't really know what you propose to change because I haven't read the ordinance. I got the call. I don't know what the old ordinance was, but I feel as long as we have license on the vehicle, be it a motor home or a trailer or a car or snowmobile if it calls for it, as long as there's a license and it's on your own property and it's not an eyesore along the street I see no reason why we should be subject to any penalty. That's all I had to say.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you, Bud. Anyone else wishing to speak? Yes, ma'am?

Patricia Hahn:

I live at 8323 43rd. First of all—

Jane Romanowski:

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

Your name please.

Patricia Hahn:

Oh, I'm sorry. Patricia Hahn. You're looking at the value of your house. If I'm going to try to sell my house and somebody has got a camper they've parked there for six months or eight months I don't know whether it runs or not. I've had trouble in my back yard with people that have left cars there that don't run. I think you're encouraging that same thing in the front of the houses. So I park a camper out there and all of a sudden it's defunct. Can I leave it sit? Do you want to sell a house with that kind of stuff? No. They've got places to keep campers. I think a garage or someplace safe. But as far as the value of my house goes I don't want to be selling to somebody and say that's a boat and motor and a camper and whatever else they want to leave out there. We're encouraging people to keep the front of their houses looking nice and I think that's very important. Like I said, I've had trouble getting cars in back yards that aren't running anymore in Pleasant Prairie. I finally said to the guy you've got to get it out of there, because if they don't see it they're going to leave it back in those yards and then you're going to have a junk yard. And I don't really think we want to. Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you. Yes, sir?

John Huxhold:

My name is John Huxhold. I live at 10636 32nd Avenue. I don't really understand why the Village, which has done an excellent job in developments throughout this area in making their streets look beautiful, you ride up and down some of these subdivisions, we developed the subdivision next to Foxmoor, drive down through the subdivisions and see how beautiful it looks, and then just plan a couple huge campers. It looks like you're putting a billboard in a residential area having this camper sit there day and night constantly, campers. You're inviting the people to have big huge snowmobile trailers and trailers with dirt bikes and motorcycles. I go into a lot of subdivisions. That's what I do as part of my work. I go into a lot of subdivisions mainly in Illinois. If you want to see some real disasters look at some of these subdivisions that are allowing people to put recreational vehicles in nice subdivisions. I really think this would be a major step backwards. The Village has restrictions on a lot having the grass grow so high and having that cut down, and here you're thinking of allowing people to put huge campers and recreational vehicles in driveways? It just doesn't make sense. You've done an excellent job building this community. Don't waste it on making an ordinance like this. Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you. Anyone else wishing to speak? Yes, ma'am?

Barbara Ward:

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

Barbara Ward, 4344 123rd Street. I guess my comments are more towards the audience because everyone here at the Board was here at the meetings where this recreational vehicle issue came up several months ago. It was in the paper, it was at the meetings, it was discussed very fully here. The public was invited to join us in rewriting the ordinance because the old ordinance was not being enforced, was not enforceable. And three people showed up, my husband, myself and one other gentleman to work on this ordinance and nobody else did.

Now, I do have a little bit of a problem with the fact that I was out of town myself camping and was brought the newspaper and it was put in the newspaper the other day and just happened we were home in time to come to tonight's meeting, because what we had proposed had been changed a little bit. I do have a problem with having to put down gravel or concrete as a base to park it on a side yard or in the front yard. That's a permanent type thing. Our motor home is not at our home during the summer because we leave it where we camp. And, therefore, if you have this base there you've got that to look at all summer instead of grass. And the only time ours is there at the side of our garage which has been okayed by our next door neighbor is during the winter when the view is not so great anyhow. It's between the two garages.

So I don't believe this is being pushed through as some people think. I would like to address that part that was changed and what we had proposed as far as the base. A lot of this was based on the fact that there were so many out there that it wasn't being enforced, and there was only certain people being pinged on either by a previous Board member, or personally we had certain neighbors, a neighbor, that just wanted to go up and down the street and that's what I would like addressed, too. Who, if this does not pass, who can complain, I mean how far away can they live and still complain about what's on your residence? Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Yes, sir?

Gregg Guttormsen:

Good evening. Gregg Guttormsen, 8307 43rd Avenue. I just walked in a little late so I haven't heard all the comments, but I get the impression from what I've heard that the majority here seems to favor not changing the existing ordinance and I would have to join in with the crowd that supports that position. I just heard something about a question or problem with enforceability and so forth. From my perspective if an ordinance isn't being enforced that doesn't mean you change the ordinance. What you do is you start enforcing it with whatever it takes. So the fact that it's not being enforced I don't think really carries a lot of water in terms of whether this is a good thing or bad thing.

I'm not sure if any of the Board members have ever lived next door to a home where a large recreational vehicle has been parked on a regular basis. I can tell you that I have and it's extremely unsightly. It's pretty much a neighborhood nuisance from the perspective of most of the neighbors who have to look out their window and see it. I have to assume that none of you would like to look out of your bedroom windows in the morning and see a 30 foot long RV

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

parked there for the majority of the year. It's unsightly. It's a nuisance whether it's an RV or a boat or snowmobile trailers or whatever.

There was an ordinance put in place quite some time ago to deal with this issue because evidently the Board at that time seemed to think this was a need because this was a problem in the community. My question is what has changed since then? If it's simply only a question of difficult to enforce then I think we need to look at more of an enforcement procedure. But if there is no real change in circumstances between the time the ordinance was originally adopted and today, then I'm really not sure why this issue is being brought up for reconsideration. There was a good reason for it when it was adopted. I think a good reason remains for it today simply because we want to protect the aesthetics and the integrity of our neighborhoods and not allow them to look like RV lots and boat trailer lots and so forth. Let's keep them looking residential and keep the large vehicles out of the driveways because the only people who don't seem to mind them are those people who own them and I think they are in the minority. Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Anyone else wishing to speak? Anyone else? Hearing none I'm going to close citizens' comments.

Mike Serpe:

While we still have the people here, at the Plan Commission meeting I was one of the guys, like John, voted in favor of this. And I asked the question of who from the citizen group was contact for their input. Peggy, I think the answer was you sent the letter out and no responses?

Peggy Herrick:

No. An e-mail was sent to someone who inquired once they saw the notice.

Mike Pollocoff:

As one of the speakers indicated, this issue arose last year, and as an outgrowth of that we held an information meeting and advertised it for residents to come wherever they stood on the issue and help us modernize the ordinance. The Village had an ordinance that was in place adopted in 1983. It's not that old as far as ordinances go, but we haven't had success in being able to prosecute violations through court on violations of the ordinance. We've consequently the enforcement if you can't get a conviction pretty soon you don't work at that anymore.

The other thing that's happened that led to the Plan Commission and the Board looking at rewriting the ordinance is that RV's in 1983 were different than they are today. When the old ordinance calls for screening of an RV, some of the RV's a six foot fence means nothing. You've still got another five feet of RV that you're looking at. They're big devices. They're expensive. If you go throughout the Village there's a lot of RV's that people are using. In Pleasant Prairie the lots are a larger size typically than City lots, and one of the reasons people get them is they've

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

got toys that they use. And so the comments that we received when we did have a workshop or a session to take a look at the ordinance is what got us to the point we're at.

There was from the staff's perspective things that we felt, given the fact that we can only enforce what really can go through court, we brought that back to a reasonable perspective. One of the weaknesses of the older ordinance, of the existing ordinance at this time, is that when we go in to cite them the RV could be there, and by the time you've gone to court the RV is gone or has been used or has changed place and then we can't make the citation stick. It's kind of like the junk vehicle ordinance. Somebody actually gets a vehicle up and running, moves it, it's still a piece of junk and it's unsightly but we're not able to make it stick.

So the old ordinance it wasn't from lack of desire to enforce it, it was really a lack of being able to convict it. And the fact that people—we'll just pick one class of RV now, if it's the Winnebago or a bus or whatever, people in the summer use those, load them up, they might as one of the speakers said take it to wherever they're going for the summer, but some people take it on long weekends, they bring it home, unload it, and load it up before they go the next weekend and it stays in the driveway.

We didn't want the driveways to be in the street. We wanted them to be on a hard packed surface so we didn't have a process where an RV had weeds growing around it or the next step is parking it on the lawn. We felt by having that hard surface that's why that should be there. I guess as we get to that item on the agenda the Board has a number of options they can take. You can send it back to Plan Commission for consideration. You can send it back to Plan Commission and ask that they again go through the process or invite people to come in and help write the ordinance like we did last time or modify it and go through it.

