# 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 June 19, 2008

A Special Meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Village Board was held on Thursday, June 19, 2008. Meeting called to order at 7:00 p.m. Present were Village Board members John Steinbrink, Monica Yuhas, Steve Kumorkiewicz, Clyde Allen and Mike Serpe. Also present were Mike Pollocoff, Village Administrator; Mike Spence, Village Engineer and Vesna Savic, Deputy Village Clerk.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER
- 2. ROLL CALL
- 3. CITIZEN COMMENTS

#### John Steinbrink:

If you're here for 55<sup>th</sup> and 80<sup>th</sup> or for 79<sup>th</sup>, you can speak under citizens' comments, but it would probably be better and we'd prefer if you waited until the item comes up under New Business. The Administrator is going to present several options and do some explanations which may answer a lot of the questions you have out there. So then at that time you can then speak afterwards or give us your opinion or your view of the issue. So at this time I will open it up for citizens' comments? Anybody wishing to speak under citizens' comments?

#### 4. NEW BUSINESS

#### A. Consider existing and proposed street connections on 79th Street and 55th Avenue.

#### Mike Pollocoff:

Thank you, Mr. President. At our meeting on Monday, citizens delivered a petition as well as a list of questions concerning the connection of 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue to 80<sup>th</sup> Street, along with a number of questions. In fact, I think there were 20 or over 20 questions. What I'd like to do is kind of quickly go through the questions that were presented and provide an answer. Some of the questions are asking for documentation and that documentation is available at the Village Clerk's office. Some of it's rather voluminous. Some of that information is voluminous and is going to require some copying. So if people want to look at it they're more than welcome to come and take a look at it and decide what they want copies of or not.

The first question is what policy or policies did the Village of Pleasant Prairie follow when choosing whom to notify of the proposed 80<sup>th</sup> Street and/or 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue modifications? My assumption is for that last round of hearings. Those notifications, there's an existing procedure within the Wisconsin State Statutes, 66.0703(7)(a) and that provides for the Village to send a written notice to anybody who is going to be specially assessed, is going to have to pay an

assessment on that project they get a letter. There's a notification that comes out in the newspaper 10 days beforehand to notify them of the hearing that's going to levy the assessments. The more expansive notice of creating that right of way connection between 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 80<sup>th</sup> Street occurred in 1988. That's when everybody within a broad range was notified of that hearing which established that right of way connection between the two parcels as part of that final plat.

The second item is what are the list of names and addresses used for this notification? Again, rather than place those on the screen those are available at the Clerk's office. But it's primarily everybody along 80<sup>th</sup> Street and some of the people that live on 79<sup>th</sup> Street that have adjoining or abutting properties where the front of their property is on 79<sup>th</sup> Street and the back of their property is on 80<sup>th</sup> Street.

Since the Village of Pleasant Prairie went to great lengths to communicate the worst case scenario to homeowners on  $82^{nd}$  if it were altered, why did the Village of Pleasant Prairie choose not to do the same for the residents affected by  $80^{th}$  Street and/or  $55^{th}$  Avenue changes such as property value decrease, loss of mature trees and vegetation and reduction of residential property. The Village did describe the expenses associated with the alignment of an arterial street along  $82^{nd}$  at a public information meeting that was held. And it described those improvements on  $82^{nd}$  along with two intersection improvements, one of which would be at  $80^{th}$  and Cooper Road, the second which would be at Cooper Road and  $82^{nd}$  Street.

Village plans and maps fully described—just for the matter of bidding the project we have to locate every tree and shrub and anything that's going to be removed from that right of way. That was shown on a plan set as well as an overhead aerial. Matter of fact, one of the better aerials was prepared by Dr. Crawford that shows the tree removal along that corridor and we used that map as well.

Loss of property value is less predictable. Property values are established by market. We evaluate properties every two years, and it's not a prospective look, it's a look back at one year based on market sales, what the properties sell for in the Village. Everybody should have received a notice in the mail describing what their new value is as of January 1<sup>st</sup> of this year based on the previous year's sales. In the coming year your values as they're done will be based on the previous year's sales. That will continue.

In reduction of residential property, and I'm assuming that means are we making property smaller, there have been properties that were made smaller but, again, primarily those reductions were made when the plat for Lawler's Subdivision was filed along with the CSM for Lawler's Subdivision. The right of way along 80<sup>th</sup> Street was dedicated when that subdivision was created. There was additional land on the south side of 80<sup>th</sup> Street that was dedicated by Dr. Crawford, and there are four properties along 80<sup>th</sup> that the Village is acquiring a strip of land to complete that project. The Village has also acquired land at the intersection of 80<sup>th</sup> Street and Cooper Road for this project.

#### Mike Pollocoff:

I think that–I don't mind doing that, but I think the questions were addressing some issues and if you want to bring those up you can bring them up to me after. But I think one of the things that the majority of the residents wanted to see is what the alternatives were that the Village prepared for  $80^{th}$  or  $79^{th}$  Street.

# (Inaudible)

#### John Steinbrink:

We'll let Mike finish his answers to the questions that were provided to us, and then after that we'll let you address other issues that you feel were not addressed.

#### Mike Pollocoff:

Number 4, when the Village of Pleasant Prairie prepared the  $82^{nd}$  Street proposal, where were the cost estimates for altering an existing  $82^{nd}$  versus created a new street, proposed  $80^{th}$ , for comparison by the Pleasant Prairie taxpayers? Again, at the neighborhood meeting the Village identified the estimated cost for the  $82^{nd}$  Street expenses, not counting land acquisition, at \$1.985 million.

Number 5, if it is the intention of the Village Board members to modify and extend 82<sup>nd</sup> Street to 31, why make any alterations to 80<sup>th</sup>? Why not use the funds to update 85<sup>th</sup> which is already extended to 31? It's not the intention of the Village to modify and extend 82<sup>nd</sup> Street to State Highway 31. That improvement is not within the Village of Pleasant Prairie. It's in the City of Kenosha. The Village Board hasn't adopted a resolution. We haven't adopted a plan. The Village has not been directed to negotiate for that to take place. That improvement would be significant, because if it were to happen it would, again, have to be an issue by the City of Kenosha. The State of Wisconsin Department of Transportation would have to agree, as would the Village of Pleasant Prairie. If you go on the end section of 82<sup>nd</sup>, assuming you're bringing across that lot that isn't there, Old Green Bay Road is in the Village of Pleasant Prairie, and then State Highway 31 is on the other side. So you would have to do some realignment of Highway 31 to get that intersection squared out and make it right.

The only plans that ever really were part of the Highway 31 improvement plan was to connect 82<sup>nd</sup> Street into Old Green Bay Road which would direct traffic on Old Green Bay Road south to 85<sup>th</sup> Street. It wasn't a plan that was feasible or accepted by any of the parties to create an intersection of 82<sup>nd</sup> Street with Highway 31 the way it exists today.

Number 6, why did the Village of Pleasant Prairie spend nearly one-half million dollars to begin the 80<sup>th</sup> Street modification it if was not approved at the time these dollars were spent and what was the money spent for? The Village spend approximately \$436,000 for design and land acquisition.

(Inaudible)

#### Mike Pollocoff:

I missed the second sentence of number 5. Why not use the funds to update 85<sup>th</sup> Street which is already extended to Highway 31? The Village has been making improvements to 85<sup>th</sup> Street. The notable ones are between 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Cooper Road, in between Highway 31 and almost 63<sup>rd</sup> Street at the edge of Tuckaway Trails. The Village has received a grant that we'll be using next year to complete those improvements between Cooper Road and where Tuckaway Trails starts along with signalization of 85<sup>th</sup> Street and Cooper Road and 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 85<sup>th</sup> Street.

Why did we spend a half million dollars to begin the modifications? The reason we started that is that those funds were approved in previous budgets, and those budgets were premised on the traffic, the transportation jurisdiction plans, as well as the Comprehensive Land Use Plans that have been in existence since the late '50s/early '60s. The 80<sup>th</sup> Street extension has been anticipated through all those years. The plans show that there's going to be a major arterial between 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Highway 32, and really this was the last loop that was needed. So in those years when the Village had funds available we budgeted for the land acquisition to take place and get it done in ways in bits and pieces, but it was at a level that we were able to afford.

Number 7, according to Mr. Clyde Allen the Village of Pleasant Prairie will still pursue the modification of 82<sup>nd</sup> Street to reach Highway 31. Why spend \$1.4 million taxpayers' dollars for a new 80<sup>th</sup> Street for a distance of six blocks? Again, the Village has not made a decision or a policy direction to extend 82<sup>nd</sup> to 31 because it's not our road to extend. 80<sup>th</sup> Street, again, that connection is the arterial loop, is the arterial connection between Sheridan Road and 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue. That piece needs to go straight through according to all the plans that have been adopted and good traffic planning principles rather than jogging on Cooper Road and down to 82<sup>nd</sup>.

