

**VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE
PLEASANT PRAIRIE VILLAGE BOARD
PLEASANT PRAIRIE WATER UTILITY
LAKE MICHIGAN SEWER UTILITY DISTRICT
SEWER UTILITY DISTRICT "D"
9915 39th Avenue
Pleasant Prairie, WI
January 21, 2008
6:30 p.m.**

A Regular Meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Village Board was held on Monday, January 21, 2008. Meeting called to order at 6:30 p.m. Present were Village Board members John Steinbrink, Mike Serpe, Monica Yuhas, Steve Kumorkiewicz, and Clyde Allen. Also present were Mike Pollocoff, Village Administrator; Jean Werbie, Community Development Director; and Jane Romanowski, Village Clerk.

1. CALL TO ORDER

John Steinbrink:

Before we do the Pledge of Allegiance this evening, today is Dr. Martin Luther King's birthday, and tonight in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King I'd like to play an excerpt from his last speech. It was given to a group of Memphis municipal employees. They were sanitation workers and they were suffering through a strike as well as the racial discrimination of the day. Today we had many ceremonies throughout the community in Milwaukee, Kenosha and Racine, and a lot of words were done and said and stories told. But his words here were inspirational then and they still are today. So if you'd join me in honoring his memory tonight we'd like to play this excerpt from his last speech.

(Speech Played)

That, of course, was Dr. King's famous speech in the Washington Mall, not the one that he did in Memphis for the municipal sanitation workers, but the message is the same, and I think it kind of dates you by generation as to where you were and how old you were when this took place. What we see today is a lot of new generations of young folks that can only read about it or watch it on YouTube, but a lot of us were able to see this in person on TV as it unfolded. Now if you would join me for the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. ROLL CALL

4. MINUTES OF MEETINGS - JANUARY 7, 2008

Monica Yuhas:

Move to approve.

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Monica, second by Steve. Any additions, corrections, changes?

YUHAS MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINTUES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2008 BOARD MEETING AS PRESENTED IN THEIR WRITTEN FORM; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

5. CITIZEN COMMENTS

Jane Romanowski:

Norm Clausen. (Chose not to speak) That's all the sign ups we had tonight?

John Steinbrink:

Anyone else wishing to speak under citizens' comments? Hearing none, I'll close citizens' comments.

6. ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT - None.

7. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Receive Plan Commission Recommendation and Consider a Conceptual Plan for the request of Lance Skala of CenterPoint Properties, to develop three (3) industrial warehouse/distribution/office buildings and associated site improvements on an approximate 105 acres generally located in the southeast quadrant of the 116th Street and 88th Avenue intersection.**

John Steinbrink:

Did you want to take more than one of these at once, Jean?

Jean Werbie:

Yes. If we could take Items A through E I'll be making one presentation.

John Steinbrink:

Do we have a motion to bring up Items A through E at the same time?

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

Clyde Allen:

So moved.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second for bringing A through E up at the same time.

ALLEN MOVED TO CONSIDER NEW BUSINESS ITEMS A THROUGH E AT THE SAME TIME; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

- B. Receive Plan Commission Recommendation and Consider Ord. #08-02 for a Zoning Map Amendment for the request of Lance Skala of CenterPoint Properties, on behalf of GAR Farms, LLC, owner, to rezone the northern approximate 47 acres of the approximate 112 acre property located at 8215 116th Street from A-1, Agricultural Preservation District to M-1, Limited Manufacturing District. The rezoning includes a small approximate 0.65 acre field-delineated wetland area located within the northern approximate 47 acres proposed to be rezoned from A-1 to C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District.**
- C. Receive Plan Commission Recommendation and Consider Ord. #08-03 for a Zoning Map Amendment for the request of Lance Skala of CenterPoint Properties to rezone the field-delineated wetland and Primary Environmental Corridor areas located on the southern portion of the approximate 58 acre CenterPoint WisPark property, located at the southeast corner of 116th Street (CTH "ML") and 88th Avenue (CTH "H"), into the C-1 District, with the non-wetland/non-PEC areas being placed into the A-2, General Agricultural District.**
- D. Receive Plan Commission Recommendation and Consider the request of Lance Skala of CenterPoint Properties, on behalf of GAR Farms, LLC, owner, for a Certified Survey Map to subdivide the approximate 112 acre property located at 8215 116th Street into two (2) lots.**
- E. Receive Plan Commission Recommendation and Consider the request of Lance Skala of CenterPoint Properties, owner, for a Certified Survey Map to subdivide the approximate 47 acre Lot 1 of the proposed GAR Farms, LLC CSM, generally located at 8215 116th Street, into two (2) lots and one (1) outlot.**

Jean Werbie:

Mr. President and members of the Board, this is a slide of the general location map for the request this evening. As you read into the record there are five items before you for consideration. The

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

first is a conceptual plan, and this is a general conceptual plan for the area south of 116th Street into the area east of 88th Avenue. This conceptual plan is for a three building warehouse, distribution and office development complex.

In addition, as part of this process, this matter was before the Plan Commission at their last meeting on Monday night and they considered the site and operational plan for the easternmost 453,000 square foot speculation building. That item was approved by the Plan Commission subject to the action of these five items that you have before you this evening.

Next is an aerial photo perspective of the area. Again, it's a very large area. It's south of the Sonopress and VW Audi buildings which are just north of 116th Street and just to the south/southeast of the Uline Warehouse building. This is a 2000 aerial photograph given to you for a perspective. There is a single family subdivision that is south/southwest of this particular property area, and the two properties in question are the GAR Farms, LLC property which is to the east and identified as Tax Parcel Number 92-4-122-332-0200, and then the second property is to the west, the CenterPoint WisPark Land Company Property. It's identified as Tax Parcel Number 92-4-122-332-0251.

This property area as some background information has been under review and consideration by the Plan Commission and the Village Board for a number of years. A comprehensive plan was approved by the Village Plan Commission on May 12, 2003, and in that comprehensive plan update the entire area south of 116th Street between 88th Avenue and where 80th Avenue extended would be was identified as industrial area in the comprehensive plan. There is some area that is just to the southwest of the industrial that's identified as PEC, that's primary environmental corridor, and then there's also a cross-hatched area that still was identified as a low medium residential classification. That area is currently in ag production.

