

**VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE  
PLEASANT PRAIRIE VILLAGE BOARD  
PLEASANT PRAIRIE WATER UTILITY  
LAKE MICHIGAN SEWER UTILITY DISTRICT  
SEWER UTILITY DISTRICT "D"  
9915 39th Avenue  
Pleasant Prairie, WI  
July 7, 2008  
6:30 p.m.**

A Regular Meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Village Board was held on Monday, July 7, 2008. Meeting called to order at 6:30 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; Peggy Herrick, Assistant Village Planner; Tom Shircel, Assistant Village Planner and Jane Romanowski, Village Clerk.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- 3. ROLL CALL**
- 4. MINUTES OF MEETINGS - JUNE 2, 2008**

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Move to approve as written.

Monica Yuhas:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Steve, second by Monica.

**KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO APPROVE THE JUNE 2, 2008 VILLAGE BOARD MINUTES AS PRESENTED IN THEIR WRITTEN FORM; SECONDED BY YUHAS; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

Mike Serpe:

Mr. Chairman, before we do the public hearing, I think Item B should be heard prior to that because it's kind of inter-related to the whole thing. I would move to bring Item B forward.

John Steinbrink:

A motion has been made to bring Item B forward from New Business ahead of Item 5, Public Hearing. Do we have a second?

Village Board Meeting  
July 7, 2008

Clyde Allen:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Second by Clyde.

**SERPE MOVED TO CONSIDER NEW BUSINESS ITEM B PRIOR TO THE PUBLIC HEARING; SECONDED BY ALLEN; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**8. NEW BUSINESS**

**B. Consider Resolution #08-26 to deny the Final Plat for the first stage of the Prairie Trails East Subdivision.**

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, the item before us tonight came to us from our last Board meeting where we had set a time frame for the developers from Prairie Trails East to complete some of the items that they needed to for the development of that project. And those items included access agreements between themselves and an abutting development, The Orchard development, as well as a water main easement and a temporary construction access easement that was needed.

Their efforts are to get that done, completed, and by and large they are—the Plan Commission and the staff have recommended all along that these two subdivisions need to work in sync so that we don't have a problem with one being finalized out and not working well with the second subdivision otherwise we're going to have a problem. That's primarily for a couple things. One is water and the other one is just the unusual limitations that we have for construction access on 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue which is really what led to us having a construction access coming off of 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

The developer of the Prairie Trails East development has made application to Lake County to have that done. That hasn't been completed yet. And, as a matter of record, the developer from Prairie Trails East has indicated that the real estate market being such as it is that development really isn't ready to go. So it would be my recommendation in order to keep these two developments synchronized as far as what needs to happen is to align the preliminary and the final plat dates between both developments so they both work off the same date. And that current date for The Orchard is November 19, 2009. I think that's sufficient time for any agreements or permits to be obtained from Lake County, the finals from FEMA on the floodplain boundary adjustments paperwork. We know it's been completed but we haven't seen it yet and that's not unusual for FEMA to approve something and send it out a month later. Get all that stuff done and then allow the marketplace to determine how quick this stuff is really going to be ready to come to market as far as creating buildable sites and housing sites.

Village Board Meeting  
July 7, 2008

We've provided the developers with modified easements that the Village will require for acquisition of a public water easement and temporary construction easement to allow that water main to be built in Prairie Trails that would service The Orchard and they've supplied that and agreed with that. So it would be my recommendation that the Resolution 08-26 be amended to be presented that, therefore be it resolved that the Village Board of Trustees hereby extend the preliminary and final plat for the Prairie Trails East Subdivision until November 19, 2009 to make it so it synchronizes with The Orchard same dates. Otherwise they're out of cycle again. If we go to November then we don't even have six months for that to cure again.

Even if Lake County gives out their permits and everything is in place, Prairie Trails the marketplace, and we can see this from existing plats, aren't ready to go. So why force a development into platting that the market is not ready for that plat to exist. We have plenty of examples where that is not a good thing to do. I think Chateau Eau Plaines is the best example of a plat that is fully approved and half done. Because we pushed that plat, it wasn't us; it was Kenosha County that pushed that plat through to completion before the market was ready for it to be absorbed. So my recommendation is to leave it in this holding pattern where they have an extension for approval until November 19, 2009.

Mike Serpe:

Mr. Chairman, I'd move to amend the Resolution 08-26 to extend the preliminary plat and the final plat to November 19, 2009.

Monica Yuhas:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Mike and a second by Monica to amend the resolution to extend the preliminary plat to November 19, 2009. Further discussion on this item?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

That should be in my opinion plenty of time to get everything in place in the way the market is right now. That's the main idea of this. So the extension that we're talking about should be the . . . should be taking place due to the fact we've got to wait for the preliminary plat here and everything . . . to November, 2009.

Mike Pollocoff:

Are you asking me—?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

This is confusing that's why I'm asking . . . .

Village Board Meeting  
July 7, 2008

Mike Pollocoff:

Your question is should we delay the consideration of The Orchard tonight to that date?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

That's my question. I don't quite put it together.

Mike Pollocoff:

My recommendation is that we don't and there are two reasons. One is I think the policy question that the Board has to address with is the petition for a variance for an extension of that cul-de-sac unreasonable based on the precedent that we've established in the Village to extend the cul-de-sacs to that length. So if it is or isn't in your mind and I think you'd vote which way you think it should go on that. If, in fact, we decide not to act on the variance because the plat isn't ready, I think at that point then what we're saying is we're not sure we're comfortable with that plat. I think if any time between now and November 19, 2009 if Prairie Trails is able to provide a final plat that would be say one-half, they'd take their first phase and cut it in half, that would enable The Orchard to develop and get the water and have the construction access they need, but then if we said before you do that you have to come back and ask for the waiver of the Land Division Ordinance again, to me the question is if the goal in this is to kind of vest everybody with some certainty as to their rights to develop their property, provide the abutting neighbors with the knowledge of what the development is going to look like and have that answer done and completed once and for all, my recommendation is that you address the variance tonight and have that completed.

