

**VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE  
PLEASANT PRAIRIE VILLAGE BOARD  
PLEASANT PRAIRIE WATER UTILITY  
LAKE MICHIGAN SEWER UTILITY DISTRICT  
SEWER UTILITY DISTRICT "D"  
9915 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Pleasant Prairie, WI  
August 7, 2006  
6:30 p.m.**

A Regular Meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Village Board was held on Monday, August 7, 2006. Meeting called to order at 6:30 p.m. Present were Village Board members John Steinbrink, Alex Tiahnybok, Steve Kumorkiewicz, Jeff Lauer and Mike Serpe. Also present were Mike Pollocoff, Village Administrator; Jean Werbie, Community Development Director and Jane Romanowski, Village Clerk.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- 3. ROLL CALL**
- 4. MINUTES OF MEETING – JULY 5 & 17, 2006**

**KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE BOARD MEETINGS OF JULY 5 AND 17, 2006 AS PRESENTED IN THEIR WRITTEN FORM; SECONDED BY TIAHNYBOK; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**5. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**A. Consider Request for Paving 9<sup>th</sup> Court North of 115<sup>th</sup> Street.**

- 1) Resolution #06-37 – Final Resolution Authorizing Construction of Public Improvements and Levying Special Assessments against Benefited Property for the Construction Paving on 9<sup>th</sup> Court North of 115<sup>th</sup> Street.**

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, we received a petition requesting that the Village consider paving 9<sup>th</sup> Court north of 115<sup>th</sup> Street in Carol Beach Unit 1. This is an older subdivision, and the only improved road that is in there is the gravel road. As you can see it's that elliptical or moon shaped right of way there. We've published a public notice as required by statutes declaring the Village Board's intent to levy special assessments upon completion of the public hearing tonight. The engineer has created an assessment report for us that reflect that the estimated cost for grading and preparation work, adjusting of sanitary sewer a manhole which is only one and then the asphalt, along with contingencies and administration would be \$19,957.13.

Special assessments in Wisconsin are based on the actual cost of projects. Once we had a formal bid on this and completed the project and found out what the actual quantities were if the project was any less than the assessment then that would be the amount that's charged. If it was any more then we would reconvene the hearing and advise the property owners as to what the new

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

cost would be. That being said, this is a relatively small project so I highly doubt that there would be any overages.

On the project the paving assessment was done on a frontage basis. That appeared to be the most equitable method of making the assessment. This is a paving assessment where the width of the lot relates to the cost of the project. The more paving in front of your house the more you pay. A majority of the parcels on the project are 50 feet wide so the paving assessment at \$34.99 a linear foot would be \$1,749.40. Some are higher at 80 feet. Again, the majority are at 50 and a good number at 55.

If the project was to proceed, we would have it completed this year. The individuals involved at that time would have the option to pay for the special assessment before October 31<sup>st</sup> so there would be no interest charged before that date. If they chose to pay it on the Village's installment plan, they could pay it over a ten year period at 9 percent of the unpaid balance until it's paid off. It would show up as a separate line item on their property tax bill they receive each year. We encourage individuals to seek other financing alternatives such as home equity loans that would be deductible for their income taxes as another option and that's an acceptable use of that.

The project would involve paving of the roadway as well as rebuilding and regravelling shoulders once the project is completed. With that, Mr. President, if you'd like to open up the hearing we could answer any questions.

John Steinbrink:

This being a public hearing I will open it up for public comment or question. We ask that you use the microphone and give us your name and address for the record. Is there anybody wishing to speak on this item?

Jane Romanowski:

We have one sign up, Mr. President, Connie Willis.

Connie Willis:

My name is Connie Willis and I live at 828 115<sup>th</sup> Street. And that anchors 9<sup>th</sup> Court. I object very strongly to the assessment that I'm being assessed because it's \$1,100 more than what everyone else is and that circle. I just have property that abuts on the side. I do not have access to that road from my property by a driveway or anything else from that property. I think my assessment is unfair. Between the lady that lives at the other end of the circle and myself we're paying one-third of the cost of this project if it goes through and the two of us will not in any way benefit from this road because neither one of us have access to our property from this road, and neither one of us will have a three foot or four foot or whatever it is approach to our driveways from this road. So we're paying for nine other people to have a new road. So I strongly object to paying to what you are trying to assess me for this new road. That's all I have to say. I just wanted you to know how I felt about it.

(Inaudible)

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

Connie Willis:

Yes, I own frontage on the road, but I do not have access to this road from my property and yet I'm being assessed at \$1,100 more than everyone that lives on that road and I don't think it's right. I paid my assessment for 115<sup>th</sup> Street when it went past my house, and I don't feel like I should have to pay for their road that they want now. Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Anyone else wishing to speak? Hearing none I'll close citizens' comments, the public input portion, and open it up to Board comments or questions.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Jean, can you confirm what Mrs. Willis just said, the driveway from parcel 926 goes to 115<sup>th</sup> Street? It's hard to tell in the photo that we got. It looks like it.

Jean Werbie:

That's what it is.

Alex Tiahnybok:

And the same thing for parcel 805?

Jean Werbie:

Yes.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I understand what Mrs. Willis is saying. It sounds like at least she inferred that somewhere along the way she paid for paving of 115<sup>th</sup> Street and yet 9<sup>th</sup> Court is a street that literally just goes past her property and the parcel 805. Interestingly enough on the petition that was included with our information packet the two no responses I believe there was a letter attached to it stating that ten parcels are involved, seven were enthusiastic about it and one basically said not interested and the other two was no response. It just so happens that the parcels that are getting charged the most are the ones that are silent on this. I believe somebody should get value for what they pay for. In this case I don't think either parcel 926 or 805 are.

My perspective on this is I can understand the people on 9<sup>th</sup> Court wanting to have their street paved, it improves their property values, etc., and there's value to that, and I think it would only be fair if we rework this not to include the properties on the corner because I don't think they have any benefit from it.

Mike Serpe:

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

If I'm not mistaken I think there's a forgiveness factor? There's not one on this one here on the corner lot?

Mike Pollocoff:

The logic on paving is if you have a parcel and you have frontage you have use of the road. People could park on the road next to your house. You can park there. It's not a driveway access. If somebody wanted to put a driveway in they could, but that's the difficult with corner parcels is they end up having a lot of frontage. There is forgiveness if it's a utility underground improvement because you're only going to be able to use so much sewer. You're only going to be able to use so much water. The courts have decided that's not the case with roads because you can use that entire frontage along your road for primarily access, parking, things such as that. That's why on most road assessments corners are a difficult thing.

I think that the assessment from the Village would probably suffer on the benefit test if we were to completely waive the assessment on the corner parcel because the people who are in the interior of 9<sup>th</sup> Court are going to be bearing the total cost of the road, whereas the corner parcels do have that measure of benefit. The other way of looking at this would be to do a unit based assessment and do it based on the units where you would charge everybody the same. But to solely exclude them because their driveway is at one place hasn't met the case in Wisconsin courts as being assessment. That's why underground utilities are treated specifically different than paving assessments or curb and gutter assessments or sidewalk assessments when those are put in. Wherever that improvement runs along that property that property owner has use of it. Maybe it's more use than they want to have of it, but that's the definition of benefit of use.

Alex Tiahnybok:

A question to Jean. Jean, I know this is probably an unfair question at this point in time, but did parcels 805 and 926 exist before 9<sup>th</sup> Court was built out? Because there's another factor here. These may not have been corner lots at one point in time.

Mike Pollocoff:

They were all platted at the same time.

Jean Werbie:

Yes, they were.

Alex Tiahnybok:

What about the land that encompasses by 9<sup>th</sup> Court and 115<sup>th</sup> Street? What's the status on that land? Could that ever be developed?

Mike Pollocoff:

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

No, that's park and that's part of the Chiwaukee Preservation Plan to stay natural.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I know Mrs. Willis would like to say something. I don't know if we can allow her.

John Steinbrink:

Once again, I closed the public hearing but I'll allow you to speak but you need to use the microphone.

Connie Willis:

I just wanted to say for the record—

John Steinbrink:

We need your name and address.

Connie Willis:

Connie Willis, 828 115<sup>th</sup> Street.

John Steinbrink:

We know who you are but the girl who transcribes doesn't.

Connie Willis:

I just want it to be on record to you that I never received a petition or any information whatsoever about this paving project until I received this which told me what I had to pay. I was never approached by anybody. I know my neighbors were but I was never approached, never asked how I felt about this. That's why you got no answer from me because I was never asked.

Mike Serpe:

Mrs. Willis, the petition started with your neighbors. We didn't start the petition.

Connie Willis:

Well, whoever started it. What I'm saying is so you are aware of the fact that I was not interested because I didn't not answer you because I was never informed. I was never questioned.

Mike Serpe:

We did not solicit signatures on a petition.

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

Connie Willis:

I'm just telling you that whoever did I was never approached to ask for my input in this until I received this. I did not know about this. So I want it on record that it was no answer because I did not know about it and I'm there all the time. I've been there for 20 some years.

John Steinbrink:

Okay, we closed it but we will take your comment because you may have something to add to this. Once again, we need your name and address for the record.

Andy Klabunde:

Andy Klabunde, 914 9<sup>th</sup> Court. I am the one that solicited the petition. I went around on a Saturday. I went to each house and knocked on the door. If somebody was home I asked them to sign it and if they weren't I moved on. I've got a job, I don't have time to keep going back and back. We just purchased in May on 9<sup>th</sup> Court, and to say that they don't receive any benefit is not really true. The primary reason for us wanting that street paved is the dust is unbearable. You can't open your windows. The dust is just--you should see our screens. You wash the screens and a week later they're filthy. I think it's a health issue. That was our primary reason for wanting it paved. That's about all I have to say. I didn't purposely avoid any house. Like I said, I went to each house and if they were home I asked for their signature. Like I said, we're new to the neighborhood. It's one of the last streets in all of Pleasant Prairie that hasn't been paved.

John Steinbrink:

Other Board comments or questions?

Jeff Lauer:

Mike, I don't know if you know this, but the petitioners who signed this said they understood the cost between \$1,600 and \$1,800. Did they contact us at all and the Village said it was okay with the new figures?

Mike Pollocoff:

I believe they contacted public works and they were provided that ballpark estimate. Oil prices being what they are it's pretty dynamic right now. I think what we're trying to do is getting a change order onto an existing contract to see if we can maintain as low a price as possible for something that's already been bid if we can get somebody to honor that price. People contact us all the time for various types of improvements, and the best we can tell them is we give them an estimate of a range based on an area but not specific parcel. I think the price that was provided by public works, again, given the volatility of oil is pretty much in the ballpark.

Jeff Lauer:

I was doing quick math. If you do the unit cost it would help two out of the ten. I feel for Ms.

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

Willis because I know if I did my math quick it was a little under \$2,000 which means everybody else's would go up except for two which then they may not agree. You mentioned we could take the total cost and divide it by all of them? Is that one way?

Mike Pollocoff:

That's one way.

Jeff Lauer:

But if you were to do that my quick math tells me it would help two and hurt eight.

Mike Pollocoff:

Unit cost in some things works well, but when you do have an identifiable incremental area that you're providing a service to that ties out--that's why a lot of times--courts have determined that's been the most equitable way of doing it. There's a foot for foot relationship between the property that's being benefited and the improvements going in.

Jeff Lauer:

I guess that's the only question I have because I feel for Ms. Willis depending on the outcome is here. I don't know if this is for you or Bob, but if her financial is omitted would that be a problem with the paving and the end result overall if hers wasn't done?

Mike Pollocoff:

If you were to omit hers and the other corner, then you would have an 80 foot stretch that would be bordered by asphalt on 115<sup>th</sup> Street and then where the circle started. It gets to be a little problematic in the sense that you're still going to get a kick up of dust in that area. The other thing is for snow plowing operations we don't salt gravel. So you're going to have a snow plow go around there, stop salting where the gravel is, put the plow back down when they get on 9<sup>th</sup> Street and put the salt back down, come around and lift the plow, stop the salt, get to 115<sup>th</sup> Street, put the plow back down, put the salt down, then we'll send out another truck with sand and whatever the mixture is to go out and do those little paths. So if that's what we end up doing operationally it's not where you want to be.

Mike Serpe:

These decisions that affect people financially are never easy. I have to agree with the neighbors. I think there's a benefit to everybody here including Mrs. Willis, and when the majority of the neighborhood is pretty much in favor of this as it appears it is, I think we have to pretty much recognize that and I would move approval of 06-37.