The Green Hill Farms Neighborhood Plan was updated subsequent to the comprehensive plan, and that update took place on May 12, 2003, and the Plan Commission approved this new neighborhood plan with this modification through Resolution 03-12. Again, it was to modify the neighborhood plan to reflect this change to the light industrial classification for this particular area.

In 2004, WisPark had brought to us a conceptual plan for the then just WisPark property which is the western portion of this land area. At that time Building 1, 2 and 3 were identified with the conceptual plan. As you know, conceptual plans are only valid for about one year, so as a result the one year time frame did expire and so any new plan moving forward would require new approvals by the Plan Commission and the Board for conceptual plan consideration.

The year 2008 conceptual plan that you have before you identifies three buildings, a first easternmost building which, again, we're considering site and operational plan by the Plan Commission, a second building in the center which is just over 500,000 square feet, and then a third building to the far west at just over 404,000 square feet.

A master grading and site plan was prepared by the developer's engineers, and it did identify specifically how all three of the sites would be developed and how they would be sharing storm water management facilities to the south and to the east and at the northwest corner of the

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

development area. In fact, the initial easternmost Phase 1 spec building will involve grading on that site for that first spec building as well as grading in the very northwest corner and the construction of a storm water management basin facility to service this property in this area.

In addition, there will be some berming that is constructed on the south end of the first development parcel, and some of the spoils and the materials from the initial basins that are being constructed will be placed at those locations so those initial berms could be constructed. There is a WEPCo easement that separates these three industrial properties with the land to the south and it runs east/west. Actually I'm not sure if it's an ATC actual easement now as opposed to WE Energies or WEPCo, but I think on all of these slides it's identified as a WEPCo easement. That's primarily our transition area between the industrial land to the north and then the starting of the change into a residential land use to the south. Currently to the south it will be, temporarily anyway, agricultural lands to the south and then it transitions over to primary corridor basin and some ag land and then it transitions into just north of the . . . area where we've got some single family homes.

Some existing conditions on the site south of 116th Street there are some existing buildings that are proposed to be razed just south of 116th Street, houses pole buildings, some out buildings, farm buildings, and there are two wetland areas, a small wetland in the southeast corner of the site on the Clausen property, and then there's a wetland and primary environmental corridor complex. The environmental areas, the wetlands and the corridors are intended to be preserved and protected throughout the development process.

This is a map that depicts the pre-zoning or the existing zoning of the site. Again, the petitioner is requesting this evening to rezone the property from the existing agricultural zoning to an M-1, Light or Limited Manufacturing District. The other property to the west was previously zoned to the M-1 classification. Again, there is an area that is south of the western building area that will remain at this time as A-2, General Agricultural District, and C-1 which is a Lowland Resource Conservancy District.

The GAR Farms, LLC M-1 rezoning is approximately 47 acres, again, adjacent to 116th Street. The .65 acre wetland rezoning just primarily means that we're placing the delineated wetland into the C-1 classification. We are not filling it. It is intended to be preserved and protected. It was Hey and Associates that did that original delineation for us. The other wetland, the CenterPoint wetland, the 6.6 acres, again, is intended to be preserved and protected. There are a number of trees within the primary environmental corridor which will also be preserved.

The rezoning request this evening is to make sure that all of the lands that have been identified for industrial development are placed into the M-1 which is that Limited Manufacturing District. The areas that have been field delineated as wetlands will be placed into the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District. The land at the southwest corner of their site will remain A-1, General Ag, and the balance of the Clausen property, the GAR property, that will remain as A-1 which is an exclusive agricultural district. That area is not intended to be developed and is intended to be continually farmed at this point. There is a small area of A-1 at the very southeast corner and that is separated by an area that is wooded or zoned C-2. So, again, the ag areas on the Clausen property and the conservancy areas will remain as they are today.

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

Then the first certified survey map is the GAR Farms, LLC certified survey map. And this initial CSM is to subdivide the approximate 112 acre property into two lots. The majority of the property is currently zoned A-1. The southern part of the property that will remain with Mr. Clausen will remain as A-1. The northern portion of the property is intended to be conveyed and placed into the M-1 District.

Lot 1 is currently improved with a farmstead which is proposed to be razed. The majority of the unimproved land is agriculturally cultivated. It is 46.8926 acres with 1,320 feet of frontage on 116th Street and over 1,500 in lot depth. The WEPCo or the ATC easements encompass the eastern and southern portions of Lot 1. Again, they run along the eastern boundary and then along the whole southern portion of this site. A proposed 20 foot wide access easement is shown to allow GAR Farms, LLC access to Lot 2 through Lot 1.

Lot 2, which is again the southern most lot for the first CSM, is unimproved with most of the land currently being farmed. There will be over 65 acres with no frontage on a public road. There is proposed to be a 20 foot wide Village dedicated sanitary sewer easement that runs through east/west through the southern portion of the property just north of the woodland area, and the southern portion contains floodplain and field delineated wetlands as well as primary environmental corridor. An additional approximate 17 feet of additional right of way is proposed to be dedicated along the south side of 116th Street for the eventual widening and improvement of 116th Street.

Municipal sanitary sewer is located along the north side of 116th Street right of way, and a 10 inch municipal sanitary sewer line is located along the east side of 88th Avenue. A 16 inch municipal water main is located along the south side of 116th Street and along the west side of 88th Avenue. It is intended that all of these developments will be serviced by public sewer and water. Any new lateral connections to the sewer and water mains will need to be bored underneath the roadway pavement. There shall be no open cutting of the roadway unless approved by Kenosha County.

The second certified survey map is the CenterPoint CSM. After recording the GAR Farms CSM, they will then subsequently subdivide Lot 1 into two lots and one outlot. The results of this CSM will be that the proposed 452,769 square foot east warehouse building will be located on its own parcel, that being Lot 4 of the CenterPoint CSM. The majority of the property, again, is currently zoned A-1, but it's intended to have the northern portion put into the M-1 classification, and there's a small wetland that will remain on the property.

Lot 3, the majority of the land is currently being cultivated. It will be 13.89 plus acres with 414 feet of frontage on 116th Street and over 1,454 feet in lot depth. Again, there is a WEPCo or an ATC easement that is along the southern portion of Lot 3.