Number 8, is it possible to ever take 80<sup>th</sup> Street beyond the proposed six block extension to Highway 31? If not, why not? I guess it is possible. Anything is possible if you spend enough money. But there's two things that run contrary to that. One, again, the same transportation system plan that Kenosha follows along with the Village and Kenosha County. And, secondly, that's a decision that the City would have to make. It would be contrary to the plans that they've adopted, and they would have to make that decision to go farther west with 80<sup>th</sup> if they chose to do that. I'm sure it would involve relocation of homes and some significant expenses. But, again, that's not a Village expense.

When does the Village expect to receive approval to begin the 80<sup>th</sup> Street project? What or whom is holding up construction now? The Village has awarded a contract to Reesman Contractors to begin construction. Right now there's surveying, some utility locates that are occurring out there, and probably within the next week we'll be beginning construction beginning with some initial grading and installation of underground utilities and storm sewers would be the first thing to take place. So the Village road we don't submit it to someone else for approval or get their permission to start on a Village project.

The neighborhood of 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 79<sup>th</sup> Street would like a written copy of the traffic study prepared for the intersection of Cooper Road and 80<sup>th</sup> to demonstrate the Village's compliance with DOT regulations for erecting a traffic light. Copies of the traffic study can be delivered to Shirley Warnock. Again, if you want to come by and pick a copy of that up with the other things that you may want to copy that's available. The Village is not required to demonstrate or obtain approval from DOT for municipal road construction.

When the Village evaluated the intersection of 80<sup>th</sup> it was based on traffic counts that we completed plus the projected counts, and primarily the biggest change in the projections that would exist is going to be the pedestrian traffic that would be moving east and west along there because there will be sidewalks on both sides of the road for pedestrians, kids who go to Lance that might live in that west area or coming out of the neighborhoods to go through there. So the traffic light serves two purposes. The one reason we want the traffic signal there is to move traffic through the intersection. To be able to as traffic comes in stack it so it doesn't stack up too long and move it through, and to provide a pedestrian signal so that people who are walking on the sidewalks and going east and west are able to cross and cross safely.

Number 11, have the Village Board members ever completed any research on the topic of traffic calming as promoted by top engineers for the DOT and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation Safety and Consumer Protection who strongly promote safer neighborhoods through traffic calming? Our engineers are familiar with that, and in the proposal we're going to present tonight we've taken some of those elements to consider in what our options are for tonight.

Exactly how much will each homeowner on 79<sup>th</sup> Street be charged as an assessment for the development of 80<sup>th</sup>? What is the total dollar amount to be collected from the homeowners adjoining 80<sup>th</sup>? Property owners on 79<sup>th</sup> Street have been assessed for improvements on 80<sup>th</sup> if their own property also goes to 80<sup>th</sup>. So if it fronts on both streets there's an assessment. And that assessment is going to be active if they've created two lots. So if they have one lot that stands alone and goes to 79<sup>th</sup> and they have another lot that stands alone and goes to 80<sup>th</sup>. Some of the property owners on 79<sup>th</sup> have a house on the lot and it's one big lot. Those people are not assessed at this time. That's a deferred assessment because you can't build two houses on the same lot. You have to create a separate lot for each house. If they do create a separate lot then that assessment would be activated.

And everyone is a little bit different because not all the lots are the same width. The determination of cost is based on the front foot cost for how much it costs to put the road in, the water main in, the sewer main in and the storm sewer. That's all lumped together. So if people live on 79<sup>th</sup>, they're an existing house, and their lot is contiguous between both streets there is no assessment that's active now until such time as they decide to develop their property and split it and someone can use it and develop it. Then they have to pay their fair share.

Parcels that, for example, on the corner of 55<sup>th</sup> and 80<sup>th</sup>, those parcels have access to 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue for street purposes. They have access to sewer and water on 55<sup>th</sup>. By assessing for any improvements on 80<sup>th</sup> they're not going to get any more value for those improvements than they already have. They've got access to their house, they've got sewer and water. Those assessments

are rolled back into the project cost and we do that on all projects. If you're already got all the improvements the Village does not come back and assess you again because it's on another side of your property.

So the total dollar amount that's being assessed is \$560,679.41 if at some point in time everybody develops their property or gets it ready for development. That could happen over a longer period of time. No one knows when some of the people are going to decide to split their land in half and decide to develop it. Until then it's going to be that assessment.

If the Village of Pleasant Prairie feels it is a safety hazard to have a cul-de-sac neighborhood with one access point, does the Village plan to modify its safety standards for all remaining cul-de-sac neighborhoods in the Village? Are there budget dollars to alter every street with single access entry? Are those dollars budgeted from taxpayers? The Village acknowledges that dead end streets are safety hazards, not cul-de-sacs. Cul-de-sacs are not a significant problem unless they're really long cul-de-sacs where you have a lot of people living on the street and there's only one way into the subdivision and one way out.

In a financial settlement of a death of an individual that was crushed by a snow plow, the Village committed to eliminate dead end roads in a diligent manner and whenever possible. The Village has not allowed any new subdivision streets to be constructed with dead ends or t-turnarounds. When the improvements are not paid for by the developer where they're connecting to another street, the Village does budget to open dead ends as possible. 55<sup>th</sup> is an example. I think this kind of ties into one of the comments and discussions that was made Monday night that your subdivision shouldn't be held responsible for somebody being killed in another subdivision. And that's not the intent. The dead end streets are difficult, and do you kill somebody every year, no, you don't. But six short years ago we did back over somebody who got right behind the spot on the snow plow, the driver couldn't see him, and the snow plow backed over him. The real problem is that it's not just snow plows, it's not just garbage trucks, it's Federal Express trucks, it's furniture deliver trucks, it's trucks or vehicles that are not ours that still are maneuvering or backing up when they go to turn around.

From our standpoint I can't think of anything worse, and I know because we've been through it, to have done that, have that happen to somebody and their family's lives are destroyed. The person who is driving the truck feels terrible, and from that time and we committed in our court settlement when the Village was sued that we were going to make those changes when we could. We admitted at that time we can't change every single one every single year, but when we have the opportunity to do it we're going to take advantage of that.

Number 14, what are the safety plans for accessing homeowner's property in the event of an emergency while stop lights at 80<sup>th</sup> and Cooper would block their driveways and access points? There's two ways that happens. The first way is a little more modern. These lights are equipped with monitors or sensors so when a fire engine or a rescue squad comes up to that intersection it's going to send a strobe out or a signal and that light will change to move traffic away from that squad to clear that intersection. So the light will change, the traffic will move and they can get where they're going to go. If that doesn't happen, these trucks and cars have lights sirens, horns and I'm sure you've seen this in other areas, they move into oncoming traffic lanes and get that

traffic moved through that. So that's how an emergency vehicle is going to get through there. We do it every day, and with a signal we have them going up on Highway 50 now. We have one up on H. When we need to get through the intersection there's a sensor that's monitoring those trucks coming and those lights change to let those trucks go through those intersections on a green light so that nobody is going on a green light against them or not having people that panic and just stop because there's a lot there.

How does the Village plan to manage snow removal if 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue dead end turn around is now used for snow dumping and plow turn around? How will snow be removed directly onto the new 80<sup>th</sup> Street? With the end of that turnaround at the end and direct access on 80<sup>th</sup> it's going to be great for the snow plow. Snow plow drivers want to make right turns and that's what they'll be doing. They'll just move that snow around the curve and keep on going down 80<sup>th</sup>. Then when they come back they'll get it the other way from the other side. It will work better.

Will drivers who use 79<sup>th</sup> and 55<sup>th</sup> as a short cut around the traffic light at Cooper Road and 80<sup>th</sup> be ticketed? How often will taxpayers pay the police to guard this new traffic outlet? If people speed or violate the traffic laws of the Village or the State of Wisconsin they're going to be cited. The taxpayers pay for services of the police department wherever they are in the Village. You pay once a year. You all know you get that fundraising letter in December and that's when you pay. And then we budget to provide service in subdivisions, service in highways where we need—there's always an area that needs additional attention or additional patrol during times to change driving habits because it does occur.

What property or properties have been seized for the development of 80<sup>th</sup>? Have these properties been purchased? If so, from whom and for what cost? What is the plan for vacant lots on 80<sup>th</sup>? Who owns them? If the Village of Pleasant Prairie owns any of the vacant lots facing 80<sup>th</sup> who receives the income from the sales of these properties? We haven't seized anybody's property. It's illegal to seize someone's property. The Village has acquired property as dedications as I described from the Lawler family when they developed their subdivision, when they developed 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue. When Dr. Crawford developed his property he dedicated land to the Village. There have been other parcels that we purchased through negotiations. There's a house that we purchased on 80<sup>th</sup> and 55<sup>th</sup> on the south side of the road. We worked a swap for those people where they gave us their house for nothing, we burned it down, and we built them another house rather than acquiring their property and finding another home for them. We built them another house and moved it over so there would be room for the road and they were okay with that.