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I'd like to second that with a comment. I'm very familiar with the area. I have traveled on the next street between Sheridan Road and 9<sup>th</sup> Court for years and I do notice over there that when there's wind coming from the east and some car goes by 9<sup>th</sup> Court you have dust all over the place. I saw that. . . . myself I have a problem with that . . . an issue when you've got a corner lot and talking about referring to the forgiveness over there . . . utility 132 feet being deducted from the site, but this not being a public utility but the roadway unfortunately we have lots in both corners wherein regular lots are 50 feet, so that's the difference in cost. So I second this because we need it. Also for the purpose of maintenance as Mike and Mike talked about is a necessity for us. Maintenance in which we provide the services and the reality is it has to be done. We have to bite the bullet and we have to do it. Some don't like it but we have to . . . . That's all I can say.

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion?

Alex Tiahnybok:

I think everything that has been said so far is extremely valid. This is one of those things that when I earned this seat somebody told me there may be a lot of judgment calls to make, and this is one of those times when judgment calls are difficult because there's two very compelling sides in my opinion. Again, I feel for the property owners whose real address is 115<sup>th</sup> Street and yet they have the largest share to pay of paving a road that their driveways don't end on.

In terms of Mr. Klabunde's comments, I'd be protecting your interests just as well as Mrs. Willis's if the situation was flipped. I don't know either one of you and I'd be making the same arguments. Your comment about dust I think that's very valid and it's something we can't ignore. I'm sure it's a problem for everyone including the people that are on 115<sup>th</sup> Street. And I'm very much in favor of paving. I think it's an improvement that everyone will realize benefits in their property values so I can't argue against that.

But I'm still troubled by the imbalance of the total bill. These two properties pay for more than 25 percent of it and I think that's just not fair. The option of a per unit cost, Jeff was kind of leading towards this, but the total project cost is just under \$20,000 which means \$2,000 per property. That means \$250 more per property for the people that would benefit from it. The one other property that had no response would be paying \$75 more which I don't think is a huge amount, but the two properties that really, and I strongly believe this, don't benefit as much as the other properties will have a relief of about \$800 and I think that would be fair. So I'd like to offer an amendment to the motion to change it to a per unit pricing which I think is more fair to everyone.

Mike Serpe:

My question, Alex, would be to you is I think we would be starting something in the Village that

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

I don't know that we really want to get into. We've been assessing this way, it's been tested in court, it's been found to be legal. We have other projects coming. Contrary to what the gentleman said there are more roads in the Village that are not paved and some of those may be coming forward at some point in time, and we better be prepared to answer them all the same or we're going to get ourselves into a--we're going to open up a can of worms. I don't know that that would be a real, real good idea right now.

Mike Pollocoff:

A point of order on the motion. What we would need is the action you take tonight on Resolution 06-37 completes the public notice cycle on the assessment schedule that was based on the engineer's report. So the people who are on this project area have been notified by mail to satisfy and make sure things don't happen just like Mrs. Willis talked about where something happens without their knowledge so we've notified everybody what the contemplated assessment is and how that assessment is going to be levied and the basis by which we calculated it in the assessment report.

If the Board wants to redefine the basis of the assessment and go to another basis, rather than amending this tonight we need to reject this resolution or continue the hearing, renounce the residents of a new assessment schedule that would reflect the new way or reallocating expenses so that the people who didn't come tonight in reliance on what they read in the public notice know that it's changed so that if they don't like that or they do like that they have the opportunity to come back to the Board and comment on it.

So I'd request that the amendment really needs to be either an objection or request that the motion not be voted on so that another motion could be submitted to resend the resolution and have it republished.

Mike Serpe:

Do you anticipate any problems in the future if we were to do it this way tonight, if we were to do what you just said, reject it and bring it back, renounce it and then come back with an amended schedule?

Mike Pollocoff:

The problem is our ability to maintain or have an asphalt contractor maintain a price. Did you or John contact--can you come to the mic? John, I think what we need to know is your price bid as a change order to an existing contract or is that an estimate on going out again?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

This is a new estimate because the bid price we put out for the paving earlier in the year when we

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

did the first RFP for the River Oaks projects was the old prices have gone up so much. When we put out this bid for 9<sup>th</sup> Court there was a day contingency that will probably expire this week, so I would probably have to get new prices for the paving project, and I would just assume it would increase by some percentage. That's something that the asphalt contractor would have to let me know.

Mike Pollocoff:

When we're dealing with asphalt we're dealing with a couple things. You're dealing with the material cost, and then everybody that works on it, the trucking, their fuel. Most of these guys are on an escalator right now. So that would be the timing concern I guess.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

My concern in this issue is setting up a precedent. I believe we're going to open up a big can of worms that is going to be detrimental for all of us, for the Village itself. I know the decision has to be made and a practical not political decision has to be done for the benefit of the Village and we don't have any choice in that.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Steve, this is certainly not a political decision on my part because right now I have one person here that sounds like they would benefit from it and a whole bunch of other people that probably won't benefit from it, so my motivation is not political at all. But based on the comments that Mr. Pollocoff made I realize now that we need to move forward with this proposal or basically can it and start over with the assessment process. With the ominous petroleum market process I'm troubled by extending this and winding up with a bigger bill for everyone and really having a political problem. So I withdraw my motion. I still don't like this, but I have no choice but to withdraw it.

Mike Serpe:

Call the question.

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion and a second on the floor at this time.

**SERPE MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION #06-37 – FINAL RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS AND LEVYING SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS AGAINST BENEFITED PROPERTY FOR THE CONSTRUCTION PAVING ON 9<sup>TH</sup> COURT NORTH OF 115<sup>TH</sup> STREET; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**B. Consider Combination Class B Liquor License for Chili's Grill & Bar, 6903 75<sup>th</sup> Street.**

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

Jane Romanowski:

Paul Thompson, agent for ERJ Dining, has submitted a Class B Fermented Malt Beverage and Class B Intoxicating Liquor License Application for the Chili's Grill & Bar at 6903 75<sup>th</sup> Street. The application comes about because of the sale of the restaurant. Actually ERJ Dining is buying nine Chili's Restaurants in Wisconsin. If I'm not mistaken I believe Mr. Thompson is going to be the agent for all nine of them.

Police checks have been completed, publication, training and residency requirements have been met. There's no delinquencies on it, and the sale of the property closed August 3<sup>rd</sup>, and I've received a copy of the ownership documentation. If the Board approves it, it would be subject to a few conditions. They've already paid their license fee and their publication costs. I've already received an affidavit of surrender from Kevin Groth. If approved I would just need the original license back that was just issued in July. As far as I'm concerned the application is in order.

John Steinbrink:

Once again, this being a public hearing I'll open it up to public comment or question.

Jane Romanowski:

Paul Thompson did sign up if you wish to speak.

Paul Thompson:

My name is Paul Thompson. I have the existing license now if we can take care of that. That's all I have.

John Steinbrink:

Anyone else wishing to speak? Anyone else wishing to speak? Anyone else wishing to speak? Hearing none I'll close the public hearing and open it up to Board comment or question. I probably just have a couple questions. First off, will the name remain the same?

Jane Romanowski:

The name will remain the same.

John Steinbrink:

And the other item is there's a lot of gift certificates floating around out there and gift cards. Will those still be honored?

Paul Thompson:

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

Yes. Everything stays the same. It's still Chili's. We are already franchisees in Louisville, Kentucky. We have eight restaurants plus we are affiliated with and operate 50 Wendy's here in town so we're from Wisconsin. Everything stays the same. It's still Chili's so your gift certificates will still be good.

John Steinbrink:

Other comments or questions?

Alex Tiahnybok:

Is it Chili's of Pleasant Prairie now or still Kenosha?

Jane Romanowski:

It's always been Pleasant Prairie.

John Steinbrink:

Other comments or questions?

**KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO APPROVE A COMBINATION CLASS B LIQUOR LICENSE TO PAUL THOMPSON, AGENT FOR ERJ DINING III, FOR THE PREMISES KNOWN AS CHILI'S GRILL & BAR LOCATED AT 6903 75<sup>TH</sup> STREET, SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS SET FORTH BY STAFF; SECONDED BY TIAHNYBOK; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

## **6. CITIZEN COMMENTS**

Goran Yordanoff:

Mr. President, Honorable Trustees, I actually have comments--

John Steinbrink:

We just need your name and address for the record.

Goran Yordanoff:

Goran Yordanoff, 9319 Lakeshore Drive. My comments are actually regarding the petition for municipal water at 9319 so is this not the correct time to provide my comments?

John Steinbrink:

You can do your comments now if you wish.

Goran Yordanoff:

If it suits the Board. Mr. President, Honorable Trustees, thank you for considering my petition today. My name is Goran Yordanoff. My wife and I are currently nearing completion at our new home at 9319 Lakeshore Drive. My family and I have owned the property for nearly 30 years. Over this time we've heard some very vocal, even threatening voices take up personal crusades to prevent the Village from bringing sewer, municipal water and storm water management to our area. Many of these voices have since left the area.

Twenty five years ago the residents fought bringing sewer to the area because they already had septic fields and holding tanks. Today, the new owners of these properties complain about the costs and inconveniences of having holding tanks and the safety risks of old, leaching septic fields. Forethought has never really been a strong point of Carol Beach residents. Rather, it's been crisis control, in-fighting and finger pointing when problems arise. The spring floods of 2004 are a prime example of this.

The problem we currently face is that many of the well around our property do not produce adequate water for normal, everyday activities and are slowly drying up. This problem will only become worse with each passing year should we not act now. As such, we respectfully request that the Village Board move this matter forward for additional consideration. With the tax assessments in Carol Beach rising so sharply the past few years, I think it's only fair that we also enjoy some of the conveniences that municipal water brings us like being able to run your dishwasher and shower at the same time.

This is an improvement that benefits everyone's property value and standard of living, not to mention the benefits to public health and safety and also the safety benefits it would bring in terms of having the fire department easily access fire hydrants as well. Thank you very much.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you. Anyone else wishing to speak under citizens' comments? If not I'll close citizens' comments.

## **7. VILLAGE BOARD COMMENTS**

John Steinbrink:

First, last week I believe it was Thursday, we were visited at the Village by the State Department and a group of world journalists from several countries around the world, and they wanted to hear Pleasant Prairie's version of the water diversion. Mike did a wonderful job of speaking with them and informing them. This is a very unique situation or agreement that we have. There's probably very few if any throughout the Great Lakes region. Mike, if you could tell us about that?

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

Mike Pollocoff:

As John indicated, the U.S. State Department had requested and asked us at the request of journalists from China, Russia, Germany, Pakistan, Great Britain and Australia to come talk with us about the trans basin water diversion that the Village has. There's only two communities in the United States that have these and Pleasant Prairie is one. We were the first one and Akron, Ohio is the second. Apparently how these things hit the wires I don't know, but the fact that it's a problem around the Great Lakes and water is an issue everywhere, and they wanted to know how we were able to arrive at doing this, and they also made note of the significant financial growth of our community since the time that we diverted water.

So John and I met with them and responded to their questions. That day they met with us we were the last stop. They had been in Michigan to meet with some local governments there, the State government in Michigan, Waukesha and the City of Milwaukee, and they described the atmosphere as being rather caustic and antagonistic and aggressive towards diversions. The Pleasant Prairie diversion was a little unusual in the sense that we took a look at what we needed to do, and I think from a historical perspective the municipal wells that Pleasant Prairie had that were dating back to the '70s and beforehand drew water from a limestone aquifer which is below the Village. That limestone aquifer goes all the way up Marquette, Michigan. We had naturally occurring radium in the water. The levels exceeded the federal standard for clean drinking water. We had to send a notice out to every water customer when we sent them their bill that said their water was a carcinogen and it was known to cause bone cancer and leukemia. We also had very hard water with iron, sulfur, calcium carbonates. It looked like orange Kool-Aid. And to treat those things would have suspended the radium and we would have had a radioactive byproduct so we couldn't treat the water either so we were in between two bad worlds.

The Village at that time took a look at our master plan for the community and we determined that over a 20 year period we could slowly phase out our treatment plants in the Des Plaines basin making a diversion nonexistent anymore, so the water we would buy wholesale from the City of Kenosha we could pump into our system and by 2010 stop the diversion in a financially responsible manner and one that was verifiable. That's something a lot of communities haven't been able to accomplish. If you're in the Great Lakes and you're on the rim of the basin or the basin you need to look at having everything go back.