With respect to Lot 4 it's improved with a farmstead that is proposed to be razed. It will be 30.2637 acres with over 900 feet of frontage on 116th Street and over 1,400 feet in lot depth. Again, there's also that WEPCo easement that runs east/west along the southern portion of the lot. A western driveway will be shared. One of the things we have examined through the site and operational plan is that we do need to make sure that there's multiple cross-access easements to

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

these properties from 116th Street. The corner property will also have an access from 88th Avenue.

A storm water management access and maintenance easement is located on Lot 4 to accommodate the storm pond that is going to be located there, and the Outlot 1 south of Lots 3 and 4 is proposed to be just over 2.7 acres with no public street frontage. The purpose of this outlot is to accommodate a very long ten foot high landscape berm to help screen any of the sounds and lights and the action that's going on on the industrial properties from the residential properties to the south.

So, this is the general location map again. The various items that you have before you this evening encompass Items A through E, the first of which is a conceptual plan. The second is a zoning map amendment. The third is a zoning map amendment. The fourth is a certified survey map. And the fifth is a certified survey map. And the staff would request, if there are no questions, separate actions on each item. And there are several representatives here from CenterPoint properties to answer any questions that you may have as well as their engineers.

Mike Serpe:

Rich or Lance, who is representing? How aggressive are you going to come forward with the next phase of this?

Lance Skala:

Lance Skala, CenterPoint Properties, 1808 Swift Drive, Oakbrook. We're in for site and operational approval right now for our first spec building which is roughly 450,000 square feet located on the eastmost lot, and we'd be looking to start that first thing this spring, early May.

Mike Serpe:

And the other two?

Lance Skala:

The other two will be market driven.

Mike Serpe:

Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Other comments or questions?

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

Monica Yuhas:

Mr. President, I have one. Any concerns with the neighbors bordering CenterPoint? If there have been concerns have they been addressed? Has anything come up?

Lance Skala:

We did meet with Mr. and Mrs. Matson about two weeks ago to discuss in detail our site plan along with to address any concerns that they expressed to us in a letter that they sent to us. Pretty much our discussions focused on three different issues, the maintenance and safety of our southernmost pond, any light or noise that would be emitted from our buildings, and the third one was the hydrology of their existing pond on their parcel. Would you like me to go into detail about our discussions there? I think we've addressed their concerns, and we also agreed that we would do some additional analysis of their existing pond and sit down with them to talk about possibly supplying their pond with additional water because they were concerned about the hydrology and maintaining the hydrology of both their wetland and their existing pond.

Monica Yuhas:

Thank you.

Clyde Allen:

Lance, a quick followup to that. At the Plan Commission the nearest neighbors were both represented and I think they liked the dialogue that was going on. Have you talked to them since Planning Commission?

Lance Skala:

I have talked to the Matson's because JSC is still doing their analysis. I did touch base with Mary, I've forgotten her last name, the Matsons' neighbors, Pakido, on Friday just to let them know that I'd like to wait and sit down with them at the same time that we sit down with the Matsons. So I did touch base on Friday just to close the loop from our discussions back on Monday.

Clyde Allen:

So these talks will continue, dialogue?

Lance Skala:

Yes.

Clyde Allen:

Thank you.

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

John Steinbrink:

Just one question, Lance. Your discussion about the retention pond there, and of course that has the built in safety features we try to ensure to make that as safe as possible. There is another pond there on the Matson property, isn't there?

Lance Skala:

There is an existing pond on the Matson property.

John Steinbrink:

Do you know the depth of that pond by chance?

Lance Skala:

I know that in our discussions with the Matson's it does support a fish population, so I think Larry mentioned that they think it's around 16 feet in one spot but the rest I think is along the five foot range.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Mr. Matson was at the meeting in the Planning Commission last week. He pretty much agreed with the statements that you make . . . on the issues.

Mike Serpe:

Mr. Chairman, I'd move approval of the conceptual plan.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Mike, second by Steve. Any further discussion?

SERPE MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND APPROVE A CONCEPTUAL PLAN FOR THE REQUEST OF LANCE SKALA OF CENTERPOINT PROPERTIES, TO DEVELOP THREE (3) INDUSTRIAL WAREHOUSE/DISTRIBUTION/OFFICE BUILDINGS AND ASSOCIATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS ON AN APPROXIMATE 105 ACRES GENERALLY LOCATED IN THE SOUTHEAST QUADRANT OF THE 116TH STREET AND 88TH AVENUE INTERSECTION, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

Mike Serpe:

Move approval of Ordinance 08-02 for the zoning map amendment.

Monica Yuhas:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Mike, second by Monica. Discussion on this item?

SERPE MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND ADOPT ORDINANCE #08-02 FOR A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT FOR THE REQUEST OF LANCE SKALA OF CENTERPOINT PROPERTIES, ON BEHALF OF GAR FARMS, LLC, OWNER, TO REZONE THE NORTHERN APPROXIMATE 47 ACRES OF THE APPROXIMATE 112 ACRE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 8215 116TH STREET FROM A-1, AGRICULTURAL PRESERVATION DISTRICT TO M-1, LIMITED MANUFACTURING DISTRICT. THE REZONING INCLUDES A SMALL APPROXIMATE 0.65 ACRE FIELD-DELINEATED WETLAND AREA LOCATED WITHIN THE NORTHERN APPROXIMATE 47 ACRES PROPOSED TO BE REZONED FROM A-1 TO C-1, LOWLAND RESOURCE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS; SECONDED BY YUHAS; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

Clyde Allen:

Move approval of Ordinance 08-03 for a zoning map amendment.

Mike Serpe:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Clyde and a second by Mike. Any questions or discussion on this item?

ALLEN MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND ADOPT ORDINANCE #08-03 FOR A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT FOR THE REQUEST OF LANCE SKALA OF CENTERPOINT PROPERTIES TO REZONE THE FIELD-DELINEATED WETLAND AND PRIMARY ENVIRONMENTAL CORRIDOR AREAS LOCATED ON THE SOUTHERN PORTION OF THE APPROXIMATE 58 ACRE CENTERPOINT WISPAK PROPERTY, LOCATED AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF 116TH STREET (CTH "ML") AND 88TH AVENUE (CTH "H"), INTO THE C-1 DISTRICT,

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

WITH THE NON-WETLAND/NON-PEC AREAS BEING PLACED INTO THE A-2, GENERAL AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS; SECONDED BY SERPE; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

John Steinbrink:

Item D.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I make a motion to approve.