If the Board isn't really ready to adjust the variance or request that variance now, I think that the real question is are you comfortable with the plat for The Orchard and maybe that's a point, then we've got a bigger problem than what we're talking about. But I think that in order to give some certainty to both developers as to what approvals they've accrued from the Village, I think in the case of Prairie Trails we say we'll approve the extension of your plat until November 19<sup>th</sup>, the same as The Orchard. You guys are hand in hand in this because you're abutting each other and you need each other to get this thing developed in an orderly manner and here you go. And I think to withhold something that affects that final plat, to be honest with you I'm not sure what it serves.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Because actually allowing the extension, allowing the variance of the extension of the cul-de-sac all the way it will not make any difference at any time because it's not developed anyway and there is no way to access the property because they don't have any answer from the Department of Transportation in Illinois. The only thing I can see the advantage they may have is they . . . .

Village Board Meeting  
July 7, 2008

Mike Pollocoff:

You've got to remember the preliminary plat that the Village has approved identified that cul-de-sac extension. And it identified at that point that they would need to come through and get an amendment to the Land Division Ordinance before they went to final plat. But the Village has already taken a position, a policy standpoint, on that preliminary plat that provided for that extension. So the developers accrued a certain level of rights on that property as that preliminary plat reflects that cul-de-sac there. So I think that the question as you go through the review process of the cul-de-sac at that south end of the property has already been answered in part. And the final plat, the draft that they prepared, doesn't deviate from the preliminary. And under the statutes they've got a two year window under that preliminary plat that as long as there's no significant deviation from the preliminary plat to the final plat that the Board would need to grant that final plat.

The difference is in this variance on the length is with the Village's Land Division Ordinance. It's a fairly older ordinance, but we have found areas where we've granted and found reason to grant an extension that was farther than the distance we have here. In this case we have a small number of lots. It's not a really dense or highly populated plat that's going to be approved where we might have a great problem with it. But in this case it was deemed by the staff and our recommendation at the preliminary level and it's still the recommendation that this is acceptable and it's not going to constitute a concern for public safety.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

We're not setting up any precedent with this?

Mike Pollocoff:

Precedent is in the eye of the beholder, or it's going to be something that a judge is going to decide, but we have had other plat that have been approved that have had equal if not longer cul-de-sacs that have been extended.

Clyde Allen:

Through the Chair to Mike or a representative of The Orchard. My question is does this extension to this date have an impact on what they have planned, what their thoughts are or anything on their time table?

Mike Pollocoff:

You'd have to ask the developer.

Clyde Allen:

Are we allowed to let them address that?

Village Board Meeting  
July 7, 2008

John Steinbrink:

Sure. If you want to use the microphone and name and address for the record.

John Roscioli:

John Roscioli, 11545 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue. I guess I'm representing The Orchard in this. I think I agree with Mike in that when the Village has asked us to adjust the plan from 27 to 22 to 20 to 19 to allow for this variance we've done so. When they asked us to change the frontage from 90 feet to 100 feet we changed that to accommodate the Village and the neighbors' request as best we could and still make this financially viable. When they asked us to work with Prairie Trails East we gladly jumped at that chance, too, to accommodate the neighbors and the Village. I think approving this variance proves to us that you're willing to work with us the way we've been willing to work with you. It's been a two year process. For you to table this variance it wouldn't be only unfortunate but it would kind of be in bad faith almost because of how we've reacted to your questions and answers. So not to sound presumptuous but I'm almost expecting you guys because you've asked us to do this, and now that we've done it if you were to come back and say not that would tell me something that isn't right. So you've asked me to do this. As a landowner I've done it. So I'm asking you to hold true what you said was right. Do you have any other questions?

John Steinbrink:

Just to remind the Board we're on Item B and that's to consider the amendment to the resolution to grant the extension. The public hearing will be next on this item. Further comment or question? We have a motion and a second before the Board.

**SERPE MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE ADMINISTRATOR'S RECOMMENDATION AND MODIFY AND ADOPT RESOLUTION #08-26 TO GRANT AN EXTENSION OF THE PRELIMINARY PLAT AND FINAL PLAT OF THE PRAIRIE TRAILS EAST PROPOSED SUBDIVISION TO NOVEMBER 19, 2009; SECONDED BY YUHAS; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

## **5. PUBLIC HEARING**

- A. Consider the request of Christopher Jackson, P.E. of CJ Engineering, on behalf of JM Squared LLC, owner, for a Variance from Section 395-60 C of the Land Division and Development Control Ordinance related to 120th Street exceeding the maximum 800 foot cul-de-sac length within The Orchard Subdivision that is generally located on the west side of 28th Avenue, south of 116th Street, at the approximate 11900 Block.**

Tom Shircel:

Thank you, Mr. President. As Mr. Pollocoff touched on, The Orchard has gone through several approvals over the last year and a half or so, everything from Sheridan Wood Neighborhood Plan

Village Board Meeting  
July 7, 2008

amendment to a zoning map amendment to correctly rezone the property pursuant to the plat, conceptual plan approval, and as also noted a preliminary plat approval back on November 19, 2007. Also, as the Board will recall, this variance request for this cul-de-sac length has been before the Board a couple of times. On February 18, 2008, the Board tabled the variance request. Then again on March 3, 2008 the Board postponed this request until tonight.

So getting to the variance request, the petitioner has applied for a 574 variance from Section 395-60 C of the Village Land Division and Development Control Ordinance related to the 120<sup>th</sup> Street proposed 1,374 foot cul-de-sac exceeding the maximum length of 800 feet within the proposed Orchard Subdivision. The granting of the variance will allow for the 1,374 foot 120<sup>th</sup> Street cul-de-sac to exceed the maximum cul-de-sac length of 800 feet by 574 feet and would not be considered contrary to the public interest, public safety and welfare of the Village and its residents. And with that, and as Mr. Pollocoff noted, staff does recommend approval of the variance for this 120<sup>th</sup> Street cul-de-sac. If you have any questions I'll be happy to answer them.

John Steinbrink:

Questions for Tom? Seeing none, this is a public hearing. I will open it up to public comment or question. We ask that you use the microphone and give us your name and address for the record.

John Roscioli:

John Roscioli, 11545 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue. A couple things. I know a couple of the Village Board members have asked me about safety issues. In the entrance to The Orchard, the proposed cul-de-sac, we took out a boulevard at the request of I believe it was Carol Kim because she didn't want The Orchard to be singled out as being whatever an elitist thing and we don't care about that. So we took out the boulevard which also creates more space for emergency access vehicles. There are two cul-de-sacs which are big enough in roundabouts based on the engineering specs the Village has given us.