The other property we bought it from someone who had it for sale, bought the house, carved off the land we needed for the right of way, re-sold the property, and someone bought it. It wasn't seized. There are four properties in total that we're acquiring through eminent domain. Eminent domain is a process of condemnation but it's a legal process that we have to follow when we're buying land from somebody that they haven't approached us that they want to sell us. Those are 40 foot strips that make up the southbound right of way of 80<sup>th</sup> Street, and there's some corners on 80<sup>th</sup> and Cooper Road that are about five feet in to make those corners a little more rounded for the intersections.

As 85<sup>th</sup> is used primarily by Cooper Road drivers as the access way to Highway 31, how will the Village of Pleasant Prairie plan to repair the road after spending \$1.4 million for the new six block stretch of 80<sup>th</sup>?

One more thing on number 17. The Village owns no land. We're not selling any land. We're not making any money on any land sales on 80<sup>th</sup>.

Since 85<sup>th</sup> Street repairs are already necessary, when this construction begins and how can 85<sup>th</sup> be altered to accommodate traffic using it for Highway 31 and who will pay for it? The Village of Pleasant Prairie has received a million dollar grant to reconstruct 85<sup>th</sup> Street, on 85<sup>th</sup> Street from Cooper Road to Tuckaway Trails as I mentioned earlier. We want to get that street constructed and we're going to do that next year. The detour routes are going to be Highway 50 and 93<sup>rd</sup> Street. That road is going to involve basically digging up the existing road bed, such as it is, installing storm sewers in there and curb and gutter and a profile just like you see on the other sections of 85<sup>th</sup> Street.

So at that point we'll have two major east/west arterials which is 80<sup>th</sup> and 85<sup>th</sup>. The other arterial going north and south is 60<sup>th</sup> which we've completed a few years back, and that will put that neighborhood in the position, that whole neighborhood, where there's two major east/west routes and one major north/south route and Cooper Road still is a major north/south route.

Why is the Village of Pleasant Prairie spending \$1.4 million dollars to create six blocks of 80<sup>th</sup> Street instead of developing and improving 85<sup>th</sup> Street? Because the traffic patterns in the area do not move efficiently without that section of road. Those people are trying to find their way on 82<sup>nd</sup>, 81<sup>st</sup>, 83<sup>rd</sup>. They would probably go down 79<sup>th</sup> if they thought they could get out. They probably went down 79<sup>th</sup> and found out they couldn't get out. So 80<sup>th</sup>, as I've said before, has been in every plan in this community, and every Board has adopted for almost 40 years to have that long linear connection between 60<sup>th</sup> and Highway 32.

When is the special meeting scheduled for the residents of 79<sup>th</sup>? This is it. This is the meeting. Maybe it's a misconception, and it's not a misconception but it's really more of a misunderstanding, as one of the reasons we planned this. This map here shows 80<sup>th</sup> Street and the Lawler development. Of course, 55<sup>th</sup> goes up north to 77<sup>th</sup>. Here is 79<sup>th</sup> up here. These are lots that are adjacent to 79<sup>th</sup>. At the time that subdivision was platted, both Kenosha County and at that time we were a Town and we were under County zoning, the Town indicated that when they approved that plat one of the things you have to look at when you approve a plat is if it's in compliance with the master plan that the community has adopted. And to be in compliance it showed 80<sup>th</sup> coming through and it needed to connect 55<sup>th</sup> to 80<sup>th</sup>. Without that connection, without that being in there, neither the Town of Pleasant Prairie nor the County of Kenosha would have approved the subdivision that created a subdivision. The developer agreed to that. The developer made another agreement with the Village of Pleasant Prairie or the Town of Pleasant Prairie at that time that this strip of land right here they would not be required to put money aside for it, but they would be required to tell the property owners here that they would have to pay for the improvements for 80<sup>th</sup> when it occurred. Nowadays as a Village we don't do that. We say put your money up or you don't get your CSM because we want to make sure that

the public isn't held to be in a position to what we're doing right now which is assessing property. But as a Town we didn't have that legal authority.

This lot here, this was, again, part of the Lawler development. Part of the agreement was if we approve this plat here Mr. Lawler as included in a lot given to him by the Lawler family and, again, that special assessment was waived until such time as the improvements were coming in which is right now. So from 1988 until now there was no special assessment on that parcel. The next page is too hard to read but it's the certified survey map language.

This is a difficult map and probably because of the lighting to see. But what I want people to visualize, because you all live there and you know what it looks like, one of the statements have been we want to have 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue dead end right here and we want to maintain that as a closed road. This is an aerial of 80<sup>th</sup> as you see it today. Then these black lines are the actual construction plans for the construction of 80<sup>th</sup> Avenue and how that's going to lay out. 80<sup>th</sup> Avenue is going to be two travel lanes going east and west and two parking lanes. Because as you can see the people who live on these lots here or are going to live on it they need a place to park their car or need a place for people who are coming to see them park their car because you can't put them all into a driveway. So just as you see it on 85<sup>th</sup> Street people can park on the side there when they're at somebody's house for a summer party or whatever there's room for them to park. So there won't be four lanes of traffic running this way. There's going to be two lanes of traffic, and we have to provide room for these people that live on these properties. And this property here these two are going to divide at some point and this could divide at some point.

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

This black line here this is the curb for 80<sup>th</sup>.

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

No, it's new pavement. It doesn't block your driveway. We put down new asphalt because we want to make the grades match up.

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

The new pavement is not even a couple hours. You'll be driving on gravel for a while. But what happens here is here is the existing t-turnaround, and this dark line that I'm going on right here and right here that's the road. That's the curb to the curb. This smaller black line that kind of ties up against in your case your lot line, that other dark line, that's the sidewalk that's running all the way to here. There's another one on this side. In this other area here we call the terrace area there's going to be street trees in that terrace area. So right now there's not as much of a

turnaround problem right here because right now we still back up, but this is going to be gone. The t-turnaround is in the eastbound lanes for 80<sup>th</sup>. So at the time the road is done there virtually is no room for a t-turnaround. There's not enough land dedicated by the plat to construct that size of turnaround, so that's why when we look from a transportation standpoint there isn't any room left. If you were to look at this map, and I don't think we included one, if you go up to the north end there's a right of way just like there is here that bulbs out to give room for a radius here.

Then when the people build their homes, here's Dr. Crawford's home, he has a setback that takes into account that right of way being spread out. The right of way here you're set back from the road right of way here takes into account for the road being straight, not being bowed out for a cul-de-sac. So when the project is complete, and even before it's complete this t-turnaround disappears because it's part of the new lane of traffic.

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

What vacant property? Over here? This is it. This is 80<sup>th</sup>.

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

That's the eastbound lane of 80<sup>th</sup>. Make 80<sup>th</sup> bow out?

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

I've been handed a plan here. We need to have that bow start significantly—you can't just have a hard turn there. You've got to bow it back and have it come out. Again, it's an arterial road, and from a design standard you want to have that traffic moving straight rather than weaving out. But that wasn't considered.

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

There's options. We came up with three options. We can probably think of a hundred options, but we came up with three options that we thought when we took a look and the comments we've heard from residents and their concerns about the amount of traffic, the cut through traffic, the speed of the traffic, the change in having other people drive through your neighborhood what are you going to do. This is Option A which is basically where we're at today which shows full intersection here, full intersection here. I took the lines off of this map because it's a little harder to read with those lines on but it's the full road right through here. Our traffic studies indicate

that we honestly don't feel that there's going to be a significant amount of traffic that's going to take this here. You guys disagree and we respect you for that. It's two different opinions.

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

The next option-

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

No, I'm not saying that. People drive on everybody's streets. People drive down my street that don't live there and they just do it. That happens.

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

No. There's other reasons to drive down our neighborhoods other than . . . .

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

One at a time. We'll give you a chance to respond to everything. The second option is the Village has voiced our concerns about backing up and the problem with it. This isn't an optimal solution because it still has a long dead end that brings it up to 79<sup>th</sup>. So you have your existing access on 79<sup>th</sup>, but what we do is when the Village vacates this road it becomes a private street and the road is blocked here. The property owners here take over possession of it. The Village disposes the liability of traffic backing up from there. It's not my preferred option but it does take away that access point, and it says for the people that live in this area you assume the responsibility for that area to maintain it and it ends up staying closed. The Village vehicles—pardon me?

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

Sure do. Just like people that live in a condominium pay taxes on a private road.

#### Mike Pollocoff:

Well, we're still going to drive a police car in there but we wouldn't plow it, we wouldn't asphalt it. We'd collect the garbage out here. Remember, the reason we want to get away from this is to not be backing up on a road. So the Village's liability is ended because we're not going to back down your road. I don't think this is desirable but it does accomplish you keeping your road exactly the way it is and the Village not assuming the liability for not opening this up.

The next option we're looking at is, again, focused in on what we heard and, again, from some of the traffic calming studies that we've read. It's a little bit unique, but what we would do is—one of the concerns was people taking a right turn on 79<sup>th</sup> to beat the light so they wouldn't have to go around the lights. There's also people coming this way taking a left on 55<sup>th</sup> because they want to beat the light here. What we would propose to do is put in a—reshape 79<sup>th</sup> Street here at Cooper Road and put in a right turn out only. So traffic coming this way could not turn down your street. There would be a sign there. It's kind of hard to read here but it says—

# Mike Spence:

That says do not enter and then no right turn. But it's actually upside down because that's what it would look like if you're coming from that direction.

