

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

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

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

John Steinbrink:

We've had quite a number of people signed up, so we're going to ask there be a three minute time limit on comments. So if somebody else makes a comment and its part of yours just kind of refer to it or try and add something new to the subject.

Marina Pennington:

To the Village of Pleasant Prairie Board President, members and residents. Re: Petition to consider the long-term future of Pleasant Prairie that includes its own distinct school district. Dear Board President, Board members and community residents: All too many of Pleasant Prairie residents has witnessed the mistakes of neighboring communities where good intentions for growth failed by addressing short-term issues while unintentionally failing to address its core long-term stability, growth and wealth of a community.

While Pleasant Prairie, as cited by the *Chicago Tribune's* real estate section, referred to us, Pleasant Prairie, as the Lake Bluff of Southeastern Wisconsin, it is imperative that we not make mistakes of other quick growth communities. Specifically, if we are to maintain the status of being a Lake Bluff of Southeastern Wisconsin, then I humbly beseech the Board President, Board members and community residents of Pleasant Prairie to make the necessary commitment and long-term visionary investment now to establish Pleasant Prairie's own distinct school district that reflects the aspirations and expectations of its residents that dollar for dollar will serve as a bedrock foundation, enhancing our property values as well as serving to encourage continual residential relocation to our community long after the housing boon has been seen across our Village, State and nation has passed.

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

It is imperative that the Board initiates this endeavor through wise land acquisitions while utilizing the knowledge base and political influence of both State officials, Pleasant Prairie, State Senator Wirch and State Representative Steinbrink, Sr.

My petition for consideration is not a condemnation of Kenosha Unified School District. It is merely an affirmation that Pleasant Prairie Village residents require a school district of quality matching the value of our residences. Just as the vitality of strip malls are dependent upon a major anchor store, so will this Village's future be anchored upon whether our Village and this Board recognizes the wisdom in creating its own Adlai Stevenson styled school district through the wise use of our property taxes. If this issue must become a voter referendum, then I will do everything in my power to make that happen if this Board fails in its long-term fiduciary responsibility to fortify Pleasant Prairie's ongoing growth with its own school district as it carefully maintains an economic growth engine for our Village that will be supported by such a school district for decades to come. Regards, Marina and Sidney F. Pennington. We're Mission Hills residents.

Thank you for allowing me to speak. And, please, I know this is an expensive endeavor, but while we have the resources everyone knows that people seeking to relocate or considering buying houses in a community always first address and accesses the school district which is anchored to that particular town, city or village. And considering the fact that we're experiencing this growth, we should, we should, we have to for a long-term basis consider this.

Vesna Savic:

Ma'am, your time is up.

Marina Pennington:

I'm sorry, I've never spoken before, so please. Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you, and I think you got it all in on the time there.

John Niemietz:

I wish I was prepared as much as she was. My name is John Niemietz. I live at 4910 93rd Street, and we're here as a concern about the development from Devonshire. We wanted to be able to understand a little bit more about what's going to be taking place on 93rd Street, along with probably the rest of the block who's here. I don't know how that's going to be possible, and maybe the Board could help us understand a little bit of the process for being able to partake in any of the decision making that's going to take place on that roadway.

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

Our concerns are mainly of the widening of the road, rumors of a turnabout at 93rd and Cooper, and just certain approaches with that property and development on that side of 93rd. So I guess if there's any question I have it's just how can we be an active participant in making a decision on what happens to the front of our properties? Thank you very much.

Dale Wellman:

I'm also here to talk about Devonshire. I don't know what you plan to do because I don't-

John Steinbrink:

We just need your name and address for the record.

Dale Wellman:

Dale Wellman, 9245 Cooper Road. Rumors are flying all over the place that you're going to be widening 93rd Street. What I've seen so far you're adding 50 feet from each side of the center line. You're going to be taking one-third of my property or just under one-third of my property. And if you're going to make a roundabout you're going to take some more off of the front. I'd be losing a minimum of nine trees, one of which is over 300 years old. I'm against everything I've seen so far on this Devonshire. What you need to do is enforce your speed limits and your stop signs at Cooper and 93rd. I'm guessing maybe five percent of the people actually stop. And, again, five percent of the people might only come down to the speed limit as they go through it. Every time you put a marked squad there they attempt to slow down and stop, but the majority of them if you had an unmarked squad there you'd see exactly what we're talking about and the noise is ridiculous. So when you get around to doing your portion of this meeting on Devonshire I'm against what I've known to this point.

Walter Safran:

Good evening. My name is Walter Safran, 4733 93rd Street. We are the adjacent property owners at the northeast corner of the subdivision. If the Board pleases, I know they don't, but I'd like to take a little bit more than the five minutes. I have a lot to say. The subdivision and 93rd Street are a very integral part of Pleasant Prairie. The addition of Devonshire ties together the entire south side of Pleasant Prairie. My wife and I are long-time residents, native residents of Pleasant Prairie. My wife was born in this house and lived in this house all of her life. We have a very deep interest into this 93rd Street and Devonshire. So if you would just please bear with me for a few seconds, maybe a few minutes.

We are the adjacent property owners of this house on 93rd Street to the Devonshire subdivision. The conceptual plan proposes construction of 48th Avenue extending south from the existing intersection of 48th and 93rd Street providing a secondary access to the subdivision. It's all in the Village plans. The entrance roadway will be centered in a 90 foot wide lot located between my neighbor's house at 4825 93rd Street and our house at 4733 93rd Street. At the intersection of 93rd

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

Street the conceptual plan proposes a deceleration lane extending 90 feet to the west across my neighbor's front yard blocking her east half of her horseshoe driveway. There is also a proposed 60 foot acceleration lane extending across the frontage of our home blocking our driveway.

We are being told that we must relocate our driveways to make way for a new road. That's not right. Our driveway is private property. Our homes are not part of Devonshire subdivision. MasterCraft must build the subdivision and roads with respect to our property and property lines. On behalf of my wife and myself, I'm sorry my wife cannot be here tonight, she's recovering from abdominal surgery. She's about six weeks healing.

We are voicing our objection to the relocation or the turning of our driveway 90 degrees to exit onto the proposed new 48th Avenue. The intersection of 48th and 93rd Street was constructed in the mid 1950s. Our house and driveway were constructed almost 50 years ago in 1959, at least five years after the intersection was built. The driveway and house at 4733 93rd Street were constructed in 1959 by my wife's mother and father, Mitchell and Jessie Urbanski, lifelong members of Kenosha and Pleasant Prairie. Mitch graduated from the University of Wisconsin-Madison in the early 1940s. He was a licensed registered professional engineer by the State of Wisconsin. He worked at American Motors for over 40 years where he was employed as Superintendent of Plan Engineering. He received letter of acclimation from the Mayor of Kenosha for his engineering an accomplishments. Everything was pre-measured, pre-calculated with no guesswork.

The driveway and its location was permitted, constructed and approved in accordance with the building codes and Village ordinances in effect in 1959. We believe that the driveway should be grandfathered into acceptance in its present location and not be turned or relocated. We can't understand why after nearly 50 years the Village of Pleasant Prairie is rescinding its permission to locate our driveway through the roadway right of way in its present location. After 50 years that our driveway was constructed, newcomer MasterCraft is permitted to build a road across our driveway blocking our access to 93rd Street, and we as homeowners must relocate our driveway after 50 years or more. That's not right.

MasterCraft owns a 90 foot wide lot access to 93rd Street. With 90 foot of deceleration lane and 60 feet of acceleration lane they are extending their road frontage from 90 feet to 240 feet. That's not right. There again, my wife and I want to go on record that we are voicing our objection to the proposal to turn or relocate our driveway.

I've also given you some photographs of our driveway, the surrounding trees on our driveway, and an intersection just a tenth of a mile down the street going into Meadowdale. Less of a tenth of a mile east on 93rd Street is the intersection of 43rd Avenue and 93rd Street. It's an entrance to Meadowdale Subdivision. The Village of Pleasant Prairie has already established a precedent of curved curbed entrance into a major subdivision with deceleration or acceleration lanes. The curbing, as you can see in the photos, that joins and abuts onto 93rd Street and an added tip measures approximately 100 feet wide, tip of tip cement curbing. I'm sure that with a little engineering the same road configuration can be applied to 48th Avenue and 93rd Street without affecting the adjacent property owners.

Also, I have some questions. Why are deceleration and acceleration lanes even required? What

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

are they decelerating from or accelerating to? 93rd Street is a two lane road with a 35 mile an hour speed limit. MasterCraft can and should be directed to build the road within the confines of their 90 foot lot frontage on 93rd Street or relocate it somewhere else.

Further, on the June 21st meeting in our driveway and our backyard Mr. Duerwaechter, owner of MasterCraft, stated this is a secondary entrance. There will be houses built along the tree line butting to Meadowdale and a cul-de-sac, a total of 24 homes. This will not be a major access point. There are already two major access points designed off Cooper Road. That meeting was attended on June 21st by MasterCraft Mr. Duerwaechter, Ms. Washburn, agent for MasterCraft, members of the Village Planning Commission Mr. Terwall and Mr. Braig, and out of Village Development Ms. Werbie.

Let me reiterate a couple of the major points. The conceptual construction of 48th Avenue with deceleration and acceleration lanes blocks existing driveways denying 50 and 60 year old established households; access to 93rd Street. Our driveway was constructed in 1959, almost 50 years ago. The driveway with this location 64 feet from center line of 48th Avenue was permitted, constructed and approved in accordance with the building codes and Village ordinance. Number three, my wife and myself object to the relocation or turning of our driveway. Number four, the Village of Pleasant Prairie has established a precedence in constructing the intersection of 43rd Avenue and 93rd Street without the decel or accel lanes accessing a major subdivision, Meadowdale. And, number five, if the Village does direct MasterCraft to build a road at 48th and 93rd, the access road should be built within the confines of the 90 foot frontage on 93rd Street with minimal discrepancy or disruption to adjacent landowners. Finally, number six, 48th Avenue is the wrong place to construct the intersection and initial entrance into this major significant subdivision.

Just a few more points here. In this presentation that the proposal of the Planning Commission last week on the 26th of June, there's at least three or four items I'd like to make issue with. There's many more, but I'd like to just make three or four issues. Page 2, the top item, item number 2, the first two pages pertain to me and that's why I want to speak about them as comments. The property owner's existing 16 foot wide driveway, and this item number 2, explains the driveway and turning onto 48th Avenue. That was one of four proposals.

There was four other proposals made by MasterCraft and Village development that weren't even discussed in this presentation. One was the angle of the driveway across the front yard and get it away from the intersection. One was to make a rear garage entry, and Mr. Braig and Mr. Duerwaechter walked into our garage, took measurements knocking out the south wall of our garage and reboarding up the front wall, putting a header in our garage, and putting the doors to the rear of the garage and then putting the driveway at the rear entry. And we also came up with maybe even making a side entry to the garage and entering direct from 48th Avenue instead of all these turnarounds.

Fourth was to just a turnaround in the front yard and leave the driveway as is and drive directly out onto 93rd Street without backing up. That one addresses Mr. Zarletti's concern that there would be a safety issue driving across the acceleration lane but driving forward onto 93rd Street addresses that issue and minimizes the safety issue.

Another issue, this says that we would remove pine trees that are located on the west side of our driveway and that would be for the turnaround of the driveway going out onto 48th Avenue. There's three trees there exactly. Two of the trees would be removed with the measurements that were given, and one tree would probably be removed because of the radius that they would have to add onto the driveway. That would make all three trees being removed. These three trees were planted by my wife's mother and father. They're 40 years old. They're 50 foot high trees and they're fully mature trees.

My father-in-law passed away in that house with a heart attack in 1992. My mother-in-law passed away in that house with a stroke in 2000, not actually in the house but she was life flighted to Froedtert and passed away at Froedtert. We found her on the kitchen floor one morning. That's all that we have left of my mother and father-in-law are some trees and the house and some memories. I don't think we, my wife and me, can allow those trees to be removed.

Item number 4 also talks about replacing the trees with two 11 or 12-foot trees. If we remove all three trees, does that mean I'm going to get six trees in its place? I don't know. Item number 6, it talks about relocation of utility poles in the right of way on 48th Avenue and Cooper Road. That's not in our property, but there is one electric pole, telephone pole that is directly in our front.

Ms. Werbie mentioned that, oh by the way, Wisconsin Electric has a proposal to relocate all the telephone poles on the south side of 93rd Street 12 feet further to the south and that goes along with the 50 foot right of way and the berms that they're going to put across. She said when the telephone posts are going to be removed and moved the trees would also be removed because of interfering with the electrical lines. The trees right now are four 50-year old oak trees and two 75-year old oak trees. The 75-year old oak trees were the corners between the Rumachik farm and the Isett farm. If you look close enough, 40 or 50 feet up in the air there's barbed wire sticking out of the trees. Those were the cornerstones of the two farms which is now Meadowdale.

There's other issues but I'll make a summary real quick here. My wife and I would also like to suggest that because of the significance of Meadowdale, Devonshire, Village Green and the extension of Cooper Road all the way from 93rd Street to Village Green and accessing the north side of Village Green, that we would like to suggest that both the Village Board and the Planning Commission, along with the Village staff, tour the area of 93rd Street and 48th Avenue and decide together the best direction for the Village of Pleasant Prairie. It's just too important of a subdivision, ties everything together, and makes Village Green even grow from the north side.

Because of the many unresolved issues and the fact that my wife and I strongly object to the turning or relocation of our driveway as one major issue, the creation of the 48th Avenue intersection with through traffic bypass lanes and constant construction traffic and deceleration/acceleration lanes as a second major issue, and then the third major issue also in this

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

blue issue from the 26th of June is that they also mentioned that there would be a regrade of the adjacent properties outside of the development plus in order to finish the grading our backyard to make it adjoin to the subdivision they're allowing an easement across our backyard for the possible additional grading. Our backyard is private property and it should not be part of the Devonshire grading whatsoever.

We respectfully ask that the Pleasant Prairie Village Board table the conceptual plan for Devonshire until all the issues and the full impact of the full 93rd Street and 48th Avenue and Cooper Road neighborhood are resolved. Thank you. One other issue. We have a petition from 93rd Street residents with 22 names on it objecting to this intersection. I've given that petition to Mr Lauer for presentation into the Board meetings. Thank you.