I know, Clyde, you asked if this is going to stop us in terms of our progress, and I think it's not necessary a stop sign, but as I said before we've come to you and you've come back to us and there's been a lot of back and forth. We've amended, you've amended and you've asked actually for us to do this. We've done it twice now. I think we're just waiting for some approvals and this is one of the approvals that we're really expecting because we've come in front of you several times and I guess we're basically, after being told this that this would be approved the time has come. Our final plat and our engineering have to go through and this is a basis for that. So this is basically tantamount to our approval, to our continuing. So do you have any questions?

John Steinbrink:

Anyone else wishing to speak on this item?

Village Board Meeting  
July 7, 2008

Mike Willkomm:

Mike Willkomm, 11904 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue. It's frustrating to sit here and hear facts thrown around that aren't true. When Mr. Roscioli comes up here and says that he's made concessions give and take both ways, from the very first informal neighborhood meeting that we had with him his plot plan showed 90 pieces of land developed, 19 additional for a total of 20 lots from the very first one. Do you have an original neighborhood plot plan for that property, for The Orchard?

The original neighborhood plan from what he's referring to with the 26 lots includes using my driveway as access and partial property for this 26 lot subdivision that the neighborhood sketch plan called for. The original neighborhood plan includes my driveway. His very first presentation included exactly the same amount of plots and land, developments that you see here today. He hasn't conceded one. It's hard to sit here and listen to that when it's just not true.

The question I have for this Board is what extenuating circumstances exist here that require this variance? I know that there's been precedence and I know there's been other developments that have exceeded the 800 feet for a cul-de-sac. But please explain to me what reasons exists here for this development. Please understand why I'm asking this. Before I made the biggest investment in my life and bought my land with my wife I looked at how could this land be developed next door to us? How could this 15 acres eventually change? And when you look at the neighborhood plan the only way that it looks how we could have 26 neighbors is including my driveway to loop through this piece of property. Without that—if you could show that to the Board. The only way you can get these 26 lots is using my driveway. Without it you can't do it.

So before we bought our land we asked ourselves how could this be developed? So we look at the neighborhood plan and we see this is how it could be developed. Well, if we don't sell our driveway it can't be developed that way. So then we look at how else could they do it? Well, by looking at the piece of land logic tells you the only way that you can do this is with a cul-de-sac. So you look up the ordinance for the cul-de-sac. Cul-de-sac can only be 800 feet. Okay, if a cul-de-sac can only be 800 feet how many pieces of lots can you develop in a size like this? And you start to put the numbers in your head and you say, okay, they can fit about 10 or 11 at the most but certainly not 20.

So I'm just trying to get you to understand our perspective when we come to you and say there's nothing that we could have foreseen to see this kind of development with the ordinance and the neighborhood sketch plans that you had. So I'm not against the development. Believe me, I understand development. I'm just in disagreement with developing it to this density level. I'm asking that you consider the neighborhood. We've had many debates upon the density level. Yes, it's zoned for it but it's zoned for it with a loop, not on a cul-de-sac. What we're asking for is that we re-evaluate this and say maybe we can do this without going against the ordinance that you have and having something that's more consistent with the existing neighborhood. Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you. Is there anyone else wishing to speak on this item?



Village Board Meeting  
July 7, 2008

John Roscioli:

Just to respond to Mike's questions, John Roscioli, 11545 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The original 27 lots that we designed were made with two additional variances involved which is why we did not have to use his property. It was suggested that we do it that way. Then the Village said we should go to R-3 zoning which are larger lots. So we took out two of the variances and went to 20 lots. And then at 20 lots we would still need a second variance for a second outlet. So if we went to 19 lots we would only need the one inlet and outlet. So that's where the give and take has occurred. It didn't use his property. I can actually try and find that drawing for you, Mike, if you want to see it. There were variances involved and it didn't include anybody else's property because that's beyond presumption. So as far as that goes we did initially do this with the Village. Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Anyone else wishing to speak under this item? Hearing none, close the comments and open it up to Mike.

Mike Pollocoff:

One thing from Mr. Willkomm, the response is the ordinance only allows 800 feet and what are the extenuating circumstances. Maybe it dates our ordinance, but the 800 foot length for a cul-de-sac is one standard that fits across the entire spectrum of all the zoning districts we have. So it goes from R-6 which would be 60 foot wide lots all the way to rural residential which is a five acre lot. At some point it's one of those things where you could have a variance by district which our zoning ordinance doesn't have, because in Pleasant Prairie we've separated the Land Division Ordinance requirements from the zoning. So that when we take a look at what's the extenuating circumstances that you have to evaluate the density and the level of traffic that's going to be in a certain area. And the 800 feet if that density was very high you wouldn't want any more than 800 feet in a highly dense street. Or, if it was a multifamily development that was on a 800 foot long cul-de-sac you wouldn't want to go any farther than that.

So as we evaluate proposals for a variance, one of the key things that comes to mind is what's the zoning of this. In this case it's half acre zoning which is in compliance with the land use plan. By and large the development, the neighborhood plan is not the preliminary plat. It's not anywhere near the final plat. It's that best indicator of what's going to be there. The true ability of someone being able to plat in there is premised on the Comprehensive Plan that sets that zoning standard which is the size of the lots in place. In this case The Orchard meets that.

I'd have to concur with Mr. Roscioli's statement that the Village staff and the planner did work through downsizing the development as it was being prepared and reviewed to eliminate the need for variances. We felt from a staff perspective that those additional variances that were required didn't meet the test of being required and we felt that it was a hardship that was being self-imposed by the number of lots. That hardship was taken away as the number of lots was reduced. But in this case, we feel based on plats that have already been approved or variances that have been given, that with this level of density that the 1,300 feet is not out of line.