#### Mike Pollocoff:

So you couldn't come in this way. The people on 79<sup>th</sup> and 55<sup>th</sup> would have the decision if I'm making a right turn I can go out this way on Cooper Road and go whatever way I want, or if I think I'm going south or I'm going east come out this way, or if I'm going west I could come down to 80<sup>th</sup> and take a right and go that way. If somebody does, and we'd sign this no outlet, and the other sign we're looking at doing is does not access Cooper Road. But the problem is if somebody's turning will they see that in time. But if they do it once they'll never do it again because they end right back up where they started where they came from.

# Mike Spence:

I'm sorry to interrupt, but also on Cooper we'd also have a no left turn sign. So if people for whatever reason wanted to go through  $79^{th}$  would not be allowed to turn left.

#### (Inaudible)

#### Mike Pollocoff:

You can't turn in there so really the only people who should be on 79<sup>th</sup> is the people in the neighborhood. Your change would be if you're used to coming down 79<sup>th</sup> and taking a left and going to Town and Country you'll come around this way. This fix really deadens the traffic because it would deaden traffic if we weren't doing 80<sup>th</sup> today because they couldn't get in there. Of course, they couldn't get out either unless they were going right. But with the connection of

 $80^{th}$  the people who do see an increase in traffic are these people right here, but it will be their neighbors. It will be the people that live on  $55^{th}$  or live at  $79^{th}$  that want to come out to  $80^{th}$ .

This intersection here an example of one would be, and I've seen some pretty good tickets given over by Nick and Willies on Highway 50. It's a right turn. You can't make that right turn there or you're going to get a ticket. From a public safety standpoint the Village has a second access. When we plow snow we have our right turns. We can make that work. Delivery vehicles can work. If this is jammed up for some reason, there's a fire and somebody rolls their car over here and we have to get up here, a fire truck or a rescue squad can still—they've got lights and sirens. They're going to drive backwards against that flow to get out of it. And if need be they would mount that island—that island will be curbed so you can't just cut across. It will be a curved island, it will be added to this property here, and it's hard to see on here but it really gets shaped. It focuses—the only way you're getting out is you're following that channel of traffic that's going to go to Cooper Road. And then it will bring you to this lane here and there's time and room to make that decision, do I want to make a left on Cooper Road or do I want to keep going south on Cooper Road. Yes?

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

It would be, but for the neighborhood it would be both ways because you could still drive either way in here. If you're going this direction and you wanted to take a left you'd have to stop. If you want to take a left you know you need to come out here.

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

Right. So this one here there's other things you can put, speed bumps, speed pads, gates, things like that. What those require, one is maintenance and if they don't work when you need them to work it's a problem. This here is just concrete and grass and it controls that traffic ultimately. There's no way that a car is going to be able to get in there. A truck could probably get over it but it's not going to be easy. We could get over it with an engine because it's high centered. It's high centered and it's going to go over it pretty easy. Yes?

/T 1		1 1	
(Inaud	1	h	$\sim 1$
CHIAUG	ш	11	C 1

Mike Pollocoff:

No.

Mike Spence:

That's what I said is there's no left turn.

Mike Pollocoff:

No left turn.

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

In your neighborhood if you want to go-are you going to Pick 'N Save or are you going to Woodman's or are you going to SuperValu? If you're going to Woodman's you're going to go out and take a right on 80<sup>th</sup>. If you're going to SuperValu you're going to take a right on Cooper if you want. Yes?

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

Yeah, but that wouldn't mitigate what we heard was the original fear. But if they come in this way—think about doing this when we're coming in we can drive back that way. The other thing that kind of makes us think this will work, when we took a look at the traffic study numbers for the interchange this is 80<sup>th</sup> and here's Cooper Road, these are actual counts, projections, we've got 40 cars making a right hand turn on 80<sup>th</sup> coming south of Cooper Road a day.

Mike Spence:

That just means it's 20 more than existing because—

Mike Pollocoff:

So you have 20 people making that right hand movement now versus the 200 going this way. The number of people that would be coming west on 80<sup>th</sup> making the left on Cooper is 15. And that's why 80<sup>th</sup> is an arterial because it's moving more traffic. If you look at these numbers here, the volume numbers, the big volume is going east and west. The small volumes are making the turns. So by blocking this up here anybody that does have that idea, and I used to live in Midwest Highlands, which is 76<sup>th</sup> and 58<sup>th</sup>, and when you talk about people cutting through the park I saw that. I used to watch it out my picture window. That just won't happen. They won't be able to do that. And, again, I think if somebody–if we sign it and we would sign it heavy so that it's a no outlet/no access to Cooper Road, making a left turn on 55<sup>th</sup> it's going to slow it down and they'll do it once because they'll come right back where they started and they won't do it again. Yes, sir?

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

You can only go west, right.

# (Inaudible)

#### Mike Pollocoff:

No, because what happens is if you put that triangle that you're talking about, the people that come out this way if they want to go—

# (Inaudible)

#### Mike Pollocoff:

One of those triangle islands. You have to have this. If you don't have this people will still make that traffic movement.

#### (Inaudible)

#### Mike Pollocoff:

Yeah, three way. So if somebody is coming this way they're going to have to stop here and then they'll come this way and then they'll have to circle back. And the only people that are going to be aggravated by these signs are going to be you guys. That traffic number is not that high.

### (Inaudible)

#### Mike Pollocoff:

Why don't you go back. Wait a minute, we've got it right here. These signs here. We have a right turn only as you're coming down 79<sup>th</sup>, and then we have no left turn from Cooper Road onto 79<sup>th</sup>. If you're coming south, tell me what that says again?

# Mike Spence:

That says do not enter, no right turn.

#### Mike Pollocoff:

This sign here says no outlet. We could put a sign that says no access to Cooper but that's a lot of verbiage on a sign to read when you're making a turn.

#### Mike Pollocoff:

Stop signs if you want-yeah, that's an option with me. I think this plan here throttles the traffic back significantly to just residents. I think if people try it they're going to-the only way they're going to try it is to come out this way.

#### Mike Spence:

One of the things I'd like to mention is I had an extensive conversation with our traffic engineer today about the traffic projections, because I was indicating to him the neighborhood's concerns. And based on the analysis that they did, and Mike echoed that before, the extension of 80<sup>th</sup> Street is really going to facilitate the east/west movement. The traffic going southbound on Cooper Road most of it is not--the patterns that they saw and that they analyzed they are not going to go west. So the number of cars that are going to be wanting to turn on 80<sup>th</sup> Street as you can see we're only 20 a day, or willing to turn on 79<sup>th</sup> Street to beat light that's not the case. I'm just saying this is a professional. I know you had indicated professionals as well.

Secondly he also further reiterated the plans for the intersection include two southbound lanes on Cooper, so the issue of trying to beat the light or whatever, first of all there will be a you can do a right turn on red. It's not like there's one lane that if somebody is going straight that you would have to wait for them to go through. So I just wanted to emphasize those are some other factors in the consideration of how this evolved. Again, the traffic engineer couldn't stress enough that the traffic patterns are such that the people traveling southbound on Cooper generally are not wanting to go west. They want to go east.

(Inaudible)

#### Mike Spence:

We are currently finalizing the design of the operation of those lights. If that is something that we needed to do we could signal that for a left turn arrow.

#### Mike Pollocoff:

The lights are really meant or they're set up to move traffic. It's not going to pull up and have a mandatory two minute waiting time. It's going to count cars and it's going to move cars. That's the whole idea.

(Inaudible)

#### Mike Pollocoff:

No, there's two lanes coming out at the intersection.

# Mike Spence:

No, that's what I just mentioned. The people driving south and trying to avoid a red light I'm saying that that's mitigated to some extent because there are two lanes southbound on Cooper Road. There will be two lanes at the intersection. So the people wanting to turn left generally would probably go in the left lane. People wanting to go straight or turn right would generally be in the right lane.

# (Inaudible)

#### Mike Spence:

Saying that the predictions that they've made are the traffic is more likely to go—traveling south on Cooper the traffic is more likely to turn left and go east because that's where a lot of development and commercial activity is or go south to 85<sup>th</sup>. And, as Mike said, this is all part of a plan. 85<sup>th</sup> Street will be completed next year, and as a through route to go west there will be somebody going south on Cooper and in that particular case would be more than likely to continue south to 85<sup>th</sup> as opposed to turning right on80th or turning right on 79<sup>th</sup> to avoid 80<sup>th</sup>.

#### (Inaudible)

# Mike Spence:

Well, it's part of an overall plan. The money is also going—we have a grant. The money is going to upgrade 85<sup>th</sup>, but 80<sup>th</sup> is part of the overall transportation plan as well. Granted, you can't go all the way to State Highway 31, but for the residents and the activity west of Cooper it provides an outlet to go to the east all the way to Sheridan Road.