We didn't try to get this thing through in a fast process. Like I said, we really have kind of been working on this over a year. Not nonstop but as we had time to get to it we took it up to the Plan Commission last Monday, it showed up in the *Kenosha News* this weekend I think, and that's—

Mike Serpe:

I certainly don't want anybody to feel that this Board is pushing anything through on the residents. That's not our intent here and it never would be. But I'm thoroughly convinced that maybe this needs to be looked at again with a little bit more thought involved and maybe a citizen committee with the staff could look at this. I don't want to rush into this. I know we're close to the budget part of the year for the Village and that's kind of very labor intensive. So when this item comes forward I'm going to recommend that we table it and send it back for further review and maybe iron out some compromises here that everybody can live with if that's at all possible.

John Steinbrink:

Maybe we have a collective group here this evening and we can find more people that would be willing to work on this to get more input from both sides and, as Mike said, come to a compromise.

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

Clyde Allen:

The only comment I want to make is rushing into it I think hardly. The Board passed a resolution in March of 2007 to take a look at it and bring it back. So for 18 months we're not rushing into anything. And those people that did show up for the citizens' workshop, work session, whatever you want to call it, had their input and showed why the old ordinance was not good, what needed to be done, what needed to be changed. So I kind of don't like the idea of anybody saying we're rushing into something after 18 months or 17 months. It's just not the case.

Mike Serpe:

What I meant by rushing, Clyde, was from this point forward that we push this thing through without further review and that's all I'm saying.

John Steinbrink:

Other Board comment or question?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

John, we have to remember that the old ordinance was passed by the County due to at the time we were a Township and we were under County ordinance. There were a lot of issues at that time that today are completely different. At that time the County didn't even consider what happens with corner lots when the setbacks are different in a regular lot. They didn't take into consideration of that. A corner lot has two sides, has two setbacks, it can be 30 feet in each side in the corner. So which one is the front, which one is the back, which one is the side. That's one of the issues that was not taken into consideration by the County at the time. So I'm not going to . . . this because we will discuss it later on—

John Steinbrink:

I have a suggestion here. Why don't we move Item D up to the front of the agenda. Right now we're discussing this as if it's up already. So, Steve if you'd make a motion—

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I make a motion to move up Item D.

Monica Yuhas:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

Motion by Steve, second by Monica to move Item D to the head of the agenda here and act on it at this time.

KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO CONSIDER NEW BUSINESS ITEM D; SECONDED BY YUHAS; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

7. NEW BUSINESS

D. Consider Ordinance #08-49 to amend Section 420-49 E of the Village Zoning Ordinance related to recreational vehicles.

John Steinbrink:

This way we can just do it in a little better more legal manner here.

Peggy Herrick:

Let me give a brief presentation. On March 19, 2007, the Village Board adopted Resolution #07-07 to evaluate the regulations in the zoning ordinance related to storage and parking of recreational vehicles. The Village staff has evaluated the ordinance and are proposing to amend Section 420-49 E of the Village ordinance related to recreational vehicles.

This ordinance specifically states that military vehicles and equipment are not recreational vehicles and that they are not allowed to be stored inside a building within any residential district, agricultural district or any upland resource conservancy district. I just want to add as well there were some comments about semi trucks and things like that, there's a whole separate ordinance related to those and those are not allowed in residential districts. And as far as junk vehicles there's a whole other section that deals with those vehicles as well.

This ordinance still allows for two recreational vehicles to be stored outside of a building, however the ordinance provides for greater flexibility for storing of recreational vehicles on properties from May 1st until October 31st of each year.

From May 1st until October 31st recreational vehicles may be parked or stored in the front street yard, the side street yard, the rear street yard, the side yard or the rear yard provided that recreational vehicles are parked on a compacted gravel or paved driveway surface that meets the minimum setback requirements for a driveway pursuant to the driveway requirements in Section 420-46. Said vehicle is set back a minimum of five feet from side property lines, rear property lines and rear street property lines. Said vehicle is set back a minimum of 15 feet from a side street property line, and set back a minimum of five feet from a front street property line.

From November 1st until April 30th a recreational vehicle may be parked or stored in the front street yard, side street yard, rear street yard, side yard or rear yard provided that the following are met. Again, it needs to be parked on a compacted gravel or paved driveway surface that meets the minimum requirements for a driveway. The vehicle is to be set back a minimum of five feet

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

from any side property line, rear property line or rear street property line. Said vehicle is set back a minimum of 15 feet from any side street property line and 30 feet from any front street property line.

On August 25, 2008, the Plan Commission did hold a public hearing and did recommend five to two that the Village Board approve this zoning text amendment.

Mike Pollocoff:

I might add that is a change as far as using an RV for living in it. The only thing that the ordinance modification addresses is those items that Peggy addressed is where the vehicle could be placed in the season that is addressed in the ordinance. It can't be used for living in it. You can't be hooking it up to have somebody stay there. It's the location and the time of year that that location is used.

Mike Serpe:

I think it would be wise for this Board to reconsider, at least review this again and maybe make some modifications where need be, and possibly get the citizens' group together and work on some type of compromise. This is going to be difficult to create an ordinance for recreational vehicles that's going to be acceptable to everybody. It's going to be nearly impossible. But concerns were raised tonight obviously from one neighborhood, and I think it's not going to hurt us to just table this for a little while, look it over and if there's some kind of corrections we can make that's going to be acceptable to the majority that would be great. So I'd move to table.

Mike Pollocoff:

As a point of order, I guess I'd recommend that if we're going to modify the ordinance it probably should go back to Plan Commission. Maybe the motion could be rather than having the Board table it and hold it, we recommend that it be sent back to Plan Commission. The direction you're stating is to have a citizen advisory group meet with staff and anybody from the Commission who wants to.

Mike Serpe:

I'll correct my motion to send it back to Plan.

Monica Yuhas:

I'll second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Mike, second by Monica. Any further discussion on the motion?

Clyde Allen:

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

Yes, I'm going to oppose sending it back to Plan Commission for the simple reason that the motion went five to two. You have someone here that has input right now on the Board. Any ideas of corrections to make modifications to this ordinance can be done now. Those that were there realize what has occurred since the County passed their ordinance to restrict recreational vehicles. I'll give you an example. Along 57th Avenue I can give you that specific example because that's my neighborhood as to what happened. There are people in that neighborhood right now that may not own a recreational vehicle the way the ordinance is written. At the time this was written, 57th Avenue had field behind it. Since this time, 56th Avenue went through. It now means every home back there may not park a recreational vehicle in their back yard along that street. On 57th Avenue and 56th Avenue along 82nd Street that gentleman may not own a recreational vehicle because he doesn't have the room to put it anywhere and he'd be in violation. There's a lot more to it, and those that were at that citizens' meeting heard all these issues come up, and I think that really needs to be considered. And I think 18 months has been a long time in getting this done.

John Steinbrink:

Other comment or question. We have a motion and a second on the floor for returning it to the Planning Commission, and when we come to Item A under correspondence, the petition to create an ordinance prohibiting vehicle parking more than 24 hours in front of a residence other than a person's, I'm going to ask that that be sent at the same time. We're going to receive it, but it will be sent to the Planning Commission also.

Mike Pollocoff:

That's not a zoning item, no. That's for vehicle parking.

John Steinbrink:

Alright, not in terms of this one. Motion and a second. Those in favor?

SERPE MOVED TO SEND ORDINANCE #08-49 BACK TO THE PLAN COMMISSION FOR CONSIDERATION AND IN THE MEANTIME, SET UP A MEETING FOR THE CITIZENS TO GIVE THEIR INPUT; SECONDED BY YUHAS; MOTION CARRIED 4-1 WITH ALLEN DISSENTING.

John Steinbrink:

Motion carries four-one. That brings us back to the agenda and I want to thank everybody for coming out this evening. As you can see it's a difficult issue and we've got people that work on the ordinance that would like to see some changes also on portions of it and people that may have missed it and want to become involved in it. It's going to be an interesting process here, so I hope everybody gives us a hand in working on this, because the final product is what's going to affect you and your neighborhoods or you and your motor vehicle depending how it is there. I've already closed it, sir, but if you have one quick comments.

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

(Inaudible)

John Steinbrink:

We're trying to get a product that will work for everybody. It's not going to be an easy product and it's not going to make everybody happy as Trustee Serpe said in the end, but hopefully it's going to be something that's going to be fair and it's going to work for everybody. As Clyde says, the Village is changing. Where we once had open fields behind the homes we now have more homes, but people have vehicles and they need a way to properly store them and use them. It becomes a real issue out there. I want to thank everybody for coming out this evening. I'm not going to open up any more, ma'am, just because we don't have a public hearing on that schedule this evening. How will people get in touch with us, Peggy, if they want to have input in this process?