Monica Yuhas:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Steve, second by Monica. Discussion on this item?

KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND APPROVE THE REQUEST OF LANCE SKALA OF CENTERPOINT PROPERTIES, ON BEHALF OF GAR FARMS, LLC, OWNER, FOR A CERTIFIED SURVEY MAP TO SUBDIVIDE THE APPROXIMATE 112 ACRE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 8215 116TH STREET INTO TWO (2) LOTS, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS; SECONDED BY YUHAS; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

John Steinbrink:

Item E?

Mike Serpe:

Move approval of the certified survey map.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

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

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

It was very well planned in the Planning Commission meeting.

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

John Steinbrink:

There were public hearings held and a lot of the questions were answered there, and the Commissioners did a very good job of bringing points up that needed to be addressed. I believe those have all been taken care of which makes this process much easier for us today. Further discussion?

SERPE MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND APPROVE THE REQUEST OF LANCE SKALA OF CENTERPOINT PROPERTIES, OWNER, FOR A CERTIFIED SURVEY MAP TO SUBDIVIDE THE APPROXIMATE 47 ACRE LOT 1 OF THE PROPOSED GAR FARMS, LLC CSM, GENERALLY LOCATED AT 8215 116TH STREET, INTO TWO (2) LOTS AND ONE (1) OUTLOT, SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED **5-0.**

- F. Receive Plan Commission Recommendation and Consider for the following Zoning Text Amendments (Ord. #08-04 and #08-05) to Sections 420-119 I (4) (a) and (b) related to principal building standards for hotels in the B-2 District and Sections 420-120 C (4), 420-120 D (2) (d) and 420-120 I (4) (a) and (b) related to hotels in the B-3 District.**

Jean Werbie:

Mr. President and members of the Board, on December 10, 2007, the Plan Commission adopted Resolution 07-31 to evaluate the regulations related to hotels in the B-2 and the B-3 zoning districts. Currently hotels are allowed as permitted uses in the B-2 and B-3 Business Districts as follows: In the B-2 District, which is our Community Business District, Section 210-119, the district allows for hotels as a permitted use, however the B-2 District does not allow for buildings to be larger than 25,000 square feet and they cannot exceed a height of 35 feet. In the B-4 District, which is our Freeway Service Business District, Section 420-120 of the zoning ordinance, the district allows for hotels as a permitted use provided that a hotel is at least three floors above grade, a minimum of 15,000 square feet per floor, a minimum of 80 guest rooms, and it shall not exceed 90 feet in height.

The following are the proposed amendment as recommended by the Village staff and the Plan Commission after public hearing last week. We're recommending that hotels in the B-2 District be increased in the area or square footage to be allowed to be no larger than 100,000 square feet with a height not to exceed 60 feet. Hotels in the B-3 District would be allowed with the approval of a conditional use permit at least three floors above grade, a minimum of 15,000 square feet per floor, a minimum of 80 guest rooms with a height not to exceed 90 feet. So with these amendments we would be allowing hotels to be located in the B-2, B-3 and B-4 Districts.

The B-2, again, are Community Business Districts that are more internal to the Village. They're at locations such as Prairie Ridge out by Highway 50, we've got a B-2 area that is at the intersection of Highway 31 and 165, so those are the types of B-2 more internal to the

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

community. The B-3 areas would be out by the Interstate such as where Prime is located. That's a B-3 area. And B-4 areas are our gas, food and lodging districts, again, along the Interstate.

So these are the proposed amendments that the staff and the Plan Commission recommend approval. if there's any questions I'd be happy to answer them.

Mike Serpe:

Just one. I have one. Just as a reference, Jean, what is the size of the Radisson?

Jean Werbie:

It's just 90 feet in height and I believe they have about 120 rooms.

Mike Serpe:

And square footage, approximate?

Jean Werbie:

200,000? Is it that big?

Mike Pollocoff:

No, I believe the Radisson is just under 170,000.

Mike Serpe:

Okay, thanks.

Monica Yuhas:

I move for approval.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

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

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I think it's a very good idea to increase the size of these hotels, because the tourism in the area is increasing most in part due to activities that we're providing in the Village in Kenosha County. I think it's a very good move.

John Steinbrink:

Jean, does this address the parking if there's an issue there as far as the low grade? We talked about above grade, that if they want to do multiple floors of underground parking, that they accept—

Jean Werbie:

The floors would be counted from grade going up.

John Steinbrink:

From grade going up. I believe we had a motion and a second.

YUHAS MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND ADOPT ZONING TEXT AMENDMENTS (ORD. #08-04 AND #08-05) TO SECTIONS 420-119 I (4) (A) AND (B) RELATED TO PRINCIPAL BUILDING STANDARDS FOR HOTELS IN THE B-2 DISTRICT AND SECTIONS 420-120 C (4), 420-120 D (2) (D) AND 420-120 I (4) (A) AND (B) RELATED TO HOTELS IN THE B-3 DISTRICT; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

G. Consider the request of Preston Kendall, agent for Village Green Development LLC, owners for a one (1) year extension of the Preliminary Condominium Plat for the Village Green Heights Townhomes North on the property generally located at 47th Avenue north of Main Street.

Jean Werbie:

Mr. President and members of the Board, the petitioner is requesting a one year extension of the preliminary condominium plat for the Village Green Heights Townhomes North generally located at 47th Avenue north of Main Street as noted on the slide. It's identified as their Phase 3 of their development. The Village Board had approved a preliminary condominium plat on March 17, 2003 pursuant to the Village's ordinance. A preliminary plat will expire within two years unless an extension is requested and approved by the Village Board.

Due to the size and the complexity of this development and the participation of several property owners and adjacent property owners and development of the Village Green Neighborhood Park and Village Center and a number of things in this area, they have not put their efforts towards the moving forward of this Phase 3 area which is the condominium area north of Sagewood. And they are requesting an extension of time in order to move this through the process.

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

As you know they have developed Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the Village Green. In fact, Village Green is just opening now with its second phase, and the Sagewood Condominiums at the southeast corner of this development is being developed by Scott Simon with the Simon Group.