So we showed them where the diversion took place. For those people that don't know where the subcontinental divide is in Pleasant Prairie, you barely notice it. If you go by Mr. Hanley's development over there right about Cooper Road is the subcontinental divide. Right in front of Whittier Elementary School, the front door, is the subcontinental divide. If you were to there on a rainy day with two pieces of tissue paper and drop them there, one would go to the Mississippi River and one would go to the Atlantic Ocean. It's a very subtle line that travels to the Village but it dictates how we provide utilities.

The Village Boards that date back to the mid '80s have help come up with this thing and it's really worked and it's become a model that other people have tried to copy or find a way around it. That's how significant it is. So it was a nice discussion. They liked the Village. They couldn't believe how big houses were and how big lots were here. So it was a nice exchange of

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

information.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you, Mike. As Mike said they were very impressed with the Village. We were able to give them a perspective that was a little different from what they've heard in other areas around the Great Lakes they had visited because of the controversy over the diversion issue. Other comments or questions?

Alex Tiahnybok:

Two issues, comments. One is I'd like to express kudos to the recreation department for I think a very successful Prairie Family Days. It was two beautiful days, and the time I spent there was a lot of activity and a lot of things going on and I think it was a great event.

Number two, and today I think there was an example of maybe why this item maybe rises to some further consideration, but I'm hearing more and more comments from citizens, especially in the eastern part of Pleasant Prairie about the intersection of Russell Road and Sheridan. During high traffic times, rush hour I think it's become a dangerous intersection because there's a Citgo station there and it's a t-bone intersection and there was an accident today just north of there. I don't know if there were any injuries but I saw a little red sports car that was pretty beat up. I know it was just north of that intersection.

I don't know what the procedure is for taking some kind of action like that. I realize Sheridan Road is a State highway, but I'd like to have the public works or the Village administration look into what it will take to at least provide some kind of signal at that intersection because it's truly becoming dangerous. People that head east on Russell Road during the afternoon hours are having a much more difficult time to turn left as the northbound traffic on Sheridan Road prevents you from turning left onto Sheridan Road. So I think that's a nightmare that's only going to get worse as development continues.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I'd like to make a comment. Alex, one of the problems we have over there is the State line and the right of way on the north side are in the State of Illinois so actually we have no control on the State line. The Sheridan Road is a State highway so I don't know at what point we can take any kind of action. . . . I don't think we can do too much over there.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, I'll write a letter to Lake County. They have jurisdiction over Russell Road and also send one to the DOT. Probably what we'll need to do is get a traffic count over there. We can provide them with at least any accident history we have on our side and I'm sure Chief Wagner will be able to get Winthrop Harbor to provide it on their side and then do a warrant study and see what we come up with.

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

John Steinbrink:

I'm sure Lake County shares the same concern. We have worked with them in the past.

Mike Serpe:

Just one thing to think about when you're talking about a controlled intersection. I think they're becoming more dangerous than stop signs because very few people are now stopping for red lights and we all see it. There are accidents at controlled intersections more now than ever before. John, you're in the Legislature and I would push for sponsorship of violation of red lights at \$500 to \$1,000 minimum because they cause serious injuries or/or death. People are just deliberately violating these signals and it's going to happen down on Sheridan and State Line Road, Alex, and you know it. You'll see it.

John Steinbrink:

What happens is the accidents are more severe of because of trying to beat the lights versus starting from a stop.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Or somebody assumes they've got a green light.

Mike Serpe:

A yellow lights means two more are coming.

John Steinbrink:

The red light legislation is something that is in the works and has been in the works. They're trying to get the fine tuning in there.

Mike Serpe:

The fines can't be big enough on that. I'm serious on that.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

That's a felony right now. If you hit somebody right now running a red light is a felony, correct?

Mike Serpe:

No, only a serious injury or death.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

Or they're trying to do that. Okay.

Alex Tiahnybok:

But that intersection technically is in Illinois, right, so it would be Illinois laws that would govern that. If you write a letter and at least get the ball rolling I think that would be smart.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, there's one thing I wanted to discuss only because it's a bone I have to pick. We recently were honored with being number one in the State in something and that was with our debt. I think that the level of debt that the Village has is something I don't have a problem with and it's been manageable. But what I did have a problem with was the way the *Kenosha News* reported it and it was listed as debt per capita. That's one way of looking at things, but in Wisconsin we don't pay for debt on a per capita basis. We don't send a bill to Jean Werbie and to her kids or to myself and my kids. Our bills are sent to property owners, people have property, and you pay based on the value of your property.

It's not unlike getting a mortgage on your home. When you go to apply for a mortgage, the mortgage company doesn't take a look at how many kids you have in your family and determine whether or not you could spread the cost of that mortgage out at a lower number amongst the people in the household. They do it based on the value of the home and your ability as an owner to generate income to pay that mortgage off. To take a Village of 19,000 people that has the fourth largest manufacturing tax base in the State and lump us in with Villages like Paddock Lake, Twin Lakes, Sturtevant where it's not the same thing where you have the commercial base that we have, any fund which was not able to generate revenues to make a payment that payment would be paid not on a per capita basis but it would be paid based on the value of home. If someone had a very valuable home they would pay more than someone who had an average home or someone who had a modest home. That's how taxes are paid in Wisconsin. It's not based on a per capita basis.

I think to indicate that every man, woman and child is paying \$5,000 to retire the debt is totally erroneous. There's no way that, one, the Village could send out a bill based on a per capita basis, and even if everybody was to default on their debt and we had to pay that out, it still wouldn't achieve \$5,000 per man, woman and child here because it's, again, based on the value of the community.

A good part of the debt that the Village has is generated by different entities whether it's the RecPlex, whether it's the Sewer and Water Utility, whether it's the TIF District. Every fund has reserves. The sewer utility probably has the last reserves, but every fund has reserves to pay those bills. In the case of the TIF District the reserves are over \$3 million. We have reserves for the general fund. Out of \$93 million, the amount that we put on the tax roll and that the Board levies each year, this coming year is going to be \$11 million. That's what our total debt is. Last year was \$13 million.

As you know, the Village has not incurred general fund debt for the last four years, and I probably won't be bringing in a budget that's going to ask you to incur any more Village general

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

fund debt. That is what goes on the tax roll. That's what is paid for, but even then the debt portion when you look at the value of the Village, the value of the Village is two and a half billion dollars. Behind Menominee Falls we're the highest valued Village in the State. Menominee Falls is clearly the largest Village. \$1.6 million is residential properties. Based on the values of someone's home, not on the bodies in that home is how those taxes of \$11 million, or the interest and principal payment on \$11 million is going to be levied.

Commercial properties are \$565 million of the value in the community. Manufacturing is \$276 million. So that's how taxes are levied and those taxes that are paid for by that debt service that's paid for by taxes is spread based on a property value basis and who pays. It's not spread based on how many people live in a home. It's amazing there's not one tax that's in Wisconsin that's based on a per capita basis. It's either based on the value of the home, income or how much you buy. I think to indicate a disproportionate relationship between the number of people in the Village and a very large Village that has a big manufacturing tax base was erroneous and it doesn't do justice to what we do, and I think it's a disservice to a community that's growing, creating jobs, creating economic development for the community that everybody is going to benefit from.

Had we not been able to obtain a bond rating that would show we've been responsible with our money I think that would be another thing but that wasn't the case. That doesn't sell newspapers. Probably didn't get the reporters excited about it but that's where we are. You hope that at some point you could see something different, and we are carrying a big debt at this point, but the debts been going down over time and we're accomplishing significant things with this debt. You look at a development like Abbott and the other improvements we're talking over there, that area along is worth \$2 billion, almost equal to what the whole Village is. For the investment we're making to grow that area I think that's a small return. That's guaranteed tax savings for the residents for the future. You're banking future tax dollars to help spread the cost of government amongst a lot of value, not amongst people. It's spread amongst value in the community.

I know people probably don't think about it, but I guarantee you when they get their assessment or they get their property tax bill they're looking at value and what the cost of government is. They're not looking at how many kids do I have and what's the tax bill.

John Steinbrink:

And part of that was the terms good debt and bad debt. The Village has the good debt. The one you want to have, the one that doesn't increase your tax base in the future, the one that does keep your taxes low, the one that does provide the jobs. That's what the Village has. So if you got past the headline then you I guess could figure out what the Village has done is the right thing. I can guarantee you there would be any other community in the State who would want to put themselves in our position because of what we have here and what we're created here. These are misleading articles. That's very unfortunate.

Everyone wants to focus on tax freeze and tricky little gimmicks. The solution to that is when you need money is to borrow it. That's the direct opposite to what you want to be doing. But yet that sounds good, and sometimes the public misunderstands what really the impact of the word tax freeze will be on their bottom line in the future. When you incur debt like this as a Village that's what helps the bottom line of the taxpayer in the future because we are creating a future for

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

our community as well as the rest of the State. I haven't seen anybody, whether it's the County, schools not standing in line to take their share of what this Village has produced and use it to their advantage with the other districts, the other townships, the other villages. Mike, I think you hit it right on the head.

Mike Serpe:

Mike, we've gone through this before and I'm going to ask you to repeat it again the best you can remember. Without the TIF, one, had we never had Lakeview Corporate Park, what would be the average tax bill of Pleasant Prairie? How much more of an increase on the average tax bill? Is that \$780 or \$740 per home?

Mike Pollocoff:

For the average Village household you basically would need to add about 45 percent to your taxes.

Mike Serpe:

Forty five percent.

Mike Pollocoff:

And that's not . . . if that's agricultural land like it was you still have 19,000 people to take care of but you just don't have a lot of big factories that are paying based on their value or an . . . paying on their value.

Mike Serpe:

A number of people have approached me since the *Kenosha News* article came out about the day in a kidding way a lot of them because they know me and everything else, but it's unfortunate that our own major newspaper has to paint such a bad picture of a community that I think is doing quite well. I don't think it would be a bad idea if the *Sun*, if Abe wanted to sit down with you and do a fair and balanced article and explain to the people just how this thing works and the debt we do have and how it's benefiting them and not hurting them. It probably wouldn't be a bad idea.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I don't expect the *Kenosha News* to tell the truth to start with. Distortion of the facts seems to me the rule with the *Kenosha News*. Misinformation is the order of the day. Inclination to let people to know some of the facts is enough for them. We're lucky to have the gentleman here who writes what's going on in the Village because the *Kenosha News* doesn't let the people know exactly what's going on here . . . I've lived here for 42 years and the reporting of the *Kenosha News* is getting worse and worse and worse. Not any better. It's true. We attend the seminars . . . look at other communities and they envy us. They are waiting for us to pass resolutions or ordinance so they can follow our lead So we have to be proud of the community we have.

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

Alex Tiahnybok:

I was not planning on saying anything about this but I have to now. It's unfortunate, Steve, I agree with you that for some reason there's such animosity between the Village and the *Kenosha News*. I don't know the roots of it and I don't know how it got started but it pre-dated me.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Long ago.

Alex Tiahnybok:

So I don't know how that got started but that is unfortunate that our newspaper of record and the Village have an antagonistic relationship. I think it's very unfortunate. But John hit it on the head. If you read the headline it sort of suggested that it's disaster, but when you scratched the surface a little further you saw that the gentleman from whatever association was interviewed in that article had indicated that there's good debt and bad debt. When the *Kenosha News* called me I said I think it's kind of analogous to a person's mortgage. You can have credit card debt for buying too many toys, and you can have a mortgage on an appreciating asset, generally your home, and that's good debt. Again, I think if you read my comments with an open mind you would see I was not very critical. I was actually saying I think it's been a good job.

But it is something the citizens need to be aware of. We're a government of the people, and I think having an open forum with the citizens that pay the taxes I think is critical. I think whether you divide it up by citizens or number of citizens or number of taxpaying parcels or evaluation, however you slice it, there's still a risk. I'm in the business world and I deal with risk all the time. There's good risk and there's bad risk. There's good debt and there's bad debt. It's just a matter of how you manage it. You can read the article yourself again and you'll see that I've actually said I think it's been a good job but we need to keep an eye on it and we need to keep citizens informed. If that's bad reporting I'd like to see what good reporting is.

## **8. CORRESPONDENCE**

### **A. Consider Petition for Municipal Water in the vicinity of 9319 Lakeshore Drive.**

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, we have correspondence from Mr. Yordanoff requesting that the Village consider his petition to extend municipal water to 9319 Lakeshore Drive and any abutting properties that would be included along from where the terminus of the water main currently is.