#### Mike Pollocoff:

The traffic count shows 200 cars I believe a day going east and west who are using that commercial corridor along 80<sup>th</sup> or going up to the commercial corridor at 60<sup>th</sup> and 85<sup>th</sup>. Then you have another group of people who are either going south into LakeView Corporate Park that will use the 85<sup>th</sup> Street route or going down to 93<sup>rd</sup> which is a subsequent improvement after 85<sup>th</sup>. Yes?

#### (Inaudible)

#### Mike Pollocoff:

The speed limit. We don't want to-no, it's going to be no different than 80<sup>th</sup> between 39<sup>th</sup> and Cooper Road or Cooper Road between Highway 50-

#### Mike Pollocoff:

I don't think so but that's in the City. I can't require them to put a light up. That's a decision they have to make. The City limits start right here. Pardon me? If we would have made our plans together all of this wouldn't have been built out before—they would have had these improvements in before they did these subdivision.

(Inaudible)

#### Mike Pollocoff:

Remember they get there anyway. What they do now is they go down  $82^{nd}$  and they go up  $60^{th}$ . 200 cars a day is a lot, but when you break it down on an hour by hour basis you know in the mid-morning it's not that bad or middle of the afternoon. It's the mornings. This whole corridor to Lance Junior High is a school time corridor. It peaks in the morning and it peaks in the afternoon and it peaks again—

(Inaudible)

# Mike Pollocoff:

There are stop signs that the City has on-wait a minute. There's one on 57<sup>th</sup> I believe.

**-:** 

No there isn't.

#### Mike Pollocoff:

I think when we're done they'll put one in because right now it's a dead end.

(Inaudible)

#### Mike Pollocoff:

What we do is we provide this to the City of Kenosha, and the City of Kenosha is very interested in this plan but right now that's a dead end street for them. I have no doubt to be honest with you they'll put a stop sign up there when 80<sup>th</sup> goes through because right now there's no 80<sup>th</sup> there.

(Inaudible)

#### Mike Pollocoff:

No, on 57<sup>th</sup> Avenue. That's right. That's why the Village is putting in wide sidewalks and away from, if you think back to that first map we had, away from the curb to move the pedestrians.

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

We're getting them to 60<sup>th</sup>. The Village cannot make the City make 60<sup>th</sup> a wider road than it is.

-:

I'm not talking about it being a wider road . . . stop signs . . . so you're not going to . . . .

Mike Pollocoff:

It's what you have at 82<sup>nd</sup> and 60<sup>th</sup>.

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

No, because there's not any good information on it but it's going to be significant we believe.

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

That's why this intersection here, if you want to flip back to the plan sheet with the lines on it, at this intersection here, like I said, these are wider sidewalks than you see normally, but the other goal in this thing is it's a little bit hard to see to scale, but the sidewalks are pushed as far away from the curb as we can get them and still be in the public right of way. But when you get down here in this intersection all the walkways here have pedestrian signals, they're timed so when you've got that middle aged kid crowd that are coming in there, and there's going to be a lot of them in the morning and in the afternoon, it's going to show them the light is changing in 15 seconds and 10 seconds. There's a count on it. There are pedestrian lights to make sure that they can get across. They have some time to know how to get across here. Right now it's been random how the kids have been getting over here. This thing is meant to get them on the sidewalks, get them off the road and get them through this intersection safely. This intersection is built and the light or signal is set to best state as we can. Your question about 60th I don't dispute that but I have no control over that. But I can only plan within the Village. I can't make the City plan. My hunch is when that traffic comes down in the City—

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

Right, but they're waiting for the Village to build the road.

#### Mike Pollocoff:

No, we're building the road with a plan to get it to  $60^{th}$ , to implement the plan the way it is. It goes right or it goes left.

-:

That's at Cooper. It's not going to 39<sup>th</sup>. It's not going to Highway 50.

#### John Steinbrink:

Mike, right now it's going down  $82^{nd}$  and  $82^{nd}$  is a four way stop there. And it's going either left or right and that's the same thing it's going to do here and you won't even have the traffic coming towards it like you do at  $82^{nd}$  so it's actually going to be an easier intersection.

#### (Inaudible)

#### John Steinbrink:

Clyde wants to explain something.

# Clyde Allen:

What 80<sup>th</sup> Street is going to do for you is by putting that through will alleviate all the traffic coming down Cooper headed south that wants to go west. Currently the only way they can do it, and I live on 57<sup>th</sup> Avenue so I see the traffic every day, it goes to 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, goes west and either comes down 57<sup>th</sup> and goes to 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue or it goes straight down 82<sup>nd</sup> Street, goes to 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue and turns right. All you're doing is giving them a shortcut and it's going to alleviate the congested traffic that's going in the bigger circle. The traffic headed west on 80<sup>th</sup> Street east of Cooper Road currently turns left to go to 82<sup>nd</sup> Street then turns right on 57<sup>th</sup> Avenue then turns left onto 80<sup>th</sup> Street again to get over by Ocean Spray again. You've got all the subdivision in the City that all those people have to use that route every day. Courtyard Junction Condominiums now have to use that route every day if they come from the east or south. This will alleviate all the traffic tied up on Cooper Road and the 80<sup>th</sup> Street headed west and on 82<sup>nd</sup> Street by giving them an alternative to go straight through to 80<sup>th</sup> Street to get to their destination.

#### John Steinbrink:

Mike, did you have anything further?

#### Mike Pollocoff:

No.

#### John Steinbrink:

So you've shown the—we're going to do this one at a time. We're going to ask you to come to the microphone.

#### Keith Hickman:

. . . you're saying that there's a lot of traffic . . . so could you recite the streets. My name is Keith.

#### John Steinbrink:

Keith, give us your name and address for the record please.

# Keith Hickman:

Keith Hickman, 7823 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue. So you're saying that it sounds like this is going to alleviate some of the traffic on what are some of the streets you mentioned, 82<sup>nd</sup>, 60<sup>th</sup>, 57<sup>th</sup> and was there another one?

#### Clyde Allen:

80<sup>th</sup> Street headed west from 57<sup>th</sup> towards 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue, yes.

# Keith Hickman:

So 57<sup>th</sup> Street?

# Clyde Allen:

57<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

#### Keith Hickman:

And, I'm sorry, what was your address?

# Clyde Allen:

8059 57<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

#### Keith Hickman:

So it's going to eliminate a lot of traffic on your street it sounds like.

# Clyde Allen:

The big point is 82<sup>nd</sup> Street.

#### John Steinbrink:

Alright, I think you're missing the point that the traffic flows through all the neighborhoods right now down all the streets. And if you lived on 82<sup>nd</sup> Street and you saw the condition of that street, and those folks have had this go through their neighborhood for quite a while, a street that wasn't designed for it, as the area grew around it, it's one of the main reasons this is being done. Yes, sir?

# Jim Toomey:

My name is Jim Toomey. I live at 7726 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue on the north end of 55<sup>th</sup>. I've noticed the old Zirk property is still pretty much intact, but since I know a realtor has purchased it and sooner or later wants to develop it can you guarantee us there's no access to that off of 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue?

#### Mike Pollocoff:

I can tell you when it was platted. At the end where the cul-de-sac is there's little easements that are granted for the cul-de-sac, but it does tie right up against the property line and it could go straight. The problem with the development of the Zirk estate is really one of sewer capacity. We would need to—there's no really basically just a few houses left that can go on that sewer line on Cooper Road because that's where everything drains to. The last really significant piece of sewer capacity that was used was used by your subdivision, Thornbury and the rest of Lawler's, and what we had planned for Cooper. In order for the Zirk estate, the Dejno property, those other properties that have big, long, deep yards along Cooper Road to develop, you would have to relay a sanitary sewer from Forest Park Elementary back up 45<sup>th</sup>, down the railroad tracks, across Highway 50, and then up Cooper Road in order to make that work.

# Jim Toomey:

But what we want is if it does get developed we want a guarantee from you they don't have access off of our road. That would add—who knows what's going to happen. They could have condominiums up there and multifamily homes and a major access would probably be off of our highway.

#### Mike Serpe:

I had that conversation with the Community Development Director, and she indicated the access to the Zirk property would take place from Cooper Road.

# Jim Toomey:

Thank you very much.

# Shirley Warnock:

Hi, I'm Shirley Warnock, 7717 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue. I just want to take a quick minute to make some clarifications. I'm not going to go through the list of questions. There's some misconceptions on your end as well as ours. But I did spend some time at the Land Management Office, and the dates that we have on the plat for the north end of 55<sup>th</sup> beginning at 79<sup>th</sup> was written in 1978. The dedication of the south end of 55<sup>th</sup> was in 1987. So two issues. One was done obviously a long time before the first. We did this research before we bought our property with no indication of what might come on 55<sup>th</sup>, only rumors of 80<sup>th</sup>. So you have 11 years difference here. So I don't want you to keep saying we homeowners should have known better because you told us. We didn't even exist then when this was arranged. Most of those lots weren't sold. They weren't built. They were on three separate surveys. There was Lawler Subdivision One, Two and Three, and your end of 55<sup>th</sup> connecting to 80<sup>th</sup> was it's own survey separate from anything that any of us would have gathered and the dates are 11 years different.