The staff recommends approval of another one year extension until February 5, 2009 for the preliminary condominium plat for the Village Green Heights Townhomes North subject to the comments and conditions of the Village Board Resolution 03-15. A copy of the resolution is on file with the Village Clerk.

Clyde Allen:

Move approval of the one year extension on the preliminary plat.

Mike Serpe:

I'll second it with a question.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Clyde, second by Mike.

Mike Serpe:

How many extensions can we give on this, Jean?

Jean Werbie:

It's up to the Village Board.

Mike Serpe:

The reason I ask is with the market the way it is right now I'm sure these are going to become commonplace and we have to kind of watch them kind of closely since ordinances change and things happen. Okay, thanks.

John Steinbrink:

Further comments or questions?

ALLEN MOVED TO APPROVE THE REQUEST OF PRESTON KENDALL, AGENT FOR VILLAGE GREEN DEVELOPMENT LLC, OWNERS FOR A ONE (1) YEAR EXTENSION OF THE PRELIMINARY CONDOMINIUM PLAT FOR THE VILLAGE GREEN HEIGHTS TOWNHOMES NORTH ON THE PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT 47TH AVENUE NORTH OF MAIN STREET; SECONDED BY ALLEN; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

H. Consider Award of Contract for Hydrological Services in the vicinity of Sheridan Road and the C & NW Railroad south of 116th Street.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, the Village issued an RFP for engineering services specifically for hydraulic engineering studies to evaluate the Elkshire Development which is along Sheridan Road between the Chicago Northwestern roughly south of 116th Street down to 122nd. As that proposal came to the Plan Commission there was significant discussion about the impact that development would have on a number of things ranging from the fens that exist in Chiwaukee Prairie and the groundwater table that charges the Prairie.

One of the concerns voiced by conservancy groups was that any development in that area would damage the aquifer that provides the water that goes into the Prairie, that it could alter the chemical nature of the water that is in that water table that enhances the plant life there. They presented a study that was prepared by SEWRPC and I believe with some assistance with the USGS.

We also received another study from another firm that disputed those findings with some equally strong science. With that, I had some discussions with the developer, the representatives from the Regional Plan Commission about how we were going to work out the differences between the studies. It was agreed at that point the best thing to do would be to issue an RFP to firms to perform and really evaluate the hydrologic studies that were done and examine the weaknesses or the differences in the models that were used.

Bob Martin prepared the RFP with review from both the developer as well as the SEWRPC staff, because the SEWRPC staff had prepared a technical report on the hydrologic studies that were done in that area before. They felt that they agreed with the structure of the RFP and we held interviews with four consulting firms that responded to the request, and the committee recommended that the proposal from Northern Environmental be accepted. They had a well rounded proposal. Both the engineer from SEWRPC as well as from our experience Northern is a good firm. One of the things they do have that wasn't available with the other firms was licensed professional engineers in Wisconsin that are familiar with the level of standards that SEWRPC as well as the State works with.

So we are recommending and I'm recommending that the Village Board engage Northern Environmental for an amount of \$12,000 to conduct this study, and we'll get the study done and then we'll again reconvene the interested parties and see where we fall out on this. We've put that development on hold in lieu of getting this work completed, because we feel without a precise answer on this no one can really guarantee or ascertain what the impacts would be. Both SEWRPC, Nature Conservancy as well as ourselves, based on the way we structured this and the kind of information we're looking to get back to resolve some of those issues, feel that we'll be able from the staff's standpoint at least be able to move forward with a recommendation to either stop the project, modify the project or proceed with the project as presented or anything in between.

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

The developer has agreed to pay the costs associated with this study and that's \$12,000, so I'd request I be authorized to enter into a contract with Northern Environmental.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

So moved.

Monica Yuhas:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Steve, second by Monica.

Mike Serpe:

I have a question. Mike, what do we know about Northern Environmental? Their age, how long they've been in business, what's their involvement with this community?

Mike Pollocoff:

Northern Environmental has been around as long as I've been here so they've been around 23 or 24 years. They've done some geotech work for the Village probably most notably on the Chesrow site which is where the sanitary sewer came down from the City along Sheridan Road. And they've also done some other environmental work I believe in the Corporate Park. So they've done a lot of not just groundwater studies but some detailed engineering work and soils analysis. They're used quite frequently. Our experiences with them haven't been bad at all and neither has SEWRPC's. You won't see them as often because they have a real narrow range of work that they do. They also do some environmental studies for—they're on the qualified consultant's list for DNR and the Wisconsin DOT.

Mike Serpe:

I'd be curious at the end of the study how close it came to one or the other consultants that were used.

Mike Pollocoff:

We're curious about that, too.

Mike Serpe:

What I mean more towards maybe SEWRPC or—I'm guessing it would probably more towards SEWRPC.

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

Mike Pollocoff:

There's a model that's used that's called G-Flow, and it's really the application of that model. Really, they're going to be taking the data sets that already exist, there have been significant borings out there and they're going to run this model. I think that really ends up being the bone of contention is how that model is being utilized and evaluated and applied to what's in the field.

So one of the representatives from Northern did some work in Indiana which is where this model was created, and we interviewed some respondents from the Indiana area, and they were well versed in it, too, but they really didn't have that other piece of the pie to be able to fit this into Wisconsin law and engineering practices. As you remember back from the Plan Commission there were two spectrums, two ends of the world on this and both credible studies. The SEWRPC study, they do good work. They don't have anything bad, and then the work that was done by the developer was also sound scientific work. That's why in doing this third study and having the consultant review the work that's been done and replicate that model again with hundreds of different scenarios I think is really going to give us another input on it. If it doesn't then the science hasn't moved that far in that area but we don't believe that to be the case.

John Steinbrink:

What was the area Parkside was looking at a couple years ago?

Mike Pollocoff:

Parkside had done a study for the Regional Plan Commission, and they had looked at 116th Street but it was a broad area, broad area review. And it was basically, as I recall, a methodology on how to approach some broad area hydrological movement, and they were focused in on the fens which are those kind of outcropping of a spring and the plant life that grows around that and the features. There's one north of 116th Street that I think had been the focus of their attention and that study. And there is another fen that's east of the tracks in this area. They're unusual features in the Prairie. That original Technical Report 55 out of SEWRPC is what they were looking for. But it wasn't addressed specifically to the issues that are being brought forward by the developer with the construction and the trenching and things that happen as the development goes forward and what impact that's going to have on that movement of water as it goes underneath the tracks.