Steven Ennis:

Good evening. My name is Steve Ennis. I live at 7743 35th Avenue in Kenosha. I'm here because my wife and her mother are co-owners of the property directly to the west of Walter Safran, Lilly Miller and Patricia Miller-Ennis. Patty couldn't be here tonight because she had to work so she asked me to come in her place. I guess I'd like to start off by saying I agree with everything I heard Mr. Safran say. I can't think of anything I don't agree with. We believe that the extension of 48th Avenue south is probably not the best access to Devonshire even as a secondary access. It's an awfully small area, 90 feet across as he said, and I think there's maybe some better frontage along 93rd Street where it could be accessed.

If the road did need to go in there, again I agree with Mr. Safran that the acceleration and deceleration lanes don't need to be there for the same reasons he spoke of, the speed limits, and the small size of that entrance. It just doesn't need to be there. That property at 4825 93rd Street has a horseshoe driveway right now. Both entrances come out on 93rd Street. The east driveway they say is going to be a safety issue because of the deceleration lane there. They want to move that driveway and have it access the east side on 48th Avenue. Now, if you can picture 93rd Street going east and a car traveling east on 93rd Street turning to the south, a right hand turn at that avenue, the new entrance that they're proposing is already less than code. It won't even be as far from the corner as the code says it has to be, but they're willing to overlook that. They're willing to give us an exception. But if safety is safety, I don't know how there can be an exception.

If that car is turning right on that corner I won't see him coming. If I'm pulling out of that driveway I won't see that car coming. If I'm pulling out of the driveway where it is right now on 93rd Street, I can see east and west down 93rd Street for quite a ways. What I'm mostly concerned about are the cars coming from the west because that will be the immediate lane that I'll be pulling out into, and I can see cars coming for a long distance. But that driveway is facing east onto 48th Avenue and I won't be able to see cars coming around that corner. I think that is less safe than pulling out onto 93rd Street.

And I also have to reiterate what Walter said about the people that have lived there. The driveways at that house have been there longer than Mr. Safran's driveways. They've probably been there at least 50 years, and I really think that people who have lived in that neighborhood have supported the Village, have paid their taxes for over 50 years and should have a little say in what goes on. Thank you very much.

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

Kelsey Shepperd:

My name is Kelsey Shepperd. My family and I live at 4732 93rd Street. I came here today to tell you how I feel. This goes out to both Pleasant Prairie Town Board and MasterCraft. We do not need this development. There are so many houses already for sale in Pleasant Prairie. Now, everywhere you go all you see is big houses. Pleasant Prairie is a Village for the people and you're not listening to the people. It seems to me that . . . all you people care about is money.

I wrote this letter to the Pleasant Prairie Town Board and I changed it a bit to make it shorter. Dear Pleasant Prairie Town Board: I just wanted to write to you to tell you how I feel about the future development of Village Green, western half by MasterCraft. My family and I have received the plans for it. I looked it over and noticed they are filling wetlands. Wetlands are very important in our community. They help cleanse the water, provide wildlife shelter and help stop floods. I don't think they need to build these houses and develop the lands which mean so much to me.

I also don't think they need to build these houses because only rich people can afford to buy them and the houses are humongous. People don't need houses that big. Now, I know the population is growing, but still there are so many houses already for sale in Pleasant Prairie. Developments close by still have houses to be sold or built. Every time I think of this subject that there might be houses there I either start crying or feel like crying.

Getting back to the wildlife, there are also many deer and other wildlife that live in those woods and fields. I've seen many animals in those fields including deer, raccoons, geese, foxes, coyotes, squirrels, sandhill cranes and rabbits. When you build those houses where are all the animals supposed to go? All of the animals will be pushed out causing them to move closer to people and to find food and shelter, kind of like the new movie Over the Hedge. That just goes to show you that that's what it would be like if you were an animal and that happened to you.

Every time I look out at the field's through my mom and dad's window it's so beautiful. But it's best when there are geese flying in the blue sky honking and deer and other wildlife roaming in the open field. Once those houses are built I'll never get to see that again, only in my memories. That land means so much to me and the other people who live by it. They don't want to see big humongous houses there and neither do I nor my family.

If you elect to let them build those houses there really wouldn't be any more prairies in Pleasant Prairie. There's a question for you, why do you call it Pleasant Prairie if there isn't any prairie left? I'm just a 12 year old girl so you may be thinking why is she writing this? Because I had to. I couldn't just stand there while you dissecting my heart. I wanted you to know you're breaking a little girl's heart.

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

I want the DNR, the Department of Natural Resources, to buy that land and have it as a preserve. They could restore the prairies and plant trees and have the generations of tomorrow enjoy it for many years to come. This is the perfect opportunity, and I just wanted to let you know how I feel about this whole situation. In my opinion you people want more money because then about 115 people would move here and have to pay taxes making you all richer. Keep the prairies in Pleasant Prairie. Don't build any more developments in Pleasant Prairie. Sincerely, A Very Sad Girl, Kelsey Shepperd.

I never received a reply. You people don't know how it is to love a piece of land. It sounds weird, but I love that land. It's very special to my neighbors and me. I don't know much about it, but in my mind it seems that I know everything there is to know about it. And that's what will break my heart. It will disrupt other peoples' lives and families. How would you feel if you had a home there for about 50 years and then all of a sudden disrupted by a development? I wouldn't be so happy about it and I'm not going to be. I have to live through it, though. I don't think I can but I will have to.

We need more open spaces in Pleasant Prairie. This is the perfect opportunity. I came here today to tell you just a little bit about how I feel about this whole situation. I think I can speak for a lot of my neighbors, too. If you still allow MasterCraft to do this development, they need to do it right. From what I can see so far you're not. For instance, the entrances that come off Cooper Road, Cooper Road should extend farther and have an entrance there. Where they want to have an entrance between Walt's and Lilly's it would cause a safety concern to my neighbors and I. It is right by a hill on both sides. MasterCraft has been told to put it there but if they want to connect the new entrance to a dead end road which is known as 48th Avenue, it makes no sense because that road can never go through. It ends at a cemetery. So one day you may dig up the bodies and move them? I don't think so.

If you are trying to fit an entrance in 90 feet you have to move Walt's driveway at the developer's cost and then put in a new one. Walt would have to get a new address also when you connect 48th Avenue to the future entrance. That will cause another safety concern to my family and me. We have small children on that road and then my family has to watch three places to back out. And not just my family. This development is causing way too many problems. Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Any one else wishing to speak on this item or on any item since it's citizen comments? Anyone else wishing to speak? Hearing none I'll close citizen comments and open it up to Village Board comments.

5. VILLAGE BOARD COMMENTS

Jeff Lauer:

As Walter said I was handed a petition when I came in so I just wanted to read it into the record pertaining to the proposed Devonshire Subdivision. "We, the residents of 93rd Street and north 48th Avenue object to the construction of an entrance access road at the intersection of 48th Avenue and 93rd Street. This entrance way has only 90 feet frontage on 93rd Street surrounded by

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

an established residential area in existence for over 50 years. 48th Avenue north is a dead end street with seven households ending with a cemetery. There is absolutely no reason to make this a thru-connecting street to the south. The expansion will cause a severe safety concern to the households with small children and other traffic problems.

“The constant traffic with bulldozers, earth moving equipment, dump trucks, trailers with building materials, cement trucks, etc., will cause untold health concerns and stress from the constant dirt, dust, mud and noise to the many elderly residents and homeowners along 93rd Street and 48th Avenue. Traffic will be a nightmare for years to come. This is not the right place for the entrance road. With the overall plans of Devonshire Subdivision to create winding roads, wetland preservation areas, undulating landscaped (sic) berms, the entrance roadway belongs in an area offering open spaces, not residential congested (sic) areas. Grand entrance signage to fit where??? We, the undersigned, strongly suggest and highly recommend the entrance roadway be moved away from the intersection of 48th Avenue and 93rd Street.” From what was presented, there’s 22 signatures on here.

John Steinbrink:

Other Board comments? Alex?

Alex Tiahnybok:

I’ll reserve my comments on the issue discussed until we get to that agenda item. But I did want to make two other comments. One, on behalf of the Carol Beach Property Owners Association, we had an informal parade in Carol Beach with the assistance of the Village and the entire Board showed up and it was very nice and I just want to say thank you.

The other comments is in regard to Marina Pennington’s letter. I think Pleasant Prairie having its own school district is a great idea, and in the process of running for this office I had an opportunity to speak with various individuals. I sought out Eric Olson who is the current President of Kenosha Unified and inquired with him as to what the ramifications of doing such would be. It sounds like you’re probably aware of at least the financial burden that the Village would undertake.

I personally would like to see that drilled down to some real numbers instead of a lot of hand waving because that’s what it seems to be right now. My understanding from a financial perspective is that since the Village is part of Kenosha Unified School District that we would pay our per capita debt, whatever total debt the Kenosha Unified has before we could spin off independently. The problem is, and the part that doesn’t make any sense to me, is that we would pay for the debt but we would get none of the assets. I don’t understand why that’s the case. I think this is a great jump off point to explore that further.

Pleasant Prairie has been relied on and asked to pay the bills for development of schools in Kenosha and other parts of Kenosha Unified, and I think it’s very arguable. Even the Devonshire development is testimony to this, but Pleasant Prairie is growing probably more rapidly than other parts of Kenosha Unified. And as a result I believe there’s going to be an out of balance need for infrastructure development in Pleasant Prairie, and I think the taxpayers of the rest of Kenosha

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

Unified are going to push back. So we're starting down a road that I think is going to be very difficult. So I welcome this and I'll do whatever I can to explore it further personally.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I'd like to make a comment on this, Alex. Four years ago that issue was brought up and I do believe the basic figures given to us was about \$80 million just to get out of the district, just to get out. On top of that you have to realize to get out of the district you've got to build your own schools here, create a complete new system. Looking at what you're talking about . . . we need to have the approval of Somers and also the City of Kenosha. So it's going to be two against one, the largest supporter of the School District related to the population we have. We have one-sixth of the population of Kenosha Unified and 24 percent of the budget is what we pay. So I don't believe Somers or the City is going to say go. Just \$80 million to get out of there plus how much it's going to cost to build the schools and provide all the services. Four or five years ago it was discussed right here. So the numbers are around and I want to dig it up because I've got it and find the person who initiated that who was firm, Mr. Jeff Kostrewa. Mr. Kostrewa said we have to do it. When Mr. Kostrewa saw the numbers that were given to him by the District he realized it was mission impossible. As it goes right now in the way we have to pay for the schools, in 1996 under the administration of Tommy Thompson school impact fees were eliminated. The majority of the States in the country paid school impact fees. Here it was eliminated . . . California . . . what do we pay here? Nothing. Why? That was builders. And if you look at the issue . . . take a look who is the biggest pusher for that elimination of those particular fees or whatever are builders and manufacturers. To see how they benefit from that . . . in 1970 residential paid for 50 percent of the taxes. In 2003 they paid 69.2 of the taxes. It went up 19 percent. Commercial went from 19.4 in 1970 to 21.4 in 2003, two percent. Manufacturing used to pay 17.7 percent in 1970. Now they pay 4.1. On other properties they go from 12.2 to 5.3. That means . . . before with the aid from the State the taxes in the community were lower. The revenues here increased.

So when people are tax exempt, that means only a portion of the population is going to be paying for any new schools or whatever. Now, it's interesting to see those figures . . . blame the local governments from Madison but we get blamed. Anybody who wants to take a look at that I've got it. I can see what's going on in Madison, why we pay more and they pay less. That includes the schools. The residents pay for the schools. Tax exempt doesn't . . . so that's part of the answer. I've love to give you the numbers from four or five years ago about the separation of the Pleasant Prairie from the Unified School District. All the facts and figures are there. Furthermore I believe there was a figure floating around that it was going to cost \$20,000 per property just to get out from this district. Do you recall, Mike?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I believe it was \$20,000 per property. That's a big number and I can't afford to do it. I'm a retiree and on Social Security . . . when I was a young guy with young kids . . . senior citizens paid for my kids to go to school and now it's my time to pay back. Thank you.

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

Mike Serpe:

The thought of Pleasant Prairie having its own school district is great, but there comes a cost with all of that. I think instead of creating a new school district for Pleasant Prairie, if you're that upset or not pleased with the Unified and what they have to offer, then I think it's incumbent upon all of us to take that displeasure to the School Board itself and let them know what you're upset about and what you'd like to see changed. You think of west of the Interstate right now the amount of school districts that are in place, elementary schools, middle schools, high schools, they all have boards and they all purchase their needs individually. Right now the Unified is one and purchases all for everything east of I-94.

It's easy to say to form another district, but I think if you're really concerned about the education that your kids are going to receive in Pleasant Prairie, we have an elected board that represents all of the residents east of I-94 and let them know your feelings if you're not happy with the way they're doing business as we see it today. The cost to get out of that Unified District would be prohibitive. We supply 12 percent of the population of students to Unified and we pay 25 or 24 percent of their budget. I think it would be nice to have our own district, but at the same time I think it would be almost impossible to attain because of the expense involved.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Personally I wish I would have had a chance to look into the history of how we got to where we're at, and I don't know when Kenosha Unified was created, but if the Village of Pleasant prairie now owes practically \$80 million of debt, then I think whoever agreed to combining with Kenosha and Somers should be fired, because that's certainly not a very good prenuptial agreement, 1966. What was the population of Pleasant Prairie back then? To hook yourself into a contract with that kind of debt is financial suicide and I'm just amazed that anybody ever committed a community like this to that kind of long-term commitment. It amazes me.

Much to your surprise, Steve, I'm willing to admit I'm a Republican, and I would be number one on the list to sign anything to support the idea of impact fees. I think it's nuts that we don't have them. I'm from Illinois originally and not to be able to . . . we argue and debate about impact fees on a regular basis here, and the biggest part of our tax bill we can't touch which I think is kind of amusing. Thanks for providing the numbers, Mike, but the 12 percent of students and the 25 percent of the bill that's going to get worse. That gap is going to grow.

If developments, and I know many of you here tonight aren't in favor of Devonshire, but if a \$400,000 average residence becomes the norm into the future that gap is just going to get worse

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

and we're going to pay a bigger chunk of the bill. It just amazes me that we have \$80 million of debt and what have we gotten for it? We have two grade schools in Pleasant Prairie. Who was managing this? It's just amazing. Three.

Mike Pollocoff:

I know this wasn't an item on the agenda but it was brought up. The process by which the Unified system was created where there was I believe six different school districts in Pleasant Prairie at the time of consolidation. So it wasn't a Pleasant Prairie School District that went to a Kenosha District. There were six different districts. It was done by referendum. People at the time voted to go to a combined school district because at that time there was no high school.