Peggy Herrick:

We can take the names of the people that spoke tonight and get in touch with them when we might hold a meeting.

John Steinbrink:

If we could set up in the back—

Peggy Herrick:

Jane will have their names of everybody that spoke.

John Steinbrink:

Jane has everybody that spoke, and if somebody didn't speak and they want to have more input—

Mike Pollocoff:

The other thing we'll do is we'll put something on our website on Channel 25 again asking for people to come and volunteer some time and sit down and look at this if that's what the Planning Commission directs us to do.

John Steinbrink:

So we now move back and the ball is in the Planning Commission's court.

Mike Pollocoff:

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

Right.

6. CORRESPONDENCE

A. Receive Petition to create an ordinance prohibiting vehicle parking for more than 24 hours in front of a residence other than the person's own residence.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, we received a petition for illegal parking. It's really a petition to create an ordinance to govern parking. The ordinance reads, We, the undersigned residents living in the Becker park area, ask the Pleasant Prairie Board to support us in creating an ordinance that states vehicle parking for more than twenty-four (24) hours in the frontage of a residence, other than that person's own residence, is illegal. After twenty-four hours the vehicle must be removed to a different location. And there's 22 signatures on the petition. My request is that this be referred to staff to review.

I've talked to a couple of the neighbors where the problems seem to be more prevalent, and we'll be setting up a meeting to meet with them and see if there's a way we can get this worked out without having to create an ordinance that's going to govern the entire Village. So I'd ask that this item be referred to staff and brought back.

Mike Serpe:

Move to receive the petition and refer it to staff.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second. Those in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? Would you like discussion?

Clyde Allen:

Yes.

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

John Steinbrink:

We're going to hold up the vote and have discussion. Clyde?

Clyde Allen:

Thank you, Mr. President. Mike, the only thing I'd like to add in there, something to consider, the 24 hours. I like it, I'm all for it, other than I live on a street that has City across from me. When they have alternate side parking we're stuck with the neighbor's car in front of our house for two days in a row. I have no problem with that and that needs to be considered.

John Steinbrink:

Any further discussion on this item?

SERPE MOVED TO RECEIVE THE PETITION AND REFERRED TO STAFF TO REVIEW; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

7. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Consider the Security Agreement and Related Documents between GB-MA Pleasant Prairie, LLC; the Target Corporation and the Village of Pleasant Prairie pertaining to the required Digital Security Imaging System (DSIS) for The Shoppes at Prairie Ridge commercial development.**

Tom Shircel:

Thank you, Mr. President. First, I'd like to give some background. For several months GB-MA Pleasant Prairie LLC who is the developer and part property owner, the Target Corporation also part property owner, and the Village of Pleasant Prairie along with professional security consultant, legal counsel and the Village IT, police and community development staffs have been working together to formulate a security agreement for a digital security imaging system for The Shoppes at Prairie Ridge. The development consists of approximately 367,000 square feet of commercial retail space which was conditionally approved by the Plan Commission on June 25, 2007.

The DSIS will afford the opportunity for the Village public safety departments, that being the police and fire departments, to visually examine the development site and will provide emergency response personnel with a visual assessment of any emergency situation in advance of arrival without placing an undue burden on the Village taxpayers.

GB-MA and Target, who are the owners, have agreed to be in compliance with the Village Municipal Code Chapter 410 entitled Security Ordinance through the implementation and use of

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

a DSIS that will monitor the exterior spaces of the development. It is anticipated the installation of the required DSIS for this development will provide for and maintain a safe and enjoyable shopping experience for customers of the development.

The properties involved are the GB-MA owned Lots 1, 3 and 4 of CSM 2603, and Target owns lot two of the same CSM.

The developed is zoned B-2, Community Business, with two Planned Unit Development Overlays. In addition to Ordinance 05-51 which is entitled the security ordinance, there were a few approvals over the years that also require that this development provide the DSIS, that being the site and operational plans of June 25, 2007, a PUD ordinance that was also approved back in 2007, and also building permits for a Target, PetSmart, Dick's Sporting Goods, JC Penney, and buildings 6, 7 and 8 of the development also had a stipulation in there that the DSIS be operational before occupancy of these tenant spaces.

In addition to other types of developments requiring a DSIS, Section 410-2 A of the security ordinance requires that all PUDs install a DSIS. Additionally, Section 410-7 of the security ordinance provides the authority of the Community Development Department to have the discretion on a case-by-case basis to determine the adequacy, ownership and easement requirements of the DSIS. Also, the Community Development Department has the right to waive certain requirements of Chapter 410, and the department has agreed to do so based on this agreement being executed between the owners and the Village.

As far as the agreement is concerned, the owners and the community development department have reached an agreement under Section 410-7 that the owners shall install the DSIS, and following the installation and inspection of the DSIS the developer has subsequently agreed to dedicate the DSIS system to the Village, and the Village has agreed to accept the dedication subject to the conditions set forth in the agreement.

The owners in the Village are aware that the Village will incur costs with regard to the charges, insurance costs, maintenance and repair of the security equipment and program, depreciation and replacement costs and administrative processing charges as described in the agreement. And, therefore, the owners have agreed to reimburse the Village for certain costs related to the system program as further described in the agreement.

And now I'll just highlight several portions of the agreement.

- The agreement shall apply to the GB-MA and the Target properties.
- Initially a total of 21 security cameras will be installed throughout the development to primarily monitor the exteriors of the buildings and the driveway entrances and exits to the site.
- The DSIS shall be operational prior to the Village granting any verbal or written building occupancy permits for the development tenants or stores.

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

- The owners have agreed to install and maintain the DSIS for security surveillance purposes.
- The DSIS shall be the system described in the agreement which is the agreement as prepared by IPC Technologies, Inc. On behalf of the owners.
- During the installation of the DSIS the Village shall inspect it at the developer's expense, and after the installation is complete if it meets with the approval of the Village, the Village shall notify the owners and the owners shall dedicate the system to the Village at no cost to the Village.
- The system shall be installed with at least a one year warranty.
- The developer shall be solely responsible for the initial cost for the purchase and installation of the system.
- In the event any owners build new buildings, alter buildings, add on to any buildings or otherwise change or increase the development on their respective property, such owners shall be responsible for installing at the owner's sole expense and dedicating to the Village such additional cameras and other exterior DSIS as the Village determines are necessary and appropriate to carry out the purposes of the agreement.
- If any changes are made to any portion of the properties, the determination as to the number and type of cameras which are reasonably necessary for the Village's surveillance needs shall rest with the reasonable discretion of the Village.
- The Village will utilize its best efforts to ensure that the DSIS is as aesthetically tasteful and architecturally harmonious as reasonably possible.
- The system will function as set forth in the agreement and shall provide visible surveillance during hours of daylight and darkness.
- The developer is providing a security room within Building 8 which is at 9901 77th Street, that's the freestanding building directly south of Famous Dave's, which will be accessible for the exclusive use by the Village departments and contracted security consultants and inspectors.
- The developer agrees to be responsible for all financial costs associated with the monthly billings for the utilities, electricity and high speed internet business connection for the DSIS equipment.
- The Developer shall also be responsible for the monthly billings for heat and electricity and routine maintenance of the security room which houses the DSIS equipment.
- At the discretion and control of the Village, the digital video recorded by the system shall be archived in the security room for a period of not less than two weeks and shall be

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

available to the Village directly through Internet Protocol transmission via the Village's area-wide data network and shall also provide a real time, live look surveillance capability.

- The owners shall grant permanent access easements to the Village allowing access and maintenance rights to the DSIS, and those easements are part of the agreement as well.
- At the time of the execution of this agreement by the owners, the owners shall also execute the recordable access easement documents.
- The owners shall be responsible for the: (a) costs of installation, and (b) inspection, equipment maintenance, repairs, insurance, and replacement and upgrading of the DSIS provided, however, there shall be no upgrading of the DSIS more frequently than every five years and such upgrading shall be only for a reasonably comparable replacement of any equipment then being used in the DSIS.
- The developer shall pay the total cost of the initial installation and set-up of the DSIS, which is currently estimated at \$175,000
- The maintenance fees, costs or charges to be paid by each Owner, shall be in the following shares and proportions: GB-MA = 65%; Target = 35%.
- Following the dedication of the DSIS by the owners and acceptance by the Village, the Village shall have exclusive ownership and sole responsibility for the installation, operation, monitoring and maintenance of the system.
- The owners shall pay the estimated first year's future costs as follows: For 2008, the owners shall pay to the Village a sum representing 1 percent of the total project cost. These sums shall be due at the execution of the agreement.
- The owners shall agree, under a Security Utility District established by the Village, to pay for the future costs following the one-year warranty period.
- The owners, at its sole cost and expense, shall also provide a conduit running to the security cameras as described in the agreement for low voltage as well as a separate conduit running to the cameras for high voltage.
- The Village may terminate the DSIS at any time by written notice given to the owners.
- The system program under the agreement shall be deemed to be sufficient to meet the requirements set forth in Chapter 410 which is the security ordinance.
- Any contractor coming onto the developer's and owner's property on behalf of the Village shall carry a non-deductible commercial general liability insurance.

