

**PLEASANT PRAIRIE PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
VILLAGE HALL AUDITORIUM
9915 39TH AVENUE
PLEASANT PRAIRIE, WISCONSIN
5:00 P.M.
April 27, 2009**

A regular meeting for the Pleasant Prairie Plan Commission convened at 5:00 p.m. on April 27, 2009. Those in attendance were Thomas Terwall; Michael Serpe; Donald Hackbarth; Andrea Rode (Alternate #2); Jim Bandura; John Braig; Larry Zarletti; and Judy Juliana (Alternate #1, voting member). Wayne Koessler was excused. Also in attendance were Mike Pollocoff, Village Administrator; Peggy Herrick, Assistant Village Planner and Zoning Administrator; and Tom Shircel, Assistant Village Planner.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER.**
- 2. ROLL CALL.**
- 3. CORRESPONDENCE.**
- 4. CONSIDER THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 13, 2009 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING.**

Judy Juliana:

Move to approve.

Mike Serpe:

Second.

Tom Terwall:

IT'S BEEN MOVED BY JUDY JULIANA AND SECONDED BY MIKE SERPE TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 13, 2009 MEETING AS PRESENTED IN WRITTEN FORM. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Tom Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

5. CITIZEN COMMENTS.

Tom Terwall:

If you're here tonight for one of the items that's on the agenda, the public hearing for example, we would ask that you hold your comments until the public hearing is held so your comments can be incorporated as part of the official record. However, if you're here for an item that is not a matter for public hearing or not on the agenda, now would be your opportunity to speak. We would ask you to step to the microphone and begin by giving us your name and address. Anybody wishing to speak under citizens' comments?

6. NEW BUSINESS

A. Consider the approval of Site and Operational Plan for a 42,000 square foot 50-meter Olympic size pool addition to LakeView RecPlex located at 10000 Terwall Terrace.

Peggy Herrick:

Thank you. The Village is proposing to construct a 50 meter Olympic size pool addition to the west side of the LakeView RecPlex. This addition will increase the existing 260,269 square foot RecPlex facility by 42,036 square feet, so the total facility at the end of this addition will be 302,305 square feet.

The addition will provide a separate entrance from the parking lot on the south side of the building and from a new hallway along from the current lobby of the RecPlex to the new lobby of the addition. Two new party rooms are being added adjacent to the existing aquatics center and can be easily accessed from the main RecPlex lobby and from the existing leisure pool. The new pool can accommodate a number of configurations by moving the bulk heads: for a full 50-meter pool with 10 lanes or two 25 meter pools each with 10 lanes. The pool depth ranges from 4 feet to 12 feet to provide adequate depths for a variety of activities and to provide for adequate diving depths off the starting blocks. Locker rooms are provided as well as restroom facilities off the new lobby area. Office and storage areas are also provided. Second level seating will be provided for approximately 600 persons. Restroom facilities will be provided and this similar to the IcePlex where we have the mezzanine up there for seating and some restrooms up there as well.

In addition to the current programs and activities that exist in the RecPlex warm water leisure pool, the new pool will accommodate specialty programming such as kayaking, canoeing, snorkeling, scuba diving, life guard training and competitive swimming lessons. This cool water pool will accommodate increased programming in triathlon training, indoor triathlons, and competitive swimming. The RecPlex intends to establish a swim team and host two to three swim meets per month. With the 600 person seating capacity of the second level, the Village will be eligible for many state, zone and national competitions.

On the slide on the wall over there on the screen, that is a perspective looking northeast at the pool addition. You can see this is the existing RecPlex facility right here. The main lobby is

right here. This is the new pool addition with an entrance at this location right at the glass areas in here.

Hours of operation, vendor deliveries and open public swim will be consistent with the current aquatic center. A minimal number of additional staff is proposed to support this facility addition. It is intended that one full-time managerial aquatic position and 15 to 20 various part-time positions will be required. Shifts for part-time staff will follow the current part time employee schedule with fewer staff on duty during the week and an increased number on the weekend. During a swim competition weekend an anticipated total of 15 additional employees will be on site.

The slide on the screen over here is, again, looking northwest at the pool addition. This is the new entrance to the pool right here. This is the existing RecPlex facility. The entrance is currently right at this location.

Additional programming will increase our program participation rate. It is anticipated that an increase of approximately 2,500 participants will be spread among various activities such as swim team practices, swim lessons and programs during the course of a full calendar year. The facility could possibly house up to 2,000 people throughout the course of a swim meet event. Given the increased number of participants in the programs it is anticipated that automobile trips will increase at a comparable rate.

And the slide on the overhead right now or on the wall is looking southeast at the pool addition . The existing RecPlex is in this location. This is coming west towards Lake Andrea. There's a glassy area right here. This railing and retaining wall here provides the walkway to continue around the building. So this is that elevation looking from Lake Andrea.

Next I'm going to be talking about parking availability on the park site itself. There is on-site parking spaces of 515 vehicles on both the RecPlex and IcePlex parking lots. So those are the parking lots both here and here, and those are the number of spaces after the addition. There are 115 parking spaces that are marked on Terwall Terrace, and that marking is right adjacent to the LakeView RecPlex. There is also additional parking on Terwall Terrace, but those are just the marked spaces and there are 115 of them.

For larger events at the RecPlex shuttles could be implemented to transport event participants to more remote parking lots within Prairie Springs Park including: 139 spaces that are next to the ball fields pavilion on the south side of the park; there are an additional 100 spaces in a gravel parking lot on the south side; there are 135 spaces that are paved on the west side of the lake. The little tot lot is right here and here is the beach pavilion. There are an addition 130 spaces up here by the ball fields on the north side of the lake. There are also not included in these calculations parking adjacent to the beach here that are gravel and not marked. So there are other opportunities in the park where there are availabilities for shuttles during large swim events or other IcePlex events.

Delivery and vendor truck visits will remain unchanged as we will be using the same vendors and products. Goods, materials and equipment that will be kept and used on site will mirror what we currently house in the aquatic center. Solid and liquid waste will be handled in the same method with the sanitation pick-up and wastewater systems will be located at the southeast corner of the

pool building. This project will include a new screened-in trash enclosure at the southwest corner of the aquatics center. There's an area right here that will be screened in with access from this parking lot for removing the trash.

A geo-thermal system will be used as a source for heating and cooling the water and air temperature in the pool addition. A fully hydronic heat pump chiller driven HVAC and a Plate HX Incoming Air System will also be installed. The geothermal system will utilize the water in Lake Andrea and it is anticipated to reduce the energy consumption for the pool addition by 46 percent.

The entire pool will be drained every four to ten years for pool maintenance purposes. That water can be treated to neutralize the chlorine. Depending on the use of the pool, the pool filters will need to be backwashed every one to eight weeks. There are four filter tank and each tank requires approximately 3,000 gallons per backwash cycle at 600 to 700 gallons per minute. Depending on the facility maintenance procedures, all four filters could be backwashed at the same time or may be staggered over multiple hours, days or weeks.

Building security and emergency response will be handled by the Village Police and Fire & Rescue Departments. Additional security cameras will be installed within the facility. The facility has a manager-on-duty rotation which ensures that a manager is on site during all operational hours. The LakeView RecPlex has a fully trained maintenance and custodial staff that maintains the facility interior and exterior of the building. The Village Public Works Department maintains the landscaping and parking lots.

According to the Village's Zoning Ordinance, the Plan Commission shall not approve a site and operational plan application without finding in the decision that the application, coupled with satisfaction of any conditions of approval, will comply with all applicable Village ordinance requirements and all other applicable Federal, State or local requirements. With that if there are further questions?

Don Hackbarth:

Looking at the encroachment on Lake Andrea, is there a setback from the edge of the building to Lake Andrea or is that met?

Peggy Herrick:

Yes, that is being met. The setback is 19 feet, and the ordinance that was recently adopted was a ten foot minimum.

Don Hackbarth:

Just an off the cuff question, are we anticipating any Olympic activity if Chicago gets it or not?

Mike Pollocoff:

We definitely could hold time trials here. This will be the only other indoor pool besides Brown Deer that's going to be a USA certified pool in the State. So given our proximity if that was to

happen and they were going to have some preliminary workouts or tryouts we definitely would put our oar in the water to be selected as that site.

Don Hackbarth:

Because looking at Lake Andrea that's a pretty pristine lake, that's pretty clean. And I understand that the triathlon, the Danskin, they kind of switched because one of the lakes that they were swimming in was whatever—

Mike Pollocoff:

Not desirable.

Don Hackbarth:

Yes, and they really enjoy Lake Andrea because it is clean. So there's a possibility of all kinds of events taking place here.

Mike Pollocoff:

Oh, yeah. In a couple months here they're going to have the State Championships for open water swim, and we put in a bid for the State Championships for indoor and outdoor swim because it will be held on the same weekend and be able to do that at Lake Andrea. They've had their open water swim two years now and it's been really successful, because it is one of the few lakes around that really doesn't have any pollution problems at all.

Don Hackbarth:

Mike, I am very grateful we didn't turn that place over to the County.

Mike Pollocoff:

So am I.

Tom Terwall:

And before that that we didn't turn it into a landfill as the previous Town Chairman was going to do.

John Braig:

A number of questions, concerns. One has to do with the operations. I assume the equipment facilities for both pools will be in a common room?

Mike Pollocoff:

No.

John Braig:

The reason why I question it is, for example, if on occasion it's going to be necessary to empty the new pool, if it was timed at a time let's say in the August shutdown for the facilities as we have now, we would empty the one pool, do maintenance on it, and then fill that pool with water from the new pool. That would save you quite a bit of water. Likewise if you were backwashing or had to backwash filters at a time when you might be emptying the present pool you could use that water to backwash.