Village Board Meeting  
July 7, 2008

I appreciate the fact, and there's a lot of people that don't do this when they purchase a property and go to develop on it is look at what it is, but at the end of the day if you have 15 acres or 20 acres of land it's really the creativity of an engineer and a landscape architect who is going to lay this out and meet the requirements of the zoning ordinance in doing that. That's really where we're at. When we put the neighborhood plan together we're looking to identify major access points in and out of the neighborhood, but we're not specifically telling a developer exactly here's how you're going to develop and this is exactly where your roads are going to go. We've let that happen and that happens as a product of the topography of the land, the existing sewer and water extensions, trees, wetlands, all those things that are variables that are not taken into consideration when the neighborhood plan is laid out completely. I guess those are just some comments I wanted to address to the Board with respect to the circumstances that would bring the staff to recommend this variance.

Clyde Allen:

Mike, being that Pleasant prairie is probably as an eclectic community as you'll ever find that the 800 foot ordinance just doesn't work sometimes. That's a given for a community like ours. When this first came before us, first or second time, the way the land was laid out, the way the plots were laid out, and with Prairie Trails East there was no second entrance. That bothered me about the cul-de-sac and it all boiled down to safety. And I think that was my message in the beginning. And I think it got addressed tonight. Mike, correct me if I'm wrong, that it was indicated that with the entrance way the way it is should there be a disaster of some type there, a huge car accident or fire or whatever, and another emergency occurred in the cul-de-sac, there would be enough room for an emergency vehicle to get through there still to the cul-de-sac, is that right?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right.

John Steinbrink:

Other Board comments or questions?

Mike Serpe:

I understand Mr. Willkomm's concern. But I look at this development and the lots are large. The development itself is kind of an offshoot from the main road. You're not going to even see most of the homes from 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue. I think we've been over this enough. I think the conditions that we placed upon Mr. Roscioli have been obviously satisfied. I don't know when it will develop, nobody knows that, or even if it will ever develop. I'd like to see it develop but that's at another time. So with that I would approval of the variance.

Village Board Meeting  
July 7, 2008

Clyde Allen:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Mike, second by Clyde. Any further discussion at this point?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

There's no question the development is going to happen and the variance is going to be needed for this. So our . . . his opinion . . . I see that the amount of lots were reduced from 27 to 19. So look at the point of view of emergency . . . there's going to be plenty of room. There's going to be room for the school buses to turn around. I think the fire trucks should have no problem. It's a wide road . . . consequently there should be no problem with emergency vehicles. So I have to agree with that.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second. Further discussion?

Monica Yuhas:

I have one question. If coming off of 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue that entrance were to be blocked for whatever reason, how would an emergency vehicle, fire truck, gain access back in that subdivision?

Mike Pollocoff:

You mean if the entire 37 feet from curb to curb was blocked?

Monica Yuhas:

Yes.

Mike Pollocoff:

That would be a major blockage, but at that point then we'd have equipment driving in yards. Or, in some of the more rural areas it wouldn't be unthought of to use an abutting driveway to go into an area. But typically I have yet to see an area—the profile of the urban road is 37 feet from back of one curb to the back of the other. And then you've got about 10 feet on either side that's a terrace that is open and is still right of way. The only thing I think could really block that is if you had a major main break and it was dug up. At that point we would ensure that we could get a vehicle by. We're faced with that every day in a lot of areas. I have yet to see something where an entire street is completely blocked. And if it is then the engine is going to do whatever it has to do to get around it which would be the biggest piece of equipment.

Village Board Meeting  
July 7, 2008

Mike Serpe:

Monica, in that area a more serious situation could happen if the road was blocked at 116<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup>. Then the whole area is cut off. Now, if it's a property damage accident, a water main break, something that is just going to take a little time to fix and clear out that's one thing. But if it involves somebody that's in need of immediate emergency care, Mike is right, the responder, whether it's police or fire, is going to get there one way or another. If they have to cut through somebody's back yard or whatever, it's going to happen.

Clyde Allen:

Now the very front of the southern most lot on 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue - that has area? I thought that's what I heard Mr. Roscioli say that that area would be flat and available for emergency vehicles.

Mike Pollocoff:

Where the retention is, right. I've seen fire and rescue and police be pretty creative, not in areas like this. Mike is correct, our read concern is 28<sup>th</sup> being blocked more so than—because that's 18 feet of asphalt. We've got a temporary road that isn't used. I know we've been on it a few times between 26<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> that we built when we built the sewer in. If we had to we could get around on that. If we had to we could come off the bike path. If for some reason we can't get in there we're going to find a way to do it. Luckily that's the exception. Really our main concern is 28<sup>th</sup> is more of a bottleneck than the new street will be. I think once the Prairie Trails development happens and there's a loop around the south that kind of opens that circulation in that whole neighborhood up to really address some of those concerns.

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion and a second.

**SERPE MOVED TO GRANT THE REQUEST OF CHRISTOPHER JACKSON, P.E. OF CJ ENGINEERING, ON BEHALF OF JM SQUARED LLC, OWNER, FOR A VARIANCE FROM SECTION 395-60 C OF THE LAND DIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL ORDINANCE RELATED TO 120TH STREET EXCEEDING THE MAXIMUM 800 FOOT CUL-DE-SAC LENGTH WITHIN THE ORCHARD SUBDIVISION THAT IS GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF 28TH AVENUE, SOUTH OF 116TH STREET, AT THE APPROXIMATE 11900 BLOCK; SECONDED BY ALLEN; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

## **6. CITIZEN COMMENTS**

Dick Ginkowski:

Good evening. Dick Ginkowski, 7022 51<sup>st</sup> Avenue. I concede and admit that I'm one of the first people who will stand up and say don't raise my taxes. I don't like to see that happen. I don't like to see unjustified spending. Fill in the blank. The flip side of it is sometimes it is the cheapskate that spends the most. And I do think at some point we need to look at something in

Village Board Meeting  
July 7, 2008

the Village, and I think the issue is when as opposed to if, and that is the compensation of Village officials, particularly our appointed Village officials. What gave rise to this, of course, is the experience in the City recently in which the City Administrator's position was filled at a rather hefty salary by someone whose credentials I would say do not stack up to our own Village Administrator who certainly one might wonder, and I've certainly looked and I've seen what they pay in other communities, could leave and perhaps pick up an additional salary in some of our neighboring communities in Illinois.