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

So that's a general summation of the agreement. With that I know there are representatives from GB-MA and the Village here to answer any questions.

Monica Yuhas:

I have a couple questions. How long are the cameras going to be kept in place until they do have to be replaced eventually?

John Steinbrink:

Could we have somebody come up to address that issue?

Ruth Otto:

Ruth Otto, IT Director. The cameras will actually have a life of eight years.

Monica Yuhas:

Eight years?

Ruth Otto:

Yeah.

Monica Yuhas:

And are these the same cameras that are out at Prime Outlets?

Ruth Otto:

That's correct.

Monica Yuhas:

Thank you.

Mike Serpe:

Don't runaway, Ruth. I have a question. How far away are we from getting live broadcast to the police vehicles from these cameras?

Ruth Otto:

Oh, we're still quite a ways away from that. We don't have accessibility because we don't have a fast enough speed in the cars to be able to get video to the cars from these connections.

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

Mike Serpe:

Is that an expensive venture to complete?

Ruth Otto:

It's a matter of expense. Everything that I take care of is kind of expensive. But you're looking at putting an air card in every police car, a cell card, so that's a monthly charge. You're looking at about \$20 a month per vehicle.

Mike Pollocoff:

That's one of the things that the IT Department is putting in its budget because that is our goal is to be able to have these cameras and have that live feed into a squad or a police car when they're going to a site. In that interim period, though, just the information that we get for a crime being committed out there, and then having something to go to rather than trying to reconstruct the scene where we're trying to find people that might have saw what's going on there it's going to help us immediately. But that is the goal we've set up for the department. That end of it is going to be part of the budget deliberations that we take care of this fall.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I have a question. Are those cameras being connected to the dispatcher room?

Ruth Otto:

Yes. We currently have Prime Outlets already connected to dispatch, and these would then also be connected in the dispatch area.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

It's a very interesting piece of equipment. With this operation that's what I wondered if the cameras are going to be connected the same way.

Ruth Otto:

Have you gone there? It's by a map, so they can click on a map and then they'll look right at the target. The Shoppes at Prairie Ridge just as well as they can look at Prime Outlets and they'll access any cameras that are on the site.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I couldn't believe it when I saw it. I think we are way ahead of any dispatchers in Kenosha County in the City of Kenosha.

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

Mike Serpe:

We have two representatives representing the commercial development. Any questions on anything that Tom has read?

(Inaudible)

Mike Serpe:

Move approval.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Mike, second by Steve. Any further discussion on this item?

SERPE MOVED TO APPROVE THE SECURITY AGREEMENT AND RELATED DOCUMENTS BETWEEN GB-MA PLEASANT PRAIRIE, LLC; THE TARGET CORPORATION AND THE VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE PERTAINING TO THE REQUIRED DIGITAL SECURITY IMAGING SYSTEM (DSIS) FOR THE SHOPPES AT PRAIRIE RIDGE COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

- B. Consider a Zoning Map and Zoning Text Amendments (Ordinances #08-44 and #08-45) for the request of Lance Skala, agent for CenterPoint Properties Trust, owners of the property generally located south of CTH Q and west of 120th Avenue (West Frontage Road) to rezone the properties by adding a PUD, Planned Unit Development Overlay District on the property and to create the specific PUD requirements for the Uline Corporate Campus Development.**

Peggy Herrick:

Thank you. The petitioner, as you noted, is requesting a zoning map amendment which is Ordinance #08-44 to rezone the properties by adding a PUD, a Planned Unit Overlay District. The current underlying zoning districts will remain on the property and those include M-1, Limited Manufacturing, C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District, C-2, Upland Resource Conservancy District, and there is some Floodplain that is on the property as well. Those will all remain.

In addition, they are requesting a zoning text amendment which is ordinance #08-45, and this proposal will create the specific PUD requirements for the Uline Corporate Campus Development.

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

Just a little bit of background, as you are aware, Uline is the leading distributor of shipping industrial and packing material throughout North America. The Company was founded by Liz and Dick Uihlein in 1980 and they have been growing steadily ever since. They are currently looking to relocate their corporate offices here to the Village and construct distribution and warehousing facilities.

They are acquiring approximately 200 acres from CenterPoint Properties, and again their corporate offices are being developed in two different phases. The first phase shows approximately 203,000 square feet of office building and over one million square feet of distribution center. When the building is complete the corporate offices in the spring of 2010 the corporation will have 650 employees with 850 employees projected by the year 2015. As part of the Phase 1 development 882 parking spaces will be provided adjacent to the building. The building is approximately 80 feet high. It is being constructed of pre-cast panels, three-quarter inch cedar plank, Ashlar stone veneer with standing seam metal roof. The materials are in front of me here and you can see those there.

The distribution center, again, is one million square feet. It includes 30,000 square feet of office. The distribution center will be constructed of a painted load bearing pre-cast walls with a steel room framing system. The overall clear area within the area is 32 feet at the lowest point, and the outside height is approximately 37 feet.

Upon completion of this building, at the end of 2009, the distribution center will have 200 employees with 250 employees anticipated by 2015. There is a small equipment yard and pump house located south of the offices and east of the distribution building. This building will be constructed of pre-cast concrete panels to match the distribution center, then on each side of the pump house will be fenced and screened areas, iron fencing and pre-cast walls to hide the equipment that's stored in that area.

The zoning map amendment, as mentioned before, creates a PUD, a Planned Unit Development, over the entire property. The underlying zoning designations will remain. In addition, the text amendment creates specific and specifies specific requirements that are required for this development. In general, the PUD ordinance allows for a campus development with multiple buildings to be constructed on at the property allows the office building on the property to exceed 50 feet, allows variation to the primary monument sign and the secondary monument sign regulations. Allows for the fence and screen walls around their equipment yard to exceed the height requirements of a fence, and allows for a standing seam metal roof on the corporate office building for the campus development. Complete ordinances are attached. And if you have further questions there are representatives here in the audience for this project, or I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have.

John Steinbrink:

Any questions for the representatives?

Mike Serpe:

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

John, no questions, just a comment. I made the comment at the Plan Commission meeting. This is a very exciting project that's coming to the Village, and when you consider the economic condition pretty much of the nation and you see what's happening in Pleasant Prairie, and then to bring this many jobs at that pay scale, that just speaks volumes for this Village and this County. I know, John, you had a considerable amount of involvement from the Madison seat and making this happen. Mike and your staff I can't say enough good about bringing this project and having Uline come into Pleasant Prairie. I think it's a fantastic marriage.

Clyde Allen:

I make a motion to approve.

Mike Serpe:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Clyde, second by Mike. Steve?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I was going to say the PowerPoint presentation that they made in the Planning Commission was excellent. That was one of the best I'd ever seen in all of my years in the So excellent.

John Steinbrink:

I have to echo Steve's comment. The presentation you did at Planning was excellent and your location is excellent. And for it to be the gateway to Wisconsin and thank you for choosing that site. I think people coming to the State are going to just gasp in awe when they see that structure and how you've designed it and made it fit the terrain there and the wooded areas and everything else. You really did your job in making that fit in there and be really something people can be proud of in the community and not just another large structure on the Interstate. Something that's going to really make people know they're coming to Wisconsin and the quality that's here. We thank you and your owners for bringing this forward, because you've made a large investment and this community thanks you. So thank you very much. Further comment or question? Those in favor?