#### Mike Pollocoff:

I agree with that.

#### Shirley Warnock:

So just for the record I want you to understand that. It may not have changed anything we're here to do today if we did know 11 years ago but we didn't. I think the other thing is that we're here and the list of questions we're challenging your decision on  $80^{th}$  for the sake of being a taxpayer, not seeing good planning in our minds for that project, not seeing good communication for that project because we live there and see the activity and you've confirmed it tonight that those travelers are going east or they're going to  $85^{th}$  go seek out 31. We're questioning how that was conducted, how the planning was done and we're saying basically we don't believe in it.

But we're here tonight I hope to talk about the end of 55<sup>th</sup> and that's the bottom line. We just want you to know that the 80<sup>th</sup> Street is not lost on us. We saw that. We saw the way it was planned which was not smart. We saw the way it was communicated which was not smart and we're just acknowledging that and that was the questions. But we're really here to talk about 85<sup>th</sup>, so if we could maybe kind of roll back to that.

#### John Steinbrink:

Further questions? We don't disagree with your dates. The dates referred to are the properties which would only be affected and those are on the 1987 plat. There's no way they would put on the other plats that 80<sup>th</sup> Street was going through because it wasn't connected to the properties.

#### Shirley Warnock:

 $\dots$  I just want to make sure you understand that  $\dots$  you're telling us we should know better  $\dots$  but it didn't exist then.

# Village Board Meeting June 19, 2008 John Steinbrink: We do. No, no, it's for the properties that abut the project because that is on all the deeds already on those properties. Shirley Warnock: (Inaudible) John Steinbrink: It's on the owner's plat. Every property abutting has that on the plat. Shirley Warnock: (Inaudible) Mike Serpe: It's on the plat. We showed the official copy for those properties that abut 80<sup>th</sup>. Shirley Warnock: (Inaudible) Mike Pollocoff: I agree. That's why that's the only plat we showed is the one that's on the wall now. John Steinbrink: Any further comments or questions? -:

John Steinbrink:

Is this citizen's comments?

This is actually the project. We already had the citizens' comments.

John Braig:

John Braig, 4707 84<sup>th</sup> Street. There seems to be an impression that streets or the roads are just for the people that live on there. And the truth of the matter is they're for all of the citizens in the

community. That's why we have some professionals that do the planning not only for the local streets but for arterial street, collector streets and all that. Tonight I support these people and what they want. I bought my house and I was on a dead end street. I'm not anymore. I've got development all around me and roads. What the people are asking for tonight is a private, gated community with streets only for themselves. Those streets are for everyone to use. 79<sup>th</sup> Street, 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue aren't exclusive streets just for those people. What you guys or what's in front of you now is a responsibility to either act as professionals or as politicians, and I'm inferring the nefarious connotation that goes with politicians.

Another point, in the days when I was working I was responsible for a utility service center. I had 125 vehicles under my jurisdiction and, of course, the crews and things to go with it. When there was an accident or an incident with a vehicle we had a safety committee that would investigate and check the whole thing, and this was at least half if not more of the members of that committee were union members. And in every instance where the accident or the incident involved a vehicle backing up their strongest recommendation was that we had to do things to avoid backing up. So I support totally the Village in its efforts to avoid situations where they have to back up. Thank you.

#### John Steinbrink:

Yes, sir, the gentleman in the back.

#### John Lawler:

Hi, I signed in earlier, John Lawler, 5409 79<sup>th</sup> Street. Leaving the meeting Monday night I had an idea that I shared with some of my neighbors. I've seen the on ramps to I-94 and they had these gates that are like a garage door opening that can open the gate and close the gate for emergency vehicles for traffic. If we had the completed intersection at 55<sup>th</sup> and 80<sup>th</sup> and had a gate there so a snow plow would want to drive around that gate he could hit the button and the gate would go up and he could make the maneuver. So could an emergency vehicle of any kind. But the gate being down would prohibit traffic from into our what we like to call a cul-de-sac neighborhood. We could continue using 79<sup>th</sup> as it is, as we've been using it for 20 years to enter and exist. But 55<sup>th</sup> would be an emergency vehicle exit entrance only by use of that gate. If that would work for you I think a lot of us would be very pleased with it. Thank you.

#### John Steinbrink:

Just one question, John. We heard from a lot of folks that you still have a lot of transient traffic coming in off of 79<sup>th</sup> which seems to be the problem. That really wouldn't solve your problem of incoming traffic, though. That's why we looked at the little island there to prevent that.

#### John Lawler:

If the gate was at 55<sup>th</sup> anybody coming in would be the same issue that we've got now living with this already, would come into our community and it says no outlet, if they can't read the sign they would back up. If they can read it and continue on they would find they can't get out and they'd

go back out. Once it's connected it would be used by more cars. With the gate being down except for emergency vehicles we accomplish our no through traffic out of 55<sup>th</sup>. We'll all use, the 65 of us that signed the petition, will continue using the intersection of 79<sup>th</sup> and Cooper Road and only emergency vehicles will have the access, garbage trucks, fire trucks, police cars can come in and save 35 seconds and enter at 55<sup>th</sup> and 80<sup>th</sup>. But ordinary everyday traffic won't be able to use it because the gate will be down, the garage door opening in effect would allow the emergency vehicle to utilize that in the intersection and only those vehicles.

#### John Steinbrink:

You'll still have the same problems you're incurring right now.

#### John Lawler:

Which we don't mind having at all.

# Clyde Allen:

One additional comment on that. Being that the gate would shorten you would not have a turnaround. The two houses at the end of 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue their driveways would become a turnaround.

#### Mike Serpe:

If it wasn't for the fact that your neighborhood got together and approached this Board with the concerns that we have tonight this project would have gone ahead. 55<sup>th</sup> would have opened up as originally planned as stated. You've indicated that you didn't want to see the cut through traffic. Mike Pollocoff came up with the idea of the no right turn onto 79<sup>th</sup> and a right turn out onto Cooper Road. I think that plan will significantly lower the amount of traffic that's in your neighborhood presently. Now, that's got to be a plus for everybody that's there. Anybody north of 79<sup>th</sup> Street on 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue I think it's business as usual. You're just not going to have that much traffic come down there. I think what you're eliminating is the cut through from Cooper Road onto 79<sup>th</sup> and that's a plus for everybody here.

So I guess the compromise that we're looking for, because if you heard Mike's statements saying that when that accident happened with the snow plow six years ago we had to enter into an agreement where we would take care and rectify all the streets that would normally have our vehicles back up to get out and this is one of those streets. I think because of your involvement, and you obviously showed a lot of interest in number 3 because there's a lot of questions and a lot of concerns, I think number 3 which is the island at 79<sup>th</sup> and Cooper works tremendously for this neighborhood, and it gives the Village the ability to do what we have to do and provide services efficiently without creating dangers to the citizens or the kids that are on the streets by our vehicles, UPS, post office, and everybody else that uses 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue to prevent them from backing up. I think it's a great plan. I think we can live with it. I think it will work fine. And if there's problems with it we'll revisit it and we'll make corrections in another way if we have to. But I think it's a good start.

John Steinbrink:

Yes, sir?

Jim Rhode:

I just wanted to ask some questions and I had some questions, too.

John Steinbrink:

Sure, just give us your name and address for the record.

Jim Rhode:

Jim Rhode, 7826 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue. So I'm north of 79<sup>th</sup> on 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue. If you put the island there, your trucks go down headed east and then turn south and do snow plowing how are they going plow the north side of 79<sup>th</sup> Street because they won't be able to enter 79<sup>th</sup> and plow the north side, right?

Mike Pollocoff:

They've got their lights on, and we do this in other places where we have a spot they can't get to, they'll come across back into the channel. They'll go against the traffic.

Jim Rhode:

So they will be able to violate the no turn into 79<sup>th</sup> in order to plow the street?

Mike Pollocoff:

It's a big truck with the flashing lights on it. They're going forward into it.

Jim Rhode:

I guess now we never wanted it to go through to 80<sup>th</sup> Street because we have a safe neighborhood. We've never had any kind of problems really with crime to speak of. We know who's going in and out of there. We're not a problem for the police department and things like that. We're walking up and down the streets with our kids and our dogs and things like that. When we open up 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue I agree with everybody else that that could be a path through there. Maybe an answer would be if you do put it through we don't put the island but we put the stop signs at the corner. That would give people an additional stop that would use it as a cut through. If they use it to cut through they're doing it to save time.

Mike Serpe:

Where are you talking? At what intersection?

#### Jim Rhode:

At 79<sup>th</sup> and 55<sup>th</sup>. You had mentioned at one point you were thinking of putting stop signs there. That might be a relatively simple solution. I like Mr. Lawler's solution of putting a gate there on 55<sup>th</sup> there myself. I know we probably don't have it anywhere else in the community—

(Inaudible)

John Steinbrink:

That's a private road.