We have Jean Werbie, our Village Planner, her credentials are substantial. Private industry would welcome someone like that. She very easily, her credentials would qualify her to be a City Manager, City Administrator in addition to what she does. We have a number of other competent people in the areas in which they have very competent people and by way of illustration and not exclusion our Assessor, Rocco Vita. Other communities rely on him to assist them in carrying out what they do. Our Chiefs. We go down the list, our Director of Public Works, our Street Director, so we go through the list of people, and it isn't so much the individual as much as it is are we attracting and keeping people and will we be able to continue to keep them?

The only way to find out I think is to have an evaluation of the compensation to determine whether or not we are remaining competitive, because it's costly to have down time. It's costly to replace good people. You may save a few bucks here but you're going to spend it more the next time you have to do a search. And the suggestion that I have down the road, this is a Board function. This isn't something where you go to the Village Administrator and say, hey, tell me about this. This is one of the things that the Board needs to look outside of obviously you can't have the fox guarding the henhouse type of thing. And I think it would be appropriate to have a citizens' advisory commission on compensation as they do in some communities.

We certainly have a lot of talent in this community. Many of the people who have been here and have spoken on issues I can name at least a dozen people who are either actively or retired from business, government, industry who would be ideal people to advise the Board and to take a look at that issue of whether or not we are adequately compensating people. If we are then we're doing the right thing. If not then we need to make some adjustments for fear of the alternative as the costly experience of losing good people. I think it's a matter of when, not a matter of if. It's a function that belongs to the Board, and it's a function that the Board certainly would do well to share with the community to eliminate I think some criticism that may come. Obviously you can't please everybody.

But I recommend very highly that the Board give strong consideration to an evaluation, a semi-independent or independent evaluation of our compensation levels to determine whether or not we are adequately compensating the people that we rely on to carry out some very, very important responsibilities in the community. If not, then we have to look at how we make those adjustments. And if we are then at least we can be satisfied that the right thing is being done. But I think it would be foolish to continue to not address this in a more formal manner. I would hate to see us lose good people, and it could happen because there are communities out there that are looking for good people and they know that if they throw a few more dollars they might attract them. I do think we need to give this some very serious consideration, not necessarily in the next few weeks, but down the road it is something. Maybe we could get some people together

Village Board Meeting  
July 7, 2008

and do a study and evaluate whether or not the Village is on the right track, and if there needs to be a correction then how to make it. Thank you very much.

John Steinbrink:

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

7. **ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT** – None.

8. **NEW BUSINESS**

- A. **Receive Plan Commission Recommendation and Consider Ord. #08-38 for a Zoning Text Amendment at the request of Mark Molinaro, Jr., of Partners in Design Architects, agent, for Prairie Ridge Investors, LLC, property owner, to repeal and re-create Section 420 Attachment 3, Appendix C, Specific Development Plans, entitled "21. Prairie Ridge Commons Planned Unit Development" of the Village Zoning Ordinance in order to accommodate the proposed Building 3 for the Prairie Ridge Commons multi-tenant commercial development located at the southeast corner of 75th Street and 99th Avenue in the Prairie Ridge Development.**

Tom Shircel:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just a little background, again, for the Board. Prairie Ridge Commons is being developed as a speculative commercial retail development consisting of three multi-tenant commercial buildings located at the southeast corner of 75<sup>th</sup> Street and 99<sup>th</sup> Avenue just across the street from Famous Dave's. Buildings 1 and 2 are already constructed, and those are two identical approximately 9,000 square foot multi-tenant buildings which consist of a few tenants in there now, FedEx, Kinko's, Verizon, Cost Cutters and Starbucks. Building 3, which received Plan Commission approval a couple weeks ago for site and operational plan, is proposed to be an approximate 12,000 square foot building located on Parcel 2 of that development.

Again, previous approvals at the Village Board and Village Plan Commission granted were a CSM on November 20, 2006 to divide that property; a zoning text amendment to create the Prairie Ridge Commons Planned Unit Development Ordinance which is being heard tonight for amendment; a conditional use permit and site and operational plans for that initial two building phase, and the conditions use grant was for the drive-thru for Starbucks; site and operational plans were approved on June 11, 2007 for a proposed TGI Friday's restaurant, however Fridays has decided not to build on this site; and a conditional use permit and site and operational plans as I mentioned on June 23, 2008 were approved by the Plan Commission for Building 3.

Also, there are two planned unit development zonings on this property. One was created back in the year 2000 and was amended in 2007, and that pertains mainly to signage throughout the Prairie Ridge Development, and Ordinance 06-56 is the Prairie Ridge Commons PUD which is being amended this evening.

Village Board Meeting  
July 7, 2008

The petitioner is requesting a zoning map amendment to repeal and recreate the Prairie Ridge Commons PUD in order to accommodate the proposed Prairie Ridge Commons Building 3. In general, the amendments to the text of the Prairie Ridge Commons PUD addressed the fact that another multi-tenant commercial building, which is that Building Number 3, is proposed to be constructed at the southeast corner of 75<sup>th</sup> and 99<sup>th</sup> Avenue, rather than the previously-approved TGI Friday's restaurant.

Building 3 is designed and will be constructed of the same blend of exterior building materials, the same architectural themes, and will have the same appearance and character of the existing Prairie Ridge Commons Buildings 1 and 2, and also will be similar to The Shoppes at Prairie Ridge commercial buildings that are currently under construction which consists of the Target, the Dick's Sporting Goods, so and so forth. Due to Building 3 having triple frontage, the building will incorporate aesthetically interesting architectural elements not only on the front elevation of the store but also on the rear and side elevations.

With that the staff recommends that the ordinance amendment 08-38 be approved as presented to amend that PUD for Prairie Ridge Commons.

Clyde Allen:

Motion to approve.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I'll second that.

John Steinbrink:

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

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

It was well discussed in the Planning Commission meeting.

Mike Serpe:

I have one question for Mark. Mark, any word on Starbucks?

Mark Molinaro:

Mark Molinaro, Partners in Design Architects, 600 52<sup>nd</sup> Street, Kenosha. No. I just saw a couple days ago or before the holiday e-mails that went back and forth and the question was posed exactly the way you put it, which Starbucks, does it affect any of the ones here in Kenosha, and the answer was it will be an underperforming store. So I can tell you that the I-94 and 50 is the top grossing store in Wisconsin, and the other two on 50 to my knowledge are not losing money. So my suspicion is that we're safe but I don't know that for sure. And Starbucks, TGI Friday's

Village Board Meeting  
July 7, 2008

they're all looking at things a little bit differently. That's why we're here tonight otherwise we wouldn't be.