The issue the way it's evolved, at that time it was easier to get out in 1966, and I think a lot of people at that time thought if you don't like it we'll bail out of it. Over time Madison has adopted rules and legislation that favors more consolidation and more unified school districts. In the statute is the exact procedure, and I can give you the statutory site of the division of assets is really what happens when you dissolve a school district and break it off into a different area. And that statute was written to make it difficult for a district to get smaller or come apart for a couple reasons. One reason is that issue is issued debt on reliance on having a tax base to be able to tax for the improvements. Unified's issued bonds to build schools, whether it's Mahone or what have you, and the State has guaranteed that there's some certainty for bond holders that the district won't come apart at the seams, the tax base is relatively stable, and it's going to be able to retire those debts. In order to grant that protection it requires that not even a Village but if there's a certain area that decided they wanted to come out, would leave, that they would have to pay for their proportionate share of the liabilities. They would get a proportionate share of the assets back. It's not all going out and none coming back, but you would get something coming in.

In the case of Pleasant prairie, we have three elementary schools. Clearly those schools would be underneath the limit that we'd be paying and we'd get those back, but at the same time the Village would be required to build a high school and build a middle school and do what have you. So the process has been made difficult by design. If you look at the drum beat over the last 10 to 15 years it's been bigger is better, have central government, have unified school districts, move everything into the County. That's been the logic and typically that isn't the case. I think the real problem, the real frustration that a lot of people have, is maybe not so much the quality of education but it's the way it's financed. Right now virtually everything is financed with property tax dollars and it's difficult. The only answer has been freeze a broken system and call it a day. And until we look at how we pay for schools, how we pay for government in ways that are more equitable or reasonable, I think people are going to be frustrated with the outcomes. That's really where I would think the best efforts are spent is to try and change that rather than taking a broken system and break it apart and having a lot more broken systems than what you have. At the end of the day people are going to pay for it through their property taxes no matter how you cut that system apart. And if you cut it apart the statutes are going to make you pay for the freight for doing it.

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

John Steinbrink:

I'm sorry I can't let you speak. This is just a topic that's come up before and we kind of looked at the numbers and Mike has kind of explained where we come from on that. I think it's a good issue to keep revisiting and to look at it. The numbers bear out when we provide 12 percent of the children and 25 percent of the assets or dollars going in. I keep hearing that same old thing that the growth in Pleasant Prairie is the one that's overburdening. That's not the fact. You look at the 12 percent number and you have to remember Somers is growing greatly, the City is growing greatly. Nobody ever seems to want to look over there and say how many kids are coming from that are but there are quite a few and they far outnumber what's coming from the Village.

I think the Village has done an excellent job in regulating its growth to the benefit of the taxpayers. As Mike said, everybody's idea is bigger is better. We had a proposal for the Sheriff to come in and patrol our streets. We know the numbers prove out that the Police Department in Pleasant Prairie is far more efficient, costs less per resident, and we're actually subsidizing the County and the Sheriff's Department for what they do. If they were to come into our area we'd be doing just like the Unified further subsidizing that entity. So bigger isn't always better and we understand that. But unfortunately we've gone down a road that makes it pretty hard to come back on.

Kelsey, it's good to see you here tonight. Good presentation. I hope you can attend a lot of the other hearings that are going to be going on for this development if it continues. This is a very long process. It's very detailed. A lot has happened before this point. Neighborhood plans, Jean Werbie and her staff has done a lot of work on this. You're going to see a lot more public hearings. There was a public hearing the other evening, Planning Commission. A lot of the folks weren't here for that unfortunately and couldn't hear what was there, and sometimes there's a lot of misconception out there and I hope we can answer a lot of those questions this evening. But this is a process where everybody gets input. We try and listen to everybody. We try and show people what's happening during the process. Maybe Jean can explain what the process is and just how long it's going to continue and what opportunities there are for input in that process.

Jean Werbie:

The Devonshire Subdivision is one of about eight subdivisions that's located within the Village Green Neighborhood. And the Village Green Neighborhood is an area that's bounded approximately by 93rd Street on the north, 104th Street on the south, the tower line on the west and approximately the bike trail on the east. This is a process that through our comprehensive planning in the Village that we have undertaken to examine areas neighborhoods by neighborhoods, approximately one square mile areas, and actually this Village Green Neighborhood is an area that we've been looking at, and the first plan for this area was approved in 1996 where all the neighbors were notified and the public was invited.

Over the years we have been modifying the neighborhood plan, again, at a larger scale for this entire area in '96, '98, I think 2001 and then most recently in 2006. So we have modified and tried to bring the neighborhood into a discussion as we keep going through the process. I think what happens is that people think that we're working at such a large scale and large area that it

doesn't impact them. But the reason why we do neighborhood plans is because there has been interest generated either by land owners, developers or others coming to the area that want to relocate to Pleasant Prairie. So that's why we've done so many years of neighborhood planning.

The next step after the neighborhood plan has been approved is a conceptual plan. That's what's on the agenda tonight. The conceptual plan has been before the Plan Commission and now before the Village Board. It's a very early process for us to get concepts, policies, issues out on the table that are concerns for the Village, for the residents, for the Board or Plan Commission members, but it's an early opportunity to sit down and go through as we get a little bit more specific on properties what are going to be the issues and how we can address those issues. We do have some information tonight, but at the concept plan stage I have conceptual engineer.

So I don't have any details on exactly how roads will be widened and exactly the precise profiles and the exact grading of how the area is going to be completed. That would come at the next planning step which is the preliminary plat. That's when we get more detailed preliminary engineer, preliminary survey work as it reflects specific lot layouts, road layouts, very specific information on where sewer, water, storm sewer, where additional right of way would be needed if any right of way is being dedicated. At that preliminary plat if there's detailed transportation studies that need to be done they need to be completed by that point. At the conceptual plan is where we start doing any type of transportation study.

And let me just mention early in the process 93rd Street, which was formerly known as County Trunk Highway T, has always been identified to be a four lane arterial highway since 1967. But it was not to happen until such time as the traffic warranted it and there was enough development that would support it. In '91 it came under the Village's jurisdiction, and as the County has suggested to us back then, as land develops in that area and right of way can be dedicated by developers, we should get that dedicated right of way. It doesn't mean we have to build it today, but, ma'am, just like everything else we have to plan to the future. We don't have to build it today and our budget and traffic will dictate when that happens. But we do have to be aware that with increased traffic at some point we might need to widen the road. So we want to make people aware of the fact that it could happen. I don't know when it's going to happen. It may not happen in my lifetime, but we do need to make people aware of the fact that it could happen at some point. It's a Village road, though; it's not a County road.

With respect to the next step in the planning process, and each of these steps involves public hearing where notices are sent to the adjacent and abutting property owners, the Plan Commission always holds the public hearing and the Board holds a public meeting as well, and if it's warranted and the Board directs it the staff will hold neighborhood meetings or individual meetings with property owners if they have specific questions on their particular property.

The next step after that is the final plat, and that's where we hold another public hearing, but everything is getting to the finalization point. We know where the roads are going to be, we know the widths, we know the dimensions, we know the depths, we know what specifics are

going to be needed with respect to any widenings, if any, what intersections are going to be where. We know where everything is going to be because once it's final platted it can be recorded and then the work can begin.

Typically from the beginning, from the comprehensive planning stage, the update was in '96 to today, we have been working on neighborhood planning and some phase of conceptual planning for this area for about ten years. It's a long time. We started to get very serious with respect to developers and property owners coming to the Village to develop their land in the last two to three years where we've been looking at more refined, detailed plans. It's the property owners that come to the Village. The Village isn't seeking out these developers. We're not soliciting developers. We wait for somebody to approach us. And if they want to develop their land and they have the right to develop their land if it conforms with the comprehensive plan and the neighborhood plan, and we look at densities, we look at environmental amenities on the property, we look at and have all the wetlands and the woodlands field delineated. It's a very lengthy process. It's not something we take lightly. We're very deliberate when we go through this process.

So, again, it sounds like we still have some issues that we need to work out through this planning process as the conceptual plan, and this is typically where these issues come up is at the conceptual plans, because the details are known enough for us to ask the questions and the residents to ask the questions.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you, Jean. Any other Village Board comments?

6. MINUTES OF MEETING - JUNE 5, 2006

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

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- A. Receive Plan Commission Recommendation and Consider the request of William Redlin, the property owner, for a Certified Survey Map, to subdivide the property located at 12121 45th Avenue.**

Jean Werbie:

Mr. President, this is an item that came up at our last Village Board meeting. It was a request for a certified survey map by a petitioner located at 12121 45th Avenue. It's identified as Tax Parcel Number 92-4-122-351-0192. What the petitioner is requesting to do is to create one additional parcel north of their existing house on approximately 45th Avenue just east of 47th Avenue. The petitioner has lived at this particular property for a number of years since the early 1990s, and at that time there were a number of questions as to how this particular property and any new vacant

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

property would get sanitary sewer and water to be able to service not only the existing home but a new lot to the north.

Back in the early 1990s there were a number of documents and conditions and a number of things that were addressed with the property owners at that time, but it really wasn't clear over the years exactly what was going to happen with respect to these particular properties. What I've done in the staff memo is to outline for you that Lot 1 is the new lot. It's proposed to be approximately 30,000 square feet with 140.9 feet of frontage on 45th Avenue. It's vacant at this time. It has a current 20 foot wide sanitary sewer easement that traverses through the property. It actually comes from 44th Avenue to the east and then goes through an adjacent lot in the Pleasant Homes Subdivision, and then it comes into this area and services that particular lot. It services Lot 2. There was a question as to whether or not there was a Y or some type of dual lateral put in to service Lot 1, and we did verify that there was a Y off the main but a separate lateral would need to be extended to service this vacant property.

What we're also looking for is whether or not there is an existing water lateral that came off of 44th Avenue to serve not only the existing house but the new. And our public works department since the last meeting went out and did some field work and found that there was only one water lateral that services the existing homes, so a second water lateral would need to be placed out there for them to get access to the new lot.

In my comments then, I outlined the sanitary sewer requirements, the special assessments and where waivers would need to be signed, as well as for water. Their surveyor would need to take their certified survey map and make some minor modifications to it so that we can reflect all of the easements on the lots, as well as we need to make a reference to any off site easements that need to be obtained for existing water that has been provided to the properties. Rich Hooper of We Energies indicated that no additional easements are required as part of this land division.

The property owners given the extent of the different things that need to be done, the easements and payment of assessments and such, they're requesting a 90 day window for approval in order to satisfy all the conditions as set forth. It's my understanding that they're going to work as quickly as they can as they would like to build on that second lot or that one to the north.

We did provide the property owner with this information. I think this is pretty accurate based on the meetings that Mr. and Mrs. Redlin had with Mr. Pollocoff and myself. I don't know if they had any additional questions or not. I think there was only one or two things that might have changed in a minor way since we met, but I'm hoping that everything is clearly spelled out now in the staff memo to consider the approval of this certified survey map for them.

John Steinbrink:

Do the petitioners have any questions? It's been a long road I understand. A lot of details, and when you work in areas like this there's a lot of gray area on what's there, what's been done and what need to be done.

SERPE MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND APPROVE THE REQUEST OF WILLIAM REDLIN, THE PROPERTY OWNER, FOR A CERTIFIED SURVEY MAP, TO SUBDIVIDE THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 12121 45TH AVENUE, SUBJECT TO STAFF CONDITIONS; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

8. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Receive Plan Commission Recommendation and Consider a Conceptual Plan for the request Kari Kittermaster, agent for Regency Hills-Devonshire, LLC for the 86 acre property generally located south of 93rd Street between 48th Avenue and Cooper Road for the proposed 114 single family lots to be known as Devonshire.**

Jean Werbie:

Mr. President and members of the Board, the petitioner is request approval of a conceptual plan for the proposed Devonshire Subdivision. This subdivision is generally located south of 93rd Street between 48th Avenue and Cooper Road within the Village Green Neighborhood.

As I mentioned previously, this Devonshire development is located within the northern/northwestern corner of the Village Green Neighborhood Plan area. The last resolution that approved this neighborhood plan was Plan Commission Resolution #06-02. As you can see, the entire neighborhood extends from the bike trail to the tower lines from approximately 93rd Street down to Highway 165 or 104th Street. As depicted on the neighborhood plan, those areas that are in the lighter peach colors are those areas of existing platted single family lots within the Village of Pleasant Prairie.

Those areas identified in yellow are proposed, through some means through some type of either concept plan or preliminary or final plat. The Village Center area, which is that area identified in the red for retail or commercial, there's also some townhomes that have been identified in the orange area. What I begin by saying is that is an area that is in transition right now. All of that land has just been purchased by another developer, and so they are going to be re-evaluating this with traffic studies and with marketing people and taking a look at how this area should be developed.

The northeastern corner of this particular neighborhood plan, the area identified in blue east of Springbrook Road is the Victory Baptist Church and the We Energy Substation, and to the west and north of Springbrook is the All Saints Cemetery property.

The one thing I want to point out on this particular neighborhood plan is that our neighborhoods are bounded primarily by arterial roads, 39th Avenue, 93rd, 104th. There's also a very strong desire for the community in order to provide good, efficient, effective services to try to have a connecting north/south arterial road. And actually since 1967, again, when the first plan was done for the Kenosha planning area which included Pleasant Prairie, Cooper Road at that time was shown to be extended south from 93rd down to 104th. A lot of people didn't believe that could ever happen or it was ever something that would be desired or that there would ever be

enough development to support something like that concept, but here we are several years later, 30 some years later, 40 years later, and the concept is coming before us. Again, Cooper Road will serve as a local north/south arterial that parallels 39th Avenue, and it also serves primarily as the western boundary of this Devonshire development. Meadowdale Farms or Estates is to the east. Cooper Road and some other development will be to the west. 93rd is at the north.

And then just to the south of the Devonshire development which is the area that's identified in the green is an area that's been identified as a park, the Village Green Neighborhood Park. The darker green areas are more substantial defined wooded or oak areas that are going to be preserved, and the other areas have been identified for active recreational park amenities.

Specifically looking at the Devonshire development, 87.45 acres of land is proposed to be developed into 114 single family lots and 12 outlots. The lots range in size from 15,000 square feet, which is just over a third of an acre, to 21,593 square feet, which is about a half acre. The average lot size is about 16,288 square feet.