Mike Pollocoff:

One of the things we're going to look at, because the pool maintenance room is right over here for the new pool, and then for the existing pool it's right over here, now, given some of the savings that we're finding with using the heat transfer, we're going to take a look to see whether or not we can do the same thing with the existing pool. Maybe something can be done then. But right now the number of times that we need to take this pool down, we won't need to take it down for an annual cleaning. The leisure pool needs an annual cleaning every year. The consultants have told us it's a pretty big stretch, four to ten years. I don't know what makes you decide it's four years or ten years, but that's not to say probably with pumps we could get water from one over to the other. But right now the way that HVAC system and the heat transfer system we wanted to get that as close to the lake as we could.

John Braig:

Also there's heat to recover from whatever water is being discharged, too. Another item, just a comment. It says here the Village Public Works Department maintains the landscaping and the parking lots. If I'm not mistaken in the budgeting public works actually builds and charges the RecPlex for the work that it does in the parking lot and so on.

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes, there's charge backs for anything that the Village does for RecPlex.

John Braig:

The reason why I mention it is I've heard a number of people make accusations that, yeah, the RecPlex is successful but public works is plowing the parking lot and doing maintenance and so on and so the taxpayer is paying for that. I would have liked to have seen a comment included in this in case the press or the media or anyone picks up that public works does something for the RecPlex. It should be very clear that the RecPlex pays its way.

Mike Pollocoff:

The Board as they budget these items it clearly is in the budget. It's just that we don't maintain a fleet of trucks or a supply of salt at RecPlex for those activities so public works does it. Like I said, everything that happens at RecPlex if it needs something from the Village whether it's the account receivables, my time, HR, computer time, that all gets charged back. I can't believe that

the amount of time that public works is out there accounts for more than a half a percent of RecPlex budget. But whatever it is it gets charged back.

John Braig:

Am I close if I said there's about \$300,000 that are charged back?

Mike Pollocoff:

It's about \$220,000. It depends what goes on in a year to be honest with you. If we do more out there for some reason then they get charged back more. But this year's anticipated budget is \$220,000.

John Braig:

In the drawings that we received there are two minor variations of the locker layout in the men's locker room. The smaller print on about page 8 I think it is, the small print, shows lockers on what would be directly across from the entry door, whereas the slightly larger print does not show--wait it does show lockers there, too. As I look at it, it looks as though there is not enough screening for someone that would be using the lockers just inside the entry door.

Mike Pollocoff:

Well, it's hard to see. If you look right here there is a wall that comes out they have to walk around. You can see it on the larger plan and you can almost see it on the other plan but some numbers are going over it. But there is a block wall that protrudes out the width of the doorway as a modesty screen. That's State code. It has to be there.

John Braig:

Not on the print that I'm looking at. Across the front of the addition is a long hallway, correct?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right.

John Braig:

If you follow the hallway all the way down just before you get to I guess it's stairway there is an entry into the locker room.

(Inaudible)

John Braig:

83.1.

Mike Pollocoff:

You're looking at this point right here?

John Braig:

That looks different than what we have here.

Mike Pollocoff:

It's just small on the print here.

John Braig:

I'm satisfied that there's a clarification for me there. Then one last item. In the Chief's notes he indicates that an alarm shall be placed within the cabinet of the AED's. Who is responsible for maintaining—I assume the alarm is battery operated radio frequency type of alarm.

Mike Pollocoff:

If I could ask Tom Patrizzi from . . .

John Braig:

Who is going to be responsible to ensure that the batteries are checked and that sort of thing, Tom?

Tom Patrizzi:

We check them once a month, John. Maintenance goes through them all. It's just a door alarm so in case the door is ajar or something like that you have a sound that points you in that direction. It gives you an alert to that situation if the door is opened or jarred. It doesn't really alarm the fire department or anything like that.

John Braig:

But it does alarm the front desk?

Tom Patrizzi:

No, that—

John Braig:

This one says it alarms the front desk. It shall transmit a signal to the front desk. That's what got my attention because it's remote and what's the likelihood of possible failure or, for that matter, you've got two things, you've got an alarm and then you've got a transmitter.

Tom Patrizzi:

They're just single stand alone door alarms on each cabinet so we'll have to check the wording on that.

John Braig:

Okay.

Don Hackbarth:

One more comment. Is the RecPlex member going to have access to that or is that just off limits?

Mike Pollocoff:

No, RecPlex members it's just going to be like the other pool.

Don Hackbarth:

Is that going to be an additional fee then or something?

Mike Pollocoff:

No. There will be times when we may close this entrance down. We don't know yet. It could be at 4:30 in the morning we won't open the main entrance just to keep our staffing levels where we want them. People enter the main lobby, go through the locker rooms and then go into the new pool through the old pool. Of course, those locker rooms you have access to toilets in there, but rather than staffing it for people to swipe through. But it really kind of depends on what the demand is as we go through a cycle and see how many people are using it when.

Mike Serpe:

Just a couple things. All of us have been a part of this evolution of this RecPlex from the ground breaking to its present state. Again, another example, the person responsible for all of this is not coming forward to take any credit for it whatsoever and that's Mike. He just never quits. He just keeps on making this Village nicer and nicer and nicer. I have one last comment. Mike, I didn't see anywhere in the plans where we have to buy Tommy Patrizzi a golf cart so he can get back and forth.

John Braig:

I think he should get a bicycle. One more question. I've always looked at the area to the east of Terwall Terrace and thought there might be room for a roadway between Terwall Terrace and the railroad right of way big enough that you can do angle parking off of it and that might generate another couple dozen parking places. There's a creek that wanders through there, you'd have to address that issue.

Mike Pollocoff:

I think you're talking about this area here?

John Braig:

Yes.

Mike Pollocoff:

That's wetlands. That's why that road curve the way it is because those are just very significant wetlands. We had to bow the road out there. So that's why there is some room there but we can't use it.

John Braig:

How about directly east of the building?

Mike Pollocoff:

There isn't that much room. Again, you've got some wetlands here. One of the things we're looking at in the long term is to either structure a parking garage right in here, and there's still some wetlands we'd have to work around. Or, I think what's more likely is to put a parking garage right here. We could probably get 900 spaces in a three story high. We've even talked about having a storefront on the Terwall Terrace side on the first level that could be rented out and then having the parking above it. If you think about it the building is coming out like this and it's not too far a haul when it's nice to get over there. Really, if you were in any city if you were parking someplace to go to a building you're going to have to hoof that far anyway. This was really one of our thoughts when the stimulus money we asked about doing it and the poison got pretty intense over that one. People thought we might get something there. So I'd be surprised if anything came of that. But that is another site that could be used.

Now, one of the things we are going to be looking at is both entrances is to put gates up and you'd have to put your member card in and swipe in to get into the parking lot. Then if we weren't busy we would sell spaces to people who are there for an event once we were sure we had all the member spaces covered for that day. Like on a Saturday morning there's a lot of members there. Saturday afternoon there isn't but there's usually a lot of events there. We could sell the spaces in the parking lot for a price. But I think our big goal, because it's the big thing that drives our revenue base is the memberships, so they're the ones that are paying to use the place and then give them the swipe to access into the lot. But we really need to kind of work through the mechanics of how that would work out.

John Braig:

How many parking places did we lose with the addition?

Mike Pollocoff:

Twenty two.

John Braig:

That's not too bad.

Mike Serpe:

Just a question. This is way out there, but what's the chance of taking a small section of the lake and filling that in?

Mike Pollocoff:

This part of the lake is the deepest part of the lake right here. And actually the path that we showed we really got a final engineered design that kind of cantilevers out over the lake a little bit so that it doesn't do a 90 degree when you get to that corner. You get a straight shot and you can see it. I don't think DNR would let it. From an expense standpoint it would be prohibitive. That's a lot of filling.

Mike Serpe:

It came to mind because I think Kenosha did that east of Simmons. They filled in a section.

Mike Pollocoff:

Right, but this is 40 feet deep. That's a lot of fill. It would have to be rock.

Tom Terwall:

Mike, is Riley going to be the contractor on this phase?

Mike Pollocoff:

We don't know. Riley is the construction manager so we're paying them to manage the construction. He can bid on work like anybody else but he's got to be low bid, so the Village will be receiving all the bids and we'll go to the lowest bid. So on the RecPlex he bid on some aspects of the project but not all of them. But they're the ones that are really making sure that what the architect's coming up with and what we want are being put together in a manner that's going to be cost effective and get a value engineer so we get the most for our money.

Tom Terwall:

I would say given the track record we've had with Riley both on the RecPlex and the IcePlex and with Partners in Design as the architect we're in pretty good hands I believe. I don't think we can do any better. Anything further?

Mike Serpe:

Move approval of the site and operational plan.

Don Hackbarth:

Second.

Tom Terwall:

IT'S BEEN MOVED BY MIKE SERPE AND SECONDED BY DON HACKBARTH TO APPROVE THE SITE AND OPERATIONAL PLAN FOR THE POOL ADDITION SUBJECT TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF MEMORANDUM. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Tom Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered. Any idea, Mike, when you'd break ground?

Mike Pollocoff:

We're going to go out to bid on May 14th or 18th. Bids will be due the 28th. The Board would get them shortly thereafter so we should be breaking ground in the first week of June. We're looking at, if we could have six months of unobstructed construction with the weather then we can probably get her in at the end of January. But more than likely we'll have a typical summer and we could be lagging into February or March.

John Braig:

I assume you also considered the triathlons and the transition space that's required.

Mike Pollocoff:

The triathlons are going to be okay, and the parking lot albeit a little bit smaller but we'll still have the bulk of use of it. But the back side of RecPlex where it was like the finish line we're having to find another spot for that because that will actually be the construction yard. That's where the trailers—

John Braig:

That will be the staging zone for construction?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes. We're meeting with the triathlon representative. We've had one meeting. We still need a few more to figure out how we can get that finish line spaced so it works. The lake is the highest it's ever been now by at least a foot.