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion and a second.

**ALLEN MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND ADOPT ORD. #08-38 FOR A ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT AT THE REQUEST OF MARK MOLINARO, JR., OF PARTNERS IN DESIGN ARCHITECTS, AGENT, FOR PRAIRIE RIDGE INVESTORS, LLC, PROPERTY OWNER, TO REPEAL AND RE-CREATE SECTION 420 ATTACHMENT 3, APPENDIX C, SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT PLANS, ENTITLED "21. PRAIRIE RIDGE COMMONS PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT" OF THE VILLAGE ZONING ORDINANCE IN ORDER TO ACCOMMODATE THE PROPOSED BUILDING 3 FOR THE PRAIRIE RIDGE COMMONS MULTI-TENANT COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT LOCATED AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF 75TH STREET AND 99TH AVENUE IN THE PRAIRIE RIDGE DEVELOPMENT; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

- C. Consider approval of the Agreement between the Village of Pleasant Prairie and Nielsen Madsen & Barber, SC for inspection and construction related services for the municipal water main being installed on Lots 3 and 4 and Outlot 1 of CSM 2622 generally located south of 116th Street and west of 80th Avenue.**

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, this is an agreement between the Village and Nielsen Madsen & Barber for engineering services that they're going to be providing in conjunction with the project adjacent to LakeView Corporate Park. For construction staking and layout they're estimating that project cost at \$1,684; construction inspection or observation \$4,666; the staking management and as-built production expense at \$3,624. Some of these estimates are estimates because it depends on how fast and accurate the contractor works. This will be paid for as part of the development and will not be a Village expense. It's my recommendation that the Village President and Clerk be authorized to enter into an agreement with Nielsen Madsen & Barber and accept the proposal as presented.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

So moved.

Monica Yuhas:

Second.



Village Board Meeting  
July 7, 2008

John Steinbrink:

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

**KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO APPROVE AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE AND NIELSEN MADSEN & BARBER, SC FOR INSPECTION AND CONSTRUCTION RELATED SERVICES FOR THE MUNICIPAL WATER MAIN BEING INSTALLED ON LOTS 3 AND 4 AND OUTLOT 1 OF CSM 2622 GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF 116TH STREET AND WEST OF 80TH AVENUE; SECONDED BY YUHAS; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

- D. Consider the approval of a Development Agreement and related documents between the Village and CenterPoint Properties Trust for the installation of a municipal water main on Lots 3 and 4 and Outlot 1 of CSM 2622 generally located south of 116th Street and west of 80th Avenue.**

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, this is related to the previous item. This is the same project where CenterPoint Properties will be constructing a building and extending a public water main on it. This is not in the TIF District. It's adjacent to the TIF District so the developer is benefitting in large part because the TIF improvements are there and this is an instance where the added improvements that were required, in this case the water main extension, is going to be something they undertake themselves and the fact that the Village is able to bring water to the site, they can bring it through their site to the development and it won't be within the TIF District but it benefits from it. So this is a short agreement similar to what we see with a residential real estate developer only this only pertains to the extension of water on the spec 12 property. It's my recommendation that the Village Clerk and President be authorized to execute the development agreement with CenterPoint Properties.

Mike Serpe:

So moved.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

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

Village Board Meeting  
July 7, 2008

**SERPE MOVED TO APPROVE A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT AND RELATED DOCUMENTS BETWEEN THE VILLAGE AND CENTERPOINT PROPERTIES TRUST FOR THE INSTALLATION OF A MUNICIPAL WATER MAIN ON LOTS 3 AND 4 AND OUTLOT 1 OF CSM 2622 GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF 116TH STREET AND WEST OF 80TH AVENUE; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**E. Consider Award of Contract to purchase video camera equipment and software for a Utility Video Truck.**

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, the Village received proposals for replacement of our environmental examination truck, also known as the TV truck that examines sanitary sewers and storm sewers. Two proposals were received. One was from Envirotech Equipment LLC out of Milwaukee and the other one was from Cues, Inc. out of Florida. We have had Cues equipment previously and it's held up reasonably well. As you can imagine a TV camera sliding down a sanitary sewer main is as toxic and bad environment as you can imagine. So they do need more frequent repairs than you think. And we have found that shipping them to Florida is time prohibitive and cost prohibitive. So it was a relief when the low bid was from Envirotech out of Pewaukee to supply the equipment and the software and training to upgrade out television truck.

There are a number of reasons why we have a television truck to look down the sewers. Probably the biggest one is to the extent that we're able to control inflow and infiltration into the sanitary sewer controls how much we pay the City of Kenosha for the waste water that we treat. And we're constantly, when the weather permits because we can't do this when it's really cold outside, we're constantly examining the sanitary sewers to look for failures. You can fix one mile worth of sewer and get everything all sealed up and be back in another year and you've got a lot of other leaks and breaks because, again, it's a bad environment. You have a lot of pressure on it. So we use these quite a bit to maintain and keep our costs down as far as treatment expense.

So I'd recommend that the Village accept the proposal from Envirotech Equipment Company for \$76,900 to purchase the equipment and the software to drive that equipment.

Monica Yuhas:

So moved.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I second with a question.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Monica, second by Steve. Steve?

Village Board Meeting  
July 7, 2008

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

. . . recommendation of \$32,200 budget for the software for the video truck . . . we discover the problem that we've got in the water system in Prairie Ridge about four years ago. Consequently, one of the contractors were disqualified to work in the Village because this system . . . Now, how do we make up the difference between the proposal and what we budgeted here? That's my question.

Mike Pollocoff:

How are we going to coverage the overage over the budgeted amount?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Yes.

Mike Pollocoff:

We have one other project that we undertook for equipment this year, and that price came in under budget. So we're going to be able to stay within budget within the capital fund. But this specific item is—

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

It's going to cover?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yeah, we'll transfer money from equipment that is surplus now. The bids were lower than we anticipated in the budget. This one is over, but as a fund in total that capital fund for sewer will be in balance.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Then I can go along with it. I like the equipment . . . it worked for us . . . but I have a question and you answered that question for me.

