

**VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE
PLEASANT PRAIRIE VILLAGE BOARD
PLEASANT PRAIRIE WATER UTILITY
PLEASANT PRAIRIE SEWER UTILITY**

9915 - 39th Avenue

Pleasant Prairie, WI

December 9, 2013

Immediately following the 6:00 p.m. Plan Commission meeting

A regular meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Village Board was held on Monday, December 9, 2013. Meeting called to order at 6:50 p.m. Present were Village Board members John Steinbrink, Monica Yuhas, Steve Kumorkiewicz, Clyde Allen and Mike Serpe. Also present were Michael Pollocoff, Village Administrator; Tom Shircel, Assistant Administrator; Jean Werbie-Harris, Community Development Director; Dave Smetana, Police Chief; Mike Spence, Village Engineer; John Steinbrink Jr., Public Works Director; Carol Willke, HR and Recreation Director; Dan Honore', IT Director and Jane M. Romanowski, Village Clerk. One citizen attended the meeting.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- 3. ROLL CALL**
- 4. MINUTES OF MEETING - NOVEMBER 18, 2013**

Monica Yuhas:

Motion to approve.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Monica, second by Steve. Any discussion on the minutes?

**YUHAS MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 18, 2013
VILLAGE BOARD MEETING AS PRESENTED IN THEIR WRITTEN FORM; SECONDED BY
KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

- 5. CITIZEN COMMENTS**

Jane Romanowski:

We have one signup tonight, Matt Phillips.

Village Board Meeting
December 9, 2013

Matt Phillips:

Good evening. I'm Matt Phillips from Senior Lifestyle Corporation in Chicago. Our address is 111 East Wacker Drive, Suite 2200. And we just received conceptual plan approval from the Plan Commission. And I just wanted to introduce ourselves. And I think the next step is probably to be in front of your body for ultimately a conditional use permit and planned unit development. So I'm here to answer any questions you'd like about the proposed project. And if not I just want to thank you for your time.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you, Matt. Anyone else wishing to speak? Hearing none I'm going to close citizens' comments.

6. ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT – None.

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Consider renewal application for Scotty's Mobile Home Park License.

SERPE MOVED TO REMOVE ITEM 7A. FROM THE TABLE; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

Jane Romanowski:

As you will recall last Monday the Board tabled consideration of Scotty's because they wanted an update on the pending building and zoning violations. And as my memo states this is what I received from Ralph last week about Lot 13, Lot 15 and Lot 27. And I don't know if Jean's has more information on that. And there was also an email that I did place at your seat tonight. So we'll let Jean update you on those.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Members of the Board and the audience, with respect to Scotty's Mobile Home Park with respect to all of the items that were on our punch list many of them were taken care of immediately. There were numbers placed on Units 1 and 10. Lots number 27 had the skirting completed and the railing put around its unit deck to get into the unit. Lot 19 the window was replaced.

The two units or lots that still had concerns or problems last week they have been very aggressive in getting things taken care of, the first one of which is Lot 13. This particular unit - they have been out there, and they have taken off the illegal porch and lean to and other areas. They put new siding on it. They're not quite finished, but it's almost completed. I'm not sure if you had an opportunity to take a look at the email that was sent with respect to the siding. I know it looks like the siding is two different colors. It is. What they intend to do is get the last side up and completed in the next few weeks, and then they'll be painting it in the spring. But it looks 100

Village Board Meeting
December 9, 2013

times better than it did with respect to the unit, and they've cleaned up everything around it. So that should actually be done probably in the next three weeks depending on weather and such.

The second issue was with respect to Lot 15. And with respect to the emails and conversations that I've had with G. John on that particular unit the individual has actually gutted out the inside and has started to remove some of the parts on the inside as well. And he believes that they'll have it done by Monday, a week from today. And I told them I said weather permitting. But he believes that they will have everything done and so that that unit can be removed before the end of the year. In addition Rocco, our Village Assessor, has now removed the majority of the value of that particular unit. And I believe that that will take care of the value of that property that's being removed before the end of the year.

Jane Romanowski:

Lot 27, the stairs?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Lot 27 the stairs that was one of the first ones I mentioned that the stairs had been put up adjacent to the unit, and a railing had been put around.

Jane Romanowski:

Since last Tuesday?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Yes.