ALLEN MOVED TO CONCUR WITH RECOMMENDATION OF THE PLAN COMMISSION AND ADOPT A ZONING MAP AND ZONING TEXT AMENDMENTS (ORDINANCES #08-44 AND #08-45) APPROVING THE REQUEST OF LANCE SKALA, AGENT FOR CENTERPOINT PROPERTIES TRUST, OWNERS OF THE PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF CTH Q AND WEST OF 120TH AVENUE (WEST FRONTAGE ROAD) TO REZONE THE PROPERTIES BY ADDING A PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY DISTRICT ON THE PROPERTY AND TO CREATE THE

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

SPECIFIC PUD REQUIREMENTS FOR THE ULINE CORPORATE CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT; SECONDED BY SERPE; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

- C. Consider Ordinance #08-46 to delete Section 18-36 A (4) of the Village Municipal Code related to Temporary Uses, Ordinance #08-47 to create Section 420-140.1 and Ordinance #08-48 to amend Sections 420-27, 420-29 and 420-49 of the Village Zoning Ordinance related to temporary uses.**

Peggy Herrick:

Thank you. I just want to note there is one typo. It should be to delete Section 18-35 A (4) and not 36. That is a typo in the agenda item. Pursuant to Section 18-35 A (4) of the Village Municipal Ordinance, the Zoning Board of Appeals, or the BOA, has the authority to approve temporary uses in any zoning district provided that such uses are temporary in nature or are incompatible with the neighboring uses.

Over the years the Board of Appeals has granted ten temporary use permits to allow property owners to construct new single family homes on their property and continue to reside in the existing home on the property during the construction. Then upon completion of the new home the existing home was razed within 60 days after receiving a verbal to occupy. The only other temporary use permit granted by the Board of Appeals was on November 18, 2003 to allow up to six recreational vehicles to be parked during the construction of the Good Shepherd Lutheran site from April 2004 to August 2004 to house the Labor of Christ workers who were constructing the proposed new Christian Day School and the addition to Good Shepherd Lutheran Church on the property.

At the March 21, 2006 Board of Appeals meeting, the Board of Appeals had requested that the Village staff look into bringing an amendment forward to the ordinance to make temporary uses an administrative permit procedure rather than a hearing before the Board of Appeals. On April 10, 2006, the Village Plan Commission adopted Resolution #06-11 to evaluate the temporary use regulations in the Village.

Village staff has evaluated the ordinance and is proposing to amend the Village ordinance as related to temporary uses. The amendment provides the administrative procedures for temporary uses to be approved by the Village Zoning Administrator rather than by the Board of Appeals after holding a public hearing. Specifically the amendments include to delete Section 18-35 A (4) of the Municipal Ordinance which currently requires temporary uses to be approved by the Board of Appeals.

The second amendment is to create Section 420-140.1 related to temporary uses which would allow the Village Zoning Administrative to approve temporary uses and specify any appropriate conditions. The next amendment is to delete section 420-27 A (4) related to application fees for temporary uses. This current fee is \$200 plus a pre-development agreement. Because there was a hearing, they had to pay for additional staff time. Prepare memos, costs for publishing the notices and costs for noticing to the neighbor. That is proposed to be deleted, and Section 420-29 I

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

related to application fees for temporary uses is proposed to be created where the fee would just be a flat \$150 fee per application.

The fifth and final amendment is to amend Section 420-49 D (5) and (6). This already states that temporary uses are allowed for construction trailers, trucks and trailers or ten sales. These sections of the ordinance will refer you back to the new section 420-140.1 that there are additional regulations for these types of temporary uses.

On August 25, 2008, the Plan Commission held a public hearing related to the zoning text amendment and recommends that the Village Board approve the ordinance amendments as presented.

Monica Yuhas:

I move to approve Ordinance 08-46.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Monica, second by Steve for adoption of 08-46.

Monica Yuhas:

I'm sorry, 08-47 and 08-48.

John Steinbrink:

You want to do all three of them?

Monica Yuhas:

Yes.

John Steinbrink:

And what was the typo you wanted correct, Peggy?

Peggy Herrick:

It's been corrected in the ordinance. It's just on the agenda item it at 18-36 and it should have been 18-35. It is correct in the ordinance.

John Steinbrink:

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

Motion by Monica, second by Steve for 08-46, 08-47 and 08-48. Any further discussion on these items?

YUHAS MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE PLAN COMMISSION AND ADOPT ORDINANCE #08-46 TO DELETE SECTION 18-36 A (4) OF THE VILLAGE MUNICIPAL CODE RELATED TO TEMPORARY USES, ORDINANCE #08-47 TO CREATE SECTION 420-140.1 AND ORDINANCE #08-48 TO AMEND SECTIONS 420-27, 420-29 AND 420-49 OF THE VILLAGE ZONING ORDINANCE RELATED TO TEMPORARY USES; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

E. Consider Ordinance #08-50 to amend Section 305-6 of the Village Municipal Code related the concrete driveways.

Peggy Herrick:

Thank you. This ordinance amendment reflects current policy related to driveways and provides consistency between the zoning regulations for residential driveways on private property and the municipal ordinance which is Section 305-6 that regulates driveway approaches and those portions of the driveway within the right of way.

The ordinance amendment adds the following language for driveways within rural road profiles. And this, again, is really between the property line and road edge. "...the width of a driveway between the paved or gravel street edge and the property line shall be a minimum 12 feet and a maximum of 24 feet; however, a maximum radius of 3 feet is allowed where the driveway meets the street edge. In no case shall a driveway extend into the right-of-way so as to cross the extension of the side property line unless approved by the Superintendent of Streets."

Very similar language for urban roads. Actually it's identical language for urban roads. The main difference between rural and urban is what type of material you can use in the right of way and that's specified currently in the ordinance where you can use concrete in urban and gravel or asphalt in rural areas. So the proposed ordinance amendments really try to clarify what can be done in the Village's right of way area when you have a driveway.

John Steinbrink:

Does that change if they're abutting a State or a County highway, or is that still all our jurisdiction up to that point?

Mike Pollocoff:

That doesn't change. So the main thing is if it's an urban profile conceivably you could put asphalt out to the curb if you have something you're matching up against if somebody was inclined to do that.

John Steinbrink:

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

Do we have a point somewhere that addresses structures in the right of way such as mailboxes that are made out of removable products like brick or concrete?

Mike Pollocoff:

That's a different ordinance.

John Steinbrink:

We'll leave that alone for now then. Do we have a motion?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

So moved.

Monica Yuhas:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Steve, second by Monica for adoption of 08-50. Further discussion on this item?

KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO ADOPT ORDINANCE #08-50 TO AMEND SECTION 305-6 OF THE VILLAGE MUNICIPAL CODE RELATED THE CONCRETE DRIVEWAYS; SECONDED BY YUHAS; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

Mike Serpe:

Can I make a comment? This just happens to trigger something. A couple places in the Village people have erected brick mailboxes. There's one in my neighborhood and there's now one on 39th Avenue right at the curb. A wing plow is going to catch that and it's going to cause all kinds of havoc. I realize that's a County street but I'm just wondering if it would be worth us looking at that in the future to maybe prohibit something like that in a right of way. Actually you can't erect a permanent structure in the right of way anyway.

Mike Pollocoff:

Right. We catch those when we can on our streets. It's a hazard to the plow operator. People that do erect a brick structure if somebody hits that it's going to cause—most of the mail posts that we specify will go over if somebody hits it. If we do hit one of those or we knock one of those over in the winter we only replace it with a wood pole. And we tell people when we catch them not to do it. The post office doesn't really have any guidelines other than the height of the box and that there's a flag. But the type they'll let you be as elaborate as you want to be.

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

John Steinbrink:

Being that we live in Wisconsin with the ice and snow and in the wintertime striking one of those by a sliding vehicle increases. If there's damage or injury when somebody hits that who assumes the liability of that?

Mike Pollocoff:

The property owner. I can guarantee you they won't be able to show a permit that allowed it to be struck there. If we permitted it then—

John Steinbrink:

Then we should be putting them on notice maybe. Not an item on the agenda but something to think about.

F. Review and consider Chapter XI, "Transportation Element" of the Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Kenosha County.

Peggy Herrick:

This is Chapter XI, the Transportation Element. This is, again, one of the chapters of the Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan that is being put together by SEWRPC on behalf of the County and most of the municipalities within the County as part of the Smart Growth requirement.

The transportation element is one of the nine elements of a comprehensive plan required by Section 66.1001 of the Wisconsin Statutes and requires this element to compile goals, objectives, policies, and programs to guide the future development of various modes of transportation in the County.

Under the comprehensive planning law, the transportation element should incorporate State and Regional transportation plans, and compare County goals, objectives, policies, and programs to those of State and Regional transportation plans.

Modes of transportation addressed in this element include: public transit, transportation for persons with compromised mobility and transit-dependent users, arterial streets and highways, collector and land access streets, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, railroads, air transportation, trucking and water transportation.