Clyde Allen:

Mike, do you know the equipment that was under budget? And the reason I ask is the equipment that came in earlier this year, one of them, the request I believe came through the Board and it was approved that that money be moved to road maintenance because of harsh winter.

Mike Pollocoff:

That was general fund, not sewer utility.

Village Board Meeting  
July 7, 2008

Clyde Allen:

So the sewer utility also had one in the utility that was under?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right.

Clyde Allen:

Do you know the difference between what was saved?

Mike Pollocoff:

I don't have that. I do know that when we—

Clyde Allen:

Can you say ballpark?

Mike Pollocoff:

It was close to \$50,000.

Clyde Allen:

That we came in under budget?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right.

Clyde Allen:

So that means with that \$50,000 there's sufficient—

Mike Pollocoff:

There's enough money. Right. I believe that was a front end loader. We had budgeted for a new one. We were able to find one that was used that didn't have a lot of hours on it so we picked that up and saved the money with that.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Good move.

Village Board Meeting  
July 7, 2008

Clyde Allen:

And the money wasn't earmarked for anywhere else?

Mike Pollocoff:

That stays within the sewer utility fund. The other money you're talking about was equipment that John, Jr. had purchased in the general fund and we moved that money and kept that allocation for use in the general fund.

Clyde Allen:

As long as we have sufficient. I don't recall anything else being purchased in the utility that came over budget?

Mike Pollocoff:

No.

Clyde Allen:

Didn't happen, okay.

Mike Pollocoff:

Not for equipment. The utility for sewer and water we do our best estimates for main extensions and things like that. Again, those are within the sewer utility but that's again a different capital fund because most of that is TIF work so that would be funded through TIF. But the equipment portion that you look at as part of the capital budget, within that equipment fund that fund is covered 100 percent.

Clyde Allen:

Okay, thank you.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

One last comment if you'll allow me, Mr. President. . . . company local in Pewaukee and with the cost of shipping we have a saving right there with that.

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion and a second.

Village Board Meeting  
July 7, 2008

**YUHAS MOVED TO AWARD A CONTRACT TO ENVIROTECH EQUIPMENT COMPANY IN THE AMOUNT OF \$76,900 TO PURCHASE VIDEO CAMERA EQUIPMENT AND SOFTWARE FOR A UTILITY VIDEO TRUCK; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**F. Consider Resolution #08-27 - Resolution to dispose of surplus vehicle.**

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, the Superintendent of Public Works is requesting the authority to dispose of a 1989 Ford snowplow or truck along with the plow and box. Because of its age, hours of operation and condition it's no longer a reliable vehicle in the fleet and we're requesting the authority to dispose of that truck to the highest bidder.

Clyde Allen:

Make a motion to approve.

Mike Serpe:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Clyde, second by Mike. Further discussion?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Yes, this can be sold . . . free for the taking? This one works?

Mike Pollocoff:

No, this truck will come under the guidelines of P.T. Barnum.

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion and a second.

**ALLEN MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION #08-27 - RESOLUTION TO DISPOSE OF A 1989 FORD PLOW TRUCK; SECONDED BY SERPE; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**G. Consider Ordinance No. 08-39 - Ordinance to Amend Section 98 of the Municipal Code relating to polling places.**

Village Board Meeting  
July 7, 2008

Jane Romanowski:

Mr. President, currently we have 11,340 registered voters that are assigned to five polling locations. We have the Village Hall, Good Shepherd Lutheran Church, Roger Prange Municipal Center, LakeView RecPlex and Fire Station #2. What's nice about that is four of those locations are Village buildings so that makes it really nice for us to use for elections. Fire Station 2 is our smallest location both in room size and parking spaces, but it's our second highest in the number of registered voters. Right now we have over 2,400 registered voters there which is second to the RecPlex which is about 3,300. So although the Fire Station 2 works for most elections, it was apparent in November of 2004 with the development in that area that November of '04 and some larger elections since we've been running out of room.

So looking in that area we kind of scoped in on St. Anne's Catholic Church. They have ample parking. They have a nice east entranceway. They have handicapped accessibility. They have a nice commons area with a hallway. And so I've talked with Father Don and I've met with the staff over at the Church, and they are very supportive of our request and plan to be very accommodating to the Village.

If the ordinance is adopted I need to send each registered voter, over 2,400 of them, a postcard notifying them of the change. All future newsletters will have information as to that change. We will also put the change on the website, Channel 25; anywhere we can and get that information out that that change will occur, as well as obviously posting signs on the next election date that you need to drive a little bit further to the north.

Just for some history, after the 2000 census the Village went from three polling places to five polling places. So it's probably a good chance that after the 2010 census we are going to be adding one to two and maybe three polling places. It all depends how it splits out. So there is a good chance that we'd probably come back to Fire Station #2 and possibly split wards 12 and 13 up. But we know that's coming. But in the meantime I think it's necessary that we change this polling location. We need to get mostly parking. The Chief and the staff have been absolutely wonderful. They store the equipment, they put it up for me, they take it down, they take care of anything that I need, they take care of the poll workers, and it's been a great working relationship and I'll miss that part of it because it's going to be a little bit more work for the Village to not store equipment there, and maybe Public Works will be helping me carry some more equipment to get set up.

But since St. Anne's has wholeheartedly agreed that this will work for them as long as we give them enough notice and we give them a plan and work with them, so it's my recommendation not to wait. If we wait until the 2010 census our new polling locations wouldn't be in effect until July of 2011. So I've got three years that we're thinking about having people stand outside in those long lines. Actually in November '04 we had over 2,100 people vote at Fire Station #2. So I think it's really important that we be a little more accommodating to our people. That parking lot is wonderful over at St. Anne's. Again, it's handicapped accessible, nice area to work with and, like I said, I'll miss the Chief and the staff because they've been absolutely wonderful to work with. But we may be coming back at some point. The census and redistricting is going to be all telling on what we'll have to do.

Village Board Meeting  
July 7, 2008

So it's my recommendation that we move the fire stations two polling location over to St. Anne's and that would be effective for the fall elections starting with the September 9 primary. Get one under our belt and then by November people should know where to go. Again, we'll advertise and do everything we can to notify the residents in press releases, whatever we have to do to make that change work.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Motion to approve.