The two Village Plan Commissioners and myself, as well as some members from the developer did meet with Mr. and Mrs. Safran at their property a couple of weeks ago, and we outlined a number of issues. Again, these were my notes based on our conversation for almost two hours. I don't know that anybody else was taking detailed notes besides me, so there might have been a situation where some things were discussed like the side and rear garage door options which I never heard. So certainly there could have been some sidebar conversations with some Plan Commissioners that I was not aware of and did not make it into my notes. So it's good that those options or those discussions were brought out by Mr. Safran tonight because I was not aware of those discussion. We did discuss structures in the back and we discussed some tree lines and a number of other things, but I was not aware of those particular options.

As I indicated to Mr. Safran there were a number of different options that we looked at respect to his driveway and the adjacent driveway to the west, what would be the most desirable, what would work, what would not work. Based on conversations that we had with our Village engineer based on information in the Village's ordinances, it is not recommended, in fact it expressly says that driveways should be a certain distance from the intersection of adjacent roadways. And driveways should not be in acceleration/deceleration lanes. So it is for that reason from the very beginning that we discussed the possibility of relocating some driveways. This is a position, actually, that the Village Board and the Plan Commission have taken in a number of other situations, but it never has met with any type of resistance in the past because most people wanted to get their driveways off of the arterial and put them on the local road.

The difference here, at least with Mr. Safran, is he's got three large pine trees that would be damaged or need to be removed in order to turn his driveway, and he's still in some proximity to that intersection. So we looked at options of shifting it over on 93rd Street, but I guess I discounted that option and didn't even talk about it because he's got several oak trees along the front of his property so those would need to come down in order to bring the driveway through the front of his yard. And he had mentioned to me that he didn't want to see his yard all asphalt or concrete, so I guess I just discounted the fact that that wasn't even a good option because that would be eliminating the trees on the front of his property as opposed to the side.

And the t-turnaround that was still going to be an option in this situation because just the portion of the driveway that is in the Village's right of way that's permitted in the right of way that would be the area that's removed, and there would still be a portion of the driveway that could be used as part of a t-turnaround. If none of these options still work we certainly can look at it again to see what might work for the side garage or the rear garage options. But I don't know if those are options at all.

One of the things I wanted to mention is that since the last Plan Commission meeting and then again this evening, I was looking at if 48th Avenue does not go through to 48th Avenue to the intersection at 93rd, there could be two other possibilities, but we'd be dealing with a whole different set of situations and problems that we would have to overcome. Again, the land division ordinance, good engineering design practices, says you line up roads. Regardless of them being dead ends or not you line them up so that they're not jogged on an arterial. So that was the first option that we always look at in the Village, and that's the option actually that's been shown since 1996 and no one raised a red flag. So we did not look at anything different than that for the last ten years because it had been an accepted practice that that's where it was going to go.

Given the situation and what they brought to light, the two other locations would likely be 49th Avenue or 50th Avenue, both between 48th and Cooper Road. Either one of them there's no road on the north side of the street. It will impact somebody. It will not impact these two folks, but it will impact driveways across the street and on either side. So we would have to look to see what that impact is going to be, but typically a bypass lane is put wherever there's no intersection. So we would need to decide whether or not we need a bypass lane, and then definitely the driveways on the north side of the street would be impacted as a result of this, unless the Board feels that either accel or decel lanes aren't necessary for the amount of traffic, or that a bypass lane is not warranted. So that's something that our Village engineer can look at more closely.

One of the concerns with at least putting 49th Avenue in is that it's a relatively low area in proximity to where we had the retention basins. So I'm not sure I want to encourage that area to all be built up because that's where the water is all draining to now. So we'll have to look at this a lot more closely with respect to grading and drainage, that maybe the 50th Avenue would be the more desirable location. It's a lot closer to Cooper Road. It scales at about 430 feet. Desirably we should be 460, but possibly that can work. Again, it will affect other people, just not these folks. There will be a resident on one side but not on both sides. So there will be less impact to adjacent landowners.

If, in fact, 48th Avenue does not go through to the north, I would think that there will probably be a single family lot placed at that location, and there would have to be a reconfiguration of this whole area so that everyone who is facing 93rd stays facing 93rd and then rear lots would all butt up to them. But that's certainly an option to do that.

The staff memo outlines the different items that were brought up at the Plan Commission. These staff notes on the slide also identify what would happen if, in fact, 48th Avenue does go through to the south. The only issue I wanted to mention was that there are some existing slab and fence structures that encroach from Mr. Safran's property onto the developer's property, and those would need to be removed at the property owner's cost as they encroach on the adjacent land.

These are some of the photos that I had taken when we were out on the property. This is facing north looking at 93rd Street. They're on the right in the white house, and in the distance you can see the pine trees that would be impacted if the driveway would come off of 48th Avenue. And this is approximately where 48th Avenue would be if it's constructed at this location.

Here I'm standing on 93rd Street and I'm looking south. Again, you can see his driveway coming off of 93rd and then the pine trees and where 48th Avenue would come down through that opening. This is the rear of their property where there is the existing shed and the fence and slab areas that would need to be removed. This is just another angle of it.

Another thing that we did discuss, and I'm not aware of the grading issues on Mr. Safran's property, but one of the things we did discuss was the fact that there's a tree line that kind of hovers both the Meadowdale Estates property and their property, and we would like to see an extended tree preservation easement that extends certainly not on Mr. Safran's property but from the northern lot, which would have been their Lot 29, on this whole lot line as it extends south on the east in order to protect those particular trees.

There are a number of outlots that are being proposed in this development. I'll go over them very briefly. Outlot 1, which is at the south end of the development, is proposed to be dedicated, given, granted, provided to the Village for no cost for park purposes. Outlots 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12 and 13 are all proposed to be dedicated to the Homeowners Association, and these are dedicated for open space, tree preservation, access and maintenance purposes. The reason why this development has so many outlots and that's not common is because of the fact that there are so many stands of trees as well as wetlands on this property that we are trying to protect. Some of them probably were pre-existing for a number of years. Some look like they are occurring as a result of some broken field tiles. It doesn't matter in the DNR's eyes.

All of the existing wetlands are proposed to be preserved and protected with the exception of two small pocket areas which the DNR recognizes are acceptable to fill, and one is Cooper Road, which is the north/south arterial that services this development, Village Green and all the developments within this mile square area. And then there was another small pocket of wetland up here just on the tip. In fact, this would be 50th Avenue. This is one area I would be suggesting possibly a connection to 93rd Street. The other would be here at 49th Avenue, but that would be much more problematic because of the lowness of the area and that's basically where all the storm water wants to go. Not the best place to put a road. But 50th Avenue certainly is a possibility.

Outlots 3 and 4 those would have been remnant parcels on either side of where 48th Avenue is. If 48th Avenue doesn't go in then they'd be part of a lot in that area. Outlot 6 is now under the control of the developer and that is that rectangular shaped area right here which they now have control over, they just have an accepted offer or something to that effect, so that would allow for some lots to come off of a north/south road such as 50th coming into this development. Outlots 10 and 11 are proposed to be retained by the developer for future single family development.

Just to go over some of the things that we've touched on at Plan Commission, under population projections based on the 2000 census and the average number of persons per household, and the

fact that 23 percent of our population is made up of children between the ages of 5 and 19, we can predict that approximately 311 persons could be added to the population upon full build out of this entire development. And the subdivision would likely generate a total of 72 school age children at full build out. Approximately 48 percent would be public school age children. Again, there's a percentage of our population that's actually quite high that attends private schools in Pleasant Prairie.

For zoning map amendment, the properties are currently zoned R-4 in Pleasant Prairie, and R-4 is an Urban Single Family Residential Lot where lots have to be a minimum of 15,000 square feet in area and 90 feet in road width. So all of these lots would have that minimum designation. This is the current zoning map that reflects just a very small area of C-1 which is our Lowland Resource Conservancy District or wetland. Again, this map reflects existing conditions. They would need to petition to have the map amended to remove any ag overlays and to put it into the R-4, and all the wetlands would go into the C-1 designation and all of the outlots to be protected would go into a PR-1, which is a Park and Recreational Designation.

Approximately 25.5 acres or 29 percent of the entire site is proposed to remain in open space, and that includes public park, wetlands, woodlands, retention areas and other open space. 7.78 acres of the site have been field delineated as wetlands. Again, as I mentioned previously .74 acre or 32,091 square feet, not a large area, would be filled wetland, and that would be to accommodate public roads. 7.05 acres of wetlands would remain on the property. The other thing that I'd like to mention is that wetlands also have a tendency to migrate, so in the common open space area outlot areas those wetlands will likely, based on the soils and conditions, will likely grow over the years within those outlot areas.

A detailed tree survey was prepared by Natural Resources Consulting. Some trees will be removed, the ones that are in the Cooper Road right of way, and some of the areas along the extension of Cooper Road off the site, but primarily most of the trees will remain intact. Again, that's why there's so many outlots because we try to put all the wooded areas within outlots. Those areas are not to be touched.

The developer is proposing to dedicate Outlot 1 which is just under nine acres to the Village for the Village Green Neighborhood park purposes. They have also offered to donate \$200,000 for park related improvements in the Village Green Neighborhood Park. Again, this is something that we always encourage the developers to do, and they feel that it is such a good amenity and it's a good selling point for the neighborhood, and it's a great opportunity to have a park when the lots are being built, as opposed to waiting years and years and years before either impact fee money can be collected or the Village can find it in their budget to put in park amenities such as soccer fields or softball diamonds or playground equipment or a walking trail. Again, this would be open to the public so everyone would benefit from the park being placed there.

The Village Park Commission this spring adopted the Village Green Neighborhood Park Plan that identified what types of amenities would be placed within this neighborhood park that would benefit the area, and this is an example or exhibit from that park plan that identifies where the walking trail, the ball diamond, soccer field, tennis court, play area, parking lot and some of the other amenities would be located, again, to benefit the residents in the area. Other open space has been identified on this particular slide.

Site access. The development will have two access points onto 93rd. What has been suggested by the Plan Commission is one at Cooper Road, one at 48th Avenue. Eventually there will be a connection point at 97th Street connecting this development to Meadowdale Estates to the east, and two other access points at 94th and 96th Streets to the east, and eventually Cooper Road will connect straight south into the Village Green Heights Subdivision. It's still the staff's recommendation that if 48th Avenue is not the connection point that there be another connection point on 93rd for the simple fact that all the other connection points are future, they're not existing, and it would not be desirable and it would be a concern of the staff and a concern of the ordinance to plat a development with only one access point.

John Steinbrink:

Jean, one thing also we've noticed over the years is we try and line intersections up with roads and roads and it just is a better idea. When you look at the map here, if we were to move 48th in any other direction, any other location, you're now going to have the issue of headlights shining into these homes where there are no roads across the street. So if you are one of the homes across the street from the future movement of 48th Avenue, you're going to run the possibility of headlights shining into your home, whereas if we keep it road to road we don't have that issue. It just makes for better neighbors in the long run. And there is no way to do berming or other defensive landscaping for that item.

Jean Werbie:

That's true. What we would probably do and what we've done in some other subdivisions like whispering knoll and some others is actually we took a car out and backed it up on the lawn and said, okay, this is where it's going to be, does it make sense for the road to come out here, here or here. Where is the garage on the opposite side of the street? So we move it until we can find out where is the most desirable location. I'm not as familiar where 50th would come out what it would hit across the street. Very close to somebody's driveway and garage, so I'm not sure what the front of their home looks like. So we would have to do that so that's not a problem for that property owner.

Cooper Road is an important local arterial for all the proposed developments in the area, as well as traffic movement throughout the Village of Pleasant Prairie, since it will connect from Highway 50 all the way down to 165. Each development needs this connection in order to provide adequate access to the respective developments, including the Village Green Heights Addition #1 Subdivision that will connect to 165. Two other developers that have approached the Village, Scott Simon and Russ Swanson, they've been discussing the impact of what their developments will be on the area as well as Cooper Road.

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

As was brought up earlier, additional right of way is proposed to be dedicated by the developer for 93rd Street. As shown in the transportation plans 50 feet from centerline is what's being asked for for a future widening at some point. Bypass and acceleration and deceleration lanes typically have been required by the Village on 93rd Street. Possibly a roundabout. Basically a traffic study needs to be done to determine exactly when and if 93rd would need to be widened. I know that the Village engineer was working on the transportation plan, but that was a 2030 transportation plan. So I know that the plan goes a few years out.

With respect to Cooper and 93rd being a roundabout or a typical intersection, the State has criteria that we will be looking at to determine what is the most appropriate type of intersection at that location. All improvements on 93rd at that intersection at Cooper will have to be made by the developer at the developer's expense. All of the lots within this particular development, as with other developments within the Village, shall be served by municipal sanitary sewer, water, storm sewer, curb and gutter, public roadways. Those are all paid for at the developer's cost.

One of the items that was brought up at a previous Plan Commission and Board meeting was the need for a fiscal impact analysis to be completed for all developments in Pleasant Prairie, not only residential but commercial as well. And the Village staff has been working with the Village Administrator and IT Director and others on the staff to put together a model of how we can best evaluate all new impacts of development on our level of services in the Village of Pleasant Prairie, what it costs us to do these developments, and how that relates to the Village's budget to be able to serve us, the community.

The developer has offered, knowing that process is going on, the separate process, the developer has offered to enter into a cost sharing agreement with the Village to address their contributions of parkland donation, park improvement, cash donation, and police, fire, EMS, public works and transportation fee donations. They understand the Village has a very low mill rate. They understand we have frozen budgets. They understand a number of things through which the Village has been over the years. But obviously they would like to develop their property. In order to do that they need to make the Village whole, and they would like to do that and make sure that their development is not a drain on the public services in Pleasant Prairie. So further discussion is warranted on that subject, and we discussed some of those things up to this point.

Mike Pollocoff:

I might add, Mr. President, that as it relates to the fiscal analysis, as Jean indicated, we're going through a complete haul over on our cost of services identifying getting it down to incremental standpoint to see what each incremental home is going to cost, what the incremental increase is on square footage for commercial or manufacturing. Right now given the way the data is structured in the Village, we're creating a model where we can basically ask the question and get the answer in this model based on what our costs are for our services and what's going to be the impact on subdivisions.

As Jean as indicated, in this case Devonshire has indicated they would be willing to pay what had been identified previously which was the impact fees some of which were repealed. It became painfully obvious that there are two things going on. One is the impact fees were taken away by the State, but secondly the Village has had a self-imposed freeze on taxes for four years, and

we're under a mandated freeze now by the State. Devonshire, as well as any other development, that is this new is going to have to come under this fiscal analysis. The fact that we're approving the conceptual plan is only . . . to the point of preliminary plat. The staff's plan and my plan is that by the time Devonshire would be ready to go to preliminary plat we'd be able to entertain or I'd be able to make a recommendation to you to whether or not the Village would be behind in our cost of services for that plat, or if we'd break even or come out ahead. If it doesn't come out ahead or reasonably break even, then I'd be making a recommendation that we would have to reject it or put the subdivision up to a referendum to see if the residents would be willing to have a tax increase in order to pay for having a new subdivision.