The following comprehensive planning goals related to the transportation element as set forth in Section 16.965 of the Statutes were addressed as part of the planning process. And they include:

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

- Promotion of the redevelopment of land with existing infrastructure and public services and the maintenance and rehabilitation of existing residential, commercial, and industrial structures.
- Encouragement of neighborhood designs that support a range of transportation choices.
- Encouragement of land uses, densities and regulations that promote efficient development patterns and relatively low municipal, State government, and utility costs.
- Encouragement of coordination and cooperation among nearby units of government.
- Providing adequate infrastructure and public services and an adequate supply of developable land to meet existing and future market demand for residential, commercial, and industrial uses.
- Providing an integrated, efficient, and economical transportation system that affords mobility, convenience, and safety and that meets the needs of all citizens, including transit-dependant citizens and persons with disabilities.

This section sets forth transportation goals and objectives through the plan design year of 2035.

Policies, which are steps or actions to achieve transportation goals and objectives; and programs, which are projects or services intended to achieve transportation policies, are also identified.

Goals and objectives were developed using the transportation data inventoried in Chapter IV which you had reviewed, and the general planning issue statements and goals and objectives related to transportation identified in Chapter VII which you also have reviewed.

Sources of public input, such as the SWOT analysis, Kenosha County Café, applicable State, regional, and County transportation plans; planning goals, objectives, principles, and policies from County and local plans; input from the nine local comprehensive plan informational meetings; and public comments obtained via the Kenosha County comprehensive planning website and e-mails were also reviewed to identify the transportation issues to be addressed by the goals, objectives, policies, and programs set forth in this element.

The general transportation issues identified in this chapter include improving transit services and accessibility, and providing a variety of transportation choices is considered important to Kenosha County residents, particularly in light of the changing age structure of the County population and energy concerns.

Participants in the visioning process placed a high emphasis on improving public transit services, including the expansion of bus service to western portions of Kenosha County and the development of the Kenosha-Racine-Milwaukee commuter rail as one of the top opportunities for Kenosha County.

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

Connecting residents in the western rural portion of Kenosha County to the eastern urban portion was a recurring theme throughout the visioning process, including the SWOT analysis. Participants also expressed a desire to expand alternative modes of transportation, including the addition of more bike paths and lanes and providing pedestrian access to open space. Concerns about increased traffic congestion due to development were also expressed.

Further analysis of public input received during the comprehensive planning process and the transportation facilities and services data inventoried in Chapter IV refines the general transportation issue into the following more specific transportation issues:

- Multi-Modal Transportation System Issue
- Transit Issue
- Transportation Services for the Elderly and Persons With Disabilities Issue
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Issue
- Airport Issue
- Interregional Transportation Issue
- Streets and Highways Issue
- Recommendations have been developed to address each of the transportation issues through the identification of goals, objectives, policies, and programs.

Recommendations have been developed to address each of the transportation issues through the identification of goals, objectives, policies, and programs.

I'm just going to go through the goals, but in the chapter there are also, again, objectives and policies that are outlined. The goals are to:

- Improve transportation infrastructure and land use design to support a range of transportation choices for all citizens.
- Provide an integrated, efficient, and economical transportation system that affords mobility, convenience, and safety and that meets the needs of all citizens, including transit-dependant residents, persons with disabilities, and the elderly.
- Provide an integrated, efficient, and economical transportation system that affords mobility, convenience, and safety and that meets the needs of all citizens, including transit-dependant residents and workers, persons with disabilities, and the elderly.

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

- Provide for a public transportation system in Kenosha County that efficiently serves County residents and businesses and the anticipated land use development pattern set forth in the land use section of the plan which has not been completed to date.
- Provide an integrated, efficient, and economical transportation system that affords mobility, convenience, and safety to persons with disabilities and the elderly, as well as other transit dependent users.
- Provide for bicycle and pedestrian facilities in Kenosha County that safely and efficiently serve the anticipated land use development up to the year 2035.
- Provide options for bicycle and pedestrian travel as an alternative to personal vehicle travel.
- Provide and maintain a safe air transportation system to meet the non-commercial travel and freight service needs of County residents and businesses.
- Provide regional, national, and world-wide transportation access to Kenosha County for passengers and freight.
- Maintain a street and highway system that efficiently serves the anticipated land use development patterns that will be set forth in the land use plan element.

In addition to the comments that are noted in the Chapter that was distributed to you, the Village is requesting that the Transportation Element further address mass transportation in the Village. The Village taxpayers are funding through their tax gas, through their income tax, through their sales tax, the Kenosha Area Rapid Transit System, and the Village has to pay additional costs to obtain bus service that we are not guaranteed we'll be able to obtain even if we are willing to pay for it.

Currently, as you are aware, a small portion of the Village is serviced by the Kenosha Area Transit System including an area at Cooper Road and 82nd Avenue where the City transit line meanders through the Village and the City. A trip to and from LakeView Corporate Park during the day that is paid for by the LakeView Corporate Park Association, however this does not meet the needs of the workforce. The transit stop at St. Catherine's and Prairie Ridge Senior Housing which is paid for by the Village. Additional routes could have been purchased by the Village but the City declined to extend more routes to the Village.

In the same time period, Kenosha County started a western County transit pickup which is scheduled personal service using transit dollars to serve everybody west of the Interstate. So as we look at where Pleasant Prairie fits in transit, we have a situation where Kenosha is covered, the east end of the County is, and we're paying for everybody west in the County. The Village has unfulfilled requests for additional bus service at this time. Planning for transportation service to the year 2035 becomes problematic if current requests are not being met while planning goals and objectives require the Village to support a new KRM project that will not service the Village.

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

The plan must address this and at what point the Village is entitled to be a part of the Kenosha Are Transit System.

As our demographic profile is a fairly wealthy community and currently decentralized, but as development continues and the population ages and as gas prices continue to increase, the Village cannot support the transportation element in this plan that does not provide for transit services to the Village between now and 2035. So these are the comments that with the Board approval will be sent back to SEWRPC to incorporate it into another draft, and when they incorporate these and other comments from the other municipalities we will receive another final draft to review at another time.

Mike Pollocoff:

One of the reasons that staff recommended that we evaluate these things is that this master plan is being done in pieces and that's just a matter of necessity. You can't integrate everything all at once. But we want to make sure that it doesn't go so far that we all sign onto the elements and the goals and objectives of transportation, but then as we get down the funding and the institutional framework that happens at the end that that doesn't work out for the Village. Then we'd be in a position where we would have agreed to all the goals of the transit operations and what that's going to accomplish but not be able to have any additional transit.

So what my recommendation is is that those issues specifically as it relates to the Village since we're providing, again, through the revenue sources that the Village generates, primarily gas tax, vehicle tax, income tax, sales tax, that some portion of that be recognized and that the Village be allowed to purchase transit service from the City of Kenosha. We haven't asked for and that's not the goal of this to say we should get free service, but right now we're not even able to purchase the service. So the planning process has to account for the fact that we have a corporate park with 8,000 people that one trip a day coming and going doesn't accommodate the needs of the park and that has to be taken into consideration as they develop that line.

Right now the plan elements sound like everything is going to tie together, but right now the base that we're starting from doesn't tie together. Kenosha County was able to secure transit for the west side of the Interstate, personal service, but that left Somers and Pleasant Prairie out. So really it's not just Pleasant Prairie, it's Somers where we have no transit alternative. If at some point the KRM project takes off, there's got to be a vehicle to get Village residents either from the KRM to their businesses or the Village residents that are going to use it to go someplace else to get them there. Otherwise the Village is totally dependent on cars. That might be a good thing. When all things are said and done we might not need a lot of transit, but we have a certain population that is going to need to use that.

Mike Serpe:

Do we know what position the City may be taking on this, because this thing is majority based on what the City is do for transportation for everybody really.

Mike Pollocoff:

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

All indications are that the current administration is favorably disposed to extend transit into the area. Again, we're not asking for free transit. Everybody recognizes that the fare box doesn't pay its freight. There's one correction I'd make in here. Right now we don't pay for St. Catherine's or Prairie Ridge. They pay us and then we pay the City. But we want to be able to find a way to get those payments made for the transit to have that happen. Right now that's not the case.

Hopefully with some of the changes, I know that the transit director from the City has been very open to working with us. He's helped us on a number of projects. He helped us get that started at St. Catherine's and Prairie Ridge. If in fact we're going to be contributing to a greater system we should be able to have access to it.

Mike Serpe:

I just have one more question. Do we know the demographics of the employees in LakeView Corporate Park, where these people live, how many are outside of the County, how many reside in the City? Do we have any idea?

Mike Pollocoff:

No, not completely, not really well. It spreads out. We know that some people are challenged by the fact that the park starts at 6 and the bus transit service starts at 7. So there's a disconnect there and it's the same way coming back.

Mike Serpe:

Wouldn't that help to study some if we had that information especially on a park that's going to employ 15,000 or 20,000 people eventually?