We've dealt with a myriad of issues from that to Blandings Turtles, there's some threatened species that could be impacted. So this doesn't bring everything to closure. We've still got a few things to move through. And then there's just some general policy issues that the Village needs to address, the layout of the development. But until we had this core issue that is significant as to how you decide where the sewer and water goes I couldn't make a recommendation to go forward or not.

Clyde Allen:

Mike, this contract is not to exceed \$12,000, but in there they mention that they would not initiate additional work without pre-approval?

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

Mike Pollocoff:

Right.

Clyde Allen:

That approval has to come through the Board?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes. Based on what they propose in the study and the data that we're providing to them, they're not having to go out and secure more data and do more drillings or whatever. They're just doing the analytical work so I believe the \$12,000 is sufficient. But if they run into something and they need more they're going to have to justify it and I'll bring it back. And we'll have to bring it back to the developer since they're paying for it.

John Steinbrink:

Further comments or questions? Hearing none, we have a motion and a second.

KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO AWARD A CONTRACT TO NORTHERN ENVIRONMENTAL TO PERFORM HYDROLOGICAL SERVICES IN THE VICINITY OF SHERIDAN ROAD AND THE C & NW RAILROAD SOUTH OF 116TH STREET AS DISCUSSED; ;SECONDED BY YUHAS; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

I. Consider an Award of Contract to purchase one wide area lawn mower.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, the Department of Public Works opened sealed bids on January 16th at 1 p.m. for the proposals and bids on a John Deere 1600 Turbo which is a wide area mower. Three bids were submitted. The low bid was submitted, total bid including trade in was submitted by Proven Power, Inc. for a total cost of \$30,108. You can see the new prices were pretty close but the trade ins were significantly different, Proven Power giving us a proposed trade in of \$12,600 versus the next closest which was \$7,500 which is Highway C. My recommendation and that of the Superintendent of Public Works is that we award a contract to Proven Power in an amount not to exceed \$30,108.

Mike Serpe:

So moved.

Monica Yuhas:

Second.

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Mike, second by Monica.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

A question for Mike. Where is Proven Power, Inc.? Where are they located at? This is the first time I hear about them.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

John Steinbrink, Jr., 8600 Green Bay Road. Proven Power is a company based out of Burlington, Wisconsin. So even though the Village hasn't purchased any mowers from them recently they are still a reputable company. I believe they have 83 of the wide area mowers in the Southeastern Wisconsin region so they're a very reputable company and I'm very comfortable in purchasing the mower and allowing them to take our trade in.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Thank you. That answers my question.

Clyde Allen:

John, do you know the amount that was included in the budget for this?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I believe it was \$38,000. I had planned on receiving only \$5,000 for a trade in so I was ecstatic to see that I got \$12,600.

John Steinbrink:

Other comments or questions?

Clyde Allen:

Just as a follow up, Mike, I assume that money will go sit in the reserve for equipment?

Mike Pollocoff:

Any savings are going to sit in the capital fund. And then as we go farther down the road in our budget we'll be making some other budget decisions so it can either be used for equipment next year or it can be applied to paving for this year.

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

Clyde Allen:

Thank you.

Mike Pollocoff:

Until we get a price on paving.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second. No further discussion.

SERPE MOVED TO AWARD A CONTRACT TO PROVEN POWER, INC. FOR A TOTAL COST OF \$30,108 TO PURCHASE ONE WIDE AREA MOWER; SECONDED BY YUHAS; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

J. Consider an Award of Contract to purchase one single axle chassis and snowplow equipment.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, on January 16th the Village received sealed bids for one single axle chassis. Again, this is the truck underneath the box and the plow. We received three bids, Lakeside International at \$72,516, Truck Country at \$66,262, and Badger Truck at \$64,231. As the Superintendent describes in his memo, in evaluation of the bids several issues have really come to light. Primarily the first one is our past experience with Badger Truck and the model that they sell which is a Sterling has not been good. We've had issues both with the quality of the truck where we have premature failures with the rust on the frame. We've had the trucks in the shop where they've had non responsive, and when we've had a truck in there for three months I consider it to be non responsive repair. Parts aren't available. I don't know how much you attribute to the manufacturer or to the dealer. After the trucks we purchased them primarily it's the solid waste truck we had the worst experience with, the Sterling.

Since then the low bid has been Freightliner which has held up pretty well. Those are Truck Country. They have a larger facility. They warehouse the parts that are needed when we need parts and are able to effectuate repairs. Lakeside International we have Internationals in our fleet as well but traditionally they haven't been low bid on the more recent purchases we've been making and we have no problem with International.

John indicated Badger Truck has poor service and service availability. On the back of his report he kind of details the problems we've been having with getting the equipment out of Badger when we've had problems. When you look at the uses of equipment one of the primary uses is what you've seen the trucks out there doing today which is plowing and salting. It's a corrosive environment and we've been doing a lot better with the aluminum than we have with steel. So the aluminum cab is being proposed in the Freightliner model. It's Steel with Badger. Truck Country in their bid offered a \$1,250 discount if we buy it in January under the firm pricing. If

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

you add in the aluminum cab and then the future frame repairs we've been paying about \$2,500 to get the frame repair on the Freightliners. So if we assume that we're going to have that same problem, and really the problem is it's not a unified piece of steel. It's two pieces of steel that are put together and the rusting is occurring because it's getting in the cracks in those, that wedge.

The Truck Country purchase would be \$65,012 versus \$68,231 for the Badger truck with is the Freightliner model. Consequently, I think the best and lowest and most responsive bid for the Village would be the one proposed by Truck Country in the amount of \$65,012. It would be my recommendation that we be authorized to enter into contract with Truck Country to purchase that chassis. If there's any questions, John is still close to the mic and I'd be glad to answer them.

Monica Yuhas:

I have a question for John. Regarding Truck Country what is the average turnaround on repairs for our truck? They come down, pick it up, bring it up, repair it. How long does that usually take?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Depending on the type of repair that we have. We just had a transmission replaced on a 1999 vehicle and Truck Country had that new transmission out and in, rebuilt everything, done within 48 hours for us. That's really important when we have as much snow as we've been having and you really need to count on that service. That's something we haven't had with Badger Truck. And until they get their act together with their maintenance operations I'm really going to have a hard time recommending any work going up there.