We're going to make sure we run that model out and we're going to test it. We're going to expose the model to developers and have them take a look at it and take a look at the logic of it. Of course, it's going to have a legal review, but I want everybody to understand the approval we're giving Devonshire tonight we're moving ahead with the conceptual plan only because they've indicated they'd be willing to pay all the impact fees that were lost by the Village, as well as making a parkland dedication that's in compliance with the park plan. But when we come to preliminary plat is when we would have to at that point be in a position to say yes or not to the development based on the fiscal analysis.

So this approval, if an approval is given in light of the fiscal analysis it's conditional because we still have the fiscal analysis to be done. If the staff is not done with the fiscal analysis by the time plats are ready to go to preliminary plat, I'm going to recommend that they be tabled until such time as we finish it so we have a good look at what the development costs us to take care of.

One other thing I wanted to mention before the staff comments close, there's a few questions that were raised from citizens under citizen comments that were insightful and I'm glad I heard them. I think Jean quite accurately addressed how the process is developed to this point. We have had a lot of public hearings before Plan Commission and Board and action taken on the neighborhood plan. There are some questions as to the alternatives of access to 48th. One of the things that is a little bit deceptive, here's 48th right here, if we move 48th along in this area here, the topography falls away to the center here. So if you move and create 49th or another street, 93rd Street in this section it kind of pitches down towards the middle. There's a creek or a drainage way that becomes a stream when there's a lot of rain that runs through there. If a road is put in there, in order to maintain vision beyond 48th and beyond Cooper, we're going to need to take out that crown on this hill and on that hill to lower that road down so you can see cars coming out. The upshot of that is if you take the road down it spreads out and it gets a little wider. I don't think that's an outcome anybody wants.

In listening to comments from the property owners, it occurs to me, and I think maybe Jean if you want to put the Cooper Road map back up it might be easier to describe. 93rd Street, by and large, has been fairly rural. And since we incorporated 17 years ago, and the Village took control over the land divisions, we've done a really good job of making sure that there hasn't been--as these developments have occurred on 93rd Street, a lot of lots have been split off and had their access onto 93rd Street. You have Meadowdale Estates, you have Prairie Village, of course you have the Monastery, or the Greek Orthodox Church which was the Monastery before and there's been no land divisions there. So the number of land divisions that have occurred on 93rd Street have been minimal. And the reason we haven't allowed that is because 93rd isn't an arterial street. The

exception is the area right here. This is a very older established area. You've heard from the residents it's 50 years old in some cases. Back then it wasn't unusual for the County to allow a certified survey lot to split off onto an arterial road. They allow that in Bristol today or Salem or Somers or wherever. As far as municipal planning goes that's something we typically don't allow.

One of the things that we may want to consider, and I think might answer some of the concerns that the residents have, if the concern is they don't want the development I don't think this helps them, but I think it addresses the concern of 48th Avenue and the impact on driveways. 93rd Street under the planning that we've done so far under the Village's master transportation plan, as Jean indicated, if everything is built out to ultimate development and we were at 45,000 in population, we would put a road there. But at least through 2030 and probably beyond the biggest improvement we might see there is a three lane road, and a three lane road would really be two lanes with a center turning lane so that people could--you wouldn't be pushing bypass lanes out into peoples' yards. A three lane with curbs you can work within the existing right of way. You don't need to acquire any more right of way. The right of way stays the same width. People can turn from that center lane. It's safe, they can get out of the traffic lane, the traffic continues in its regular lane, which I think would probably more than likely be the profile that would ultimately occur along 93rd Street.

If you look at the four lane profile that's down where 93rd turns into 95th, you've got to have a four lane profile there because you're taking those large sweeps in that road there and you've got to be able to square the traffic off so they can see who's coming around the road, and as there's accesses off those roads you need to have vision. That's not the case here.

One of the things you may want to look at, and I think it would be an acceptable alternative from my standpoint would be to take the traffic on 93rd Street, as you come into this little residential area where we have a lot of driveways that are coming onto 93rd Street, crank down the speed limit, post a stop sign at 48th. We'll have a stop sign at Cooper, or if a traffic plan shows a roundabout is good, a roundabout be there, but the purpose of a roundabout is to slow the traffic down without stacking it. What we'd be doing then is that would taper back the acceleration, deceleration. If the driveway stays there it's not ideal but the traffic would be stopped there so it wouldn't be an issue whether or not they can get their car out and moving into the traffic would have to stop. They want to keep their driveways going out to 93rd Street they keep them going out to 93rd Street.

The 90 foot strip of land we would only need 66. If they want the remnant they can have it, if not it would just be a 90 foot wide right of way that the Village would maintain and require that the developer maintain that terrace area from the curb back to the property line. So hopefully that would be one way of doing it. We would be slowing the traffic down in here, but at the end of the day we've got the number of driveways that are on that stretch of road anyway, and the Village isn't proposing a hazard or I don't see us ever proposing acquiring all these properties for the purpose of speeding traffic up on 93rd Street.

93rd can function, if an improvement is made to a three lane arterial, and we don't have a plan for that, that can carry a significant load of traffic for quite a while. A stop sign would serve to slow the traffic down. It would be a close area for signage but that's what you'd want if want to slow

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

the speed down. I really think that once the engineering was done as we showed an access point right here where I've got my laser there, you'll win the battle about getting 48th off the lot, but then you end up with so much grading here to make 93rd Street vision free because you're going into a lower area. You've got to get the two humps out so then people end up with big cuts in front of their yard because the road is getting lower and I don't think that would meet anybody's desire, although that hasn't been designed. I've seen that in a couple areas and everybody was miserable with it afterwards.

So that would be an alternative. It would not be the way you'd ideally want to go, but I think in listening to the concerns of the residents that would take care of the issue of the driveway access on 48th, that goes away. It would take care of the issue as far as the speeds on 93rd Street in that area. That would go away. And it would serve to really crank down the traffic in that area and make sure that as it moves around that area on its way to Cooper Road or going through that it would slow down. That would be an alternate recommendation that the staff would have that we would make on this proposal as we've seen it. I haven't shared that with the developer. I don't know if the developer is here tonight or not. If not, I'd probably even recommend that it be tabled just so they have their kick at the cat. But I think that's one alternative that I would offer that might help everybody all the way around.

The other thing I want to make sure that's clearly understood, because I think people were informed otherwise, is with regards to fiscal impact. The staff when Jean negotiated with the developer to ensure that they paid their share, she's not doing that to get herself any money, the Board members any money, myself any money. This is not what's been referred to as a good old boy negotiation. Jean's job is to represent the Village and negotiate to make sure that the Village is made whole. That's her primary responsibility. She works for the Village. She doesn't work for herself.

If a developer does not want to make the contributions that are needed to make the Village whole, that's their choice, and we'll bring that back to the Board and say here's what our expenses are, they choose not to do it. At that point the Board and developer can proceed or you can say no and buy that off. But there has never been any personal involvement in any negotiations to make sure that the developer makes a contribution to the Village, because that's, in fact, exactly what it is, a contribution to the Village and no one else.

If the Board wants the staff to stop negotiating with developers and try and secure whatever contributions are necessary to maintain Village services and make the Village whole, advise us of that and we'll cease and desist those negotiations. But that's something that Jean's done successfully for the 17 years she's been here, and we're lucky to have one of the best planners in the State that protects our interest and does it above board and ethically at all times. There is no other connection between myself, Jean, MasterCraft or any other developer. We work for the Village and nobody else. I guess if there are any other questions we haven't answered, Jean or myself would be glad to answer them from the Board.

Mike Serpe:

There's a number of things that come to mind. Jean, just a couple of questions to you. North of 93rd on 48th what would the future development or build out be in that area, if any?

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

Jean Werbie:

I think you see it. There's probably 12 to 14 homes that dead ends into a fenced area which is just south of the cemetery.

Mike Serpe:

I think the neighbors expressed some concern here tonight and they did it professionally and sometimes that's a breath of fresh air. There's a concern that they don't know exactly what's going on. I look at the deceleration lanes if 48th were to go through, but I don't see a bypass lane on the north side of 93rd. I think I've been on this earth long enough to know that when a car in front of me is slowing down I'm going to start slowing down as well and if the car makes a right turn in front of me that's fine. But sometimes when a car is stopped on a main road waiting to make a left turn, he becomes a target for somebody that's not paying attention coming up from the rear. That's when bad accidents happen.

I'm thinking of the roundabout which I think roundabouts are very good. We had a little education on them, but I can't see how it's going to fit in without impacting on Mr. Wellman's property or the property in the northwest corner. We could take a look at that. But because there's so many questions here, I'm going to offer just a couple of suggestions. Mike, I think the best thing right now would be to table this. I agree with you. And, secondly, I think in the near future it would be a good idea to have the neighbors meet with staff and go over some of these alternatives and let's come up with the best solution that's going to fit in everybody's--that will fit in the best scheme of everybody's interest.

Naturally, we're not going to be able to please everybody, but we may be able to come to some type of compromise that will be acceptable for this to happen. We can't stop a person from developing his land, but we can make sure that if it is done it's going to be done right. I do agree I think there are concerns here on 48th Avenue. If there's a different alternative that's going to fit into this scheme better, at least we owe it to the people that are there and to ourselves to give it better look or another look. I'd move for tabling.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Mike, second by Steve. Further discussion?

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I want to clarify. In 1959 we were under the County ordinance, because we were a Township. At that time we were County . . . construction, any driveway distance or whatever was approved by the County. When we became a Village in the late 1990's is when we actually got to have our own code and make our own changes independent of the County. I might say there are too many questions that were not brought up in the Planning Commission meeting last week. I have my reservations concerning 48th and the acceleration lane. Mike is talking . . . on the north side. I like the idea from Mike about putting four-way stop signs on a straight street and doesn't affect properties in that case, because what I'm concern with is two concerns I guess.

One of the concerns is we cannot deny the building or the development of the property because we are going to be under the taking laws. The taking laws you're going to have to force the Village to buy the property because we deny building without a reason. That's a big issue in my mind. Consequently we have to work in a way to make 98 percent of the population happy. I know we cannot make everyone happy. Stop signs should be okay as I look at this.

I look at elevation. The property at 4835 93rd Street is . . . and road is 699.6. But the property at 4733 is 698.2 against 699.6, that means the street is higher than the highest point of the property at 4733. So those are the observations I've got and I concur with Mike that there's too many questions and not enough answers so far.

John Steinbrink:

The motion is to table to look at some of the items brought up tonight and what the Administrator has brought forward as suggestions for a possible change. Any further discussion?

Jeff Lauer:

Just one question, Mike, if you can help me. For the fiscal review, and I know this is something new the Village is looking at, what beyond--I know when a development is done for homes the developer/ homeowner pays for the roads and sewer and all the things that go into that, and then once the homes are there the taxpayers pay for the garbage, the police, the fire, etc. What additional costs of services are we looking at as far as when we're analyzing this new sequence here that we're doing.

Mike Pollocoff:

We're looking at everything, and the taxpayers don't pay for garbage and the taxpayers don't pay for sewer and water, but there is an incremental increase for every home that goes in. At some point the garbage utility is going to be buying another truck, and right now the cost of solid waste is we replace trucks. We haven't made the conscious decision yet to subsidize new development. So right now in this development here, 141 homes, they're going to pay their monthly garbage fee and that's going to pay for the tipping and pay for replacing trucks. But the policy question

that the Board needs to address is should a new home have to come up with an incremental fee to help buy the next garbage truck, to help buy the next recycling truck, to help buy the next ambulance, to help buy the next fire truck or what have you?

The other thing we're looking at, and we're looking at everything, there's incremental impacts at the Village Hall. You have a subdivision that comes in, and take a look at Village Green, for example, which is 255 lots and we have a file on each of the 255 lots. If you look at what a residential file is it's about that wide. Well, you take 255 of them in and you move that much space that you have to account for. Well, over ten years, we're building or putting up an average of 200 homes a year, that's 2,000 homes or people we have to keep track of. We've been keeping, like I say, contrary to popular belief, we've had a freeze in taxes for four years while we're not bringing in more dollars, and we're incurring more expenses. So in all those areas we're looking at what that incremental increase is.

Really the policy question for the Board is as new growth comes in, because it doesn't come in all at once, Village Green Heights is 50 percent done but Chief Wagner still has to patrol the whole darn subdivision because people buy lots in different places so he's got to patrol the whole subdivision. John Steinbrink, Jr. has to plow the whole subdivision because you need to get from place to place. You have to take care of these things from the day they're there, but not everybody is paying their taxes the first day. They can't. Even if every house was there the first day, you go back to the year prior because that's what taxes are based on. So if we can't raise our budget we have to look at what our expenses are and take a rational look at whether or not we can afford it.

That doesn't say we don't also take a look at the revenues that come in, whether it's garbage revenue, sewer, water, building permit fees, any of those fees come in they come off the sheet as something that helps at some level, but at the end of the day if you keep growing and you keep your taxes flat what you're doing is you're reducing your services to the existing residents. You're taking the police department at 27 guys and say, okay, you were taking care of 18,000 people, now take care of 19,000 people, now take care of 20,000 people, now take care of 21,000 people, and we're diluting our--this is what nobody in Madison has come to because it's a slick slogan, freeze the taxes and then let the existing people pay for development growth with the same amount of services. Well, you're reducing the services that are provided because you have no more people to do the service and you have more people wanting the service. That's what we want to come to. It's not to be vengeful and it's not to be spiteful, it's the reality of it.

You can't raise taxes unless you go to a referendum and get people to raise them and say we want higher taxes. I don't think that's going to happen. I don't even think you're going to ask people to do that. So the policy question is do we like development so much that we're willing to reduce our services or not, or do we want to have them pay for what we got. I can tell you we've had a lot of communities asking us to get a copy of the model once we put it together because everybody is struggling with it. We're not the only ones. I guess if you're in Paris where you don't have any services and no growth maybe it doesn't matter. But we're not in Paris. If there's something else that you think we should be looking at by all means let me know. Or, if you think that something is off the table that we should give the developers a pass on, tell me.