Clyde Allen:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Steve, second by Clyde. Motion and a second for approval. Further discussion on this item?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Is there any chance to get a site closer for the people who live on the south side? For example, the Lutheran Church in Timber Ridge?

Jane Romanowski:

Not accessible. Not only that, when we're putting polling places together you have to think of a lot of different things. And to put one way far south, and when you're redistricting you have to have a certain amount of number, you have to be a certain amount, and the RecPlex I know there's people that have to drive a few minutes more, but they drive a few minutes more to get a gallon of milk, too. So I think it's really important. They can vote absentee if they don't want to drive, but the RecPlex works wonderful. And I think it's just the best location. And the IcePlex might our next or another polling location after the census. We might have one on each side of the building. We've talked about the Timber Ridge Church and it's not going to work. We look at a lot of different things, but I think people should be happy that they've got the RecPlex to go to to vote because it's accommodating and it's large.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I don't mind driving a long distance. We've got the freedom to vote in this country. I live by the State Line and I got to RecPlex and I don't complain but there are people who do. Some people who live in those areas wonder why we don't have a closer poll.



Village Board Meeting  
July 7, 2008

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion and a second. Further discussion?

**KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO ADOPT ORDINANCE NO. 08-39 - ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION 98 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE RELATING TO CHANGE THE POLLING PLACE FOR WARDS 12 & 13 FROM FIRE STATION NO. 2 TO ST. ANNE'S CHURCH; SECONDED BY ALLEN; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**H. Consent Agenda**

- 1) Approve Renewal of Bartender License Applications.**
- 2) Approve Bartender License Applications on file.**
- 3) Approve Letter of Credit Reduction for the Hideaway Homes Subdivision.**
- 4) Approve Letter of Credit Reduction for Shoppes at Prairie Ridge.**

Mike Serpe:

Move approval of Consent Agenda Items 1 through 4.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Mike, second by Steve.

**SERPE MOVED TO APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS 1-4 AS PRESENTED; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**9. VILLAGE BOARD COMMENTS**

Mike Serpe:

I have one. What Dick Ginkowski was talking about tonight I think it might be worth looking at in the future. If you look at the want ads in the Municipality take a look at some of the wages that some of these municipalities are paying their employees. I'm not putting down any other community, but Pleasant Prairie is doing a lot more and paying a lot less. I have to agree with Dick. I think we're blessed with one of the best Administrator's to ever hold the position and he's proven that for over 20 years. I don't think it would hurt to do a study on it. If it comes out that we're right on the money, fine, we know where we stand. If not, then I think we have to probably look at how do we get to where we want to be. I know politically it's tough to tell somebody we're going to give certain increases because your opposition will just beat you up on it, but you have to do what's right, and right now we have a very, very good management team. To keep that team together and to show our appreciation for them I think at least we should

Village Board Meeting  
July 7, 2008

consider giving them what the going rates are with comparable municipalities. I think it's a good idea that Dick brought that up and it might be worth looking into and formulating a little group to get the information that we need.

Monica Yuhas:

Mr. President, on June 20<sup>th</sup> I had the pleasure of spending the day with the Pleasant Prairie Police Department during their tactical training. It was quite an experience. I had no idea that our police officers were trained in tactical response. I did not know that. I spent a little time in the classroom reviewing things and then actually was able to participate in a few scenarios as a good person and a bad person. So it was quite interesting. Brian, I'm very impressed. I had the opportunity to work with Sergeant Scott Durkee, Field Training Office Mike Prange, Officer Paul Marik, Sergeant Keith Biernat, Officer Sandy Thomey, Officer Chad Brown and one of our new officers which I got to meet for the first time was Officer Bill Kohler. It was an interesting day. It's a very dedicated group of individuals. It's reassuring to me to know, God forbid if anything were to happen, we have people trained to respond right away and that was reassuring to me. So thank you for allowing me the opportunity to spend the day. I do appreciate it, Chief Wagner.

John Steinbrink:

Also, on behalf of the Board Monica and Steve and myself were in the Carol Beach Parade over the weekend, July 4<sup>th</sup> actually. They had great weather. They gave us a great reception. It was a good turnout. Lot of neighbors out there. The kids got to partake in the parade or watch the parade or whichever part they wanted. But it was a good event down there for July 4<sup>th</sup>. I don't think the weather could have been any better. My only complaint was I was at the end of the parade and Bob Babcock was up at the front of the parade in a convertible filled with beautiful young women. So I'm not sure how that works out.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

He knows somebody.

John Steinbrink:

He knows somebody, that's right. But it was a good event. Also, we're looking forward to the Danskin coming up this weekend.

Mike Pollocoff:

There are still opportunities to volunteer if people want to get involved and see a really moving event, the Danskin race. You can call LakeView RecPlex at 947-0437 and ask to speak with Erin and she'll find a spot for you to help out.

Village Board Meeting  
July 7, 2008

John Steinbrink:

So there's a lot going on in our community and if anybody says there's nothing to do just call the Village and we'll find something or keep you informed of what's going on because there's a lot going on in the Village and the City and all of Kenosha County.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

And Mike Serpe . . . be with us at five o'clock in the morning on Sunday for security.

Mike Serpe:

I'm hoping to be there, but I didn't make the Carol Beach parade. I'm having trouble walking. I have a very bad knee. I'm looking at replacement probably in the near future. So it's not that I shunned the Carol Beach people. I just can't walk that far. And I'm hoping to be able to do my job on Sunday at Danskin, otherwise I'm going to have to find somewhere else that I can possibly sit for a while to do it but I'll be there.

John Steinbrink:

Just be aware we picked up the slack. Special thanks to the police department. They had a squad car out there and a motorcycle officer. Fire department had a fire truck and a rescue squad. And the parks department did a great job of barricading the street so it was a safe event. Everybody chipped in.

Clyde Allen:

Just a quick comment, again, on what Mr. Ginkowski had commented on. A fine idea. Rather than a group, though, I suggest at budget hearings we look at a consultant. Because just talking to municipalities, communities, different responsibilities go with the different positions. So we may want to look at the budget as to what it will be to bring in a consultant sometime in '09 to look at an equity study for duties required.

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

**YUHAS MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ;  
MOTION CARRIED 5-0 AND MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:40 P.M.**