John Braig:

There is no outfall from that lake is there?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yeah, there is.

John Braig:

Where?

Mike Pollocoff:

It's right over by the childcare services building. You can see it right there.

John Braig:

But it's always dry, is that it?

Mike Pollocoff:

It's never gotten up that high. It's wet now.

B. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF SEVERAL ZONING TEXT AND MAP AMENDMENTS including: 1) to amend Section 420-127 relating to the PR-1 Neighborhood Park-Recreational District regulations; 2) to amend Section 420-127.1 relating to the PR-2, Community Park-Recreational District regulations; 3) to amend Section 420-127.2 relating to the PR-3, Regional Park-Recreational District regulations, respectively; 4) to amend Section 420-76 relating to Signs; 5) to amend Section 420-148 B relating to Conditional Uses; 6) to amend Section 420-152, relating to Definitions; and 7) to amend the Zoning Map to rezone 230 properties as a result of the changes to the Park-Recreational Districts.

Peggy Herrick:

These are several zoning text and zoning map amendments related to the Village Park and Recreational Districts. Specifically, they include 1) to amend Section 420-127 relating to the PR-1 Neighborhood Park-Recreational District regulations; 2) to amend Section 420-127.1 relating to the PR-2, Community Park-Recreational District regulations; 3) to amend Section 420-127.2 relating to the PR-3, Regional Park-Recreational District regulations, respectively; 4) to amend Section 420-76 relating to signs; 5) to amend Section 420-148 B relating to conditional uses; 6) to

amend Section 420-152, relating to definitions; and 7) to amend the zoning map to rezone 230 properties as a result of the changes to the Park-Recreational Districts.

On November 24, 2008, the Village Plan Commission adopted Resolution #08-20 to initiate a zoning text amendment related to the PUD for Prairie Springs Park and also adopted Resolution #08-21 to initiate zoning text amendments to the zoning ordinance related to Section 420-127 which was the Park and Recreational District PR-1. In addition, both resolutions indicated that the evaluation of both these sections of the zoning ordinance may require that other sections of the ordinance, including the zoning map may need to be re-evaluated and updated.

The Village staff began evaluating the Park and Recreational District and the various types of parks and open space areas in the Village. As the staff evaluated sections of the zoning ordinance, the staff also reviewed the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, and with the understanding that through the Smart Growth, the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and the zoning ordinance including the zoning map needed to be consistent by January 1, 2010. The Land Use Plan identifies a variety of open spaces, park and recreational type areas including neighborhood parks, community parks, major parks, special use parks, and other open space areas. In order to provide consistency with the land use plan and to provide for a wide range of open space, park and recreational areas in the Village, three Park and Recreational Districts are being proposed, the PR-1, Neighborhood Park and Recreational District, PR-2, Community Park and Recreational District, and PR-3, Regional Park and Recreational District.

The PR-1, which is the Neighborhood Park and Recreational District, would generally include small, open space areas primarily in residential and commercial and industrial developments for storm water retention and detention facilities, lot lots and areas for limited recreational activities, and this includes Village parks that are less than five acres in size. This also includes property owned by homeowners associations and commercial business associations for their retention and detention facilities as well.

The PR-2, Community Park and Recreational District, would generally include larger active private or public parks or recreational areas including areas such as Prairie Harbor Yacht Club, Halter Wildlife, Transcendental Golf, and Big Oaks Golf Course, and Village parks that are at least five acres in size.

The PR-3, which is the Regional Park and Recreational District, would include major public parks larger than 200 acres that serve the entire community and the surrounding region. The only Regional Park and Recreational District in the Village is Prairie Springs Park. As you may recall, on March 9, 2009, the Plan Commission held a public hearing and on March 16, 2009, the Village Board approved the PR-3, Regional Park and Recreational District requirements and rezoned Prairie Springs Park area into the PR-3 District. However, at tonight's meeting there are a few minor corrections we need to make to that ordinance that was adopted and I'll explain those when we get to that section.

I'm going to go through each of these zoning text amendments now. The first one is to amend Section 420-127 entitled PR-1, Neighborhood Park and Recreational District. The PR-1, Neighborhood Park-Recreational District, is intended to provide for areas for storm water facilities and other limited recreational and open space uses. These are both public and/or private open space or recreational areas. These areas are typically under five acres in size and include

property owned by associations, like I said before, homeowners associations or commercial business associations and, again, used for storm water retention or detention or open space areas. Park areas adjacent to Lake Michigan owned by the Village and the Kenosha County Bike Trail are other area that would remain in the PR-1 District.

Principal uses in the PR-1 District specifically include storm water detention or retention facilities, provided that the detention or retention facility is not used for recreational purposes such as but not limited to boating, fishing, ice skating or swimming. Again, these facilities are used for storm water management purposes.

Another use allowed would be limited recreational and open space uses including beaches, bicycle or hiking or nature trails and walks, boat access sites, boating, cross-country ski trails, fishing, historical monuments or sites, picnic areas, playgrounds and tot lots, play fields, courts or athletic fields, roller blading, roller skating, sledding or tobogganing areas or outdoor swimming areas.

A third use would be Pavilions, gazebos, shelters or maintenance buildings and temporary restroom facilities. The ordinance requires a maximum size of 1,000 square feet and a maximum height of 20 feet for any building.

Another area that is zoned PR-1 would be the area by Lake Russo that is owned by the association of River Oaks. They have a pavilion out there that meets these requirements, they have two horseshoe pits and things like that. That's a private recreational area for that association. That is an area that would be zoned PR-1.

Another area that is PR-1 is in the Village Green Heights Subdivision. They have a number of outlots there that are owned by the association, they're not public parks. Some have storm water facilities on them. Some are just open space for the residents there and those areas are zoned PR-1.

Conditional uses in the PR-1 in those types of areas would be indoor swimming pools, any permanent restroom facilities, or any transmission lines whether they be electric powered or natural gas. So those would be conditional uses allowed in the PR-1 District.

The PR-1 District also allows for accessory uses and structures and temporary uses, allows for a combination of uses within a building or on a site, and includes dimensional, design and operational standards as all of our districts do.

The next set of amendments deal with the creation of the district regulations for the PR-2, Community Park and Recreational District and creating the district requirements. This district is intended to provide for public or private parks, open space and recreational uses to serve the adjacent neighborhoods or the entire community. Again, these are public or private recreational or open space areas. The PR-2 District shall be at least five acres and may incorporate other natural features such as wetlands, woodlands, shorelands, floodplains and other resources that may be zoned C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District; C-2, Upland Resource Conservancy District; or may have floodplain located on those properties. These areas include all public neighborhood and community parks that are owned by the Village that are greater than five acres, excluding Prairie Springs Park which, again, is a regional park and that is zoned PR-3. It includes

private properties such as Halter Wildlife, Prairie Harbor Yacht Club, Transcendental Golf, Big Oaks Golf Course and the Village special purpose park Momper's Woods. So those would all be into the PR-2 District.

Principal uses in the PR-2 District include outdoor recreational facilities and activities such as beaches, bicycle, nature trails, cross-country ski trails, historic monuments or sites, picnic areas, playgrounds, athletic fields, roller blading, swimming, skating rink, sledding and tobogganing areas. It includes dry cabarets. A dry cabaret is a facility that doesn't serve alcohol but provides live music. Indoor swimming pools, pavilions, gazebos, other shelters and maintenance buildings, nature and education centers, restaurants and snack bars with some limitations related to feeding and serving of alcohol. It also allows for storm water detention and retention facilities.

Conditional uses in the PR-2 District include archery ranges, boat rentals, cabarets. Again, a cabaret as opposed to a dry cabaret is serving of alcohol with live music as a cabaret. Campgrounds, commercial communication structures, equestrian trails, golf course, golf driving ranges, marinas, miniature golf courses, off-road vehicular trails, residential corridors for the owner or proprietor for use on the property, restaurants or snack bars with some limitations, sportsmen clubs such as Halter Wildlife, summer theaters, amphitheaters or band shells, transmission lines whether they're electric, power or natural gas, utility substation and buildings, wind energy conservation systems, zoological or botanical gardens.

Similar to the PR-1 District the PR-2 District also allows for accessory uses and structures, and temporary uses allows for the combination of uses within a building or on the site including dimensional and design and operational standards for all uses within the district.

The next set of amendments deal with amendments to Section 420-127.2 entitled PR-3, Park and Recreational District. As I mentioned earlier, the bulk of the requirements in the PR-3 District were approved by the Village Board after recommendation from the Plan Commission in March. However, after finalizing the PR-1 and PR-2 Districts, there were a few modifications we wanted to make to the PR-3 to make them consistent, and those deal with a section was added related to temporary uses.

Temporary uses may be allowed in the PR-3 District pursuant to Section 140.1 of this chapter. Temporary use section was added to the ordinance a year or so ago, so we want to make reference that temporary uses are allowed in this district as well pursuant to those requirements so that is proposed to be added.

As a result of adding that section, another section needed to be amended related to prohibited uses. We needed to reference that temporary uses are not prohibited uses, so we needed to add a few words in the ordinance related to prohibited uses that it includes temporary uses.

The last change relates to site and operational plan requirements. The operational standards refers to compliances with site and operational plan requirements pursuant to Article IX of the zoning ordinance, and we're adding a clause that the zoning administrator may allow other building materials as appropriate for the building type in that particular use. The similar language is in the PR-1 and the PR-2 District. So those are the three minor changes that are being proposed to the PR-3 District.

The next set of amendments deal with Section 420-76 and these relate to signs. As a result of creating three districts, our ordinance had to be amended to refer to the correct district based on the types of signs. Since now we have three districts we just can't refer to PR-1 anymore, we needed to update it and see which signs needed to be looked at.