We had a historical problem with some of the deeper wells in Carol Beach really ranging from Lakeshore Drive to Sheridan Road. We went through a session where almost all of Unit 6 was out of water with wells until we put water in there. So it is problematic. This is one of the areas provided by the Chiwaukee Land Use Plan that can have sanitary sewer and water. We've crossed the road a long time ago where sanitary sewer was taken out of that area where we won't be bringing it in. It would be extremely expensive right now to do that. But Municipal water

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

could be extended all the way to Barnes Creek and no farther. Then at that point that's where the true LUSA kicks in where it's a limited service area, and we are not permitted to submit plans for construction or extend water in that area or anything east of Lakeshore Drive.

But this area is an area that was anticipated for municipal water primarily because they felt there would be development along Lakeshore Drive at the time the plan was adopted. So I'd request that I be authorized to prepare an assessment report, send out notices and conduct an assessment hearing. We'll probably have that in a month. September 18<sup>th</sup> is soonest.

Mike Serpe:

Approximately how many parcels are we talking about to get to Mr. Yordanoff's property.

Mike Pollocoff:

I think it's four.

(Inaudible)

Mike Serpe:

Everything that he mentioned during citizens' comments I agree 100 percent with. Having that ability to have a fire hydrant, to eliminate the problems with the well. We've been saying that for years, and you're the first ever to come forward and say all of that on behalf of your neighbors and I think that's good. I would move to receive and file and set this for a public hearing.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second. Other discussion?

Alex Tiahnybok:

Mr. and Mrs. Yordanoff I live six blocks north of you, and I understand your desire to see this happen. I live in an area where there is municipal water but there is no sewer. I guess the sewer conversation would be for another time in the future. But I wholly support the idea of the Village calculating the cost of doing this.

Mike, you said that we could do this all the way to Barnes Creek. Is there a reason why we would only stop at 9319 or could we go further? From an efficiency perspective would be better off undertaking a bigger project than having a smaller project and then obviously having a higher cost of operation in the future?

Mike Pollocoff:

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

The costs go up. Some of the units get better as you get bigger. My primary reason that would be desirable to extend it to Barnes Creek would be, one, I think people would be good potable water along that stretch. But we've made it all the shorter that when Chief Guilbert has to when there's a fire anyplace in Carol Beach from the State Lines to Barnes Creek you've made that distance shorter where he has to run and fill a tanker to fight fires where there is no hydrants. And you have Unit 2 and the other areas down there where there's been significant urban development in there. As much as we tell people when they build a house out there that you're building a house with no urban improvements, the reality is when these trucks pull up to a fire and they're dumping water into a little swimming pool repeatedly trying to fill it up so they can fight the fire, so I know that from my standpoint from public safety would be the most advantageous reason to have it.

Alex Tiahnybok:

If it was only the benefit of the water and the public safety issue wasn't an element in this, then I would be obliged I think by everything I've done so far is to go with majority rules, so whatever the circle that we draw of affected properties, just like we did with 9<sup>th</sup> Court half an hour ago, I would be obliged to go with the majority. But there is the public safety I think which is another

layer of motivation I think that needs to be considered. I think the only right thing personally would be to have this project go as far as we can so that we'd have the benefit of public safety. I don't know what the motion included but-

Mike Serpe:

We usually don't do projects like this without a petition requesting it. If the petition was right next to Barnes Creek and had to come all the way across that would be another matter but it isn't. How much further is it from their house to Barnes Creek?

Alex Tiahnybok:

It's a ways.

Mike Serpe:

Alex, if as the President of the homeowners association you want to go down there and ask those people if they want to submit a petition-

Alex Tiahnybok:

That's where I was going with this. As Mr. Yordanoff said there have been some very vocal opposition to any kind of improvements like this in the past. Some of those people have left. Of course, some of them are still there. We do have a property owners association that can maybe act as a vehicle for figuring this out. So I would think that would probably be a smart move to try to really get some public sentiment to see whether people are in favor of this or not. It would be

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

hard for me to support something if 90 percent of the people say no.

Mike Serpe:

If you're going to do that, I think kind of sooner would be good rather than later, and then maybe we can tie this whole thing together if it goes that far. But going without the petition then it looks like we're ramming this thing down their throat and I don't want to do that.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I couldn't agree more.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I wanted to say that the people might think we're trying to impose the water on them. We had an issue two years ago in Carol Beach, too.

John Steinbrink:

Where are we Jane? We have a motion and a second?

Jane Romanowski:

Yes.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I seconded it.

Mike Pollocoff:

What we could probably do in that month period, it might be a little cumbersome, but if we could get the issue addressed for Mr. Yordanoff so he knows one way or another where it is, and then that would give Alex a month to talk to the people farther south from Mr. Yordanoff's property whether or not they want it.

Jane Romanowski:

The only problem with that is we have to have the preliminary on August 21<sup>st</sup>.

Mike Pollocoff:

I'm saying do the process for this petition and let Alex talk to the other people, so before we go to construction we can get some feedback on whether or not we're going to amend the hearing.

Jane Romanowski:

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

So the project is for the petition before the Board.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Just a final comment. Carol Beach is a unique area. It's not like a Greenfield development where everyone is starting from scratch. Everyone that has a well, everyone that has a septic tank or a holding tank has an investment already, and they view municipal water or municipal sewer as a new cost when they've already sunk costs in their improvements so it's a different situation. We need to be sensitive to that, but I understand your concern.

**SERPE MOVED TO RECEIVE THE PETITION FOR MUNICIPAL WATER IN THE VICINITY OF 9319 LAKESHORE DRIVE AND TO SET THE MATTER FOR PUBLIC HEARING; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**B. Consider Request to lower height requirements of fences around swimming pools.**

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, we received a letter from the Bakkila's requesting that the Village consider amending their ordinances to change the height of fences from six feet to 48 inches or 54 inches. Specifically in their house, and we've had some other instances where people built a home, they have an in-ground swimming pool, and they don't want to fence their entire yard, but they'd like to fence the deck around an in-ground pool and put a six foot fence around that deck area makes it look like it's a caged area.

The purpose of the ordinance, as we know, is the safety of children that don't respect property lines that don't know any better and they're going to get into one of these things. At the same time we raised it to 6 feet the City lowered it to 48. The fence contractors tell the Pleasant Prairie residents you're from the City and you can do what you want to do, and we have it this way.

I've seen, and it kind of depends on how big the deck area is around the in-ground, some had a 6 foot fence and it really didn't look that bad, and I've seen some older ones before we did the ordinance where they had a 48 or 52 and especially if it's wrought iron that makes it tough for the younger ones to get over that. My own thought in talking with Jean and some of the other staff we thought about six foot at the property line. If you're going to fence off at the property lines that makes more sense because, one, a kid is not going to be able to get a good run and jump and they could like the one I have next to my house. Somebody has a pool next to me and they have a four foot board on board fence. A kid can clear that pretty easy. But being able to jump it at the pool would be a little bit more difficult.

But it's a question they have for the Board if you want to consider it. If you want to start the process to go back to Plan Commission and have them consider amending the ordinance, or if we want to just amend the ordinance here.

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

Mike Serpe:

Fences should be put around pools that keeps kids from crawling in, toddlers. You get a kid that's going to be 8, 10, 12, 13 or 14 years old, I don't care how high that fence is they're going to scale it. The proof is Anderson Park and Washington Park Pool. Over the years they had a number of drownings. Those are 12 foot high fences. Kids climb them and kids get over them. Personally you want to keep little animals and little kids that crawl that are unable to swim and care for themselves out of that pool area four feet will do it just fine as far as I'm concerned. If that fence was 18 feet high, kids are going to climb an 18 foot high fence. They're going to get over it. I think we should look at this thing again and give it some consideration and kick it around a little bit and see what we come up with. I think it's worth looking at.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Mike, you said Kenosha went from 6 feet to 4 feet?

Mike Pollocoff:

Forty eight inches.

Alex Tiahnybok:

So 6 feet and 4 feet.

Mike Pollocoff:

They did that a while back.

Jean Werbie:

A long time ago.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Having been a kid myself at one time I agree with Mike. If once you reach a certain age, 4 feet or 5 feet or 6 feet or 7 feet is not going to make any difference. I think somebody made a comment that a chain link fence is easier to climb, but a wrought iron fence where the bars are vertical is much more difficult to climb. Would it make sense, and this is just an idea for thought, would it make sense for us to have two different standards, one for chain link and one for wrought iron because, frankly, one is much more difficult to climb? I just thought I'd throw that out there.

Mike Pollocoff:

You can do whatever you want.

John Steinbrink:

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

Do we have anything, Jean, where we have the wrought fences with the points on the top. We have chain link that can have the points on the top or the roll top. Is there anything we say you should have that's safer than the other? You start climbing one of those gated looking fences and you get impaled on one of those and that's not the best thing either.

Jean Werbie:

We don't specifically identify what type of fence. Most of the homeowners association restrictive covenants identify the types of fences that are allowed within a subdivision or not and whether or not they're required to put in six foot or if they want on an above ground pool whether or not they can put decking with an additional two feet above that. We have multiple different types of fencing that we have permitted as long as the intent meets the ordinance of the six foot. So I can present back probably 20 different options of different types of fencing that we could show you. To be honest this has been one of the most argued points over the last 18 to 20 years is whether or not there should be a fence, what height the fence should be, how far it has to be set back and why they're needed around above ground pools. It's been the most argued topic.

John Steinbrink:

So if we have the minimum ordinance, the minimum standard, then the subdivision can enhance it or go stronger with theirs?

Jean Werbie:

That's correct. And most choose to if an in-ground pool, for example, is allowed, many subdivisions don't allow board on board fences or chain link fences. They have to be aluminum or wrought iron looking fences on the perimeter of the property. So every subdivision is a little bit different. Some don't even allow swimming pools at all. The staff would be happy to look at it again. We've looked at it several times over the last 15 or 20 years, but we'd be happy to look at it again. It's not been brought up probably in about five or six years.

John Steinbrink:

So I guess the question is do we want to send this back to the Plan Commission or do we want the Board to do it? The Plan Commission because they're really the ones that had gone through the issue and really have the nuts and bolts of it.

Jean Werbie:

It's actually governed by the zoning ordinance, so eventually--it can go to the Village Board for discussion, but eventually it will have to go back to the Plan Commission for a public hearing

before them for an amendment to the zoning ordinance, and then it will have to be brought back to the Village Board.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

The only problem I have with this is it bothers me that many times the covenants and our Village ordinances conflict with each other. I was talking with a resident on 116<sup>th</sup> Street who actually mentioned to me this issue of putting in their pool with a wrought iron fence around the pool going from 6 feet to 4 feet. Evidently we're going to have to look at . . . . fence around the property as a Village ordinance or two types, one for surrounding the property and one surrounding the pool. I think I was one of the first ones in the Village who put up a stockade fence around my house complete back in the early '70s to comply with the ordinance in the Township at that time. I think the best way to do it is send it back to the Plan Commission.

**KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO SEND THE REQUEST TO LOWER HEIGHT REQUIREMENTS OF FENCES AROUND SWIMMING POOLS TO THE PLAN COMMISSION FOR THEIR REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION; SECONDED BY SERPE; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**9. NEW BUSINESS**

- A. Receive Plan Commission Recommendation and Consider Resolution #06-34 for a Final Plat for the request of Martin Hanley, agent for Village Green Development LLC owners of the property generally located north of Main Street between 47<sup>th</sup> and 55<sup>th</sup> Avenues for the proposed 83 single family lot subdivision to be known as Village Green Heights Addition #1 Subdivision.**

Jean Werbie:

Mr. President and members of the Board, you have before you a request for Resolution 06-34. It's for the final plat for the request of Martin Hanley, agent for Village Green Development LLC, the owners of the property. It's for the development of the Village Green Heights Addition #1 Subdivision which would propose to plat 83 single family lots generally located north of Main Street between 47<sup>th</sup> and 55<sup>th</sup> Avenues. This would be immediately north of the current Village Green Heights first stage of development that's under construction.

The Village has been working with the developer for approximately six years, and there have been many, many plans and plats related to the development that have been approved. As you can see on this slide and the subsequent slides we have been working since the first amendment to the Village Green Neighborhood Plan in November of 2000. The concept plan for this entire development was approved on August 20, 2001. On March 17, 2003 the first preliminary plats for the subdivision and some subsequent extensions were granted for this development. On March 17<sup>th</sup> the preliminary condominium plat for the Village Green Heights Town homes North and Town homes South, which is now known as Sagewood, were also approved.