**-:** 

But there's a gate there.

John Steinbrink:

It's still their private road. The park takes care of those roads themselves, the condominiums.

(Inaudible)

John Steinbrink:

If you listened to Mr. Allen he explained what happens there. You have to be on her property there basically where the sidewalk is at that end. So now anybody coming into that subdivision would have to turn around in her driveway and go back out because that gate is going to be right up against—you don't have that luxury of that island in there in 80<sup>th</sup> Street anymore. That's going to become right of way and sidewalk and road. So that gate is now all the way up to her property and they're going to be using her driveway to turn around after they come in. Even with the blue paint they're still going to turn around in your driveway.

#### Mike Pollocoff:

One of the problems with gates it's pretty typical in some southern areas or some areas of Wisconsin where it's monitored. But in the climate we have here and when it's cold, we have a gate over at the Roger Prange Center that doesn't work that much. You get snow stuck in the wheel if it's a gate that goes sideways. It's not a good—they're not reliable and they end up being extensive and having more maintenance than not having it. If we were in a warmer climate it might be a viable option. You still have the turning movements that you don't have there. That's still the problem.

#### Mike Pollocoff:

Well, if you've got a rescue squad going out then you're going to stop, have the paramedics run out, lever up the gate and run in there that's not what we're looking for. That's not what you're looking for either.

(Inaudible)

#### Mike Serpe:

Could I give one more example and I think I can relate to everybody in this room. We're headed eastbound on 80<sup>th</sup> Street and we're going to approach 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue and we want to make a left turn onto 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The light turns read at 80<sup>th</sup> for eastbound traffic. I use that road a lot and I think all of us here do. Has anybody turned down 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue northbound to avoid that light at 80<sup>th</sup> and 39<sup>th</sup>? And I'm willing to be no. And as much as you're concerned, and I appreciate your concern for the amount of vehicles that you think might come into your neighborhood, and I understand your concern and this is a big change for your neighborhood and I understand that and all of us understand that as well. But I think you might be putting a little bit more in here than what's actually going to take place.

I said it a minute ago if there's something that we have to evaluate after this project is completed that something is not exactly right, I assure you we will work with you and correct that problem as well. Don't look at 100 cars coming through your neighborhood every day to avoid that light. That's not going to be happening.

(Inaudible)

#### Mike Serpe:

I understand. Now, look at this one more time. Let's say there's 50 people that use your area every day that want to avoid that light at 80<sup>th</sup> and Cooper and they cut through your neighborhood onto 55<sup>th</sup> down to 79<sup>th</sup>, right turn only. Think they're going to come back the next time? I don't think so.

(Inaudible)

Mike Serpe:

I know. I've seen it as well. I know.

(Inaudible)

#### Mike Serpe:

Okay, I'm referring to impatient drivers that want to avoid lights. The ones that cut through the gas stations, you know what I'm talking about, that's what I'm saying.

(Inaudible)

#### Mike Serpe:

And I think we might have a misunderstanding here or at least a difference of opinion as to are there going to be less cars in your neighborhood with this Cooper and 79<sup>th</sup> island or are there going to be more. Our estimation, and Mike Spence correct me if I'm wrong, our estimation is you're going to have less traffic after this is completed than what you have now. So put more kids in the street, they'll probably be safe. The island is going in.

(Inaudible)

Mike Serpe:

Say that one more time.

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

There will be a stop sign on 55<sup>th</sup> to go out. There won't be a stop sign on 80<sup>th</sup>, and I think the nearest example, the best example, would be on 85<sup>th</sup> Street. If you look at 43<sup>rd</sup>, 47<sup>th</sup>, 45<sup>th</sup>, 42<sup>nd</sup>, all those streets that bring subdivision traffic to 85<sup>th</sup> Street are all able to get out. Because, again, you're going to have two lanes of traffic, and you're going to have that parking lane which functions like a shadow lane so you can come out and be protected and not be right out in the traffic. So you would be able to make that left turn. We haven't had any issues on 85<sup>th</sup> Street where we have those subdivisions coming in at that same level. So your left hand turn would be easier. In fact, if you're just looking at the traffic counts with that island on 79<sup>th</sup>, 79<sup>th</sup> alone the traffic counts significantly drop off. People who live on 79<sup>th</sup> Avenue almost come back to the traffic counts that they were concerned about when 55<sup>th</sup> was built. We sat in this room for 55<sup>th</sup> when that subdivision was planned and the biggest complaint from the residents that lived on 79<sup>th</sup> was you're going to be running all those people from 55<sup>th</sup> down our street on 79<sup>th</sup>.

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

With this plan this almost brings you back to where you were before 55<sup>th</sup> was built if you live on 79<sup>th</sup>. It splits the traffic up in the subdivision two different ways. There's two options to get out.

John Steinbrink:

Anyone else with a comment or question? We need you to come forward to the microphone.

#### John Lawler:

Since we can't turn north on Cooper Road and go north, the only way to get out of our intersection is 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue. How about a three-way stop sign there so we can get out and not have to fight all that traffic. If we're trying to turn to go east we have to go across two lanes. That's going to be an accident waiting to happen maybe if we're seeing increased traffic on 80<sup>th</sup> especially busy times of the day. You might as well just turn west and go to 60<sup>th</sup> because you can't go east.

#### Mike Pollocoff:

I think that if we were to put a three-way stop at 80<sup>th</sup> and 55<sup>th</sup> it's going to encourage traffic to take a left at 55<sup>th</sup> and it might not do so otherwise. Remember, the traffic counts are showing that higher volume going east and west. And if you give somebody an opportunity to stop at 55<sup>th</sup> and say maybe I should take a left and see where I can go—pardon me?

#### (Inaudible)

#### Mike Pollocoff:

Right. But I think, again, I'd say that the problems you're going to have come out of 55<sup>th</sup> is not going to be any greater than people who live on the other side of 80<sup>th</sup> in any of those side streets leading up to Lance. Those are some densely populated areas, far more densely populated than your subdivision. And during those peak times they're still able to turn out. Because remember you're not turning out to a two lane road. It's two lanes of traffic but you'd have an opportunity with the side lanes to merge into traffic and get out.

#### (Inaudible)

#### Mike Pollocoff:

No, even if you're going east you've got room to turn out and see the traffic. Again, this is a wide road. It doesn't mean it's four lanes of traffic. It's a wide road to give everybody some forgiveness for a mistake or the opportunity to see the traffic that's coming either way. The subdivisions, again, that come into 80<sup>th</sup> Street east of Cooper Road are more densely populated than yours and those traffic patterns haven't had a problem.

# Shirley Warnock:

Could you put up B again and just let us clarify. I know it was like the stinko one but could we look at it again?

#### Mike Pollocoff:

B is a option where this would become a private road. The Village would—it would have to be an agreeable situation between the Village and anybody who is on this street to vacate that right of way. We could just do it and they couldn't just do it. Everybody would have to agree to it.

# Shirley Warnock:

And could you be specific about who would be responsible for what when you say-

#### Mike Pollocoff:

The Village would no longer maintain the road.

Shirley Warnock:

At all?

Mike Pollocoff:

No.

# Shirley Warnock:

And so fire and ambulance if they had a fire-

#### Mike Pollocoff:

No, they would go in there. They would still access it but we wouldn't maintain the road. So it would be snow removal. It would function more like a condominium. These property owners would be required to maintain that road.

# Shirley Warnock:

So they'd push the garbage cans to the end?

#### Mike Pollocoff:

Probably the people that live here would have their garbage cans come out to 80<sup>th</sup> on the ends and these people here would bring it to 79<sup>th</sup>.

(Inaudible)

#### Mike Pollocoff:

I said it wasn't a preferred option but it does for the people that—

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

It's possible. It's not punishment. It's a possibility.

Shirley Warnock:

That's a preferable plan to us except for the withdrawal of services that we pay for.

Mike Pollocoff:

I didn't say it was a recommended option but it is an option.

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

I'm sorry, I can't hear you without the mic.

Sue Weslager:

Sue Weslager, 7706 55<sup>th</sup>. When you say that you're not going to get benefits such as snow removal, what about keeping up the road, taking care of it, maintaining it? Does Pleasant Prairie excuse themselves from that as well?

#### Mike Pollocoff:

When there's a private road in the Village where the taxpayers do not own the road and do not own the improvements on the road, you as a property tax payer do not pay for a condominium to have their roads plowed and maintained or asphalted or seal coated or whatever. That's a responsibility of those people on that street. They get the benefit of having that road function the way they want to have it function. It works better in a condominium because a condominium is built for it to be that way. The houses are typically done that way because they have a closer setback to the road. But in a residential setting where you have a plat like this it's not optimal. I wouldn't recommend it but it's an option that property owners have.

#### Sue Weslager:

I just wanted it to be clarified.