So the amendment proposes to allow in the PR-2 and the PR-3 districts bulletin board, canopy, coming soon, primary monument, projecting, roof, secondary monument and temporary banner all in the PR-2 and PR-3 District. The next set of amendments would allow in the PR-1 District the following signs, multifamily residential identification signs and single and two family residential identification signs. As you recall, the PR-1 are in subdivisions where the storm water and detention facilities or other outlots, and that's a lot of time where developers will put their signs. So we wanted to make sure that the developers' signs would still be conforming once we change some of their outlots to PR-1.

The third amendment related to signs is to allow window signs in not only business districts but also in manufacturing, institutional and park and recreational districts in all three of the districts. The fourth amendment relates to special event signs or devices. This section relates to the number allowed per calendar year. Currently the ordinance allows for three per calendar year except in a PR-1 or Institutional District. We're proposing to change that to four per calendar year in any district except in the PR-3 and the I-1 Districts where those signs are unlimited so they could have one every month. With all the events that go on at the RecPlex temporary signs are out there all the time so that change is proposed to be made.

The fifth amendment related to signs relates to the primary monument sign. There are some issues when properties have more than one frontage, they have a frontage on a local road and frontage on an arterial road. Our ordinance currently allows for one primary monument sign and a second sign only if you have a large amount of acres and I believe it's 600 acres. We're finding that properties that have less than that are needing a secondary monument sign. For example, if you go out to Prairie Ridge, Famous Dave's, they have three streets that abut them. They don't have 600 acres. They're allowed one primary monument sign and they chose to put that on the local road where their address is on. Their address is off of 76th Street or 77th Street. Our ordinance doesn't allow them to have another primary monument sign. And it makes sense in situations where the abut an arterial road then another sign may be allowed.

So these amendments would allow for a secondary monument sign, are less than 600 acres and you abut more a local road, an arterial road and your access is off the local road rather than the arterial, that a second monument sign is allowed on that arterial street. So that's the fifth set of recommendations. In addition there are restrictions on the size of those signs as well. They're a little bit smaller than what's allowed for their first primary sign.

The next set of amendments amend Section 420-148 B. This relates to conditional uses. The conditional use section of the ordinance has standards that are set up in addition to the regular standards that are set forth in other places in the ordinance like site and operational or performance standards. A number of these sections are being deleted because the specific requirements are no longer specifically allowed in the Park and Recreational District or where the existing conditions specified are covered elsewhere in the zoning ordinance.

A lot of this section other than the sections we updated were done by the County in 1983. And at that time we didn't have the site and operational procedures like we have now. So a lot of the conditional uses said they need to have a site plan approved by the community. Well, we already covered that elsewhere in the ordinance. So a number of these sections, including sections related to amusement parks, carnivals, circuses, fairgrounds, exposition grounds, arenas, stadiums, coliseums, auditoriums and gymnasiums, assemblies over 5,000 people, beaches and public swimming pools, marinas, marine sales and service, mini-bike trails, recreational or RV campgrounds or subdivisions, resorts, skeet and trap shooting ranges, ski hills and restaurants and ski shops and snowmobile trails. Those are all being deleted because either they're not allowed any more in the Park and Recreational District or there are specific requirements that are required for a conditional use covered elsewhere in the ordinance so it was being redundant.

There's a section related to archery ranges and that's being amended to delete the reference to shooting ranges and to change the reference to being allowed in the PR-1 District to being allowed in the PR-2 District.

(Inaudible)

Peggy Herrick:

That's allowed as a principal use. The section related to campgrounds is being amended to reference the PR-2 and the PR-3 District rather than just the PR-1 District. And the specific conditions are being modified related to required landscaping around the perimeter of the campground, and the unnecessary requirements that are covered elsewhere in the ordinance are being deleted as well.

The section related to communication structures, and this is referring to communication structures allowed with a conditional use in the PR-2, PR-3 and the Institutional District are required to follow the requirements in Section 420-89 of our zoning ordinance which are specific requirements for communication structures.

The sections related to golf course, driving ranges and wind energy conversion systems and zoological and botanical gardens are being amended to reference the PR-2 and PR-3 District rather than the PR-1 and, again, unnecessary requirements are being deleted from those sections as well.

The section related to residential quarters, sportsmen clubs and summer theaters and amphitheaters or band shelters are being amended to refer to the PR-2 District rather than the PR-1 District and, again, unnecessary requirements are being deleted.

The last section of our zoning text amendments related to definitions and those are in Section 420-152. These amendments include deleting definitions for park, amusement and recreational RV pad. These definitions are no longer applicable due to other changes that are made in the zoning ordinance. So those two definitions are proposed to be deleted.

Next is a series of zoning maps that I'm going to go through. As a result of making the above referenced zoning text amendments, the official Village zoning map is proposed to be amended to rezone 230 properties into their appropriate zoning classifications. The proposed zoning maps are

shown on a series of 25 map exhibits that correspond with a chart attached to the proposed zoning map amendments. I'm going to go through each of these maps briefly. If you want to follow along, there is a chart attached to the zoning exhibit. It's Exhibit 1 attached to the zoning map amendments which should be the last set of ordinances in this group of the packet.

Exhibit A-1 shows property that's owned by the Village, and this area is proposed to be rezoned to PR-1. This is part of a larger piece of property that goes all the way up to Highway 50 to the Interstate. It's part of . . . property that was donated to the Village back in the '80s. For some reason a portion of this property is still zoned R-5, so that portion is being rezoned to PR-1.

Exhibit A-2 shows some property that was recently acquired by the Village adjacent to Pleasant Prairie Park. There is one correction. This whole area, these four properties listed here and the existing PR-1 park area that was inadvertently missed. That whole area should go to PR-2. The total acreage of the whole Pleasant Prairie Park that is owned by the Village is almost ten acres. And when we did the notices we were just looking at the acreages of each individual parcel that were under five so that was an error. We are recommending that all of Pleasant Prairie Park, this whole PR-1 area and the purple areas and this little sliver up here be rezoned to PR-2 which is a community park, again, because the whole park area is more than five acres, it's almost ten acres.

This exhibit map, B-3, this is a retention facilities in Prairie Ridge. It's currently zoned A-4. It's proposed to go to PR-1. It is a detention facility for Prairie Ridge Development. This is an outlot in Ashbury Creek Subdivision. It is proposed to go to PR-1. It's just open space. They have their sign there. There's detention or retention basin, but that area is proposed to go to PR-1 as an open space area.

This area on this slide is the retention basin in Bentz Estates. That property is proposed to go to PR-1. This is an area that was recently donated to the Village as Ingram Park. The portion where the home is on in this area down here is proposed to go to R-4 to allow the continued use of that single family home. The remainder including the high tension ATC property is proposed to go to PR-2, which is the Community Park and Recreational District.

Exhibit D-2, this is land that's owned by Rich and Jill Oscarson. They are currently building a house in the C-2 area on the property right here. The remainder of their property which is open space was zoned into the PR-1 District as a result of the changes in the PR-1 District. That area is proposed to go to residential R-3. The lot meets the minimum requirements for the R-3 District. The intention of the property owner is to leave that as open space on his own private property, so we're proposing to put that into a residential district. In the event he wants to put a shed or some other residential use on his property that would not be an issue.

Exhibit E-1, these purple areas are proposed to go to PR-1. These are the areas that are owned by the LakeView Corporate Park Business Association. These are the retention and detention facilities for the park. There is one exception to this. There is a small pink area on that map that is a Village lift station or substation property. That is proposed to go into the I-1, Institutional District. That's a small triangular piece at the corner of 88th Avenue and about 93rd Street, so that's proposed to go to—I-1 is right up in this triangle right here. The remainder, again, are open spaces and retention and detention facilities in LakeView Corporate Park.

This area is south of McDonald's and Culver's out by 120th Avenue. This is Corporate Drive. There's a small area right here owned by LakeView Business Association which is part of their retention and storm water facilities. That's proposed to go to PR-1 as well.

These are outlot areas in the Meadowlands Subdivision on Old Green Bay Road and State Trunk Highway 165. Those areas are supposed to go to the PR-1 District. These are areas adjacent to Highway 31 that are part of the Momper's Woods. These two areas in yellow are currently zoned manufacturing but they're part of the Momper's Woods property. Those are proposed to go to PR-2. Most of that site is zoned C-2, which is a Woodland Upland Conservancy District, so the areas highlighted in yellow there are proposed to go to PR-2.

Exhibit G is areas related to Village Green Park and some outlots in Meadowdale Subdivision. This is Meadowdale right here. There's a retention basin here, a retention basin here. This is an outlot with some open space. I'll go into more detail with that. I have another slide that blows that up. Those areas are going to PR-1 which is the Neighborhood Park and Recreational District. The area in yellow is part of Village Green Park owned by the Village. That area is proposed to go into PR-2, the Community Park. There's a little sliver of land right here that's part of this outlot owned by the association. That is proposed to be going into the PR-1 District.

This area right in here, I'm just going to go to the next slide, there were some inconsistencies in the current zoning map. This property right here is a single family lot. That entire lot should be zoned R-3. The area in purple is part of the outlot owned by the association, and this yellow within the purple is wetlands that were field delineated at the time that subdivision was platted. So the map is being corrected to put this yellow area within the purple into the C-1 District. The purple area would go into the PR-1 District, and this yellow lot, lot I think it's 101, that whole lot will be zoned R-3. So that's just a correction to the map for that area.

This area that's somewhat shaded in purple, this is Rolling Meadow Park. That whole park is proposed to be in the PR-1 District. This area in yellow is parking area adjacent to the Kenosha County Bike Trail. This is Springbrook Road. This is 93rd Street. There are two parcels there owned by Kenosha County which has a little gravel parking area and some picnic tables for access to the bike trail. That will go into PR-1.