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

Okay, that's what I thought. I just wanted to make sure we're all on the same page for future growth really. More or less like I want to buy a car, save now and get it later. Thanks.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I think we're on the right track with the concept of tabling this, because there are too many open issues and I think it's the right approach. I think it's refreshing, whether this development moves forward in its current form or not, that the builder is willing to participate in a process where they do share some of the costs instead of trying to slough it off on existing taxpayers.

Regarding the 48th Avenue issue, I'm a big believer in legacy and respecting it. People, regardless of how they got there and what the history is, they've demonstrated a commitment to the community. They've built homes on a road that regardless of what the future plans were they built there, they were allowed, they built driveways, they planted trees, they have memories, and I don't believe that just giving carte blanche to any developer to start changing grades and cutting down trees is the way to go so I'm glad we're tabling this.

I think we have some precedence established as Mr. Safran showed. There's an existing interchange at 43rd Avenue and 93rd Street where Meadowdale Estates access is and that's curbed. I don't believe there's any significant build out of acceleration and deceleration lanes there. I think that's a precedent we can follow. I've driven past many subdivisions where there's multiple entrances off a main arterial, and I think it's very easy to accommodate the needs of the existing neighbors and still provide the access that this development if it moves forwards needs. What I'm driving at is you see many subdivisions where there's a main lighted entrance with signs, etc., and then there is a secondary entrance that's sort of reserved for locals that know where they're going. So I think it should be a simple process for us to make sure that Cooper Road is the primary entrance and build that one out if we need turn lanes, etc., and then leave 48th Avenue as a very modest secondary entrance. Public safety issues are covered and it's not highlighted as the main access point. That's all I've got.

John Steinbrink:

I think when you read the minutes, unfortunately you weren't here for the Planning Commission hearing and the public hearing, but when you read the minutes you'll see the Planning Commissioners had all those concerns for the public safety, for the trees, for the wetlands, and looking out for the interests of the neighbors. So we're not reinventing the wheel with some of this here. This has already been part of the process, it's always been part of the process and will continue to be part of the process.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

One observation to make, I'd like to make. We made the entrance to Mission Hills, 115th Street and 47th Avenue. The . . . property used to have the driveway straight to 47th Avenue, and in that particular property the builder agreed to move the driveway from 47th Avenue to 115th Street. I've been there many times and I've seen that. That's one of the cases I can remember right now.

SERPE MOVED TO TABLE CONSIDERATION OF A CONCEPTUAL PLAN FOR THE

REQUEST KARI KITTERMASTER, AGENT FOR REGENCY HILLS-DEVONSHIRE, LLC FOR THE 86 ACRE PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF 93RD STREET BETWEEN 48TH AVENUE AND COOPER ROAD FOR THE PROPOSED 114 SINGLE FAMILY LOTS TO BE KNOWN AS DEVONSHIRE; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

- B. Receive Plan Commission Recommendation and Consider Ord. #06-31 related to the Zoning Map Amendment request of Kenneth Kohlmeier, agent for Hospice Alliance Foundation, Inc. owner of the property located at 10220 Prairie Ridge Blvd. to rezone Lot 2 of CSM 2514, which is a portion of the property that was recently purchased and combined with the Hospice property (Lot 2 of CSM 2314) from B-2, Community Business District into the I-1, Institutional District. The PUD (Planned Unit Development Overlay District will remain on the entire property.**

Jean Werbie:

Mr. President and members of the Board, you have before you this evening Ordinance #06-31. It's related to a zoning map amendment. It's the request of Kenneth Kohlmeier. He's the agent for the Hospice Alliance Foundation. That property is located at 10220 Prairie Ridge Boulevard. They're requesting to rezone Lot 2 of their CSM 2514 that was recently combined with their property from the B-2, Community Business District, into the I-1, Institutional District. The PUD will remain on the particular property.

As you can see by the slide, this is our zoning map, there's a northern portion of the property that they recently purchased from VK Development. They're looking to expand Hospice Alliance to the north, and the purpose of the rezoning is for them to include all of the purchased land into the I-1 or Institutional District. The 1.075 acre property that was purchased was B-2 and proposed to be I-1. The facility is the Hospice Alliance that they're looking to pull permits on any day. The Hospice Alliance is the facility that provides a 24-hour care to terminally ill individuals who have a life expectancy of six months or less. There are currently eight residential beds available for inpatient care. The proposed addition will be used to support the expanding clinical staff that services the area for home hospice care.

The average census of home care patients has more than doubled since the facility originally opened. Hospice Alliance has 80 to 85 full and part-time employees. The majority of their professional Hospice team spends more of their day out in the field. The office and the facility staff includes approximately 25 employees, and they will continue to operate the residential care facility 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The facility will have business hours from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. and an on-call nurse will be based out of the facility.

This is just a sketch or a site plan that has been presented to the Plan Commission. It shows their 16,825 square foot addition to the north for their Hospice Alliance expansion. They will have parking both on the north of Prairie Ridge Boulevard and then north of the proposed addition. Their project will not connect directly into the Target and Prairie Ridge Shoppe's complex. There will be connection points to the east into the medical office area, and then that eventually will connect to the north.

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

The Plan Commission and the Village staff recommend that the Village Board approve Ordinance #06-31 for the zoning map amendment as presented.

John Steinbrink:

Jean, I'm correct there were no beds added to this facility, it's just an expansion to allow the staff to work with a larger population because most of the work is at the homes, correct?

Jean Werbie:

That's correct.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I have a question for Mike. Mike, this property goes from B-2 to I-1. Institutional-1 is tax exempt, right?

Mike Pollocoff:

No, the tax exemption isn't determined by the district it's in. It's really if the use is tax exempt. In this case this use is tax exempt regardless of the district. The use has to be in an appropriate district, but you can have a tax exempt use in a number of districts. Once this use is approved it will be tax exempt.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

That way the taxes get smaller . . . the amount of people that pay the Village. We've got no choice.

John Steinbrink:

They're set up so they do a public service for the community. We have to understand that most of the funding or financing they use is basically from donations.

LAUER MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND ADOPT ORD. #06-31 RELATED TO THE ZONING MAP AMENDMENT REQUEST OF KENNETH KOHLMEIER, AGENT FOR HOSPICE ALLIANCE FOUNDATION, INC. OWNER OF THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 10220 PRAIRIE RIDGE BLVD. TO REZONE LOT 2 OF CSM 2514, WHICH IS A PORTION OF THE PROPERTY THAT WAS RECENTLY PURCHASED AND COMBINED WITH THE HOSPICE PROPERTY (LOT 2 OF CSM 2314) FROM B-2, COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT INTO THE I-1, INSTITUTIONAL DISTRICT. THE PUD (PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY DISTRICT WILL REMAIN ON THE ENTIRE PROPERTY; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

C. Consider Ordinance #06-32 – Ordinance to Amend Chapter 181 of the Municipal Code relating to Impact Fees.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, as we've bemoaned probably more than the people want to hear and they're tired of hearing us, the State has waived their magic wand and reduced impact fees. We've prepared, as required by statute, we've spent the money to have another study done and we've got that done. We need to make the modifications to our ordinance to reflect the new found revenue for development. Kathy, do you have anything you want to go into as far as the VK study?

Kathy Goessl:

I have a detail on each of the fees and how they're changing. There are four different fees for our impact fee. The first one is fire and EMS. The new statutes state that we can no longer cover equipment in our impact fees, so the original fee that we had for fire and EMS had equipment in it of \$264. So we had to remove that equipment from our impact fee, therefore the revised fee is building only for \$181. That's Fire Station 3 that we're proposing in the future.

For police we only had buildings in our police impact fee, so for the police there was no change to our ordinance for the police. For public works we also had equipment. I believe there was a snow plow truck in this number. Again, we had to remove equipment, therefore the fee has dropped \$202 just for building improvements for the public works area. And our last fee is our park impact fee. We had to remove the pool from the fee and, therefore, the ordinance is parks only for \$632.

So this slide summarizes the changes and it's decreased by \$891. That's for our residential impact fee. For nonresidential it's based on \$1,000 of valuation and that dropped by \$1.22 per \$1,000 valuation.

Other changes, this new reduced fee was actually implemented on June 14th per State law. So as of June 14th we've been collecting less fees than the original impact fee ordinance had. Also, in our original ordinance payment was due at the time the building permit was pulled. The new statute says that the payment is due in full within 14 days of the building permit instead of before the building permit is issued. Also, impact fees must be used within seven years. In the original ordinance that we had we had different time frames based on the different types of equipment and buildings that we had, and we had to remove that and we had the seven years put into the ordinance. Also, the seven years may be extended by three years and that has been put into the ordinance also. Those are the changes that we made to the ordinance. We have Ordinance 06-32 with the changes bolded and lines crossed out for the changes. That's all I have if you have any questions.

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I have a question for Alex. Alex, when this park issue came up you said I guess we deserve it. Can you explain that.

Alex Tiahnybok:

In what context did I say that, Steve?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

When it was announced here that the impact fee was being reduced by the State you said I guess we deserve it . . . maybe you can

Alex Tiahnybok:

I don't exactly remember saying that, but if I did probably in the context of people complaining that they're getting hurt left and right, and this is probably one sign of people pushing back and saying enough is enough. I'm sure that's what I referred to.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Pushing back - the people are the builders and the legislators in Madison – they are the ones who are passing those laws so actually they are the ones who are undermining the population of residents . . . so just looking at this one right here we provide a service to the communities . . . Madison provides a service to the lobbyists and the big corporations . . . but the builders come first and the we come second.

John Steinbrink:

We'll let you Republicans fight that out later. Now for another Republican, Jeff?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I had the fight with Jeff for the same reason years ago.

John Steinbrink:

You had a comment, Jeff?

Jeff Lauer:

I'm waiting to speak. Regarding the new update here, I know last year I didn't vote in favor of it because of the \$6.4 million pool. I do understand that impact fees are a necessity for services that developments bring to the table. Obviously, last year a pool is not a necessity for anybody.

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

But given the update here, given the pool isn't in here, Steve you will be happy to note I move for approval of this.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I'll second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second. Any further discussion?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

We don't have any choice.

John Steinbrink:

I think when we start talking necessity and people who are against impact fees, I think if people are well versed in it and understand what it is and how it affects their taxes, how it affects their community, we first find out that the people that pushed for this were the builders and developers who wanted to use their profits, lobby Madison to use those dollars to pass or put impact onto the current residents. Impact fees actually mean no impact to current residents. We can keep a stable tax base, a stable tax rate without having to raise taxes to provide the services. And as Mike explained the other direction is just to kind of cannibalize yourself and use your existing taxes, spread it out, reduce your services, and to make the people pay more or get less.

So if you think it's unfair to have impact fees for new developments so that we can maintain low taxes in this community, I guess that's the thinking of the builders and the developers and the folks in Madison who supported the change.

Mike Serpe:

Most municipalities will build swimming pools at the taxpayers' expense. Anderson Park, Washington Park pools were built at taxpayer expense. That's accepted. The Village of Pleasant Prairie decided to have impact fees help pay for the pool expansion for a multitude of reasons, mostly for therapeutic reasons and to help a great deal of the handicapped kids in this area. People choose a community to live in because of what it has to offer. Right now the way I see it Pleasant Prairie has an enormous amount to offer. So it's not really unrealistic to charge new residents impact fees that would include covering the expansion of a pool because that's a benefit that's going to enhance this Village that people are going to enjoy.

The person, and we talked about this many times, who lives on a fixed income is not going to be asked to support that pool. The person with four or five kids who may never use that facility is not going to be asked to support that pool. But we're asking the people that are moving in here because they like what they see to help keep this Village on top and be the envy of many around us. That's the reason we asked for the impact fees that we did, to make it that much nicer of a place to live. But the powers to be in Madison don't agree with that. They made the decision and

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

now we have to live with it and we'll move on. We'll get through this.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second. Further discussion?

Alex Tiahnybok:

I think I made it pretty loud and clear even going back as far as when Doug Wheaton was here from the Kenosha Realtors Association, and I was relieved to hear that for aspects of the impacts new development creates I'm not opposed to impact fees at all. I just said it earlier today that if we could bring school impact fees back I think that's more important than any of those things, frankly, as far as I'm concerned.

The debate I think almost entirely last fall when we were arguing about impact fees centered on the pool issue. And as to whether or not it's fair to saddle somebody new coming into this community to pay for a pool that's part of a private club essentially, that was my objection. Everything else I have no issues with. I'd like to see it get bigger to account for schools. I'm absolutely fine with this.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Just looking at the way this impact goes it's very clear here when we talk about . . . Republicans . . . legislation at the request of the Wisconsin Builders Association. Nobody says at the request of the Village of Pleasant Prairie or the City of Kenosha or Kenosha County . . . the swimming pool in the City . . . paid by taxes in the community but also by the users.

Mike Pollocoff:

I told myself I wasn't going to say anything about this but my mouth is engaging for it. The pool at RecPlex this community was able to secure a significant donation to build that pool in that facility, and it's an asset of the community. It's not a private club. We have so many people that take swim lessons there that aren't members. We have so many handicapped people that go there for therapy that aren't RecPlex members. We have so many people that go there for physical therapy that aren't RecPlex members. It's no different for any other people. We have a lot of people, and I've probably got the number here, hundreds of thousands of dollars that are paid to RecPlex from people that just walk up and say I want a day pass to go swimming, I want a day pass to go play basketball, I want to do whatever.

RecPlex is not a private club. It's a municipal recreation department that's funded as an enterprise. Above all of the facilities we don't discriminate against anybody who just wants to come and use it for the day. If they've got a handicap we encourage it. We have a program that isn't paid for by taxpayers that facilitates that. It's one of the most solid municipal recreation programs in the country. We've had universities looking at how RecPlex operates and the

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

services we provide. It's not Bali's. It's not Club Med. It's a municipal recreation department, and the only difference between our pool and Anderson Pool is ours is inside.

The concept and the policy was, and I can respect Mr. Lauer's contention that it's a frivolous item that isn't needed, but if you believe that we already have a pool and that it's okay for the population to grow and make that pool unusable because there's more and more people coming to it, so be it. That's a policy decision you make. If you think that as our community grows that the new people that come and add to our community should help pay for our new pool then that's one point of view that was taken away by the State. But Virchow-Krause showed we didn't cook any books to come up with that. That needs analysis was done following the State statutes.

I think we have a recreation department to be proud of. It's not a private club to be proud of. It's a recreation facility and operation that is--if you dislike government then you probably dislike this, but it's a solid municipal operation that serves anybody that comes to it whether it's from Pleasant Prairie or anyplace else. You pay your fee and you get in, whether it's an annual membership or it's a day pass.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second. Alex?