Mike Pollocoff:

When they say they're going to have it done they mean removed, not just stripped out on the inside and redone for reuse.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

My understanding is that it's going to be removed. Possibly Vince can add some additional comments with respect to that. But they were gutting it as of last week and this week.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

So they are working to remove it from the inside out?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

That's my understanding. Isn't that correct? Maybe Vince could come up.

Village Board Meeting
December 9, 2013

John Steinbrink:

Vince, if you want to just clarify. Just give us your name and address for the record.

Vince Ruffolo:

Vince Ruffolo, 3805 13th Place. In respect to the lot for the unit there I think the lot in question you're talking about, Jean, that's been gutted out, and it's going to be repaired. Now, I'm looking into -- can we remove something like that, if we would remove it off the property, but I think it's being remodeled and being redone. Now, the question is we don't own that. So the question is the court or by court or by injunction you guys can technically condemn and then it would have to be removed if that would be the case. I've not been inside there but my brother has. And apparently what was the comment he gave you, Jean, you think he's remodeling that or the owner went in there and redid it.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

I mean I have some photos if you haven't seen some of the photos in there. But it was trashed pretty much on the inside.

Vince Ruffolo:

See the whole -- and in something like that obviously. I don't know. I'm dealing and talking to an attorney right now to see what kind of lien that we have in order to go in and take control of some of these mobile home parks that are like that. Because we do not own the housing. We own the land. We're renting the land. So I don't know to what conditions -- something like that we don't tolerate, and it's not something we want to see. But the question is do we have the right to go in and put pressure and remove a mobile home, a housing. Now that's where the trick of the trade is.

Now, I just want to say one thing further. When we took over this mobile home park there were drug addicts, there were alcoholics, infested with prostitution, and we cleaned it up. Now, the majority, 99 percent, are working families. They have jobs at the pizza place, gas stations. Now, their vision in life is not the same as ours otherwise they would have a \$600,000 home in Meadowdale. Their vision is a little different. So we're trying very hard and work towards getting this under control as best as we can. And obviously we appreciate your input into this and give us ideas and so on.

But along those lines I think it's critical that some plan be done. Because a few years ago I had an opportunity, there's three lots there, one of them is three acres in front, there's two acres in the back, and then there's probably another quarter of an acre or half acre on the side which gives a total of five and a half acres. And a few years ago I had a buyer that was willing to put up a dealership, but I couldn't convince the Village at the time to combine the three because the fact is it is designated as residential. The front is obviously the mobile home park, and then the sides

Village Board Meeting
December 9, 2013

also residential which is next to the auto -- well, now you've got a little strip mall on the side on the west end of it.

So from this standpoint it's vital how are we going to approach this. Because I come every year and obviously I don't like it no more than you do the questions. We show a long-term and short-term plan, and obviously the short-term plan is you cannot -- what are we going to do with those individuals that live there. And obviously you have the right not to renew the license. But on the other hand what are we going to do with those people? That's the question that comes in.

We are working very -- as Jean said we took a very severe action, and we worked very diligently to go ahead and get this in place and get to right some of these so-called violations. And it's not that we're correcting them, we're making the individuals who own the mobile home correct this. But, again, the point I'm trying to make is we're not dealing with individuals that so-called [inaudible] University of Wisconsin-Madison law school. We're dealing with individuals that they look at life totally different. So we're working very hard to [inaudible].

You also can help us from that standpoint because obviously they pay taxes and you tax them on the mobile home. And if you condemn a mobile home then obviously, yeah, then I guess from that standpoint it could be removed. But until then it can't be removed. So these are the issues that I think that -- and as I've mentioned to some of you I would like to -- it's prime property. I'd like to look at long-term and short-term some type of, that's it. And I don't know what direction the Village wants to move. If the Village wants to say, look, we're not into the mobile home park, I don't know, we want to abolish that and eventually put them aside and bring in some more commercial and high end residential, that's great. I'm all for that. The question is how are we going to approach this. That's the question. What question are we going to go?

I think those people have a right to have some type of home in their means, and in order for me or you or anyone to say, look, you have some type of a junk car in front of the house and that's got to go. Well, in your eyes or my eyes it's not good and I agree. But on the other hand you've got to look to see who we're looking at. If they repair their car in front of their home or a mobile home, and I understand they wouldn't do that in Meadowdale, but they do it in that particular scenario.

So the whole thing is how are we going to as a Village and also as a business owner how are we going to approach this so everybody can be on the same page. And also be kind enough and gentle enough that we gradually find a way for these folks to find a home, not to be kicked in the street and be kicked on the curb of the road. So these are the issues. And if we try very hard to kind of look at them, how to improve them, but then you only get so far. Those of you who have dealt with so-called the individuals with that kind of mentality.