On March 17, 2003, zoning map amendments were approved by the Village for the development. The field delineated wetlands that were not to be filled were zoned into the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District. Outlot areas 2 and 7 were put into Upland Resource Conservancy District because they were wooded. This single family development was identified as R-4, Urban Single Family Residential District, and some non-wetland areas were put into R-8

in the upper northeast corner of the site, as well as putting in an Overlay District in because that will be a subsequent stage. Some non-wetland/non-woodland areas were also put into the R-10, and that's where the condominium developments are located or going to be located south of Main Street in the southeast corner of the property. And some non-wetland and woodland areas within outlots were also put into the PR-1, Park and Recreational District.

The final plat for stage 1 of the single family was approved on February 2, 2004 by Resolution 04-02. As you might have seen if you've driven by, they just are completing their phase 2 improvements which is paving and curb and gutter for that portion of the development. On June 7, 2004, a certified survey map was created to help divide some property on the east end of the development site. And a final condominium plat was approved for Sagewood on October 3, 2005, and that is the Scott Simon or the Simon Group development that was purchased from Mr. Hanley.

As you know, the neighborhood plan for the Village Green neighborhood was recently amended, and primarily the amendments that are reflected as part of this development impact the area that's kind of just north of where the single family is going to be located. What I'd like to do is just mention briefly that there's a Village Green neighborhood park which we'll be talking about that some of the land that's specifically identified in yellow and the bluish color are areas that will be used for park and recreational open space amenities for this development as well as development to the north.

The final plat for Village Green Heights then, the site area is 79.8 acres; 31.4 acres will be developed with 83 single family lots; 17.9 acres will eventually be developed for condominium purposes; 14.1 acres of land will be used for public road right of ways; 16.4 acres will be designated as open space. The lots range between 15,000 and 22,885 square feet which is right between the R-4 and the R-3 sized lots with the average being 16,468 square feet. The net density for this development is 1.27 units per net acre. Under projected population at full build out for this addition based on our population numbers in Pleasant Prairie would be 227 persons, 52 school age children and 35 public school age children.

With respect to open space on this plat, 16.4 acres or 21 percent will remain in open space, and this includes wetlands, Village park which is almost 10 acres, and some other open space identified for storm water management purposes. Again, the area that's being dedicated by the developer for park purposes is the south portion of the Village Green neighborhood park.

Site access and public improvements, as you know there are currently two main access points to this development from the south, one at Cooper Road and the other at 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue. 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue will be the main construction access for the north portion of the single family development. Prior to building out this stage of development, they will need to have a third access point, and that third access point will either be Cooper Road to the north which eventually will connect into the Devonshire development, or east through Devonshire into the Meadowdale Estates development. Or, there will be a temporary connection to the east in the area of Main Street either connecting all the way to Springbrook Road or north to Meadowdale Estates. The developer that owns all of the Village Green property also owns the Village Center property. So there are some options for that third access point to be completed. All of these things are spelled out in the development agreement as well as the memorandum.

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

So what the developer is requesting then this evening is the final plat approval for the Village Green Heights Addition #1 Subdivision which will create 83 single family lots and providing outlots for storm water management and park purposes for the Village of Pleasant Prairie. Everything is in order, and preconstruction meetings as well as closing are scheduled for this week. The staff recommends approval subject to the comments and conditions as attached in the resolution and the staff comments.

Mike Serpe:

Marty, that development on Village Green is better than I ever imagined, and I just hope the second one I'm sure will go as well and watch the dust. Keep it down. I'd move approval of 06-34.

Jeff Lauer:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second. Further discussion?

Alex Tiahnybok:

As I mentioned at a recent Plan Commission meeting I have a great deal of admiration for the work they do. I know it's a lot of work. With that recommendation I support this.

**SERPE MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND ADOPT RESOLUTION #06-34 FOR A FINAL PLAT FOR THE REQUEST OF MARTIN HANLEY, AGENT FOR VILLAGE GREEN DEVELOPMENT LLC OWNERS OF THE PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED NORTH OF MAIN STREET BETWEEN 47<sup>TH</sup> AND 55<sup>TH</sup> AVENUES FOR THE PROPOSED 83 SINGLE FAMILY LOT SUBDIVISION TO BE KNOWN AS VILLAGE GREEN HEIGHTS ADDITION #1 SUBDIVISION; SECONDED BY LAUER; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**B. Receive Plan Commission Recommendation and Consider Resolution #06-35 for a Preliminary Plat for the request of Kari Kittermaster of Regency Hills-Creekside Crossing LLC, owner of the property generally located north of 93<sup>rd</sup> Street east of Old Green Bay Road in the Village of Pleasant Prairie for approval of a Preliminary Plat for Creekside Crossing Addition #1 Subdivision.**

Jean Werbie:

Mr. President and members of the Board, the petitioner is requesting approval of the preliminary plat for Creekside Crossing Addition #1. Creekside Crossing development is generally located north of 93<sup>rd</sup> Street at 63<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. Let me begin by saying preliminary plats are valid for two

years per State statutes. Once the preliminary plat has expired per our Village ordinance, developers are required to come back and seek a re-approval of that preliminary plat. In this particular case we've been working with this developer for a number of years and the preliminary plat did expire. So much of this information is repeat information and you've seen it before. So I'm going to be going through the slides rather quickly.

To date, the Village has approved the following plans related to Creekside Crossing, as you can see dating back to May of 2002 with the neighborhood plan that was approved with this development. Conceptual plan was approved by the Board in 2003, and the first preliminary plat was also approved in October of 2003. This was both for the subdivision and for the condominium development of this project.

This particular development went through an extensive floodplain boundary adjustment procedure, which it looks like we might be just starting to finalize with respect to all the work that's been done since 2003. The process is initiated through the Village, works its way through the Wisconsin DNR, sent to FEMA, they give them temporary approvals, they have to do the work, they come back, complete the work, provide as built, have to follow up the paperwork, and sometimes that process can take three to five years to get through that entire process. And specifically with respect to at least their first stage, it looks like we might be wrapping that up sometime soon. Again, there were portions of their property that were zoned floodplain. Some of those areas will be redefined when everything is completely done and the final paperwork has been filed. The property is also zoned PUD for the condominium areas. The single family areas are zoned R-4, and the multifamily areas are zoned either R-9 or R-10. All of that work has already been completed.

There were some variances that were granted by the Village Board in order to commence the mass grading on this development in the past. Development agreements were approved at that time. Again, as we go through this preliminary plat and final plat for this next stage, we will be following up with final documents probably in the next few months. We may be looking at doing some initial mass grading just to beat the winter season this year as well. They also received a stipulated shoreland permit for the development.

There were two areas of this project that were single family. The first phase or stage was platted back in 2005. They are going to be bringing the next phase within the next 30 days for single family. PUD for the condominium development was also approved based on detailed plans that were provided by the developer. All of this has gone through the process as well. You have before you the different resolutions back in 2003 that identified the number of units proposed for both single family and the condominiums, the various stages. As you can see, five different stages, and total population projections at full build out. I know that there is still some question and debate on exactly how many public age school children will come from this development because typically condominium development does not have a lot of children. But, again, I think Unified tries to do more of an averaging across the entire Village between the single family and the condominium development.

Significant with this project is that 28 acres or 23 percent of the development proposed to remain as open space. That's either park, walkways, the creek, floodplain or wetland areas and storm

water retention areas on the development site.

Site access, this particular development has multiple ways in. There are two points of connection from 93<sup>rd</sup> Street to the north. There will be eventually two points of connection to the east. There's a possible connection to the north, to the northwest, and with this next stage that you're going to be seeing 91<sup>st</sup> Street is actually going to make the connection from Creekside Crossing all the way to Old Green Bay Road, and that will be under construction possibly this fall.

So we have the preliminary plat for your consideration for Creekside Crossing Stage 2 for the single family. This Stage 2 is only nine single family lots, however it is going to be identifying all the outlots and then dedicating any remaining right of way and open space that's going to be provided to the Village.

A separate certified survey map is going to be presented to the Village for the dedication of 91<sup>st</sup> Street. That will connect Creekside Circle to Old Green Bay Road. The developer, as you will recall in the past, purchased this 92 foot wide by 704 foot wide parcel, razed the existing structures so a public road could traverse through the property. Once the roadway is constructed, I have been notified by some of the adjacent landowners they have an interest in connecting to those public improvements, so the petitioner and developer has requested that there be a special assessment hearing, right of recovery hearing, so they can be compensated for those public improvements that they will be putting in that others will benefit from.

The Village staff recommends approval as does the Plan Commission of Resolution #06-35 which is for the preliminary plat for the request of Kari Kittermaster for Regency Hills-Creekside Crossing LLC. Again, this is the preliminary plat for Creekside Crossing Addition #1 Subdivision.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I don't have any questions. I just want to commend the planning department for working out that cost sharing provision for the shortfall from impact fees. It's very welcomed that the builders are willing to participate in that.

**TIAHNYBOK MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND ADOPT RESOLUTION #06-35 FOR A PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR THE REQUEST OF KARI KITTERMATER OF REGENCY HILLS-CREEKSIDE CROSSING LLC, OWNER OF THE PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED NORTH OF 93<sup>RD</sup> STREET EAST OF OLD GREEN BAY ROAD IN THE VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE FOR APPROVAL OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR CREEKSIDE CROSSING ADDITION #1 SUBDIVISION, SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS SET FORTH BY STAFF; SECONDED BY LAUER; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

- C. Receive Plan Commission Recommendation and Consider Resolution #06-36 for a Final Condominium Plat for the request of Michael Dilworth, agent for LexVil Ltd, owners for the conversion of the Lexington Village Apartments to Condominiums located east of 88<sup>th</sup> Avenue at Lexington Place.**

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

John Steinbrink:

This item was brought up before the Planning Commission this evening at five o'clock.

Jean Werbie:

Mr. President, I would ask that both Items C and D be discussed together as I'll be making one presentation. Item C is Resolution #06-36 and D is Ordinance #06-36. So if we could do that.

**D. Receive Plan Commission Recommendation and Consider a Zoning Text Amendment (Ord. #06-36) for the request of Michael Dilworth, agent for LexVil Ltd, owners for to create the Planned Unit Development Overlay Zoning District for the condominium project pursuant to section 420-137 of the Village Zoning Ordinance.**

Jean Werbie:

The second item then is Ordinance 06-36, and this also relates to the Lexington Village project and the zoning text amendment for a request for a planned unit development overlay district for that condominium project pursuant to Section 420-137 of the Village Zoning Ordinance.

The petitioner is requesting approval of a final condominium plat to convert the existing Lexington Village Apartments to condominiums. The property is located east of 88<sup>th</sup> Avenue at Lexington Place. This is just south of Highway 50 and just north of the Westwood Estates manufactured housing community.

Lexington Village Apartments and the related infrastructure was installed in 1997 pursuant to a development agreement entered into between the Village and Paramount Ventures, LLC, along with Ener-Con Builders. Lexington Village consists of two 6-unit buildings and nine 12-unit buildings. There are a total of 120 units on the site which is 19.888 acres. The development has a net density of 6.59 units per net acre. All units have individual entrances and two bedrooms that range in size from 1,090 square feet to 11,160 square feet. Two units in each of the 6-unit buildings and four units in each of the 12-unit buildings have one car attached garages and the remainder all have two car attached garages. Each of these units do have individual entrances so there's no long, common hallway within each of these units, so it makes it very easy to make a condominium development out of this apartment project.

Current zoning, on May 19, 1997 there were 1.7 acres of wetlands on the property and they were rezoned into the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District. The non-wetland areas were rezoned into the R-10, Multiple Family Residential District, and the entire property was rezoned into the PUD, which is a Planned Unit Development Overlay District.

Specifically with respect to the planned unit development, back in 1997 while we have that particular overlay district there were no detailed ordinance regulations that were written at that

time. So as part of the conversion from the apartments to the condominiums, we have now written very detailed regulations specifically that pertain to this development with respect to the size of the units, the setback of the units, the fact that there's a private road, Lexington Place is a private road that comes into the development, the types of the materials, the height of the building, the gazebo, the management responsibilities that relate to the homeowners association's responsibilities.