There's two properties here in Foxmore Estates. Foxmore is located at 39th Avenue and 109th Street, Kenosha County Bike Trail. This lot has I believe a detention basin on it, then there's another parcel that has access to the bike trail. Both of those will go into the PR-1 District.

This is in the subdivision Country Lane. Here's 116th Street, 39th Avenue. There are some outlots in this subdivision that have detention facilities or open space. Those are also proposed to go into the PR-1 District.

The purple areas over on this site, Springbrook Road, this is Springbrook Meadow Subdivision. There are outlots with a retention facility on and other open spaces of the outlots that are not wetlands are proposed to go to the PR-1 District.

This subdivision is Whispering Knoll. Again, the outlot, the nonwetland portions of their outlots are proposed to go to PR-1. This is a basin owned by the Village in Prairie Lane Subdivision.

That is proposed to go to PR-1. We're in Mission Hills Subdivision. The outlots in Mission Hills, the areas that are not wetlands and are zoned C-1 are proposed to go to the PR-1 District.

I just want to make a comment. A lot of the newer subdivisions I would say in the last two years the outlots for these retention basins have been put in the PR-1. A lot of these other subdivisions are older ones where that was not common practice to put those into those districts. A few years ago we had some issues in a subdivision where the association thought, they were zoned R-4, these outlots, let's fill this in and let's sell the lot as a single family home. So after that point we started rezoning these into the PR-1. So a lot of these are making corrections to some of the older subdivisions in the Village.

Exhibit K, this is owned by the Des Plaines Conservancy, part of Halter Wildlife. Everything in yellow is currently zoned either PR-1, A-2 or A-1. The rest is zoned C-1 and there's some floodplain out there, too. All of the nonwetland areas are proposed to go into the PR-2 District. Halter Wildlife has a number of properties out there, 11 different properties. They're all part of their sportsmen club, so all of the nonwetlands are proposed to go to PR-2, and the areas in yellow kind of indicate where those are. The areas in white kind of intermixed in between these are zoned C-1 which are wetland areas.

This exhibit related to Big Oaks. A number of the properties within Big Oaks are zoned PR-1. There are some area that are zoned agricultural, A-1. A few years ago the golf course they had two parcels out there and they redelineated their lot lines and did lot line adjustments so that their whole golf course property is on one parcel, and the property that they're farming for future development is on another parcel. Back in '83 when the County rezoned and created our zoning district maps they were not based on parcel information, they were on aerial photo maps. And when we readopted the maps back in 2006 we digitized our maps and everything. This is really a cleanup from that. Everything on the golf course property is going into the PR-2 District except for the areas that are zoned C-2 and C-1. And there are some areas right up in here that are orange on your maps and they don't really show up very well on here, those are part of the adjacent property that's owned by Big Oaks that is farming. The little areas that are zoned PR-1 are going into the ag district that the adjacent zoning is in. So this is really a cleanup of putting what is using as golf course into the PR-2 District, and the stuff that they're farming on their adjacent property into the ag district.

This Exhibit M-1, this parcel right here, this is in Tobin Woods Subdivision. This is their retention facility. This is 119th Street, this is 26th Avenue. That's proposed to go into the PR-1 District. These three properties are owned by the Village. They are the detention facilities in Green Tree Estates. Green Tree Estates is located adjacent to the bike trail, 39th Avenue is over here, this is 125th Street. So those three properties there those are proposed to go into the PR-1 District.

This is property on Sheridan Road owned by the Village. This is Sheridan Road right here. This area is proposed to go into I-1 which is Institutional District. That's this area long the road here. The remainder is proposed to go into PR-1 with an AGO Overlay District because it's the intent of the Village to farm this area. But it is intended to be open space. The other area on this map, this little purple area, this is part of Carol Beach Park. This little sliver here is currently zoned residential R-6. It's proposed to go into the PR-1 District. There's one more on there. This area

right up in here this is also proposed to go to the I-1 District. That is right south of the Village's storage tank. 104th is right up here.

This is Transcendental Golf property on 116th Street. Sheridan Road is about right here. That property is currently zoned PR-1, proposed to go to PR-2. Again, that's the Community Park and Recreational District. And, finally, Prairie Harbor Yacht Club. That is currently zoned PR-1. That property that they own is proposed to go into the PR-2, Community Park and Recreational District.

Also, pursuant to the Section 420-14 of the Village zoning ordinance, any land rezoned from the A-1, Agricultural Preservation District, shall not be rezoned unless the Village Board determines that the rezoning from the A-1 District meets the three standards pursuant to § 91.77(1), Wis. State Statutes. Those statutes are:

1. Adequate public facilities to accommodate development either exist or will be provided within a reasonable time.
2. Provision of public facilities to accommodate development will not place an unreasonable burden on the ability of affected local units of government to provide them.
3. The land proposed for rezoning is suitable for development, and development will not result in undue water or air pollution, cause unreasonable soil erosion or have an unreasonably adverse effect on rare or irreplaceable natural resource areas.

There are two areas where we are proposing to rezone land out of the A-1 District and they're both going into the PR-2 District. One of these areas relates to areas owned by the Des Plaines Wetland Conservancy which is, again, part of Halter Wildlife. There's two areas down here, this yellow area and this yellow area. This area is zoned A-1. They use this to plant crops for their pheasant and part of their sportsmen club so those are proposed to be rezoned and the map corrected to put those into the PR-2 Districts, and those are accessory uses to their hunt club.

The other area is related to Big Oaks Golf Course. Again, there's some areas down here that are zoned A-1 and up in here and those are proposed to go into the PR-2 District. There are also areas that are going into the A-1 which is right in this area, again, and those are areas that are farmed. So these properties that are currently developed, both in Halter Wildlife and in Big Oaks Golf Course, and the zoning map is basically being corrected. These properties have adequate public facilities to accommodate the existing park and recreational uses and do not place an unreasonable burden on the Village and the existing park and recreational uses do not result in undue water or air pollution, cause unreasonable soil erosion or have unreasonable adverse effect on rare or irreplaceable or natural resource areas. So Village staff believes that it meets these standards to rezone them out of the A-1 District and basically we're correcting the map.

With that, lots of ordinance amendments. This is a public hearing. We can certainly entertain any comments from the audience or the Plan Commission.

Tom Terwall:

This is a matter for public hearing. Is there anybody wishing to speak on this matter? Yes, sir, please come to the microphone and give us your name and address please.

Ken Stein:

My name is Ken Stein and I reside at 5522 89th Street. My comment is in reference to the Ingram Park that has been deeded to the Village. When we received the notes we met with Mike Pollocoff and also Monica and Clyde in reference to finding out that our properties had been moved into a flood zone due to the map that's proposed to be completed which still hasn't been approved by FEMA. And after talking to them they said that it is possible that by taking the fishing pond or small lake area that they are deeding that they can shift that and remove our properties and put them back as to a bordering of floodplain or adjacent to a floodplain. We were basically the only one of the neighbors that were able to attend tonight. One of the individuals is at a doctor's appointment and the other people were tied up. But we would like to state that our understanding is that it has already been proposed to move that and we would like to state that we are all in favor of moving that and see that the properties retain their value and don't decrease in value by being moved into a floodplain which we had nothing to do about. Thank you.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you. With reference to a floodplain isn't that a question of mapping? I mean it either is in the floodplain or it isn't, isn't it?

Mike Pollocoff:

If you look at this map here, of course the yellow is Ingram's Park. Mr. Stein's property I believe is right there. It doesn't show up very well but it's a green line that's the floodplain line. We met with one of the individuals with one of these properties. So what we're looking to do is the Rec Commission made a recommendation to the Village Board which they're going to hear next week for a contractors, Schreiber Anderson to complete the park plan for Ingram Park which is going to include some grading. So as part of that, one of the things that Ingrams wanted in the park was a fishing pond. We want to make sure that that pond that gets set up doesn't have surface water draining into it unless it's gone through a sedimentation screen before. So what we want to do is regrade this area here, do a cut and fill, and bring this area where the residential area is out of the floodplain and put it in the back of the park as part of the water cleansing basin before it goes into the pond.

This is a confluence of three waterways. This is Jerome Creek waterway right here, and these are not demarked waterways but the water all comes from three angles right down to this corner here and also down to 89th Street. So by doing this work here it's going to enhance the park as far as the quality of that new pond that gets built, plus we want to use this opportunity to haul some existing land out of the floodplain.

Mike Pollocoff:

The Rec Commission recommended approval of the contract with Schreiber Anderson on the park plan and the Board will be hearing that on Monday night and then they'll get started.

Tom Terwall:

In our motion to send a favorable recommendation to the Village Board we can include that recommendation from us also, is that correct?

Mike Pollocoff:

Sure.

John Braig:

Is the subcontinental divide west of Cooper Road in this area?

Mike Pollocoff:

No, it's east. It runs basically—well over here it actually goes on the other side, you're right, of Cooper Road, and it meanders over at about 87th Place and kind of goes along the back lot lines of Whittier Heights Subdivision. Then it goes right out the front door of Whittier Elementary.

John Braig:

Somebody told me that Whittier if teachers were really paying attention there could point out that Whittier straddles the subcontinental divide.

Mike Pollocoff:

I've done some science—

John Braig:

On the west the down spouts go to the Mississippi and the east goes to the St. Lawrence.

Mike Pollocoff:

It's right out the front door. I've done some science class demonstrations where I've taken two pieces of tissue paper at the front door and we went out in the rain and you drop them at that one point and one goes to Lake Michigan and the other one goes to the Mississippi River. They didn't think it was that neat but I thought it was.

John Braig:

But further south on Cooper the subcontinental divide is on the west side of Cooper, isn't it, somewhere around about—

Mike Pollocoff:

About 91st it jogs over to the west side again and then it kind of swings around.