John Steinbrink:

Vince, maybe a quick question. You spoke of an opportunity you had at one time. If another opportunity was to arise to do something else with this property what would be your procedure to go through to allow it to happen in a timely time when you have these units all on there? What

Village Board Meeting
December 9, 2013

would be the time line? What would you have to do in order to make the land available for development?

Vince Ruffolo:

Well, I think a reasonable amount of time would be that -- and if you have a developer come in and the Village would go along and combine the three lots, the three so-called identifies and you would have another scenario like we had a few years ago, then we have the people that [inaudible] for some time I think it's only appropriate to give them at least a six months notice to say within six months this part will be demolished, no longer be a park. And then we expect you to find yourself another area that you can bring your mobile home to. And at the same time I believe that we go ahead and maybe give them some ideas and give them some feedback where they can go to a [inaudible] because there are parks in the area that would accept.

John Steinbrink:

I guess legally how much time do you have to give them notice-wise.

Vince Ruffolo:

I don't know. That I don't have the answer. I guess you want to -- I'm a true believer not only you go legally but also you want to go above and beyond that because it's only fair to --

John Steinbrink:

But we've been talking about time lines for trailers like Lot 15 and not being able to do anything with it because you can't find the owner.

Vince Ruffolo:

Correct. John, I can mention to you I talked to my attorney, and basically they said as long as -- you have to go through the processes. You have to foreclose on it, somewhere along the line the court has to order you to go ahead and remove it. The process could be lengthy.

John Steinbrink:

That would be the same process then for if you were going to develop the property for something else then.

Vince Ruffolo:

Well, not necessarily, because then I think what you could do is you could make an announcement to say that the park will be closed effective six months, eight months down the road. And these are areas you have to move from here, and the first thing they'll question is where am I going? Do you have any leads? Well, maybe we can go ahead and give them some leads that there will be parks in the area that they're accepting mobile homes. Then it's up to

Village Board Meeting
December 9, 2013

them to move it. Then if they don't move it then obviously you have to take other actions accordingly.

But I believe you have to give them at least what the law requires, and I don't have that number unless one of you would know. But I don't have that number. But it's something that -- and, John, in regard to the whole picture it's a process. In the meantime we're going to continue keeping it up. Like I said, we went from a park that was full of drug addicts, alcohol, prostitution, and we cleaned it up to people who at least have jobs and they're working.

John Steinbrink:

Okay, any other questions for Vince? Mike?

Mike Pollocoff:

I guess the Village ordinance requires that park management maintain the park and that the owner is required to maintain their dwellings in a livable standard. The problem we've had is that action, and it's the responsibility of the park management to ensure through the rental contracts for the lease of the space that that's the mobile homeowner's responsibility to do that. And that's the park management's responsibility to enforce that.

Now, nobody on this Board and nobody on the Village staff has said we want to get these type people out. That's not our goal. Our goal is that dwellings cannot be allowed to exist in such a rundown condition that for the working people that you describe that are living in that area they shouldn't have to put up with that. And I think the problem is this problem arises at the eleventh month every year where it's a big surprise that all of a sudden there's a unit that isn't in good shape.

The Village cannot condemn the mobile home. We cannot condemn personal property on leased land. We can condemn real estate. We can condemn the dwelling on the real estate. But we can't condemn a mobile unit that's valued as personal property. And it's on land that they're leasing. So that's why the statutes and the ordinance are geared to give that responsibility to the park management, and the park management responsibility is to administer that through the lease.

And so the extent that you're the one that executes the lease with the people, so if you give them one month's notice through the lease or you give them two months or three months, whatever that is that's between you as the park management and them as the people that are going to park their personal property on the leased land. And then that's what makes it happen. That's why a mobile home park operator gets the privilege of having densities at that higher level, they get the benefits of having a park that you can't typically put into existing residential.

So this Board cannot sit there and condemn a home. We'd have better luck saying that it was an unlicensed home and then we could tow it off as we would a trailer or a car on private property. But that's not our responsibility. That's your responsibility. And your contracts have to -- I'm assuming that your attorney has drafted contracts for you that's giving you that leverage to make that happen. Because you're the only one that can do it. Our only time in the situation is for you

Village Board Meeting
December 9, 2013

to keep a licensed mobile home park you have to live up to those conditions within the statutes and within the mobile home park ordinance because that's our connection to you.