Monica Yuhas:

Thank you.

Clyde Allen:

John, again, what was the budget on this?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

The budget was a combination for the single axle chassis and for the plow truck equipment was \$140,000 as was noted in the memo. And the combination by paying the \$65,012 for the chassis and then the next item on the agenda, the snow plow equipment for \$74,054 brings us to \$139,066 so we're still about \$934 under budget.

Clyde Allen:

With going with Truck Country?

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

That's correct.

Clyde Allen:

My question is was this sent out as an RFP or an RFB?

Mike Pollocoff:

RFB.

Clyde Allen:

Can we accept the non low bid like you would in an RFP being that it isn't the lowest bid? Do we run into any problems that way legally?

Mike Pollocoff:

One of the requirements in the bid is they're able to provide comprehensive maintenance and repair work on the equipment that they're supplying. Our truck spec is fairly open where really the big ones are Freightliner, Sterling and International. I think we've come to the conclusion that some of the problems are with the Sterling design but they haven't been excluded in the bid. But the Village still has the opportunity to evaluate the product that's being proposed and to evaluate whether or not that product best meets our needs, and whether or not the vendor has the wherewithal to complete the maintenance on that equipment as we go forward.

We haven't with the equipment vendors required them to go through a prequalification to bid process. We've pretty much tried to keep it in those areas where we can because not all things we can keep open in specs and equipment so we haven't done that. Maybe it could be possible that if another vendor was the supplier for Sterling and they had more responsive maintenance and were able to repair equipment in a more timely manner or address maintenance issues and keep stock on hand, we might be able to deal with some of the other things and maybe it wouldn't be as big an issue.

But we have seen and basically with this last round of bids as John has indicated Freightliner, and I don't know if it's true for International as well, going to aluminum cabs, providing those things that are lengthening the lives of the trucks are significantly different than was Sterling is doing. When we remove a truck from the fleet it's had 20 years of service. If we're able to keep those trucks lasting 20 years that saves all this money. I think with the aluminum—it's not to say aluminum suffers from corrosion but it's just different and it's not as ravaging as it is with the steel. We go through repainting the boxes or do what we have to do with those as we do now, but hopefully not as much as we do with the aluminum.

We may take a look at our next set of specifications and write out Sterling if we feel that they're not going to be able to meet the needs of the Village. And we can do that, but I also believe that

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

given their past performance if they continue to provide the service they do they're not going to be able to meet the qualifications of the spec for maintenance and warranty work. And that would be my recommendation basing the exclusion of their bid.

Clyde Allen:

One more. Wouldn't we be wise in calling it an RFP in the future?

Mike Pollocoff:

We could definitely do that, but my experience is when bidding equipment, whether it's dump trucks, fire trucks, there are so many peculiarities of the manufacturers and there's things that work well and how we operate that might be different than other communities. John has a really specific list of things that he wants to see in those trucks that are going to work for us in the future.

In an RFP environment I think typically from these guys you don't get as clean a bid and you don't have them going by the list on what you need. So even if you do an RFP it almost functions like an RFB because even in the RFP we're going to be sending out everything we want and they're going to be giving it back. But if we just do a straight RFP usually you just get a proposal. You get a price sheet and you won't get the details that we're looking for. You can request that but at the end of the day I'd much rather have a vendor come back and say—I wouldn't have him coming back saying you're using an RFP to be able to exclude me from consideration. An RFP you can surely say I don't care what the price is, we're going to take what's good for us. With an RFB we're really trying to drive these guys to sharpen their pencils and get a price down because we know they're going to look at it. And, at the end of the day, they still have to come up with a quality product and the ability to maintain that product so if they can't so that I think we're able to include them. We've done it a couple of times and I can't say that I was really happy with the results.

Clyde Allen:

I just want to make sure that we're protecting ourselves for anything legally to come back and say they were low bidder.

Mike Serpe:

Buying a vehicle, whether it be a garbage truck or a car the service on that vehicle is just as important as the vehicle itself. I recall vividly the problem that John had with the garbage truck. There was an item that was under warranty that should have been taken care in a timely manner that wasn't. I don't care what anybody says that tie up cost this Village money and it caused us an enormous amount of inconvenience to the residents. John's crew, as usual, picked up the slack and did a great job, but they had to do a little extra to get there.

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

So it's unfortunate that things like this have to happen. Maybe things will improve with Badger in the future. I can only hope. But right now I would not have a problem at all with awarding this bid to Truck Country.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Clyde, I'd say about four or five years ago one of the issues . . .the municipalities the issue of low bidding was brought up. There is some part in the statute that allows you to take a bid larger than the lowest one. You don't have to take the lowest one but you have to justify that. The way that John is justifying here, the explanation about the maintenance and so on and so on, there is no way that anybody can make any noise . . . that we didn't go to low bid. In my opinion, from what I remember, it's perfectly legal.

Clyde Allen:

Thank you. I was not aware that's in the statutes.

Monica Yuhas:

Mr. President, I'd like to make a motion to award Truck Country the amount of \$65,012 to purchase one single axle chassis.

Mike Serpe:

Did we already have a motion on that?

Monica Yuhas:

I just made it.

Mike Serpe:

I'll second Monica's motion.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Monica, second Mike. Further discussion on this item?

Mike Pollocoff:

I might add the times that we've taken not the low bid is rare. It doesn't happen very often.

John Steinbrink:

If you look at the circumstances and the outline here and it doesn't leave much question.

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

YUHAS MOVED TO AWARD A CONTRACT TO TRUCK COUNTRY IN THE AMOUNT OF \$65,012 TO PURCHASE ONE SINGLE AXLE CHASSIS; SECONDED BY SERPE; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

John Steinbrink:

That brings us to the snowplow equipment.