A couple of other things I wanted to mention was that back in 1997 the sanitary sewer that is provided to this development was identified as public and the Village had been maintaining it. The water, however, was built to Village specifications but it was identified as a private water main, and with this new project or this conversion project, the Village is going to be taking the responsibilities of management and ownership of the public now water main. So sewer and water will be public. The storm sewer, storm water management responsibilities will stay private. The roadway will also stay private.

The way we have arranged things with respect to their bylaws and their declarations they have indicated that they will restrict so that 80 percent of the units will always be owner occupied and a maximum of 20 percent would be rental. They are going through a process, as Mr. Dilworth had indicated at Plan Commission, that they are allowing up to a year or so for those that are renting the units to convert or to stay as renters as long as they don't exceed that limit that was set within their declarations.

With that, the staff and the Plan Commission recommend approval subject to the comments and conditions as outlined. Again, there's a resolution for approval of the condominium plat, and then an ordinance that approves the planned unit development zoning text amendment.

Mike Serpe:

I said at the Plan Commission meeting and I'll say it at the Board level here, there's always a benefit to owner occupied dwellings and this will be a benefit to that area, to the neighbors in that area and to the Village because the care and maintenance for those units will not be a little bit more attentive and it's a plus/plus for everybody.

**SERPE MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND ADOPT RESOLUTION #06-36 FOR A FINAL CONDOMINIUM PLAT FOR THE REQUEST OF MICHAEL DILWORTH, AGENT FOR LEXVIL LTD, OWNERS FOR THE CONVERSION OF THE LEXINGTON VILLAGE APARTMENTS TO CONDOMINIUMS LOCATED EAST OF 88<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE AT LEXINGTON PLACE; SECONDED BY LAUER; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**SERPE MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND ADOPT A ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT (ORD. #06-36) FOR THE REQUEST OF MICHAEL DILWORTH, AGENT FOR LEXVIL LTD, OWNERS FOR TO CREATE THE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY ZONING DISTRICT FOR THE CONDOMINIUM PROJECT PURSUANT TO SECTION 420-137 OF THE VILLAGE ZONING ORDINANCE; SECONDED BY TIAHNYBOK; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**E. Consider Construction Related Services Agreement for Creekside Crossing Addition No. 1.**

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, you acted on Creekside Crossing #1. Submitted here is the engineer's estimate for the inspection of the construction that will take place there. These are estimates based on hours and effort on the job. The professional services as it relates to the project for construction management, inspection and staking is \$63,600 on an hourly basis, \$84,300 on an hourly basis, and \$133,500 on an hourly basis. This would be an expense that would be paid for by the developer and I recommend that the Village Board authorize the President and Village Clerk to execute the document.

**TIAHNYBOK MOVED TO APPROVE A CONSTRUCTION RELATED SERVICES AGREEMENT FOR CREEKSIDE CROSSING ADDITION NO. 1; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**F. Consider Professional Services Agreement for Village Green Heights Subdivision Phases 3, 4 & 5.**

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, this is a proposed contract from Bonestroo and Associates for Village Green Heights Subdivision that we just approved. They're proposing this in a little bit different light. Bob, if you want to take this.

Bob Martin:

Actually both subdivisions the engineers doing the first phases are doing the second phases essentially for both Creekside and for Village Green Heights, so there's a continuation of their services. They're both based on an hourly rate, and we look at what their proposal for the services are, and it should be in the range of around 8 to 10 percent of the construction fees. Both these contracts do that. But it is based on the actual hours of the services of the engineers. So it's pretty common and a pretty routine way to do things.

Mike Pollocoff:

In this Bonestroo contract they're estimating the fee for all their services at \$402,600.

Bob Martin:

Which I believe is around 8 percent construction fee.

Mike Pollocoff:

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

That's how big that project is.

**SERPE MOVED TO APPROVE A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT FOR VILLAGE GREEN HEIGHTS SUBDIVISION PHASES 3, 4 & 5 AS PRESENTED; SECONDED BY LAUER; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**G. Consider Recreation Commissioner's request to serve as an alternate member instead of regular member and reappointment of alternate member to fill the regular position.**

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, we received a letter, it's in your file, from Dino Laurenzi who is a member of the Recreation Commission, and anybody who knows Mr. Laurenzi he's an active person in our community, and he's indicated to us it's difficult for him to get to some of the meetings that have been scheduled. The Commission had offered to reschedule the meetings to a different date and he didn't want to do that, but he would like to stay involved. We do have an alternate member who has been coming to meetings, so the two had requested if they could switch, since the terms are the same, and Mr. Laurenzi would take the alternate position and Travis Laib would assume Mr. Laurenzi's current term as a regular position. Those terms end May 1<sup>st</sup> of 2007.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I'm a member of the Recreation Commission and I don't see any problem with that myself just swapping the two positions. Two good members. I so move.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I see that Dino Laurenzi is Chairman of the Commission. So would a new Chairman would need to be nominated and appointed?

Mike Pollocoff:

Every year they go through and elect officers, the Commission does.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I understand Mr. Laurenzi's personal conflict with work and travel. I had the same experience. If I was on a Commission where I couldn't make a significant number of meetings I would be doing exactly the same thing he is doing so I have great respect for this. How do we act on this? Is it a motion?

John Steinbrink:

It would be the second then.

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

Alex Tiahnybok:

I'll second.

**KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO MOVE DINO LAURENZI TO AN ALTERNATE POSITION ON THE RECREATION COMMISSION AND TRAVIS LAIB TO A REGULAR POSITION ON THE COMMISSION WITH EXPIRATION DATES TO REMAIN MAY 1, 2007 FOR BOTH; SECONDED BY TIAHNYBOK; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**H. Discuss Administrator's report on Village Board district instead of at large representation.**

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, this issue was brought to the Village Board probably about a half a year ago. We were directed to evaluate the proposal. The proposal we heard was basically go to districts and expand the Board by two members. The current village Board is, of course, at large representation with four Trustees. The size of the Village Board was reduced at the time of incorporation from six Trustees and the Village President. That's what the statute proscribed unless it's at the time of incorporation or a recharter the seats could be changed. We also at that time did away with the constables.

One of the things as people look at these, and I know there's been some discussions from all over the place, people who are interested in this, is identifying areas of the Village and combining wards, take Wards 1 and 2 and make that the Carol Beach Ward, and make wards 12 and 13 the northwest part of the community a ward, but that's not what wards are. Wards don't serve that purpose in Wisconsin law. A Ward is something that contains things that are developed as part of the census.

Wards by definition have to be as compact as possible and suite directed towards the convenience of voters because it's an administrative tool for elections. Wards should be comprised of contiguous territory. You don't want to have long drawn out wards or they can't be barbell. The wards need to take into account the county supervisory district. Really we set those wards up and then the County uses that ward designation to create their supervisory districts that we currently have in place. Ward creation must consider racial and ethnic considerations. That's something we do when we receive the census. The wards must comply with population ranges as set forth by State law to be between 600 and 2,100 people, not an exact science as to what that population ends up being. They can't cross municipal, county or legislative district boundaries, and they must reflect municipal boundaries as they existed on August 1<sup>st</sup> in the year of the census and that's what we have.

Wards are intended to be as permanent as possible with changes to be made only for the following reasons: To reflect changes in population, changes in minority population, changes in municipal boundaries, to accommodate the establishment of county supervisory districts, to facilitate the creation of aldermanic districts of equal population, and to accommodate mid-

decade adjustments.

To create new representative districts, the current wards could not serve as the districts because the wards do not contain the same amount of people. If you think back to the Constitution, one man one vote. So every representative district has to have the same. There's usually a bubble between one and two votes because it's not always an even number, but every Trustee in a representative system would have to have the same number of constituents so no one has more or less. New representative districts when we create them, if we decided to do it this way, would have to be based on the 2000 census. We can't take the population as we know it to be today and use it to create the new representative districts. That would probably be the easiest thing to do, but therein lies the rub.

I don't know if we that slide. This is a description of the problem. If you look at the 2000 population based on the census that was taken, and let's look at Ward 13 for example, in 2000 men, women and children, no goats or chickens, was 1,671 people. So Ward 13 you have 1,671 people, but in our last election in our current voter list there's 1,707 voters there. That's just people over the age of 18. So if we redistrict Ward 13 and we base that ward on what it's at now, what's going to happen is that district will be under represented. And another district will be under represented.

That becomes really obvious when you look at these maps. It's a little bit hard to tell, but there's ward boundaries. It's this dark line on the maps here. In the areas as you go from bright red to dark green, this kind of mustard yellow here as you come down that's a positive population change that's occurred. So you look at the Village green area we had, at the census there was 176 people here. Now there's 659 people, but this is not a populous ward when you look at the wards as they existed. Or, if you come down here to the area where we've had the development along 116<sup>th</sup> excluding Tobin Creek, at the census they had 688 and now they have 911. Ward 13, this area up here, at the census there was 98 people and now there's 366 people.

So to create representative districts that have the same amount of population, we would be using 2000 data but it wouldn't represent reality. So you'd have some districts that were over represented and some that were under. But we could do that based on the data that was available to us as of the census. I think that runs against one of the requirements for changing wards and that's that reflecting changes in population and we definitely have had that. You can see the census doesn't lead the voters, but if you look at both those columns we have 12,000 voters as of 2006 that are registered. We had 12,000 in population not too long after we incorporated so it's a significant growth. So to deal with the problem of getting the population right, you almost need to make a mid decade adjustment in the census. Right now we're a year past mid decade.

If the Village Board wishes to create districts, there are three options: One is use the 2000 census data which I don't think--I'd be surprised if the State Election Board would let us get away with it. Secondly, we would conduct another census of the Village of Pleasant Prairie. The estimated cost based on a recent census in Illinois of a municipality of 15,000 was \$260,000. The Bureau of Census requires you fill out a document, you send them \$200, they tell you how much it costs. I can't say ours would be \$260,000. I think it would be more. This census, Jane, was not even a year ago, was it?

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

Jane Romanowski:

It was within the last year.

Mike Pollocoff:

A special census requested by the Village at this time, though, could not be started before 2008 and possibly 2009. The 2010 census comes out and that one we don't pay for. Or, we could wait until the 2010 census is completed and create districts at that time.

Adding two members to the Village Board of Trustees. Adding two members to the Village Board can be accomplished by the adoption of a charter ordinance. The Village Board would adopt an ordinance creating six Village trustees and defining their terms of office. If you were to adopt that ordinance, you would need to re-juggle the term of office for everybody on the Board other than the Village President because you still need to re-stagger for the new Trustees that were coming aboard. So if you wanted that to be two and two, or have two going and two new ones, whatever you'd want to be at. At that time you'd also have the opportunity to make it a four year term if you wanted to.

The Village citizens could accept that ordinance while having 60 days to file a petition for an election to put the question to the residents of the Village. Typically when you're changing your form of government, when you're expanding a governing body, I think good policy says that's a referendum question. Rather than adopting an ordinance and wait to see if somebody protests it, I think the Village Board would be farther ahead to say let's set the election, here's the election question, should we raise the number of the members of the Board to seven instead of five.

The Village Board also has the option of splitting the representative format of the Trustees by having four serve defined areas and have two serve at large along with the Village President. It's a pretty common method of representation in a lot of Midwestern States with the exception of Wisconsin where you juggle those two things of having some representatives that are elected at large and they're looking at everybody's interest and not being tied down to an appropriate issues that a Trustee would to a specific ward district, and then again the Trustee of that specific ward district would be looking out just for their interest. I think it's pretty problematic how much that really happens.

You can see where you have a long history of aldermanic districts and cities where some of the alderman only do look at what's good for their district and everybody else goes swinging. There's study after study that shows that that does tend to happen and the communities that are represented at large tend to have less of that. In fact, there was a study done by . . . that those represented at large tend to spend less money than those that are represented by districts because there's usually some kind of log rolling to get different aldermanic districts to sign onto projects. That's neither here nor there, but that's an option to create a split where you have one of each.

There's a lot of alternatives in here. What I'm looking at is we're coming up on the point where we would need to, if you want to structure a referendum for this coming November, we'll be coming up on the point where we need to put something together. You can create two Trustee positions at large for the next April election following a referendum in this November. This November election is not the biggest, probably the second biggest election we have. You can create two Trustee positions at large for the April Election following a referendum in the November Presidential election. That would get you pretty close to the census period.