So these issues out there that live out there that create out there are the responsibility of management that allowed it to go to this point. And if it had just been an issue that cropped up, but every year we kind of go through the same thing where we're right at the end of the year and we need more time, the ground's frozen, we can't put asphalt in. And this happens every year. And I think whoever you've got working for you out there he's got to take a more interest outlook in managing this thing and making sure it operates well.

I agree with you there's a lot of people out there they're probably not making a lot of money. That's not their fault and it's not our fault but that's the way it is. But they don't deserve to live next to somebody that's devaluating their property because it's out there. And that's who's getting hurt, the people you're talking about by letting these bad units exist out there. So if they can get that thing done by the end of the year you'd be in compliance. There would be no issue with the license for the park. I mean that's where it is.

As you indicated we can't condemn a property because we just don't have the legal authority to do that. And for me to condemn something I have to -- the government is going to exercise probably one of the strongest powers they have is to take property away from somebody, the dirt that they own and the improvements on it and say this now belongs to us, and we're going to give you some money to go someplace else. I don't think this Board would do that and we can't do that. We legally can't do that because you own the property. It's like we'd have to condemn your property and then they would be the relocation.

Vince Ruffolo:

Mike, the rule was put in by a statute that if somebody goes in by a property and happens to dump a trailer or a mobile home or a car or whatever, that you can do. Long as they're paying the rent, if that individual pays his rent, we were told you have no right to go in and tell them they've got to move or take it out. Now the statute also calls for the Village [inaudible] an ordinance. The village can impose on that mobile home say you have to keep it so long. You can issue basically an informing piece of paper saying you're in violation of X, Y and Z.

But what I've seen going on, Mike, is this. That a lot of times we can go to any mobile home park, any one of them, and I guarantee you we'll find an issue. We'll find an issue. I mean in the eyes of the beholder a lot of times. Some of these issues, the picture I saw is something like that, yes. But how am I going to go and say, alright, this is trash, I'm going to go tie a chain to it and I'm going to pull it out of that because actually that's what is required.

Mike Pollocoff:

No, what I'm saying is that surely you must have something in your leases that doesn't permit this to exist.

Village Board Meeting
December 9, 2013

Vince Ruffolo:

The lease basically is totally accorded to the ordinance of the Village.

Mike Pollocoff:

Nope. The lease is accorded to the rights of you as a property owner that own the real estate property and the rights of that mobile home who owns personal property. We have no rights in that agreement. You're the one that has the rights.

Vince Ruffolo:

I cannot go in their property and inside the facility.

Mike Pollocoff:

But does your lease permit this?

Vince Ruffolo:

It does not. It does not allow me to go into their home.

Mike Pollocoff:

So they violated their lease if it doesn't permit.

Vince Ruffolo:

In their home I can't go in. I can go on the outside and say you've got to move your car. Your car is in the way [inaudible]. And believe me it's not something that we condone, and we try very diligently and very hard to kind of make sure we encourage them to live and repair technically their home. I'm not repairing it. They're repairing their own. And we stand there and over and over say -- then you come to a point, okay, then legally you have to take legal action to go ahead and do that, and that's a lengthy process to do that.

The point I'm trying to make is the Village has because they pay taxes, the mobile home pays taxes to the Village. So the Village could -- could it condemn the property? Well, it could say, and I don't know if it can be done or not. The question is how are we going to go about -- and we work very -- from my standpoint we work very diligently on it. And if we see a car that doesn't belong there it gets towed away because of the roadway and everything else [inaudible]. The question is you're going to go in and how are we going to go about and do that. We encourage him, we can work at it.

But there's been a situation where we walked in, there was a tree that fell on one of them, not too long, maybe a year or so ago, and the guy said he was going to fix it and he never fixed it. We finally said you've got to repair this, you've got to repair this porch. So we'll stay on top of it

Village Board Meeting
December 9, 2013

but, again, the point of the whole thing is I agree I'm not disputing what you're saying. I'm just saying to you that it's a very touchy subject especially when you're dealing with, like you said, it's a low income, and it's people that they [inaudible]. And the question is I'm willing to look at a solution for the long term to see what can be done about and maybe bring it -- it's prime land. I'd like to see something for myself.

John Steinbrink:

Okay, thank you, Vince. Mike?

Michael Serpe:

Right now I think the issue tonight is the letter that was sent that we have to address on these mobile homes and the condition of them. As I understand it, Vince, number 15 is being dismantled and it's going to be removed according to the conversation I had with your brother.