John Braig:

Yes, because I think you've got a culvert under Cooper there.

Tom Terwall:

Let's complete the public hearing. Is there anybody else—

Peggy Herrick:

Can I just add one thing regarding that floodplain boundary adjustment. It's really an engineering exercise so they'll have to go through that gymnastics and make sure it meets all the Village and State and federal requirements to make those amendments. So that certainly can be evaluated as part of the park plan that Mike indicated is being done, but they still have to go through that process.

Tom Terwall:

Is there anybody else wishing—yes?

Jelena Socava:

My name is Jelena Socava, and I live at 9794 47th Court which is the new Devonshire Subdivision. I did receive a letter a couple weeks ago regarding this meeting and I thank you very much for the presentation. But for the public it was very dizzying because it was zoned this, zone that, zone that. I got dizzy. But anyway, we just moved in in November. Our house was built on Lot 4 in Devonshire which is nearing the back woods which goes into the Village Green. And when we signed a contract to buy the land we were told that that woods and the back woods that goes totally between Devonshire and the Village Green is protected by DNR. So then I find out that we're building stadiums and bathrooms and gazebos and black . . . through the beautiful woods back there. I'm a little bit concerned that we're messing up that nature. So I wanted to hear more about it but I heard very little. So perhaps someone can educate me on what's going on I guess.

And I don't know whose responsibility, it was probably mine to find out more about the land I'm buying so I'll take the fall for that, but I'm thinking between the Pleasant Prairie and the developer and my husband and me somebody should have been informed that this is what's happening in my backyard. So I guess I'll take a little bit of blame, but I think the developer should, and maybe we should send a note saying please inform the future buyers that this is what's going to happen, especially to the property that's right across from this PR-2 and PR-3 or whatever the zoning is so they know that right across from their front door will be a baseball stadium with big lights, etc.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you.

Mike Pollocoff:

That area was the subject of numerous and extensive neighborhood plans for development as part of the Master Park Plan. We're not going to put a baseball stadium there. It's going to be a neighborhood kids' pickup ball field.

—:

Lights?

Mike Pollocoff:

No. It's going to be kind of like a Becker Park, just a backstop. There's not even going to be an infield. There will just be some bases they'll put out. There will be a trail as part of our trail plan that will go through there. We're tentatively looking at making it a rubberized trail so people who will walk on it it's going to be easy on their joints. It's a lengthy trail. There was a plan for a gazebo and a tot lot, and it's a fairly active area, but we're not looking to do any clear cutting of the trees or anything like that. We'll probably be hauling some dead ones out of there as we start our construction.

But actually public works is getting ready to grade this area out here as part of the contract and get that seeded and grassed in the first instance this year. The developer provided us with I believe \$200,000 for park improvements from Mastercraft. Our commitment in accepting that money is we're going to install the improvements that the Master Park Plan provided for. But that park plan is available. It's on line and it's also here at the Village Hall.

As far as people buying their houses we really rely on buyers and sellers, we make that information available at the Village Hall and on line to take a look at just where your property or future property fits within the master plan of the Village, and if you have any questions about it we'll be more than glad when you see those to come visit with us.

Tom Terwall:

Is there anybody else wishing to speak? Anybody else? Anybody else? Hearing none I'm going to open it up to comments from Commissioners and staff.

Don Hackbarth:

On page 6 of the blue document, just a couple comments. I don't know where they fit. Let's say that St. Therese wants to have a carnival or an event, where would that fit under this?

Peggy Herrick:

That would be a temporary use . . . City of Kenosha.

Don Hackbarth:

But would it be in these documents or would it be something else?

Peggy Herrick:

That's in the City of Kenosha anyways, but a carnival or something like that would be a temporary use approved by the zoning administrator, because it would be a one day even or a weekend event or something like that, not something you'd do on a permanent basis.

Don Hackbarth:

The other comment I had was in going through these provisions here, let's say somebody like Laborers for Christ came again to build. Where would that fit or how would that work?

Peggy Herrick:

That would be, again, a temporary use permit. And as you may recall, temporary uses used to be approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals. And back a year or so ago we rewrote a whole section on temporary uses and putting it in the zoning ordinance to be approved by the zoning administrator so there are no longer hearings.

Don Hackbarth:

The other question I have is looking at our master plan, in the event high speed rail goes through here do we have a plan for where it would go through?

Mike Pollocoff:

The last one I saw it was going to be the Canadian Pacific line which is that westernmost line.

Don Hackbarth:

So where would that be located? Where would that go through?

Mike Pollocoff:

Pardon me?

Don Hackbarth:

Where would that go through?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right along Prairie Springs Park and H.

John Braig:

With reference to temporary and permanent campgrounds, when we have a major event on Lake Andrea and people come in with their RV vehicles for the weekend, is that considered a permanent-type campground or is that just temporary?

Mike Pollocoff:

Temporary.

Peggy Herrick:

That would be a temporary.

John Braig:

I like what we see here and if there's no further comments, do we need separate motions?

Peggy Herrick:

No, just one motion for the text and map amendments unless there's specific—

John Braig:

So moved.

Judy Juliana:

Second.

Tom Terwall:

IT'S BEEN MOVED BY JOHN BRAIG AND SECONDED BY JUDY JULIANA TO SEND A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE BOARD TO APPROVE THE ZONING TEXT AND MAP AMENDMENTS AND TO INCLUDE THE RECOMMENDATION THAT THEY MOVE FORWARD WITH THE REMOVAL OF THE PRIVATELY OWNED PROPERTIES FROM THE FLOODPLAIN AND DO A FILL AND SWAP.

Peggy Herrick:

Does that also include the changes of the Pleasant Prairie Ball Park from PR-1 to PR-2 and those properties as well?

John Braig:

Yes.

Mike Serpe:

I'm just curious, Peg, this was pretty involved. Was this more public inquiry on this?

Peggy Herrick:

Yes. We sent out over 1,000 notices to property owners. I received over 25 phone calls and several e-mails. Tom and Jean probably received the same amount. Most of them were just curious what we were doing. When we explained they had no issues or no comments.

Tom Terwall:

One last question before we take the vote. This pretty much gets us in line with what we have to do by 2010, correct?

Peggy Herrick:

For the Park and Recreational Districts, yes.

Tom Terwall:

How many communities in the State do you think there are that are at the stage where we're at? I know we're less than a year away, or do you think that's all going to go by the wayside?

Peggy Herrick:

The only way it can go by the wayside is if the State law changes. The State law still says the zoning ordinance needs to be consistent with your comp plan if you want to do zoning and land development by 2010. So that's still the State law. If they grant an extension to that date that's going to be a change in the statutes. I don't know if that's going to happen or not going to happen.

Tom Terwall:

Doesn't State law also state that they have to balance the budget?

Peggy Herrick:

Sure.

Mike Pollocoff:

It says we have to balance not the budget, not they.

Peggy Herrick:

We're working towards that January 1, 2010 deadline. We're still working towards that end.

Tom Terwall:

And I'm very proud of the progress we've made. I just question how many communities in the State are as close to compliance as we are, because I'll be there's a lot of them that haven't even begun yet.

Peggy Herrick:

I don't know but I would tend to agree with you.

Tom Terwall:

WE HAVEN'T VOTED YET, HAVE WE. THERE'S A MOTION BY JOHN BRAIG AND A SECOND BY JUDY JULIANA TO SEND A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE BOARD TO APPROVE THE ZONING MAP AND TEXT AMENDMENTS SUBJECT TO THE CORRECTIONS THAT WERE PUT FORWARD. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Tom Terwall:

Opposed?

John Braig:

When it comes to assessment for tax purposes, the zoning does not influence the assessment as compared to use? I'm thinking of the situations where we're changing the zoning from agricultural to park and recreation. Obviously, if land is in agricultural use it has an entirely different assessment. The zoning will not affect that?

Mike Pollocoff:

Correct. It's just a use.

John Braig:

Thank you.

C. Review and consider Chapter XIV, "Intergovernmental Cooperation Element" of the Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Kenosha County.

Peggy Herrick:

This is Chapter XIV of the Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan that we've been working on for the last three years with Kenosha County and participating municipalities within the County.

This chapter relates to intergovernmental cooperation. The State requires that an intergovernmental cooperation element be prepared to deal with relationships between governments and districts, to discuss current plans and agreements, and to identify and resolve conflicts between municipalities and local governments.

In addition, the State comprehensive planning goals relate to an intergovernmental cooperation element. They're set forth in Section 16.965 of the Statute, and they are to encourage cooperation and coordination among nearby units of government, provide adequate infrastructure and public services, and an adequate supply of developable land to meet existing and future market demands for residential, commercial and industrial uses. It provides an integrated, efficient and economical transportation system that affords mobility, convenience and safety that meets the needs of all citizens including transit dependent citizens and persons with disabilities.

There are many benefits in intergovernmental cooperation including early identification of issues, reduced litigations potentially, provide consistency, understanding of trust and history of success. There's potentially cost savings if you have intergovernmental agreements and it can address regional issues.

This chapter is divided in four parts. Part 1 talks about the analysis of intergovernmental relationships. Within Kenosha County there's planning and development, human services, public works and Sheriff's department which all work together and provide services to the County. There are intergovernmental relationships between local governments. Currently there are 13 local governments in Kenosha County. They all have various agreements with each other and between each other on various topics and issues. There are school districts. We have three public high school districts, Kenosha Unified District #1 with Central High School District and Wilmot High School District in Kenosha County, so there are relationships between school districts. There are also libraries that have special relationships. Like, again, the Village doesn't have its own library but there are relationships with the City of Kenosha and the County system where we can share those facilities.