You could create two Trustee positions at large for the election following the 2010 census and you could also do it for two Trustee positions added to the existing four for representative districts in the 2010 census. You could leave everything the way it is. You could create representative districts for the next April following a referendum in November. You could create districts following the referendum in the November Presidential.

Another tool that could be used that's been used by a number of communities, and typically this happens as communities are approaching their census redistricting is to create a committee of citizens to study the issue and bring forth a recommendation for the Village Board to consider. As you can see, we've got a pretty good plate full of issues to consider here. The committee should be comprised of citizens who do not hold office, are not running for office or planning to run for office. The task of the committee would be to bring back a recommendation on both questions, the size of the Board and representative districts versus at large.

I think financially unless we borrow money I don't see us paying for a \$260,000 plus study to recensus the Village one year or two years out from the regular census. I think that if we weren't growing at the rate we're growing I could see using the 2000 census, but we're clicking along at about 3 to 4 percent a year. So what the Village looks like today versus 2000 is significantly different. We've approved plats tonight that are going to add another 1,200 people to the Village. Whether we want to admit it or not, that doesn't get you what the Constitution says you should have, and that's one man one vote, and that's what all of us up here swore to uphold was what the Constitution says. So I don't think believing that it's not there or it's not an issue is really doing our jobs.

I've also added that this doesn't come without a lot of staff work. There's a page here that I've inserted what the staff work for the voting system is. All times being equal this would not be that difficult, but the State of Wisconsin is moving to a Statewide Voter Registration System. Jane was on the committee for it. We were one of the initial test sites, and we're one of the few communities to have everything up and running. As she says in here, we have to take and create address ranges to make this system work. But the problem is that the consultant and the Election Bureau they don't have the system done for the State yet. In this intervening period we'd be asking them to stop, do new districts for us when they don't have the districts done for everybody else, and they're already late on getting the system up for everybody that needs to do it. I'm sure they have every intention, and Jane's called them and they said they'd tried to get them done, but realistically they're not even done with the ones that are waiting so they can have it for the September or the November election.

That's our voter system now. We used to have that system on a PC here and we could just change it here. On the State system we have to work that and they're not ready yet. That's going

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

to take a significant amount of work to do that. We know we have to do that in 2011 when the 2010 census comes in. We have to do this every ten years. I'd caution against doing it in 2009 and then doing it again in 2011 especially if it's going to cost us a quarter million to do it. That's something we have to do irregardless.

The other thing I think is when we set this thing up, put yourself in the position of a poll worker. God bless those ladies and gentlemen. They do a lot of work for \$100. But what we want to be in a position to do when people vote is to give them one ballot and not go through what they do out in the west part of the County where in one voting place they have five different ballots given what school district you're in, what representative district you're in for a Village, and that makes it difficult for people to vote. It just invites problems. The voting in Pleasant Prairie has been pretty easy. People get one ballot and everybody is on that ballot and that wouldn't be the case if we were going to be splitting things out. It's easy to do it at the time of the census because you're working with the County to put it together, we're putting our things together, and everybody is working on the same sheet of music.

If we jump out of this and go out of it the people that get hurt are the people trying to run your election for you on election day and the people that are voting trying to understand why they're voting on a different ballot than the guy who pulled a ballot right before them and pulled the ballot right after them. It just isn't a simple solution. I think in my mind the issue got a lot easier when I found out how much it was going to cost to do this if we want to pull the trigger early.

That being said I docketed this item for discussion. I want to find out where you guys are and what you want me to be working on, if we need to get something together for a referendum. We've talked about it. You don't need to do anything if you don't want to do that either. I need to know that, too.

Mike Serpe:

There's no doubt that running districts would be from the Board's standpoint a lot easier than running at large. There's no question about that. But the reality is a good example tonight that we had two citizens that came forward with a request, and all five Board members acted on their request regardless of where that person lived. We represent everybody. It's not that this person lives in my district and that person lives in your district and so on. The representation that the people are getting from the Board I think is as good as it's going to get which I think is outstanding because we represent everybody's concerns.

To add two Board members just for the sake of adding to the Board makes no sense to me at all. I don't believe bigger is better. I think smaller is better. I know there's now a lot of controversy in the City and the County Board to reduce the size of City government and County government. I agree with that. I don't know about serving as a dual role and I don't necessarily agree with that, but reducing the size of the County Board and City Council I agree.

So for us to go bigger I would not support that. For us to do anything at this time I would not support it for obvious reasons, financially being the biggest and confusion being the next because it would be tough to implement something like this and think it's going to go smooth. It

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

wouldn't. So are we ready for a referendum yet? I don't think so. If we gain another 16,000 population between now and whenever it's going to cause us to go to a city status if I'm not mistaken. What is it, 35,000 or 40,000 to be a city status. When that time comes, it might be looking at aldermanic statuses with districts. I don't know. I guarantee you when that comes I won't be here. I'm just throwing my thoughts out.

I don't think it calls for any action to be on any ballot this year. As a matter of fact if we're going to look at it a gain any time it's not going to be for another three or four years before we even start considering it to be even affordable, feasible or workable.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Looking at the census in the year 2000 it's 16,136. Right now, six years later, we have close to 20,000, which means in six years roughly we're going to be close to 25 percent. That means in three more years we're going to be up 2 percent and up 37 percent or 40 percent increase for the year 2010. So to request a special census \$260,000 is very impractical for us especially with the budget limits so hard for us. There's no question we're growing. But, as you say, Mike, we may go to a Class 2 city, correct, with a population of 30,000?

Mike Pollocoff:

Class 3 at 40,000.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

So I think doing something right now I don't think it's going to be practical because the cost involved, the quick change in the population, the representation isn't going to be there the way it should be. I have reservations on this and I'd like to hear other comments from other members of the Board.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I know it's an age old debate as to whether or not areas get represented better or worse when they have district representatives. I know Kenosha had an awful lot of flame throwing lately about the lakefront. I think there was a particular Alderman, Wamboldt I think was his name, and obviously it was the lakefront itself with the mistake on the lake and all that in his district, and obviously that representative took the greatest amount of heat, but I would hope that the other aldermen in Kenosha didn't take the situation seriously and acted on it like as if it was in their own districts. I'm not sure I agree with the notion that the district thing is a bad thing.

When you look at our current representation,, and obviously we're all at large and that sort of takes care of the argument a little bit, but when you look where we're at today I'm in Ward 1. There's nobody in Ward 2. Mike is in Ward 4. Jeff is in Ward 5. Steve is in 9. But 6 and 7 have nobody and haven't had anybody for a while as far as I know. 12 and 13 is empty now. John lives in 10 but he wouldn't be at large anyway. 11 has probably never had a Trustee. So from a representative perspective I would argue that if we went to some kind of districts it would force us to be more representative of the entire community than we are now because there are parts of

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

our community that have no representation at all. Certainly 6 and 7, the more Kenosha areas of Pleasant Prairie, are sitting there all alone, and based on these numbers represent some

significant pieces of our population. So even if we have to use somewhat bad data like the 2000 census I think we argue with anybody that challenges it that it's better representation than we're doing now.

Regarding ballots, I agree that at any polling place citizens would get one ballot, but the Village currently has three ballots because of the County districts, correct? Aren't there three different ballots?

Mike Pollocoff:

No.

Alex Tiahnybok:

It's the same ballot and you just choose the district you're voting in?

Mike Serpe:

The County representatives are different on the—

John Steinbrink:

We have to comply with the—

Alex Tiahnybok:

So there's three ballots.

Jane Romanowski:

No, one ballot at each polling place.

Alex Tiahnybok:

That's what I meant. But we actually deal with three different ballots?

Jane Romanowski:

Yes.

Alex Tiahnybok:

We do. So we're not really taking that and making it six. We're taking three and making it six.

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

Jane Romanowski:

We're only dealing with three ballots at one polling place.

Mike Pollocoff:

I'm not worried about us having the problem. It's the people that are voting and poll workers that see us four days a year.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I think the polling places would have to be restructured, but in terms of the citizens pulling a ballot I don't see why they would have to get more than one ballot if we made these changes. Regarding November, I personally, and I've heard this over and over again, and I think just looking at the map of Pleasant Prairie, we're not representing Pleasant Prairie very well. Within a mile of each other we have three Trustees all down in this 4, 5 and 9 range, and I don't think that's good representation. So I think anyone that would challenge us using the 2000 census data we could say, well, what kind of representation are we doing now anyway?

Finally, I don't think anyone wants to see another \$40,000 election for two Trustee seats that pay \$5,000 a year. I don't think anyone wants to see that, and I think that's a big motivating force on why we should do this. We've taken the person that would say, hey, I might give this a go, and we've basically said don't bother because if we don't like you we're going to spend you out of town. That's what we did. So I think this is necessary and I strongly support that we put at least an advisory referendum on the ballot so we can get the citizens' input. We don't have to act on it. It doesn't have to be binding, but at least we get citizens' input, and to ignore this I think is ignoring a call for some changes.

John Steinbrink:

Actually, that group, Alex, is made up of people from probably every part of the Village, every ward, every district. They represented all their neighborhood.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Which group?

John Steinbrink:

The one you complained about spending \$40,000.

Alex Tiahnybok:

That's the total of all the spending. I didn't name any group.

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

John Steinbrink:

For some of us that haven't lived here just a few short years, you might even check, we know people over the entire Village from end to the other, from one district, one ward to the other including Somers, Bristol, Salem. We're not isolationists. We don't live in a vacuum. We don't draw lines for the people we represent or the people we know. People call us from everywhere.

Mike Serpe:

Let me ask this, Alex. Let's debate this a little bit here. You recommend that we got to some type of advisory referendum on this to get some direction. I don't care how you shake that out and what you call it, if that were to pass and then you don't do it because we can't afford to do the recensus, you're going to make this promise. Number one, I don't agree with your representation theory at all. I do agree with John. I know a lot of people in River Oaks. I know a lot of people in Mission Hills. I know a lot of people all over the Village. I represent all those people. I've done it for years. But if you go to an advisory referendum and it passes, you're not going to act on that anyway because we can't afford to act on that. There's no money to do that. So why would you even consider putting something like that on the ballot as a false hope for something that we can't deliver on? That makes no sense. Then we're going to be labeled you guys make all these stupid promises and just like any politician you can't follow through. I don't want to set us up for that because we're going to be set up for criticism and that makes no sense. There's no way on this earth that this Village can afford to implement what we just talked about tonight. We just can't do it. Now am I saying that we shouldn't look at it again? We should look at it again in about three or four years, I don't know when, to see what's going to shake out. But to put it on the ballot now knowing that we're not going to do anything anyway?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

There's no money for that. That's the issue.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I heard that we might be in a position where a census would be required. I didn't hear that there's absolutely certainty that we would have to do it. I think somebody has to challenge us first before we can say that, well, the 2000 census data isn't good enough, so the \$260,000 argument as far as, if I heard correctly, is a possibility of being in a position to spend that kind of money. And if the citizens said yes then maybe we would have to use that as the excuse why we don't move forward until the census. But there's a possibility that the citizens will say no, too, and then we're off the hook completely.

Jane Romanowski:

I just don't know how you can use 2000 numbers and get wards and say that you have equal population. You look at those maps and consciously I'm creating wards that are saying they're going to be equal, and I'm using data by the time we get this time, if we can even do it next year,

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

of six or seven years old, and I'm reading the statutes as I have in the last couple months, and I'm trying to create wards within County Board Supervisory Districts that are six years old, and we're trying to keep our polling places because that's a cost, you don't want to add polling places. From a standpoint of an election administration you need to keep your wards constant. If we change them now and we change them again in three years, I'm still feeling the effects of the 2000 census. I still have people going to the wrong places. God help the poll workers when they're trying to tell somebody who has been to three different places already that, sorry, you didn't read your post card I sent you. So from an election administration standpoint this would be a nightmare.

Mike Pollocoff:

I think the other thing, Alex, the question is whether or not people have bad representation right now versus what the new districts would be if you created districts with old data because you all are bound to represent everybody regardless of where you live. If you're only representing your neighborhood that's your business and you'll have to deal with it somewhere down the road if that's how you approach it, but you are elected to represent 19,000 people in the entire Village wherever you live because that's what at large representation is. So you'd be measuring going away from a community that would have four representatives and one Village President that are solely directed to take care of everybody's issues in the Village to a method where you have four representatives elected by districts or six if you added two to it that would be based on districts that would not be equal.