Alex Tiahnybok:

I'm willing to be corrected. It's not a private club. Private clubs suggest that its members only and nobody can pay on a per use basis. As a lot of other municipal facilities there's a per use fee. I'm okay with that. Again, I still don't think that a certain segment of our population should be targeted for paying for something that's a per use type environment. I just have a philosophical difference with that. Believe me, I don't want to personally share in the burden of these impacts on our community at all. I pay enough in property taxes so I'm not looking to see mine personally go up. But I think it's a philosophical difference as to who deserves to pay for what and then how big you draw that circle. I think my circle is smaller, that's all.

Mike Serpe:

When a municipality creates something not everybody uses what it creates, but there's a benefit to having certain things in place. For example, there's a benefit to everybody in a community to have good schools because education is good, even though a number of families don't have kids but they benefit by the kids that are going to school and getting a good education. The pool, the RecPlex, the IcePlex, whatever is being done out there is benefiting the community because somebody is out there recreating instead of creating problems, and I'm getting more to the youth here than anybody. If you don't give kids something to do they're going to find things to do that you're not going to like. And I think we've pretty much shown our success in that area so there is a benefit to even those just coming in here because the people are going to benefit by that facility being out there keeping youth and families busy instead of too much idle time to get in trouble. So there is a benefit to that no different than the schools.

LAUER MOVED TO ADOPT ORDINANCE #06-32 – ORDINANCE TO AMEND

CHAPTER 181 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE RELATING TO IMPACT FEES; SECONDED BY TIAHNYBOK; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

D. Consider Resolution #06-33 – Resolution Relating to Amendment of the 2006 Recreation Fund Budget.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, we have this resolution in front of you to amend the 2006 budget for the recreation fund. We just got done talking about this. One of the things that's become apparent in evaluating the RecPlex and IcePlex budget is the extent to which, one, either there's a lack of understanding of it or there's a willingness to not recognize the financial plan that put that together and how that's rolling out. And there's also a healthy fear to make sure that this thing doesn't go on the tax roll which is shared by everybody. But, we've dealt with questions from the press, we've dealt with questions from the Board members as we went through the budget process. There's been a fair amount of information that, one, hasn't been helpful to the recreation enterprise in the sense it's reflecting a problem that we don't believe exists.

When we started RecPlex, we anticipated at the time we started that project that we would be not going into black for a few years. But the opposite end of that being the truth we did go in the black relatively quickly after about two years. The enterprise was successful to the point where we were having problems with capacity at RecPlex not having enough room. We were also being bombarded with requests for a couple things. One was ice in large part due to the failure of the Kenosha County Ice Rink to sustain itself and the ability that RecPlex would have to offer programs that support ice, not more so just including an ice arena, but those things that ice users use, whether it's Palates for figure skaters or if it's speed and weight training for hockey players that didn't exist in other places.

The other thing, strangely enough, that we were requested and there was a lot of demand for was the pool. A lot of people felt it was a necessity, it wasn't just something to play around with in that our pool space was tight. The Park Commission at that time undertook a study. We did two pro formas to see whether or not an ice arena in particular would pay its way. The study showed that there's a market in this area for three arenas or three sheets of ice I should say. The Park Commission toured facilities and contracted with two separate consultants to evaluate how to come up with an operating program for the ice arena and decided to begin. At that time, we felt that it would be at least three years before we could get an ice arena to be profitable and we undertook the project.

One of the problems, though, that became evident, and we had some personnel problems as far as maintaining some ice management in the first year, but one of the problems that became readily apparent was that we had all of our expenses associated with the arena accounted for in the IcePlex division of the recreation budget, but the only revenues that were showing up there was ice rental and figure skating rental and the concession and the pro shop, which are significant items, but don't reflect the true operation, and that's true for RecPlex. So we were in a position where we were trying to explain and justify to the people why the RecPlex or the IcePlex wasn't making money because the rental revenues and the supporting revenues just in IcePlex didn't support the total project. I guess we knew this internally and we were used to dealing with it, but

it became apparent that the general public didn't understand it.

I think in reviewing comments by the Board at Board meetings or in the press it was almost as though IcePlex was going in the tank and coming off the edge of the earth. But you can make the same statement for the pool at RecPlex. If we have to evaluate the Abdoos Pool based on what we make on swimming, lesson revenue, based on birthday parties, those things, the Abdoos Pool loses money every year. If we have to look at the field house on what we get on basketball league fees, what we get on adult basketball, volleyball, running out to Danskin or whatever, and based on what it costs to operate that facility, we lose money in the field house every year. We look at the kid's court where parents drop their kids off and they play, and what we make in there, we lose money every year. Look at the fitness center. In there we have almost a half million dollars worth of programs where people sign up for classes. If that fitness center had to live just based on those revenues alone we lose money in the fitness center every year.

You have to look at the recreation enterprise as a whole, because the only department that makes any money out there, and it consists of 12 people, is guest services because they make almost \$4 million in revenue because that's where all the memberships are charged to. That's the money that sustains the facility. People join RecPlex for a lot of reasons, and one of the reasons that a lot of people join RecPlex is because they get better prices on programs. They're able to get free childcare. They're able to reduce their costs for their kids being in basketball programs or softball programs. They're able to get better ice skating fees. They can get services at IcePlex that they don't get. The kids that are doing figure skating are able to participate in the ballet and the Palates classes that are at RecPlex. The kids that are playing hockey are able to participate in the strength and conditioning programs at RecPlex.

You can't take a look at just one side of it and not look at the revenue side of it. We have it in the entire recreation enterprise, and I think to be cautious at the time we wanted to see where the IcePlex revenues are supporting. But we took a look at revenues for the enterprise last year and we're seeing this big bump up in memberships. What's different between last year and this year? It's IcePlex. We have a lot of people using IcePlex that are taking out RecPlex memberships. It only makes sense to look at the entire enterprise fund to say it's all one fund and not carve up the IcePlex. If we want to do that, and I'm not sure at the end of the day what it gets you if you're going to ignore any RecPlex revenues that are generated because of IcePlex, it doesn't tell the whole story.

So, I'm recommending that the budget be amended to reflect the entire recreation enterprise as a whole because it's so integral. You have day camp. Kids are going to day camp and they're down skating for a couple hours a day. RecPlex members can go skate whenever there's open skate and it doesn't cost them anything if they have skates. If they don't have skates it costs them \$3. It's no different than the racquetball courts. You can go play racquetball whenever you want. It doesn't cost anything if you have a racket. If you want a racket from us you have to rent a racket.

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

IcePlex is doing better. It's doing better and better all the time. We're in the midst of renegotiating an agreement with Blue Line that's going to be more favorable not in the sense we're going to get more money but it's going to give the IcePlex some flexibility to rent out additional ice and not be stuck holding ice. We had over 400 kids learning how to skate in this last session. The year before that we didn't even have 100 I don't think. The program itself is doing well. I've included in the revised budget sheet to show the nets are there. From a cash standpoint I think we're going to be close this year. And I think right now in our negotiations with Blue Line we don't have any ice left for prime time next year. For 2007 the ice is already gone. It's pre-sold. We weren't in that condition last year. We were looking for people to pick up ice and we were going to put in bargain prices to do it. Right now we're scrambling to make sure we can maintain enough time to have public programs.

So this resolution is the vehicle to amend that budget to do that. Kathy, if you want to go through your presentation on this and describe the new account groups and how we're combining these accounts and what we're looking to achieve.

Kathy Goessl:

As part of this process we also reviewed not just the IcePlex and their account groups and their accounts but also we evaluated and reviewed the entire recreational enterprise fund structure. So that includes IcePlex or ice related things as well as other things. I broke this into two different categories of revenue, budget amendments and the expense budget amendments. First of all, we created some new account groups to bring things together. The new account groups we created was public sessions. We took some of the ice stuff which on your sheet is most of them are in blue for ice. We brought that into this public session group. We added birthday parties and field trips from the rec side of the organization and other miscellaneous income that were related to public sessions. We also brought in video game rentals, revenue from the ice side that we have. So we brought everything related to public sessions into one group.

We also created a new group called ice buy ons. In the past all ice revenues were just all lumped together in one IcePlex revenue group. It wasn't segregated into different groups. So this helps you look at it a little bit better at the different groups, so ice buy ons was one of the groups we thought that we needed as a separate category. This includes free style buy ons for our free style skaters, as well as hockey buy ons for our hockey players. And then also for figure skaters the coaches pay a pro fee and that gets grouped into that category.

We also looked at our facilities over the last five years have grown and changed. We initially set up the rec side. We tried to make different accounts that would categorize our different rentals and stuff. It's gotten a little out of control in terms of the different things we were renting, so we re-evaluated that whole section in terms of rentals. There used to be only one account group called rentals. Now we have made a facility rental category account group as well as equipment rental account group, and we have condensed some of the stuff down to make it easier to look at a summarized trend of our different rental categories.

Some of the rental categories we have made are field house rental, multipurpose rental, aquatic center, ice arena rentals, our business leases which include United Hospital and Common Grounds. We have made these different account groups to summarize there. Our new software

does really well on the detail end of the things, if we want to know how many times we rent the multipurpose rooms, how many times did we rent - the LakeView room versus the ice multipurpose rooms or the multipurpose rooms on the rec side. That's all available in our CSI software, operational software for the organization. The accounting part of it or the accounts groups are more meant for a summarized view to look at things. We can always drill down into more detail in terms of the rental area.

We also combined some accounts together. When evaluating the fitness area that was one of the big areas that we combined together. We just had too much detail in the general ledger. We combined our adult programs. In the beginning we only offered adult fitness and then it came into a different category called specialty fitness and youth fitness and water. We're combining all that together into one account. But, again, on our operating software CSI we have all that detail in terms of how much revenue we're making on water classes versus youth classes so we don't need that kind of detail at this higher level. It will be easier to analyze into the trends instead of spending a lot of time making journal entries and separating things out. We'll spend more time analyzing and looking at trends.

Also, we're combining initially the budget had an ice day camp as well as a rec day camp. We're taking it and bringing it all under and using the synergies of the operation to have this under the umbrella, and then they can split off and spend some hours skating or spend some hours in some of our other specialty camps.

And we're also moving some accounts to different account groups. The major move is we used to have a special events category for ice as well as for the rec side. We are now moving our special event, our major special event, the ice show, underneath the special event category so all the special events are in one account group.

On the other side of the coin are expense accounts. The major change we're making is currently we have two--each of the different areas has different operating divisions within RecPlex. We have guest services, facilities, marketing, administration. - but there's two areas where the departments are actually split. We have an ice marketing and we have a rec marketing. We have a rec facility and an ice facility. We were trying to separate the cost out, spending the time allocating things out to the two different areas. This budget amendment would collapse the marketing into this one marketing division and one facility division and not try to do these allocations. One of the biggest expenses of the facilities is gas and electric. Those things are not metered on the two facilities. We were doing space analysis and square footage stuff to make the allocation to those two areas. Now with it being collapsed we wouldn't have to do this detailed analysis. We look at the whole building and see how electric and gas are doing. Those are the only two divisions that were separated out in the past.

Also, this next thing has to do with program wages and benefits. When we first set up the accounts groups for rec we stuck all of the expenses into the operating division and other expenses in this program division. During the budget process we evaluated salaries and benefits and expenses compared to revenue for programming. But on a month-to-month basis we weren't looking at salaries along with the other expenses. So to have the division managers concentrate and see what their total cost to their programs are, we're moving the salaries and benefits like the instructors, the massage therapist, those type of salaries and benefits over to the programming

division.

On the report that you have in your packet that is done on a manual basis, but the detail sheets that we get from our ledger does not show that being moved into the programming division. So that is one of the major things we did that wasn't even related to ice. It was just basically as we reviewed through the whole account structure we moved those programming people. You can see on page three mainly all the different people or groups of people that we're moving to the programming divisions.

Also, again, in this area we moved some accounts to different account groups. Looking at responsibility, one of the major changes here again is not ice related but we moved a lot of the stuff to do with collections and bad debt and credit card processing before it was in administration, but all of that is dealt with in our guest services division, so we're recommending to move that into our guest services division. That was the major change there. There are other things moving around there like the expense for the ice show is moving into the special events division. Also, there's some combining of accounts again. Mainly that's to do with fitness is a major one and the ice day camp, the expense of ice day camp is moving to day camp in our rec division just being one day camp.

Another thing back in moving accounts to different account groups, we have some accounts that are currently mainly in administration that are not controlled by the RecPlex administration. It's basically stuff that's more controlled at the administrative level that's been financed like property and liability insurance. We're financially the one that negotiates the contracts and knows those numbers. So we made another account group of other expenses that are these type of things like depreciation, also the administration charge from IT, HR and finance and also administration. We pulled those out of administration because those aren't really managed by them and put them in a separate group that's managed by the finance department and administration here at the Village Hall.

So these account changes are all listed on a sheet that you have in your packet, as well as the latest May 2006 financial report that we issue on a monthly basis. This report has been redesigned a couple months ago, and now all the RecPlex and IcePlex managers, all the division managers in the rec, get this report and see how they're doing as well as how others are doing within the rec division. Currently, overall, as of the end of May if you look at the first page at the bottom you can see a comparison. We're doing really well compared to last year. We're ahead of last year through May \$446,000 almost. And then for 2006 budget we're currently ahead almost \$21,000.

Currently we post information - mainly the revenues are posted on a real time basis. So the revenue earned in May is posted in May, but we do have a lag in expenditures. We lay payroll by like two weeks, and we lag our accounts payable about four to six weeks depending on how fast they submit it in. So this is not a final May ending close. The best comparison is last year. Last year we were on the same type of cycle, same lagging from last year, and we're almost a half a million dollars ahead so we're doing really well in terms of accelerating our net rec enterprise. So that's what I have in terms of the detail concerning the detail of this budget amendment we're asking for. If you have any questions for me or Mike, or Cathi Klaver is also here.

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

John Steinbrink:

Questions?

Alex Tiahnybok:

Kathy, are you saying that this report that was part of the packet this is the ongoing report, this will continue, or am I misinterpreting what you're saying?

Kathy Goessl:

This is a monthly report that's issued to all division managers. If you want to see it on a regular basis it's available every month probably the 15th of the month for the previous month.

Mike Pollocoff:

Before it was where the divisions were busted out and IcePlex was separate minus any RecPlex revenues that IcePlex generated. Where this is combined.

Alex Tiahnybok:

It's combined but yet it is separate. In explaining our performance of the recreational enterprise we're \$445,000 year to date better than last year, but we're still splitting it out into the RecPlex component.