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes, the snowplow equipment. Mr. Chairman, now this is one of the items where we do focus in on one particular type and that's Monroe, the people who have supplied the plows, cab controls, equipment on it. One of the reasons is everything works together. So any truck can pull up to a piece on their old plow and it will fit on any truck. It's not a Wausau or a Henke or anything like that. It's not as interchangeable. So everything to keep our fleet integrated so that we don't get a truck that's isolated because it can't hook up to the Monroe equipment we keep it all the same. As such I know John prices out what the other guys are selling their equipment for to know that we're honest. John, do you have anything you want to add?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I did just want to add that there are other manufacturers out there besides Monroe that make snowplow equipment. One is Henke and one is Wausau. Both of those pieces of equipment are traditionally a little bit heavier pieces of equipment that are used by counties on the Interstate, but it does come with a larger price tag. We have found that for the last about 18 years we've using Monroe trucks and we've been very happy with their product and the cost they've been providing the Village.

Mike Serpe:

Move to award the bid to Monroe Truck for \$71,664.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

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

SERPE MOVED TO AWARD A CONTRAC TO MONROE TRUCK FOR \$71,664 TO PURCHASE SNOWPLOW EQUIPMENT AS PRESENTED; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

K. Consider an Award of Contract for the Prairie Springs Park north ball field lighting equipment and electrical installation.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, we received on January 16, 2008 sealed bids for ball field lights at the north diamonds in Prairie Springs Park. It's broken into two contracts. Contract A is for the sports lighting equipment, installation of the sports lighting equipment and the analysis of the actual energy costs. Contract B is for the installation of electrical for lighting equipment for either any vendor that would be there.

The low bid submitted under Contract A was Musco in the amount of \$194,504. I'm sorry, for contract A goes to Page Electric for \$150,775 and Contract B is to Pieper Electric in the amount of \$43,729. In the budget this was a total project cost of \$232,150. WE Energies needs to bring power to the site in the amount of \$37,646. They're the only ones to do that. So the total project cost is \$232,150. In the budget we had bonds identified for \$208,000 and impact fees for this project of \$24,150 to fully fund the project.

Mike Serpe:

Move to award Contract A to Page Electric and Contract B to Pieper.

Clyde Allen:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Mike, second by Clyde. Further discussion on this item?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Question for Mike. How come the power here is not included? You've got a switch here . . . installation included in the lighting system . . . or we have to have two . . .

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I believe your question was how come we have a Contract A and a Contract B and we still contract out with WE Energies?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

The service . . . altogether, yes.

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Because WE Energies is only going to bring us the transformer of the 400 amp power with the three phase from Highway H all the way up to mid field between diamonds two and three and that's all that WE Energies can do.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

That's the closest?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Right. Or the same way that WE Energies brings power up into the pedestal in your house and then your electrical contractor takes it from the house and wires your house. It's really that same theory we use in the ball fields and that's because we have to. You really can't have just a contractor bring a major power supply as that three phase line all the way up into there. It has to be done by WE Energies, so that's why that item was not bid out.

Then we bid out Items A and B because that if we would have just one contract for it you would have to pay the sales tax on the lights which is probably about an additional \$6,500. And so by buying the lights direct and then by hiring a contractor to install the electrical we end up just saving money at the end of the day and then you still get the lowest price for the installation as a whole.

Mike Pollocoff:

Plus it's safer to hire Musco or Page. If you're going to hire those people to do it you're going to pay a contract administration or premium or overhead for them to do it.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

It's interesting to note the energy savings between the two systems and the amount of lights that go up with the two systems to achieve the same goals. Quite a savings there when you start looking at the number of fixtures.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Yes, there was a savings of almost \$900 per year that we identified in our energy analysis. And that's because Musco has a new green system that's out that is able to project the same amount of light with less fixtures up on the pole. So they can get by doing four light sales at the identified levels that we need for only 68 lights where U.S. Cell has to do it for 100 lights. That's really where the installation costs were kind of blow out of proportion on the first page. Where you

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

have more lights it takes a larger size wire, larger breakers to operate all those lights. So there's about \$21,000 more in copper wire, larger conduit, larger breakers and static contactors to operate that system. But the Village felt that it was very important to go through and identify the annual energy costs when evaluating the system and the bids.

Monica Yuhas:

I just have one quick question, John. The lights, time that they go on, time that they shut off in spring, summer, fall with the ball games?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

That's going to really be driven by the amount of practice times and what times that the games are. So it's not going to be set just on a timer where they go on at four and they go off at nine. There's going to be a key system with an on/off button where if a coach has a practice at night or if there's a game scheduled they'll be able to turn on the lights. But then if there's nothing scheduled the lights will be off on the four diamonds.

John Steinbrink:

Are we able to do any maintenance or servicing on these with our own Village truck?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

No, our boom truck unfortunately only goes up to 45 feet, and we are using 60 foot poles. If we had the boom on the ladder truck does reach high enough and we have used that in the past to service our 90 foot poles over on the south diamond. So if it's something like just one or two lights we can probably borrow the equipment from the fire department and go up and change a few lights versus contracting out the service for that.

Clyde Allen:

Not a question, just a comment. This really is in my opinion money well spent in that this is an investment in the youths' future that we have here. It will allow more of our youth to play ball and have more accessible time to our diamonds which is a good thing in my opinion.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I need to add two comments with what John just said. The fire department is going to cooperate with the public works to do that. That doesn't happen in many communities. And the second comment I'm going to make, the other night was Sunday night and I went by 85th Street and the lights by Tremper and Anderson Park were on and nobody was playing. So if they have a timer or whatever, nobody was around and the light was on. It doesn't happen in the Village because they are on only when there are activities going on which is great. No timers. Good idea.

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

John Steinbrink:

Any further comments or questions? Thank you.

SERPE MOVED TO AWARD A CONTRACT A TO PAGE ELECTRIC FOR \$150,775 AND CONTRACT B IS TO PIEPER ELECTRIC IN THE AMOUNT OF \$43,729; SECONDED BY ALLEN; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

L. Consent Agenda

- 1) Approve a Letter of Credit Reduction for the Arbor Ridge Development.**
- 2) Approve a Letter of Credit Reduction for the Kings Cove Development.**
- 3) Approve a Letter of Credit Reduction for the Hideaway Homes Development.**
- 4) Approve Bartender License Applications on File.**

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Move to approve.

Clyde Allen:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Steve, second by Clyde. Any comment or question on any of the items involved in the Consent Agenda?

KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS 1-4; SECONDED BY ALLEN; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

8. VILLAGE BOARD COMMENTS – None.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Monica Yuhas:

Motion to adjourn.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second for adjournment.

Village Board Meeting
January 21, 2008

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