There are also drainage districts that are special purpose districts that are created under Chapter 88 of the Wisconsin Statutes that are formed to plan and carry out area wide drainage. As you are aware, drainage districts do not follow municipal boundaries, they follow topography, so there are intergovernmental relationships related to drainage.

There are intergovernmental relationships between the County and the local governments that are outlined in this chapter. They include transit marketing, the Southeastern Wisconsin Transit Partnership includes Kenosha, Racine, Washington, Ozaukee, Waukesha and Milwaukee Counties. They share resources. Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Transit Authority, Kenosha Family Care Consortium, Tri-County Public Health Consortium, Wisconsin/Illinois Border County Mutual Aid Agreement, there's a Kenosha County Fire and Rescue Safety Association, there's an Emergency Management Mutual Aid Agreement, the Southern Lake Michigan Regional Water Supply Consortium. There's an Upper Des Plaines Phase II Feasibility Study, the Northern Illinois County Cooperative GIS Program, and the Kenosha/Racine Lead Free Communities Partnership. So those are all County and local agreements and relationships that currently exist.

There are regional organizations, SEWRPC, which provides services to seven counties in the Southeastern Wisconsin area, Milwaukee Seven is a council representing the seven Southeastern Wisconsin counties. They're made of about 35 civic and business leaders and they're formed with an idea that a regional approach is important on fostering economic growth. And then there's nonprofit conservation organizations that are active in the County to preserve lands and natural resources.

There are intergovernmental relationships in the State itself including Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Department of Commerce, Department of Health and Family Services and other governmental units. There are a number of special purpose units within the County, and these are directly involved in land use planning and development. They include drainage districts, lake districts, sanitary districts and utility districts. So, again, Part 1 are existing type of intergovernmental agreements and relationships that are out there.

Part 2 provides examples of existing services and other agreements in Kenosha County. It refers to intergovernmental cooperation agreements pursuant to 66.0301 of the statutes. There are boundary changes pursuant to approved cooperative plans pursuant to Section 66.0307 of the statutes. There are cooperative plan agreements pursuant to 66.0203 of the statutes. There are stipulated boundary agreements pursuant to Section 66.0225 of the statutes. There are also powers and duties of regional planning commissions that are allowed pursuant to 66.0309 of the statutes.

This chapter goes through and lists all the different agreements that were adopted pursuant to these sections of the State Statutes. There are a number of them that we are making recommendations that they excluded or have the wrong section numbers for things in the Village, and you can see those noted in the staff comments in red of the proposed changes to those existing facilities.

This part of the chapter also lists existing shared services and equipment within the County relating to EMS, garbage and recycling, public works and shared equipment and staff. It makes recommendations to potential shared services and equipment for public education, coordinated police and sheriff patrols, coordinated fire response, joint garbage recycling, highway maintenance and joint purposes.

The Village has made several comments to the draft related to if there are consolidation or coordination of these facilities that there needs to be not only some financial benefit to the local municipality. There also needs to be no reduction of service or quality of service or change in the character of that community. So we made very specific comments related to those things. A lot of the issues really pointed to consolidation. Whether or not that is good in all instances needs to be evaluated on each particular instance and should be initiated by the local municipality, not initiated by the County. We want to make sure that there is language in here to make sure it's beneficial to that local municipality not only financially but the level of service and the quality of service that's being provided for the community.

There are existing shared utilities and community facility agreements related to sanitary sewer, water testing, libraries, schools and parks and medical facilities. There's potential shared utility and community facilities, interconnection of trails, school district west of I-94 may be a potential shared facility. There's some talk about share shared community buildings where if it's in the

best interest of a community to share a village hall or a town hall with another community that that should be a potential possibility to look into from those municipalities or local governments. Shared school facilities, shared storm water management facilities, and the Village is recommending that the regional Lake Michigan waste water facility as recommended in another plan be further investigated. Again, these all go back to the same thing. It needs to be financially feasible and beneficial to the local municipality. There needs to be no reduction in the level of service in the things that are being provided.

Next talks about existing shared technology services. Currently there are shared services for digital maps and ortho photographs between the Counties, SEWRPC and the Village and other municipalities. There is a Statewide voter registration system in other areas of the County, not in the Village of Pleasant Prairie. We handle our own information.

(Inaudible)

Peggy Herrick:

Yes, but the County doesn't provide any support services for that. But in other areas in towns they do but not in the Village. The County prepares our tax bills, our tax rolls and they do some tax receipting. There's some shared UW-Extension programs that are out there. There's some potential shared services, potentially public safety communications, telecommunication infrastructure. Again, there needs to be benefit financially and level of service and quality of service needs to be maintained. Existing cooperative planning and ordinance administration, again, we're working with the County and the municipalities to prepare this countywide comprehensive plan. There are boundary agreements out there.

There's planning with KUSD. The Village currently served on their long-range plan. We provide information to KUSD every month for developments that are going on, where development is occurring. There's a Keep Our Water Clean plan. There's access management plans with the State, on 165 we're working on one, the Interstate we're working on an update, Highway 50 we're working on an update so there's those intergovernmental agreements for that.

There's a County transit development plan. There's non metallic mining reclamation programs, and we're currently working on a FEMA map modernization program to update all of the floodplain maps for Kenosha County so that's under way as well. There's potential cooperative planning and ordinance administration and this includes, again, storm water management, additional boundary agreements potentially out there, transportation planning can be coordinated at all levels, same with economic development planning. The development of impact on schools can be done at more than just a community level. Natural resource planning, joint land preservation plans and multi-use planning are things that are potentially out there that go beyond boundaries of the local municipality.

The next part is intergovernmental conflicts and conflict resolution. This section deals with how conflict can be resolved. There are different agreements that can be put in place relating to annexation. There are boundary agreements. There are residential and development and school impact agreements that can be worked out where information is shared, how residential development occurs and that growth pattern and how that affects the schools.

The next section, Part 4, talks about intergovernmental cooperation, goals, objectives, policies and programs. The first talks about intergovernmental cooperation issues. The goal is to encourage that cooperation. The chapter sets forth objectives to meet that goal. The next goal is to cooperate with other units and agencies of government where appropriate to provide cost effective government services provided the level of service will be maintained or improved. Again, there's objectives and policies related to that.

Some of the Village's concerns are it needs to be beneficial to the affected local government or school and it's cost effective and continues to provide the same or greater level of service. We wanted to add some of those comments into their proposed language.

The next goal is to promote better understanding among all levels of government on the roles and responsibilities of each. And, again, there are objectives, to continue the cooperation through all the different levels of government, to continue sharing information. And the fourth and final goal is to fully coordinate land use planning and development decisions with the school district. Again, the Village already is very active in that. Other communities are not, and it's been brought up that west of the I the school districts over there would like to see the same sort of information that's being provided on the east side of the Interstate.

So with that, that is the chapter on intergovernmental cooperation. The comments that are in your packet that are outlined in red are Village staff recommendations that we'll be making to the Village Board and then forward on to the multi-jurisdictional committee.

Don Hackbarth:

This is a very changeable chapter because there are things—how are they going to do that? Is somebody going to keep updating this thing?

Peggy Herrick:

SEWRPC does, yes.

Don Hackbarth:

Okay, because we talk about the Kenosha County tactical team and we have Paul Merrick as our member on there. That could change overnight. He could go. So somebody is following all these things?

Mike Pollocoff:

No.

Peggy Herrick:

Well, we don't list Paul Merrick as that person.

Don Hackbarth:

I understand, but I'm just saying that there's one person. What happens if there's two? I mean it's a very changeable document. A lot of things I can see that would be changeable.

Peggy Herrick:

Correct. They have to set a certain date and as of this date this is what is there.

Don Hackbarth:

The other thing is, too, I understand this is a guide. It's very interesting that it's in that small print. But I understand it's a guide. Let's say there's a conflict between Pleasant Prairie and the City and we can't resolve it. Who is the mediating body that's going to sit in here and say, well, now we've got this document and I want to point this out to you and want to point that out. It's a nice guide, but I really believe that if you're going to produce a document like this you have to say there is a body that will come in and be a mediator in the event there is a conflict.

Mike Pollocoff:

I think you speak to one of the weaknesses of this particular phase. Quite frankly, I'm disappointed in the presentation of the document that SEWRPC has given us for a couple reasons. One is that they've basically bought into the concept that in order to have the best government you can have is to consolidate the governments and that everything should be consolidated in with the County. This municipality went through organizational hell a few years back over an uninvited consolidation of services with Kenosha County. And so they've looked at it in that mind frame and they just took and put it on there, and it was a basic assumption that you should consolidate your police departments, you should consolidate your fire departments, you should consolidate your public works departments.

Nobody has done the work, and it's hard work, to sit down and say let's, because I think it requires changes in State laws, to say what are the certain functions of government? What should the County be responsible for, what should municipalities be responsible for or towns? To me one of the things that shows the weaknesses of this document what wasn't included. When you look at what is just crying out for consolidation is those capital intensive activities like sewer and water and solid waste. The Village has water and sewer infrastructure of nearly a quarter of a billion dollars that we own that we manage. The City I have no idea how much they have. But when you deliver municipal services like sewer and water you spread the cost of those assets across your customer base. And the more customers you have the less that costs you.

The level to which you decide how to staff that is by and large not determined by municipalities, it's determined by public health or the DNR. Same thing with solid waste. Way back when, and I don't know when, the County decided it was best to allow private enterprise to operate the landfill, again, another real capital intensive thing as far as owning a landfill and operating it. So this community gave away our control over landfill operations to a private company and today you see the Town of Paris sitting on \$23 million as a beneficiary of a private deal that year after year after year municipalities and private individuals pay for. They don't mention that at all in this study.