Would somebody in a district that had a smaller number of representatives, citizens that are elected by somebody, be the target and say, listen, you have a small amount of people, just say it's Carol Beach 1 and 2 if that's the number if that ends up being where it is, we have so few people in Carol Beach dictating what happens in the Village when in 8 and 9 we have one representative and we have twice as many people that are in that area. At that point we know based on data today that that's not equal. So what we've done is gone from a situation that is purely equal, everybody has the same number of representatives. If you live in Pleasant Prairie you have four Trustees that have to, and they don't have to do it, but they're there to work for you, and you go to a point where you have one Trustee who is able to wield a certain amount of power on the Board with less voters than somebody who has a lot of voters that are depending on him to wield a certain amount of power.

So I think the question is not whether you're going from where you guys happen to live by the luck of the draw that you're elected and basing that against the new ward system. You're going from a perfect system where everybody has representation no matter where they live to one where you have imperfect one. We know from our own data and everything that that's not perfect and you're going to have an imbalance. You're going to close your eyes to any growth and you're going to look at 2000 numbers.

I think that's the challenge if someone decides to make the challenge against us, and I wouldn't be surprised, to be honest with you, if it wasn't the State that would say what the hell you doing?

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

Jane Romanowski:

Very likely.

Mike Serpe:

One other thing. You lean towards a certain political party, and that party usually represents less and not more. And what you're advocating here is really making a lot more. I think when you're talking about doing districting, I think you're going to increase position in at least Jane's department, you're going to increase people on this Board. You're going to add to government cost only by districting. Is the representation going to be any better? I don't know. I'll be honest with you, Alex, what we had tonight with the street hearing, if we had districts and I knew that this person that I was going to hurt wasn't in my district, I might think twice how I might vote for that because I don't care type of thing. That's not true, I would never do that, but that does happen in aldermanic districts.

I think if you looked at this whole thing, this government is going to get bigger as a result of just that one thing itself. This government is going to get bigger just because of its demographics because we're growing. We're just going to add to that I feel unnecessarily at this time. Believe me, I don't want to go through another election like last time either. Trust me when I tell you that. Never do I want to see another election like that. I wouldn't wish that on my worst enemy, but there were reasons why that election had to take place and why it was done. That's another matter. We'll have a beer over that and we'll talk about it. But I don't think now is the time to do this, and I don't think now is the time to entertain it with the people only because we're going to be able to follow through with it. Cut the \$260,000 in half, \$130,000 we haven't got that. We haven't got \$30,000 to spend on a recensus. Can't do it.

Right now I'm saying if we're going to represent the people right now then you tell the people, you say you know what, this is going to be cost prohibitive, and I think for your benefit to keep your tax dollar where it's at we're going to continue to operate at large until we look at it again at the next census year.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I can see a lot of places we can use \$260,000 in the Village. A lot of places. Representation . . . for many years and I have been every place in the Village, around the neighborhoods . . . every place. So I don't know. I represent everybody. I have been all over the place. There's no question some day it's going to have to be changed, but at this time right now it's a problem. To do a special census, it's very negative in my opinion to even think about making a change now and there is the. money situation.

Jeff Lauer:

I know Joe Clark and Mr. O'Toole brought this up months ago. I believe I was the only one that was adamantly against it. But after doing my homework since then and seeing this coming up on the agenda I did some work between when Joe Clark and Mr. O'Toole brought it forth. Actually my position has changed because the facts showed differently that I believe districts would

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

actually benefit the Village. Now, since unfortunately I did not get this e-mail until late this afternoon and to expect to do my homework throughout the State in less than an hour and a half is quite a task, so I wouldn't recommend us taking any sort of action as far as doing this or that tonight. I would say leave this open until the next Board meeting, because getting this at the 11<sup>th</sup> hour I don't have time to do the research.

But I think the Village needs to go to districts. Now, I agree with Mike that more is not necessarily better, but yet if you have fewer that can be a problem also. So maybe we can look at some sort of districts that if we don't want to go to 7 or whatever, maybe we'll keep it at 4 with the President and make the districts however we have to do. I don't know all the legalities. Again, I just got this this afternoon. But that might be one route to go. I think as my memory serves me correctly, Steve and Mike last time when Joe Clark and Mr. O'Toole brought this up it was mentioned to look at it. And again I admit I was adamantly against it because I was believing you're elected from this district and you're not going to do anything else. I've seen it. But I've seen it does work in other parts of the State and the country where it does work. Unfortunately those who want to cause a problem they're eventually voted out anyways.

But I think it's something we should look at still, not necessarily shove it off tonight. One thing I don't know if and when districting ever occurs who actually does it. If you look at the map who says this section is ward whatever. Is that done through the State?

Jane Romanowski:

I do it.

Jeff Lauer:

Does the State have to approve it or do you do it on your own?

Jane Romanowski:

Yes, we get the Kenosha County Plan, we get their supervisory plan, they do their plan first. We have 60 days to create our wards, then we have to send our plan to the Kenosha County and to the Legislative Bureau. Then when they approve it then our plan goes into place. The last time we redistricted we had to add two polling places, and we probably in the 2010 will have to add one or two or maybe three. I don't know what the numbers are going to show. This is not an easy process, I can tell you that. Redistricting we had eight months from the start of the census to do it. From an election standpoint, management standpoint, this would be a total nightmare before 2010 because we know the County Board Supervisors are going to change their lines, and then we would have to go through and change everything again to get equal representation with those numbers.

SVRS don't have a clue. In 2010 they'll have a plan because the entire State run system and the entire State is going to have to do this, and they'll probably have a program that will do just that. Four more years of that program which isn't all up and running yet it's going to be very advantageous for us. I don't know how we would do it right now with ours and they didn't either. So from my standpoint, in 2010 if they want to do it, do an advisory referendum or a

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

binding referendum in 2010 in November, and if they want that in 2011 great. But it would be a total nightmare to do it now and to do it again in three years to change all the records, tell everybody where to go, cram people into polling places because you don't have enough room, you don't have the money to create polling places. \$15,000 just for equipment for each polling place. So it would all have to be a referendum to raise to get the money to do it, too.

I've done a lot of research on this and I've talked to a lot of clerks, and I'll literally tell you right now there's not one clerk that would ever support this just because redistricting is a nightmare just in itself and is a lot of work. And you want it to be accurate because you have to implement it and you have to have your poll workers to implement it. From September of 2000 we had 7,600 registered voters and now we're at 12,000. In 2010 you'll have 14,000 or 15,000 people you're going to have to tell where to go and get them to the right place. The more I researched it I'm not saying it's not right or wrong, but I'm just saying let's do it at the right time and do it right. We would need more staff and more poll workers. I think we'll be ready in 2010 or 2011 just from what I've researched and I've done a lot of work on it.

Jeff Lauer:

So you'd work with the counties and that--

Jane Romanowski:

We'd have to.

Jeff Lauer:

And get the boundaries. So this would never come to Board vote--

Jane Romanowski:

I have to submit the plan to you for approval, but I'm working off what Kenosha County sends me first. They take the Village or their whole County and they map it out. They send it to me and I've got 60 days to create wards. I have to bring my plan to you within five days from the time that you accept the plan and then it goes back to the County along with going to the State. I have to get approval from both of them before our plan actually goes into effect. So the plan actually would come to you well within the 60 days, because if there was changes I'd need to make them.

It was easier last time, obviously, at large because I just had to stay within the population. Any Village over 10,000 residents has to stay in a ward population of 600 to 2,100, and we did that. But we also had to stay within the County Board Supervisor lines and that's not easy to do either. You want your wards to be contiguous. You don't want to have little inlets all over the place. It's a science. You've got to make it work mostly for the people. We've got to make it easy for them, but also it's got to be approved by the State and the County.

Jeff Lauer:

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

Since it would eventually come to the Board if it ever does that does not mean, and I'm just going to ask it straight forward and I'll use me as an example and nobody else. A Trustee like me cannot come to you and say, hey, Jane, we're going to do this redistricting so do this one over here and make this one such and such.

Jane Romanowski:

No, last time the Deputy Clerk and I did them and we did them according to the State statute guidelines and the big redistricting book we had. We had a GIS program and you have census blocks and they're telling you what your population is. You can't take a census block and cut it in half. You're taking and you're clicking on these polygons and it's telling you what the population is and you need to make that work. Just as Mike said, they have to be contiguous. They have to be compact. This is going to work from the way I'm directed by the Legislative Bureau to do this and we went through a lot of training on this to get the redistricting plan accurate. You can ask the question, but I'll tell you I'm doing it by the book because that's what I have to do and send it back to Kenosha County.

Jeff Lauer:

This is a new process for me. Like I said, I recently got it. I just want to make sure that the Village does it and I don't care if it's the Village or the City—

Jane Romanowski:

We have to do it.

Jeff Lauer:

I want to make sure that there's no, quote, politicians working to redraw the maps because I know how they do it in Washington. They have fun doing it and I want to make sure that doesn't happen at the local level, that you have the broad authority and then the State has to approve it.

Jane Romanowski:

You approve it after I draw the lines.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I think everyone can agree it's a very complex situation. One of the possibilities I think, perhaps even in 2010, that if the County Board was to restructure and if we have to have our wards and any districts that we would form that would have to be consistent with those boundaries. If the

County Board shrinks in size I imagine that's going to change the number of representatives from Pleasant Prairie. If it doesn't shrink in size and the County Board remains at 28, then I think

Pleasant Prairie probably will be deserving another district anyway, because I would think our

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

growth rate is probably faster than other parts of Kenosha County so there's that factor.

I appreciate what Jeff said. The meeting about six months ago when Joe Clark and Bill O'Toole presented their opinions about this matter it sounds like I'm the only person that didn't change his mind. I thought it was a good idea then and I still think it's a good idea. I think the point that Jeff was leading to was the time stamp on my e-mail was three o'clock, the time stamp on the e-mail of getting this attachment. And, yeah, I've had a chance to study this a little bit, but there's some questions I'd like to ask even of some people in County government in terms of what they predict is going to happen to Pleasant Prairie in terms of any kind of redistricting, etc., etc. If Jeff makes a motion to table I'll second his motion.

Mike Serpe:

Before you start that—

Jane Romanowski:

There's no action on it.

Mike Pollocoff:

Point of order. If you look at the agenda I'm not looking for action. This is a discussion item. It was in your packet and you guys could pick it up. I didn't put this out, we were waiting on some information—

John Steinbrink:

They were sent out last week already.

Jane Romanowski:

No, not this.

Mike Pollocoff:

Not this one.

John Steinbrink:

That part, but the packet itself was out there.

Mike Pollocoff:

So be it. If you want to make a complaint about getting it at three that's it, but this is merely a discussion item. I was directed when it was brought up by the citizens to look at it and we have been looking at it. That's where it's at. You guys can make a motion to receive the report, but

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

this isn't an action item on the agenda. It's a discussion item.

Mike Serpe:

I wouldn't have any objection to talking about this a couple more times.

Alex Tiahnybok:

That's all I ask for. If that's the way we want to leave it, I'm okay with that, as long as it's not a dead issue.

Jane Romanowski:

Alex, I'd just like to tell you the supervisory districts are going to change no matter what because of population. So those will definitely change and I have to wait until those come to me.

Alex Tiahnybok:

That's a very good argument for delaying this. I couldn't agree more.

Jane Romanowski:

That's a given. They're not going to stay the same. We know that already. It's just a matter of what they're going to do at their end which I have to wait for.

John Steinbrink:

We don't want to be under the misconception that only the growth is in Pleasant Prairie. The City, Somers, Bristol, they've got big plans out there. They've already put some big subdivisions in. Salem, Randall, Twin Lakes they're fighting over land out there and it's not to grow corn. It's for other reasons.

Mike Serpe:

Alex, I want you to understand something. I'm not closing the door on districts. I'm saying right now is not the time to even talk about this as far as a referendum on the ballot this November. I just don't think now is the time, and Jane kind of reaffirmed exactly my feelings. So we don't have to take action on this. Lets just talk about it again. Not a problem.

**I. Consent Agenda**

- 1) Approve Bartender License Applications on file.**
- 2) Approve Letter of Credit Reduction for Woodfield Estates.**
- 3) Approve Letter of Credit Reduction for Creekside Hill.**

Village Board Meeting  
August 7, 2006

**SERPE MOVED TO APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS 1-3 AS PRESENTED;  
SECONDED BY TIAHNYBOK; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**10. ADJOURNMENT.**

**TIAHYBOK MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING; SECONDED BY LAUER;  
MOTION CARRIED 5-0 AND MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:05 P.M.**