Kathy Goessl:

Yes, this is the May report. This is before any of the budget amendments are done. When we do the June report if this all gets approved you won't see ice and rec anymore on this sheet. You'll see the new account structure showing what we're recommending. So it would be in the same detail in terms of salaries and benefits, gross revenues, net revenues and other expenditures.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I like the fact that the year to date IcePlex is \$100,000 to the better than they were last year. So that's good news. I personally like the idea of being able to see the detail. I still don't believe they're one in the same in terms of the entire operation.

Mike Pollocoff:

The detail is in there. If you look you can see what's going on.

Alex Tiahnybok:

But this is not going to be the same anymore. This is going to be—

Mike Pollocoff:

No, but as she identified on the sheet there, if you look at the line accounts they're going to be there. If you want to see that then you want to see how the pool does without memberships and allocate the debt to the pool. Or, do you want to see how the field house does without memberships and allocate that? That's why this thing has been goofy is that none of the other RecPlex operations had any debt allocated to them which is their operational expenses and they look great. But RecPlex or IcePlex we allocated debt to it but then we wouldn't allocate the revenues that were generated by memberships. We just pretend that anybody who used IcePlex never went into RecPlex.

If you just look at the RecPlex numbers from year to date from 2005 and 2006, we were net last year \$448,000 and this year is \$791,000. What's the difference? The difference is IcePlex. That's a significant difference. If we're going to say we're going to pretend that IcePlex has to live on its own, the only way we can really do that is we have to trail everybody and find out are you over here because you're an IcePlex member or because you use IcePlex? And that ends up being the problem.

When we talk with the hockey group, the thing they liked the best was that they could bring people in and take them into the fitness center, have a structured program for speed and strength particular to that sport. You can't do that at Kenosha Ice and you can't do that at a lot of arenas. There's others that bring their kids in there to skate hockey and they go work out and they put their kids into kids court or the other kids are skating. They can only do that if they're a member. There's all these synergies that go back and forth, and by structuring it the way we did before we were ignoring completely any--we were pretending that there was no IcePlex impact on RecPlex and there is. There's a lot. Intuitively we know it because when that door pass breaks down everybody is screaming because they can't get from the IcePlex into the RecPlex where you swipe to get from one to the other.

Mike Serpe:

This accounting procedure just makes all the sense in the world as far as I'm concerned. You can take any business and identify an employee that doesn't carry their weight, but that employee is still an integral part of the operation. This is no different. Mike, I wish we would have done this from the beginning but we didn't. And as long as you're identifying, and if anybody is interested they can still monitor the progress of the IcePlex, it's still going to be in there but it still should be considered as one. I think it's a good move and I move approval.

Kathy Goessl:

We need to concentrate on the whole enterprise, and right now we're spending time allocating things back and forth. We need to concentrate on the whole thing and not just waste time allocating between the two to figure out whether IcePlex is losing or not losing or whatever. This makes more sense to take this synergy. Like day camp right now--in the beginning we had them split. We were expecting IcePlex to run their own day camp and now we're going to use the synergies and take them under the big umbrella. It just makes sense.

Mike Pollocoff:

Plus it creates an unhealthy organization from a couple standpoints. One is that if it's two separate organizations the people in the IcePlex are saying let the RecPlex people do this. People in the RecPlex are saying that's IcePlex. And we want to be able to take advantage of overhead savings out there so somebody at the desk on guest services on the RecPlex side we need help on IcePlex and they go over. Just like on the RecPlex side if we need help from fitness somebody goes from guest services up to fitness. They don't even think twice about it. The guy who is sweeping why should he stop at the door because that's RecPlex. Go on and do what they have to do in IcePlex. That's one side of the unhealthy organization.

The other side of the unhealthy organization is people read in the *Kenosha News* that IcePlex is going in the tank and all of a sudden you get a whole group of people that are looking at this picture that really isn't accurately painted as how the enterprise as a whole is functioning, and you're making employees crazy needlessly because overall things are doing good. And we look at these numbers and we're trending in the direction we want to go.

We looked at that one facility in Colorado that was almost a mirror or RecPlex. It's called Apex. And they started as an Ice Arena and RecPlex at the same time we just started RecPlex. So when we looked at them they were five years old. The ice operation was subsidizing the rec operation there. Once the ice takes off, because it's a big money sport, it takes off and it didn't start off that way there, but when we went and looked at them, ice was really dictating how the facility was running because that's where the money was being paid. I think that's unhealthy if we were to stay the way we were and ice was making a lot of money you'd have the same problem.

At the end of the day, to mind to the Village the recreation enterprise is healthy, that we're providing the services that we want to provide and it's paying its own way and it's not going to the tax roll and treated no differently than we treat the sewer utility, the water utility, the solid waste utility. I'll tell you, maybe we could bring somebody in, a consultant, to talk to us about it, but our recreation enterprise for Pleasant Prairie is one of the few in the country, they're telling us, one of the few in the country that's running as an enterprise and not being supported by tax dollars. We've got something going here that's very successful contrary to what you read in the paper that's doing well. That goes to the people who are out there running it and what we put together.

But to parse this thing up just to make a point I don't know what that gets us. I think it's important that we--just like you saw in the general fund budgets and the other budgets when you go through them, Kathy has got the budget line out to the most manageable detail and that isn't going to change. It's just all under one budget rather than a third of one and two-thirds of the other.

John Steinbrink:

Maybe we need to get the outside opinion of people with expertise in this field. We've been looked at by some of those people and they've marveled at what we have here and how we've done it, but we never hear about that.

Mike Pollocoff:

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

Klaver is giving more tours to people across the country, it's not people around the area, that are coming to look at RecPlex to see what we have and how we're doing it. It's popular in town here to berate what we have, but when you look at what we have and see what other people are saying it's amazing. Why does somebody come here from Indiana to see how we're doing it and how we get it done? We have somebody coming out from Indiana or Ohio wanting to see exactly how we got the program structured, how we put this thing together, how do you make this thing work? And it is working.

There's no question in 2004 when we had the place half shut down and we were under construction that we weren't making money. We knew that when we started that we were going to pay a price for expanding it. And it was used by some people to beat the snot out of us over the fact that we were losing money rather than looking at how that happened. But when you sit down and take a look at the operation and how it all ties together and not look at it separately it's doing well. We're catching up kind of like we thought we would and we're going to do better and better. This just makes ten times more sense. Otherwise we're just looking to get beat up for no reason because at the end of the day the bottom line shows that we're turned the corner and we're doing better and better.

Mike Serpe:

Mike, because of a couple of past headlines that people have read about the IcePlex, a lot of people talk about it and are concerned. I agree with you that it's doing well and we're not getting, at least the employees at the RecPlex are not getting the credit they deserve. Appropriately I think if somebody could take the time and let the Village residents know through *The Village Times* exactly what you said about how many people and how many organizations in how many different states are coming to this area to see what we have to offer I think that would be great. Right now to this day people ask you how the IcePlex is doing because of the negative headline. Instead of looking at something positive that could be thrown out to the people in this area it's a lot of negative. It just doesn't help our image in this area. I think we might as well take advantage of our *Village Times* and let the people know exactly what we're doing and what's happening. You get companies in Milwaukee now that are talking about leaving Milwaukee because of what's going on in that City. I realize we're not Milwaukee, but you know what, we offer a heck of a lot more in certain areas than a lot of the big cities.

Mike Pollocoff:

We've had companies locate here because of RecPlex.

Mike Serpe:

Exactly my point. But you're not going to see that in the local media. So I think that's something we have to get out ourselves.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I stated in previous meetings that I'd like nothing more than to see IcePlex be a huge success in

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

terms of our programs for this year. I had indicated that this Board has a responsibility to ensure that we enable the IcePlex to reach those goals. I'm thrilled to see that if you continue to look at IcePlex as a separate operation they've closed the gap dramatically. I think that's an excellent sign.

From a subjective basis the connection between the draw to IcePlex enhancing the RecPlex's budget in terms of memberships and all that I have no data to support it either way. If you're all so convinced that there's a direct connection between that I don't have anything to refute that. The RecPlex is a separate operation obviously as is \$450,000 or whatever better than last year which I think is phenomenal. And that basically negates the small \$12,500 that the IcePlex is showing in the negative. So I think the trends to use the word that you used, Mike, is very positive.

The concern I have about consolidating these numbers is if the trend right now shows that everything is moving in the right direction together then what's the need to consolidate if it looks like the IcePlex is getting ready to be in the black anyway? So I'm kind of concerned as to why we're doing that. I'd rather be able to say, wow, look at the IcePlex is doing phenomenally on its own and there's no need to consolidate anything because it's generating its own profits and there's no reason to believe that one facility is supporting the other one so I'm concerned about that.

And this whole concept of consolidation we can carry that to ridiculous extremes and start saying, okay, let's forget about having a separate police and fire budget and let's combine them and call it public safety. I think there are limitations to how far you can go with that. So, anyway, it looks like the trends are in the right direction. I think if there's a need to drill down and actually make an honest estimate as to whether or not one or the other isn't operating properly. I would have huge objections to supporting this if it didn't look like the IcePlex was moving in the right direction but it looks like it is. But, again, this consolidation concept it seems like we like consolidation when it suits our personal needs, and when it doesn't obviously everything has to be separate because it's more efficient being smaller.

John Steinbrink:

What would you like separate that we've consolidated?

Alex Tiahnybok:

The whole idea—

John Steinbrink:

You make these statements and you make these comments. What would you like separate rather than consolidated?

Alex Tiahnybok:

Well, we're talking about consolidating some of the costs of operating both of the facilities. So

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

it's going to blur the line as to what's a cost and what's a revenue.

John Steinbrink:

You refer to it in the text that we've done this or do this to make something look good. Where is this? Where is the smoking gun?

Alex Tiahnybok:

And I just said if the IcePlex was hugely in the negative and we were consolidating to make it all look positive I would have serious objections to this. But it looks like we're moving in the right direction. If it was hugely negative or getting worse then I would say this is really an attempt to hide the fact. But it appears as though it's not a bad idea.

John Steinbrink:

Right, but you preface the comment with a comment that we do that in the cases where we want to make something look good. Where are these other issues?

Alex Tiahnybok:

No, I'm saying if that was the case--

John Steinbrink:

But you said we've done that in the past. Where are these things we've done in the past? I'm going from your comments and I just asked for clarification.

Alex Tiahnybok:

If I said it that way suggesting that there was an effort to do this in the past to hide funds then it was a misstatement. But if it was in this case then I would be against it.

Mike Serpe:

Can I make a motion?

John Steinbrink:

Sure.

Mike Serpe:

Thank you. I think I did before but I'll say it again. I move approval of Resolution 06-33.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second. Any other discussion?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I think it's a good idea no matter how you look at it.

John Steinbrink:

Hearing no more those in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? So carries.

SERPE MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION #06-33 – RESOLUTION RELATING TO AMENDMENT OF THE 2006 RECREATION FUND BUDGET; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 3-0 WITH TIAHNYBOK AND LAUER NOT VOTING.

E. Consider Resolution #06-30 - Resolution Certifying the Creation, Review and Adoption of the Compliance Maintenance Annual Reports for the Wastewater Treatment Plant in Sewer Utility District 73-1.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, these are the annual reviews that are required by the DNR for our waste water treatment utilities. The first one, 06-30 is Utility 73-1. The State a few years back moved to the GPA just like a school district method of rating. If you want, I can go through the specifics of how they rate the plants. Ideally it's based on our ability to do a couple things. One is to meet the treatment standards that have been established to the Village as it relates to BOD, suspended solids, influent averages, the level of discharge, are we bypassing, and to what extent we exceeded our permit. And then our ability to manage the finances of the utility. In the case of 73-1 we had a raw score of 116 points. We had a GPA of 4.0. Our financial record was 16 points with a record of 4.0. 73-1 is going to be abandoned in 2009 as part of the Lake Michigan Diversion Program. We have to have it done by 2010 but we'll have it done in '09. I recommend that the resolution be adopted and forwarded to the State.

KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION #06-30 - RESOLUTION CERTIFYING THE CREATION, REVIEW AND ADOPTION OF THE COMPLIANCE

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

MAINTENANCE ANNUAL REPORTS FOR THE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT IN SEWER UTILITY DISTRICT 73-1; SECONDED BY TIAHNYBOK; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

- F. Consider Resolution #06-31 - Resolution Certifying the Creation, Review and Adoption of the Compliance Maintenance Annual Reports for the Wastewater Treatment Plant in Sewer Utility District D.**

Mike Pollocoff:

Again, the same parameters. Sewer D a little bit lower score but it's still really good. It's a 3.91 and the raw score is 121. The reason it's dropping to 3.91 is there's been significant growth in the Sewer D drainage basin which is roughly 88th Avenue to the Interstate and Highway 50 down to C. So with the Prairie Ridge development as your flows go up and start approaching your design levels you'll get points deducted, but we're still not anywhere near a compliance requirement. Again, the financial management score is perfect at 4.0. I'd recommend that Resolution 06-31 be adopted and forwarded to the State.

TIAHNYBOK MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION #06-31 - RESOLUTION CERTIFYING THE CREATION, REVIEW AND ADOPTION OF THE COMPLIANCE MAINTENANCE ANNUAL REPORTS FOR THE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT IN SEWER UTILITY DISTRICT D; SECONDED BY LAUER; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

- G. Consider Resolution #06-32 - Preliminary Resolution Declaring Intent to Exercise Special Assessment Police Powers for the Construction of Municipal Roadway on 9th Court North of 115th Street.**

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, we received a petition from residents requesting that 9th Court north of 115th Street be paved. This resolution authorizes the Clerk to prepare the assessment documents and notices for a public hearing to be held. This hearing would be held at our next meeting, or the first meeting in August.

Village Board Meeting
July 5, 2006

SERPE MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION #06-32 - PRELIMINARY RESOLUTION DECLARING INTENT TO EXERCISE SPECIAL ASSESSMENT POLICE POWERS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MUNICIPAL ROADWAY ON 9TH COURT NORTH OF 115TH STREET; SECONDED BY LAUER; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

H. Consent Agenda

- 1) **Approve Bartender License Applications on file.**
- 2) **Approve Letter of Credit Reduction for Kings Cove Subdivision.**
- 3) **Approve Park Amplification Permits for two wedding receptions.**

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

9. ADJOURNMENT.

KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING; SECONDED BY LAUER; MOTION CARRIED 5-0 AND MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:50 P.M.