# Cindy Pascual:

I'm not going to talk about paint. Cindy Pascual, 7906 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue. We've been here for so long tonight and I really need to get moving. Can I please get all three options, can I get a copy of them?

#### Mike Pollocoff:

We've got them on the-we don't have copies of them but we can have some made, yeah.

#### Cindy Pascual:

I'd just like copies of the options.

# Mike Serpe:

The options are it either goes through you would be private-

# Cindy Pascual:

I know but I'd like copies of them just so I can have them.

# John Steinbrink:

They can make them up tomorrow.

#### Cindy Pascual:

I was just wondering if you had handouts for tonight.

#### John Steinbrink:

We had the presentation on the overhead here.

#### Mike Pollocoff:

I think the Board needs to decide what-

#### Randy Berner:

Randy Berner, 5402 79<sup>th</sup> Street. Option 3 does it still include a three-way stop at 79 and 55? Okay, and then the other question is if the original plan goes through, we did a six month assessment to see whether or not your vision on the original plan actually creates a safe and viable traffic pattern in our neighborhood, how long would it take to implement Option 3 if it didn't work?

#### Mike Pollocoff:

It would probably be—it's not a lot of construction. It's probably a couple weeks of construction. One of the reasons I'd recommend doing it sooner than later there's two reasons. One is that we could include it as part of the 80<sup>th</sup> Street construction so when they're squirting curbs for 80<sup>th</sup> they can come over and get this all done at once, and we're going to have to repave the end of 79<sup>th</sup> and Cooper Road to make this lay out so that could all happen at once. It would save the Village considerably to have that done.. And, secondly, in listening to the comments from the residents there, it was like 80 percent of the comments that we've either received in e-mail or we've heard from at the last meeting was people were concerned about cut through traffic to avoid the intersections at 80<sup>th</sup> and Cooper Road. And we feel from a traffic calming standpoint this really does calm traffic. It calms it significantly.

# Randy Berner:

Thank you.

# Shirley Warnock:

If one of us came to pick up the options tomorrow you tell me when and where and could it be possible for us to get together as a neighborhood and talk about the options and get back to you? Is there a time line for instance you can give us as well?

#### Mike Pollocoff:

We're constructing.

#### Mike Serpe:

You pick one of the three is that what you're talking about?

#### Shirley Warnock:

I believe so as long as you can spell out for us a little bit in more detail about the private road. Tell us specifically what your obligations are from a Pleasant Prairie perspective and what aren't so that we can make an intelligent decision. I think you said in the rest of the details pretty much what Option 1 and 3 entail.

#### Mike Serpe:

Keep in mind, though, the private road, the four property owners that live in that section are totally responsible for everything that happens on that road.

# Shirley Warnock:

Unless we agree together that we'll all take care of it.

Mike Serpe:

That's fine.

#### Mike Pollocoff:

I guess I want to tell the Board that that is an option that homeowners have but I'd be recommending against it. I think you're not—

# Shirley Warnock:

We'd rather have the gated option somehow turned into an option that's more viable for us. So if there's still a way to make it a gated end that's still our first choice to have it closed if I'm not mistaken. That's the unanimous decision here. It's just how to appropriately close it to satisfy you and satisfy you that's the dilemma. So that's the only option that I have that you've offered other than our idea to have the gate available for you to open and close.

#### John Steinbrink:

Shirley, you understand the gate puts you in the same position that you're in now. We heard about the vehicles coming in and the children on the road and that's what we're trying to protect is the kids on the road by eliminating that traffic coming through there. And it actually increases her problem because she doesn't have that turnaround that's now part of 80<sup>th</sup> Street. Everybody is going to turn in her driveway there.

#### Shirley Warnock:

They turn in our driveways now. That's what we're trying to eliminate, too. So, yes, you're right it doesn't change the existing pattern for those who don't read the sign now. So the decision really would have to be do we want to keep it the way it is and take our chances with the few that come in; do we want to try and take our chances with the few that come in and find out they have to go in a circle but they have to find that out first so neither one is perfect. We're just trying to make sure that we're talking about ideas that are viable to both of us so we don't spin our wheels.

Mike Serpe:

How much time do you need, Shirley?

Shirley Warnock:

A week.

Mike Serpe:

Today is Thursday. Could we push it to Monday?

# Shirley Warnock:

Yeah, as long as we get all the material adequately together tomorrow.

#### John Steinbrink:

What we're going to ask then, we've delayed this to allow more input here. So if you can just report back to the Village on Monday. We're not going to have another meeting over it, but if you give us what you prefer as an option and we'll look at that in our decision. We can't guarantee that's going to totally base our decision but it's going to have influence on our decision I can guarantee you that.

# Shirley Warnock:

What percentage of influence are we talking, 20 percent or 95 percent?

#### John Steinbrink:

It's hard to say because we're still going to rely on the professional input. Not that you may not be a good professional graphic engineer but—

# Shirley Warnock:

Well, we've read a lot. So I just don't want you to think we don't know. We're pretty good.

#### John Steinbrink:

We've listened to the concerns and we've brought options that would kind of address those concerns that work for the Village, too, because there's limits to what we can really do.

# Shirley Warnock:

Right, and we appreciate that and just so you know we thought of all those, too. We're just trying to say that's not bad but this will still happen. So we kept coming back to the only solution was really to leave it the way it was but that we came here tonight still, again, concerned about the 80<sup>th</sup> Street—

#### John Steinbrink:

And we wanted to answer your questions and clarify any questions you had and I think we've gone through that. Everything is pretty well clarified and we've presented the options here that would be available, the three basic ones, and there's not much else we can do. I know John came up with a gate but that's really not a viable solution.

# Shirley Warnock:

So you won't work with that option whatsoever?

#### John Steinbrink:

I don't think so because you've got sidewalks there and we're back to that same situation. So it's not going to help the original concerns you had, the kids in the street and the people driving into there that you don't want in there.

#### Shirley Warnock:

Except it will eliminate all the ones who are going to try it once and I just don't know how many that is.

#### John Steinbrink:

But you've stated it didn't eliminate them now.

#### Shirley Warnock:

Yes, we do have some now and we know the result is when they try it.

# Clyde Allen:

One quick comment, Shirley. You made a comment, and I don't want to influence what the decision is or what your thoughts are, but just as a reminder you made a comment to them that, gee, if we all got together to maintain the private road just remember when some of you did not read or were notified some of the information when you were deeded the property what happens when somebody there sells? Will they know that? As an alert that the next buyer that comes into the neighborhood is going to be very unhappy if they don't know about it.

# Mike Serpe:

They don't have a homeowners association now do they?

#### Shirley Warnock:

We have a covenant for restrictions.

#### Steve Kumorkiewicz:

They have an association then.

# Shirley Warnock:

Yeah, but nobody pays any attention to it. We self-check each other. As long as it's safe and it doesn't hurt anybody we let everybody do it.

#### Steve Kumorkiewicz:

You're talking about the gate in the street. I was in a . . . for many more years than I want to remember and a working gate, and I've got more problem with the gates in the guardhouse especially in the wintertime than anyplace else in the plant. I'd rather go work on one of the roofing machines than on one of the gates because gates especially in wintertime are a problem. That's what I have against them because I worked with them and that's my opinion.

#### John Steinbrink:

Thank you, Shirley, and thank you everybody for coming tonight. A lot of back and forth input. Everybody is trying to make their point. I hope we clarified back and forth kind of the Village's decision. We understand what you would like and we're trying to reach that goal to accomplish what you need done there to protect your neighborhood and keep it. Everybody wants a safe neighborhood and I think that's what everybody up here wants for you also. Thank you for coming. I'm going to call the meeting back to order. If the Board members would come back to their seats.

# B. Consider Ordinance #08-37 - Ordinance to Create Chapter 287 of the Code of the Village of Pleasant Prairie entitled "Sexual Offender Residency Restrictions."

#### Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, this is an ordinance that we had adopted on the 20<sup>th</sup> of August of 2007. I'm recommending that the ordinance be amended to delete paragraph 287-4, the effective date. Since the City of Kenosha has adopted an ordinance and have the reconstituted ordinance not include that.

#### Monica Yuhas:

So this is the same ordinance that Kenosha has?

#### Mike Pollocoff:

No. It's close but it's not tied to the effective date of the City's. It just now stands alone.

#### Monica Yuhas:

Okay. It's very well written. I move to approve Ordinance 08-37.

Mike Serpe:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

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

YUHAS MOVED TO ADOPT ORDINANCE #08-37 - ORDINANCE TO CREATE CHAPTER 287 OF THE CODE OF THE VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE ENTITLED "SEXUAL OFFENDER RESIDENCY RESTRICTIONS; SECONDED BY SERPE; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

# 5. VILLAGE BOARD COMMENTS.

Mike Serpe:

Mike, you put together a good meeting tonight and I really appreciate that. I think the way you handle it, your knowledge of the situation, Mike's input, I think put the residents a little bit more at ease as to what we have to offer and I think something good will come of this that's acceptable to everybody. So thanks again.

Mike Pollocoff:

Thank you.

#### 6. ADJOURNMENT.

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