Mike Pollocoff:

We rely on the TIAs that have been done in that area. I think SEWRPC has some information generated, but the park itself doesn't keep that. I think KABA has some samplings of information that they prepared. It's kind of transient. So once a corporation moves here, if it's a move, a relocate from Illinois, a lot of those people will stay in Illinois. But eventually they find it's less expensive and it's a nicer area to live and they end up moving up here. So it's always evolving even with the existing companies that come in here.

Clyde Allen:

Mike, a question that I don't know if it's even feasible or can be done, to look at including an estimate of what kind of money Pleasant Prairie is generating into these revenues that support this, and track what we get out of it just to show kind of a balance sheet where we stand so that if we do need something it's out there say and look at what we contribute yet look at what we receive?

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

Mike Pollocoff:

We did that a few years ago what our gross payments to the State are, and then how that gets allocated. It's the voodoo that happens at the Department of Revenue and that's going to be a little bit harder to track. But we can see if we can come up with that number again, a more current number.

John Steinbrink:

That was alluded to in the statements earlier. We know what funds go to fund the transportation fund and what returns back to the area. And I think what we're asking for is only our fair share to put toward the cost of providing the service into our area.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Talking about transportation, I've got a big problem with the KRM system. Right now the transportation, the bus transportation is extended to the west side of the Interstate. Now the . . . in the City is in the east side closer to the lake than closer to I-94. . . . products and everything else is next to and west of I-94. Although we're required to pay for the KRM, right?

Mike Pollocoff:

That's the big question how they're going to allocate out who pays what. So I don't think anybody really knows. I think the premise or the concept is that everybody is going to share in it at some level or somehow but nobody really knows that that is.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I think the City should make a provision on that. We've got the railroad on the east side of the County, they've got to go through Pleasant Prairie or they should facilitate the access to the commuters to the industrial parks and the same as Somers. I'm pretty sure they have access to the industrial park in the City . . . in Somers and in the Village. So that's not up to the County to do something like that because the County is not paying for the services right now, we pay for it, don't we?

Mike Pollocoff:

The County is paying for specialized transit. The City is paying for their transit. And the City is in an urbanized mass transit program area, and right now that grant that comes from the State—I mean federal money with some State dollars pays for a percentage of their operations then the rest have to come off the fare box. And if they're short then they have to come up with it. So what our previous arrangement with the City was if we wanted bus service someplace other than where they were just kind of driving through the Village on their way to another part of the City is the Village would make—the City gave us credit for the amount of the grant so we got to share in the fact that that grant was there, and then we had our anticipated fare box receipts that would go into

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

the fare, and then whatever the difference was is what we would charge back to the users that were using the service which was probably about as fair as you're going to get. Hardly any bus transit route pays for itself. There's some level of subsidy in it just by virtue of the fact that you need a grant to make it go.

It's really coming to that level, and then the Village makes the decisions. Right now we don't pay for any—it's been such that LakeView Corporate Park they've agreed as an association to pay for the transit they have out there. Same thing with St. Catherine's and Prairie Ridge. They pay for theirs. The transit we've asked for that we haven't been able to get yet is earlier runs out to LakeView Corporate Park and a little bit earlier also for the shift change that occurs out there about three o'clock or two thirty. That seems to have stalled.

I think the other thing that we've been hearing from people that are locating here is they'd like to be able to see not the KRM but the Metro having a stop in Pleasant Prairie. That's something we may want to talk with our neighbor to the south about, about consolidating a stop in Pleasant Prairie and Winthrop Harbor and finding an area where that could happen making it easier to get out to the west end of the Village from the train.

There are a lot of issues that need to be resolved. But if at the core base we haven't come to an agreement of an institutional arrangement of how those finances are going to work, it makes the planning part a little difficult. This plan is assuming that the current institutional arrangement works as far as how you're funding it and right now it doesn't. I think if it does work I don't have any problem recommending or supporting all those items. But if we don't have an institutional relationship that provides for the funding then you're agreeing to a plan that still has no basis to be funded.

Mike Serpe:

How do you want to handle the adoption of this?

Mike Pollocoff:

I'd recommend we adopt that chapter, but that we can't support the transportation element that doesn't provide for transit service in the Village between now and 2035 that's tied to some type of pro forma as to how that's going to be achieved.

John Steinbrink:

That line that runs west of the Interstate by the County I think that's specialized, as you said, for seniors and it takes them from the senior centers to shopping to different things they have to do. A lot of those folks don't have a driver's license. The irony here is we have the same needs east of the I and yet we don't have that for lack of a term a vehicle to get them around.

Mike Pollocoff:

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

What they say is the Village is wealthier demographically and that may be true, but we don't have a vehicle to pay for it. We don't have a tax, we don't have a sales tax, we don't have a gas tax. So what they're saying is pay for it with the property tax but that's under a cap, and every municipality struggles to stay away from having property tax dollars pay for transit and I agree with that.

John Steinbrink:

That's something we need to look at. The comments are in here so we're covered there.

Mike Pollocoff:

I guess I'd recommend it be forward to the planning group with the recommendations provided.

Mike Serpe:

I'd make that motion.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Mike, second by Steve. Further discussion?

SERPE MOVED TO APPROVE CHAPTER XI, "TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT" OF THE MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR KENOSHA COUNTY SUBJECT TO THE STAFF COMMENTS WHICH ARE TO BE FORWARDED TO SEWRPC; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

G. Consider Award of Contract for the 11th Avenue Storm Sewer Replacement Project.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, sealed bids were received on August 14th at 10:30 a.m. for the project on the 11th Avenue storm sewer replacement area that's in Carol Beach Unit #1. Five bids were received. The low bid was submitted by DK Contractors in the amount of \$59,448.83. Second low bid was submitted by CW Purpero in the amount of \$77,523. The superintendent for streets has reviewed the bids and recommends DK Contractors be awarded the contract for construction. The total estimated project cost in addition to DK Contractors is Clark Dietz for \$9,000 for design engineering, Clark Dietz for \$1,000 for construction layout and as built documents. Our Pleasant Prairie estimate and DPW site work is \$10,000. So the estimate project cost is \$79,448.83. Our budgeted amount was \$82,688. I recommend that the contract be awarded to DK in the amount of \$59,448.83.

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

Monica Yuhas:

Motion to award DK Contractors not to exceed \$59,448.83.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second that.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Monica, second by Steve.

Clyde Allen:

I was going to second with a question. This is coming out of Clean Water Utility?

Mike Pollocoff:

Correct.

Clyde Allen:

The difference between, again, you came in under your budgeted amount, a small amount this time of \$3,000. Would it be wise to put the \$3,000 or whatever may be left if it comes in left than that start here in some other projects like we did earlier this year, put it in a reserve to save it toward the upcoming '10 budget?

Mike Pollocoff:

The capital budget we look at it every year and we fund it every year, so if there's any money left for a project that isn't completed in that fund it does roll to the fund balance for use that next year.

Clyde Allen:

So none of this can lapse to general?

Mike Pollocoff:

No, none of this lapses to general. And we are using some of the surplus in this amount to fund that portion of the Barnes Creek Bridge where it came in over budget.

Mike Serpe:

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

Mike, whatever is used out of the Clean Water Utility fund if there's a surplus it stays right in that fund?

Mike Pollocoff:

It stays in that fund.

Mike Serpe:

We don't put it anywhere else.

Mike Pollocoff:

. . . enterprise.

John Steinbrink:

Further comment or question?

YUHAS MOVED TO AWARD A CONTRACT TO DK CONTRACTORS IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$59,448.83 AS PRESENTED FOR THE 11TH AVENUE STORM SEWER REPLACEMENT PROJECT; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

H. Consider the purchase of a 2007 Gradall excavator.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, I'm going to let John, Jr. explain what he's been able to arrange. But in our capital improvement program for the Clean Water Utility we've planned for the replacement of a Gradall this coming budget year in 2009. And at that time, and it's still a reasonably good number, any Gradall with wheel excavator which is, if you've seen that one, that's for streets, that's our primary excavation device and that thing is out all the time. It digs ditches, it shapes ditches, it puts in culverts, it gets a lot of use. A new one is \$239,500. That's a recent \$15,000 increase due to the increased cost of steel.