So they haven't taken a good, serious look as to what are those definite functions of government and what should be allocated and how that should be allocated. I, myself, think that a municipality, the City of Kenosha, Pleasant Prairie, Twin Lake, whatever, if they decide they want to have a certain level of police protection and they're willing to fund it, as a home rule community they have that opportunity to do that. And if they decided they didn't want any police protection and they're going to take whatever the Sheriff gives them I guess they've got that option, too, but that would be a home rule. But what they're saying is you're going to take a department that historically has not performed at the same level as municipal departments and you're all going to get it. The only premise was if it's consolidated it's got to be better.

So the underlying pins that this sits on are faulty. They're faulty beyond belief. And what we end up doing is making some constructs that says we won't do this because it's got to benefit us and it's got to be cost effective and get the same results and I don't know what that means. I don't know how you engage in a long-term plan and say it's your long-term plan when you have all this stuff in there that people pick at it. They're just going to say Pleasant Prairie won't cooperate with this or that. And what I'm saying is I don't think—the plan for intergovernmental cooperation is a train wreck. You're taking the very big things that you really need to address and you throw them out of consideration, and then you take the rest of it and say let's consolidate it and that will be better because it would be consolidated.

Don Hackbarth:

Mike, where would you start? What would you recommend?

Mike Pollocoff:

I really think the best recommendation that could come out of this in my mind is that the community should sit down together as a community and talk about what are the functions of government that are best assigned to what levels of government and work on making that determination. If anything is going to change for the County you're going to have to get State legislation to do it. Municipalities can do just about whatever they want to do, the County is the one that's really hindered on what they statutorily have to do, and make that decision.

Should the County be involved in mass transit or you can have every community involved in mass transit. Should the County be involved in owning and operating a landfill, or do you contract it out or do you have other communities set up their own. You have communities do their own collection and they have a County landfill. But those decisions don't get made. The only decision that gets made in here is if you're consolidating it it's got to be better.

Don Hackbarth:

My question then is this was handed to us for review. So we can make recommendations. Before we even approve this thing, can somebody take the bull by the horns, and I know you've got enough on your plate, but can somebody take the bull by the horns and contact these agencies and say let's work on this together to make it better and then make our recommendations as a body back to the State or the body that generated this?

Mike Pollocoff:

I think they could. I think what they would probably say is, Pleasant Prairie, you can adopt your own plan. We're following the template that we have. I can't say that that's exactly what they'll do. There have been other changes that we've had and they've been helpful. But this is the only thing I've seen in the plan where I've said these guys have really taken the easy way out on this.

Don Hackbarth:

Like I say, if there's a conflict between communities who is going to be the mediating body, or is it just this document saying work this thing through.

Mike Pollocoff:

The mediating body really has to be the State statutes. That's our charter whether we're a village or a city or a town or the state. The law says these are the things you have to do.

Don Hackbarth:

But do municipalities follow that? Do they really follow that?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes, because anything else they'd do is illegal. We don't have any legal basis to do what we're doing if it's not based on the statutes.

Don Hackbarth:

I mean cooperation is a beautiful document but, like I say, if there is a conflict between communities somebody has got to sit down and say I'm in charge here and let's hear two sides of it.

Mike Pollocoff:

I guess my thought is this doesn't say cooperate. We forced that into the language. This says consolidate. When they're talking about consolidation they're talking about everything.

Tom Terwall:

Mike, has the Fire Chief, Chief of Police and the Director of Public Works had their input in here?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes.

Tom Terwall:

And they're happy with what they see here?

Mike Pollocoff:

No, they've made what we think are modifications within the template but, no, they're not happy with it at all. It doesn't relate to what the real world is that we have to deal with here. We have to deal with an aggressive County that wants to take things and operate them.

Don Hackbarth:

Mike, then why did they call this intergovernmental cooperation element?

Mike Pollocoff:

I don't know.

Peggy Herrick:

The statutes require that this chapter be put in this comprehensive plan.

Tom Terwall:

But you look at fire, for example, communities like Pleasant Prairie and the City have enough people, I mean the City is 100 percent full time and we're probably 60 or 70 percent full time and 30 percent paid on call, and the communities on the west end are 100 percent volunteer. If you pull those guys into the same system and now we're all going to be full time, the \$23 million that Paris has got now is going to be gone in a minute.

Mike Pollocoff:

And I think the fire departments have done an extremely an extremely good job through MABAS of coordinating their resources. That seems to work pretty well. And, again, they call for consolidation. Well, every community has got their own concept of what they're willing to fund and not fund. If they don't really fund very much then they stand to be out of MABAS because you've got to bring something to the table.

Tom Terwall:

A classic example of that right now. The Town of Somers they're all in favor of getting a big Wal-Mart and a Sam's, but don't talk to me about a ladder truck. We'll borrow Pleasant Prairie's if we ever get a fire. Give me a break. And if they're going to make that decision for us I've got a real problem with that.

Don Hackbarth:

So what do we do

Mike Pollocoff:

You can recommend—I mean I guess if there's any comments, I told you what I thought were the shortcomings of it, and we've made amendments to the best within the structure that we can. But this will just end up on a shelf with everything else. Given the inadequacy of it I'd probably be happy if that's all that happened to it.

Mike Serpe:

The amendments you make in there are those accepted into this packet, does SEWRPC accept those as part of this?

Peggy Herrick:

We'll be submitting them to them.

Mike Pollocoff:

They may not.

Mike Serpe:

But they have the right to say no?

Peggy Herrick:

The committee would have the right to say no.

Mike Serpe:

Any of our recommendations that you put in, the things in red, SEWRPC doesn't have to accept those, do they?

Mike Pollocoff:

The committee doesn't have to accept them. SEWRPC doesn't have the final say. But if the County or the City says we think it should be consolidated—

Peggy Herrick:

In the past all of our recommendations have been included in the plans. So all those issues we had on community utility facilities and things like that those have all been included in. All of our recommendations have been included.

Don Hackbarth:

Can we just pass this along to the Board without any recommendation at all and let them do it?

Tom Terwall:

I just don't want to see it shoved down our throat. I agree with Mike. If it's capital intensive it definitely makes sense to try to consolidate. But when you're talking about anything that's labor intensive it's not going to be any cheaper.

Peggy Herrick:

The other thing is the Village will be drafting its own chapter related to this, and that's going to be part of our comprehensive plan that the Village will adopt before the end of the year. So a lot of these things we can address in our own plan as to our we see the Village fitting in with cooperating with other municipalities and the County. So we will be taking this as a basis but formulating our own chapter specifically for the Village.

Don Hackbarth:

With that understanding I vote that we do not approve this.

Peggy Herrick:

Do you have additional recommendations we need to make to SEWRPC?

Don Hackbarth:

If you're going to be producing a chapter yourself, if the Village is going to be producing its chapter, I would say that we don't approve this one and we follow yours, follow the Village's.

Peggy Herrick:

But at a minimum do we want the County to review our proposed changes?

Tom Terwall:

I'd say yes. We've got all five members of the Village Board here tonight and they know where we stand and I think we know where they stand. So if we send it on to them with the understanding that there's big holes in it.

Mike Serpe:

Something just comes to my mind. We're all a part of the Unified School District right now. If knowing what we know today and the vote came up to do this again would we?

Larry Zarletti:

Mr. Chairman, I don't think we're necessarily voting on whether it's all good or all bad or whatever. The fact of the matter is it's like when a builder brings something to this organization and wants something passed and has followed all the rules and guidelines set forth we have the

responsibility to send it forward. So with that in mind you're never going to agree on all the things that are in there even if you started meeting today and stopped meeting in 2020. You're not going to come to a solid agreement that all things will be beautiful with regards to intergovernmental cooperation. So with that in mind I do think the Village Board is aware of it, needs to take a look at it, and it's our responsibility to send it to them. So whether we use the word favorable or not I am recommending that we send this to the Village Board.

Don Hackbarth:

Let me first withdraw my motion.

Larry Zarletti:

I didn't know there was a motion. Was there a motion on the floor? I'm sorry.

Tom Terwall:

There was no second.

Larry Zarletti:

Okay, that's my motion.

Mike Serpe:

And I think what Larry just said was correct. You have no choice. I'll second his motion.

Tom Terwall:

My only concern is that someday this document gets adopted and now it becomes the Bible and they're going to start ramming things down your throat. Whether it happens at the County or Madison it doesn't make any difference to me. I don't approve of either one.

Mike Serpe:

I agree with you, but I think they have to have the opportunity to insert your wishes into this document and they're trying to do that.

Tom Terwall:

Then I would say our recommendation should include the fact that we're not abdicating any authority or responsibility. Ultimately the Village has got to make the decision on what they want to consolidate. And if it's cost effective our residents will make dog gone sure that it happens.

(Inaudible)

Peggy Herrick:

And a lot of the things we did insert in there is that it has to be at the request of a local municipality throughout this document. In other chapters we indicated the same thing, that it needs to be at the request of the local municipality to even start the discussion, it needs to be financially feasible and needs to be a win for the Village and the local municipality.

Tom Terwall:

IF THERE EVER WAS A THING THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN COUNTY WIDE IT WAS ASSESSMENTS. AND THEY THROW THAT AWAY AND FORCE EVERY COMMUNITY TO DO IT ON THEIR OWN, BUT NOW THEY'RE GOING TO COME BACK AND TELL US THEY SHOULD. I HAVE A REAL PROBLEM WITH THAT. A REAL BIG PROBLEM. WE HAVE A MOTION BY LARRY ZARLETTI AND A SECOND BY MIKE SERPE, AND I THINK WITH MIKE'S WORD SMITHING WE'RE GOING TO GET THIS THING ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Tom Terwall:

Opposed?

Don Hackbarth:

Aye.

Tom Terwall:

No.

7. ADJOURN.

Larry Zarletti:

Motion to adjourn.

Judy Juliana:

Second.

Tom Terwall:

All in favor signify by saying aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Tom Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

Meeting Adjourned: 6:55 p.m.