In this intervening time before this 2009 budget starts, he's located one and one's become available for the amount of \$182,500. Believe it has 400 hours on it. So it's a lightly used vehicle, lightly used excavator. These don't come by that often. So what we're recommending, the source of funds would still be from the Clean Water Utility and we have that money set aside that we'd be using in our fund balance to pay for it. But we'd be recommending that we purchase it this year and not the next year because the savings is substantial. So, John, why don't you just kind of walk through what you have here and what you're proposing and what the trade is going to be or the sale of the existing Gradall.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

My name is John Steinbrink, Jr., Superintendent of Public Works, 8600 Green Bay Road. I think Mike really hit some of the high points. We did have a budget of \$225,000 out of the Clean Water Utility capital fund for replacement of our 2001 Gradall wheeled excavator. The Gradall wheeled excavator is a machine that's out pretty much almost every day digging the ditches, putting in culverts, any sort of grading activity that we may use in the Village we end up using it for. It's a little bit different than some of our other excavators that we might have that the construction crew uses. Those are on a heavy metal track. And when you put those on the asphalt roadway it really tears up the roadway. This is on a wheeled base so you can pretty much drive it anywhere that you can drive a wheeled truck or vehicle and it doesn't do any damage onto the roadway.

And so we did have one in the budget for \$225,000. There was a recent \$15,000 increase that brings a new machine up to about \$240,000 that we were budgeted to have in 2009. I was talking with the Gradall dealer out in Franksville, Roland Machinery, and during the budgeting process for 2009 I had mentioned to him that we're looking for a machine coming up in January, what kind of a budget number, what kind of a trade in so we can start preparing our budget documents for this upcoming fall. And they had told me that they have one that has about 400 hours on it, and I guess to explain the engine hours a little bit, the Village uses it about 500 engine hours in the course of a year, and the machine that we have now has just over 3,100 or 3,200 engine hours on it and that's how you gauge the age of a diesel machine. So it's really a wheeled excavator that's—it's like buying a car that's one year old. You're really not paying the full price for it. It still has the factory warranty of it. It still has the life expectancy it might have had minus one year but we're paying about \$57,000 less for the machine.

I asked the Gradall dealer who had used that machine and where they had used it. It was used by A.W. Oakes around the Pleasant Prairie Power Plant for digging some ditches around that general area. I asked them how the machine worked and they said that they were very happy with it. They would have purchased it but they don't use it often enough to really purchase the machine. They might just use it a couple times a year. So I went up and I saw the machine and we saw it run and operate. It's a beautiful machine with \$57,000 less than what I would pay for a brand new one in January.

So we were investigating the possibility of—I guess it's not very often that we come up here asking for less money than we would so we took advantage of this and we'd like to purchase that machine now, because there are other municipalities and contractors I believe that—I believe Boston is one of the areas that's looking for it and then there's other contractors nationally that are trying to save dollars the same way that we are. So we have it on hold until September 8th. Then if the Board agrees to move forward with this we would probably purchase it at the end of this week.

Mike Serpe:

John, when the present Gradall would break down what would you do?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

I would call out a repair man for it if we can repair it ourselves. Average repair on something like that if it's a pump or something serious probably around \$5,000.

Mike Pollocoff:

We don't have another piece of equipment that can do it.

Mike Serpe:

That's what I was getting to.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Everything gets put on hold.

Mike Serpe:

Did you ever have to rent a piece of equipment to replace it temporarily?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I have not. Normally it can be repaired within a week and I would just bump all my projects back a week because it's pretty expensive to rent. Just the transportation costs would probably be a couple thousand dollars just to get the machine down to the Village and then pick it back up and haul it away plus the rental charges. So it's really important that we have a machine that's very dependable to use on a regular basis.

Mike Serpe:

For the amount of money you're paying for new used Gradall and the amount of money that you can possibly get for the old one would there be any value in keeping that old one as a backup?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

My highway foreman actually wanted to keep the used one as a backup, but if you have a new one and if I can get \$50,000, I would rather put that \$50,000 towards another capital project by replacing some of our video equipment that we have in there. So I think it's almost worth just trading that in if I can get the \$50,000 for it. That's a pretty good trade in value for a machine with over 3,000 hours on it.

Mike Serpe:

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

I would agree with that and it is. What I was thinking of is if the Gradall does break down and let's say over a three year period you lose six or seven weeks of down time, there's got to be a price tag to go along with that down time. So I was just wondering if keeping something like this for \$40,000 and some or \$50,000 would be—and if you don't think it is that's fine. I'm just asking.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

The price tag is more so in . . . I'd probably just bump projects back. I won't install culverts for a week or something and then try to catch up on periods when we did not plan on using the machine.

Mike Pollocoff:

The real trick is maintaining a good working piece of equipment. Like I say, once we get to that threshold of hours where we start having more and more maintenance on it, for us it doesn't mean we're losing money. It's just that we can't provide service and that's what kills us. We depend on that to lay a certain amount of pipe every day. And when you need that machine you need it. So I think our money is better spent making sure we have a good piece of equipment there and one that we might not be putting more money into it as it goes on. The more you cross that threshold of 4,000 hours nothing good is going to come of that after a while.

Mike Serpe:

Okay, just a thought.

Monica Yuhas:

Question. John, is there a warranty with this piece of equipment?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

There is a one year warranty that comes with it. It's like a bumper to bumper warranty that pretty much covers everything on the machine.

Monica Yuhas:

One year from the day we get it?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

One year from the day we take ownership of that machine.

John Steinbrink:

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

What we know is it was operated by a reputable company that has reputable operators that are properly trained so the machine is not abused, versus one that sat out on a demo and everybody tried it and didn't have the experience to really run it and that's when damage can occur. So this is a machine that you don't come across very often.

Clyde Allen:

John, this is a good deal. I agree with you 100 percent due to the trade in. That's 25 percent of another new machine similar, a used one like that. I agree wholeheartedly. With that I make a motion to approve.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Clyde, second by Steve. Further discussion?

ALLEN MOVED TO APPROVE THE PURCHASE OF A 2007 GRADALL EXCAVATOR AS PRESENTED; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

I. Consent Agenda

- 1) **Approve a Letter of Credit Reduction for the Westfield Development.**
- 2) **Approve a Letter of Credit Reduction for the Tobin Woods Development.**
- 3) **Approve Halloween Trick or Treat Schedule - October 26, 2008 3 p.m. - 6 p.m.**

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Move to approve.

Monica Yuhas:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Steve, second by Monica.

KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS 1-3; SECONDED BY YUHAS; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

John Steinbrink:

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

One item on there is to approve trick or treat schedule. Is that worthy of any discussion?

Jane Romanowski:

It's the same as City of Kenosha's, and we got a call wondering when it was.

John Steinbrink:

Then everybody is in coordination. All the goblins will be out on the same night. Very good.

8. VILLAGE BOARD COMMENTS

Monica Yuhas:

Last Friday the 29th, I had the opportunity to spend the day in public works. I had the opportunity to learn about how grading is done on the road, the process, how the gravel is laid, how it's packed, how the process is done. And I was also able to spend a good part of the day seeing a culvert being replaced and I also got to see the Gradall and what that piece of machinery is able to do. During the culvert removal and installation I was also learning how they pitch the ditch and how they measure. And I was also allowed to work the front end loader and load a dump truck full of gravel. So that was a highlight. It was a lot of fun. I didn't hit anything. It went very smooth. I would like to thank John Steinbrink, Jr. and Dennis Kammerzelt and Rory Franke, those are the three guys that I ran with. I spent a lot time with Dennis and Rory on the culvert. Also, John took me out to Prairie Springs Park and showed me the addition of the cement columns that he was able to have installed with grant money for the pedestrian path. So it's making progress. Hopefully with more grant money we'll be able to get it installed and people will be able to use it. So thank you very much for allowing me the day to spend time and learn more about public works and machinery.

Mike Serpe:

You know if we hired Monica we could probably lay off ten people.

John Steinbrink:

Monica mentioned some of the projects and one of them was the trail out there with the cement. You talk to different youth groups around the Pleasant Prairie area and the City and we're using a lot of groups out there to do these projects and it's a real learning experience for them. You've had a chance to visit with the Scouts a week or so ago and they're excited because a lot of the Eagle Scout projects they come out to the Village, we get them involved with things with the park or different areas in subdivisions and they do a great job.

John has been able to incorporate football teams and everybody else in putting together equipment on playgrounds. It not only helps us but it helps them and they learn the responsibility of doing this and they do projects. I did hear from neighbors in the Bohat's area that were very

Village Board Meeting
September 2, 2008

excited about the project that's going on there and the quality of the equipment and the way it's been done. We have one going on at the RecPlex for the special needs out there. These are great projects and everybody wins at it when we do it this way. I hope we keep this up. Further Board comment?

9. ADJOURNMENT

YUHAS MOED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING; SECONDED BY SERPE; MOTION CARRIED 5-0 AND MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:30 P.M.