Vince Ruffolo:

Yes, correct.

Michael Serpe:

The inside is almost done, they're going to start working on the outside. If we don't renew the license, the people don't get evicted, the fines start daily, and those fines are \$625 or something like that a day. I'm not too sure. And I want to avoid that. I don't want to see that happen. But I think, Mike, you hit it right on the head. I think a better effort has to come from the person that you have overseeing that park, the superintendent of the park or whatever you want to call him. That person should be made a little bit more aware of what's required and what has to be done to get the license renewed every year.

Now, if everything that has been noted on the letter has been addressed or almost addressed with the exception of number 15 which is in the works, then I would say that we can approve the license subject to that number 15 being totally removed from the park by the end of the year. And if it's not then the fines are going to have to start. But I'm confident that that trailer will be gone.'

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I've got a question here for you. It appears to me that you list the land to put a mobile home, now you don't have terms and conditions for the lease of the piece of property do you?

Vince Ruffolo:

No.

Village Board Meeting
December 9, 2013

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

And I think that's the root of the whole problem because we cannot put a solution to that one. It's your property. When you sign a lease, I signed a lease for a property in the city years ago and there were terms and conditions. Told me what I have to do. And you don't have nothing like that.

Vince Ruffolo:

Correct.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

So don't try to send it to us now to take care of the problem because the problem is yours. What I hear right now is you trying to say you -- wait a minute, don't say you, say we, okay? Because it's not our problem, it's yours.

Vince Ruffolo:

I didn't say it was your problem.

John Steinbrink:

Okay, Trustee Serpe has asked that we stick to the --

Michael Serpe:

We have to stick to the letter and to the agenda item.

John Steinbrink:

-- letter. And as long as we're agreed that 13 is going to be redone and we can see the process there and 15 that is going to be removed, I guess.

Vince Ruffolo:

Is that's right, Mike, that's what's going to be removed?

Michael Serpe:

Yeah, John said 15 is going. I don't think you're collecting any rent on 15 anymore. I'd be surprised if you are.

John Steinbrink:

Well, 15 was going to be given away anyhow to somebody.

Village Board Meeting
December 9, 2013

Michael Serpe:

Right. So the only thing we need from you, Vince, is a commitment that 15 will be removed before the end of the year. If that happens your license goes for another year.

Vince Ruffolo:

Before the end of the year? Before the end of this month?

Michael Serpe:

It has to be gone before the end of the month.

Vince Ruffolo:

This month?

Michael Serpe:

Yes.

John Steinbrink:

It's already being dismantled.

Vince Ruffolo:

Alright, if you got it from my brother.

Michael Serpe:

Yeah, John said it's going to be gone. I would make a motion to approve the license subject to trailer number 15 being totally removed from the park by the end of the year.

Monica Yuhas:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

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

Village Board Meeting
December 9, 2013

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Yes. I don't think I'd like to see a license for a year. I'd like to see give him a license for three months or six months.

John Steinbrink:

Right now it's subject to this being done by the end of the year.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Yeah, but if he complies with that we're going to give a full year [inaudible]. I've got a problem with that.

Michael Serpe:

I wouldn't recommend that. If he's complying with the letter then I think we owe it to him to give him a year.

John Steinbrink:

The motion so far, we'll take a vote on that -- Clyde?

Clyde Allen:

Thank you, Mr. President. The problem I have with allowing a license for another year even if they remove this unit number 15 is if you look at Lot 13 how in the world does that even allow to happen? Every year -- I understand but I'm saying every year it seems that we come up with these issues that we have a unit that does not look very good, and 13 should not occur. That just should not occur. I understand. I agree with you wholeheartedly these people have a different vision in life, they're low income, they're working pizza places, they're working gas stations. God bless them, I hope they can make things work the best they can. But 13 should not occur, 15 just should not occur. But every year this does occur. And somebody's got to watch out to say 13 should not happen. That is visible to everybody in the world.

Vince Ruffolo:

I agree with you. Mr. Allen, the question again as I stated we can go ahead and put a sign tomorrow but what do you do with those folks? I'm open for ideas. I really am open for ideas.

John Steinbrink:

Okay, we had the discussion last week on 13, 15 shouldn't, 27 should have been skirted, that wasn't, that was a whole year. The issue before us is the motion. We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion?

Village Board Meeting
December 9, 2013

SERPE MOVED TO APPROVE A MOBILE HOME PARK LICENSE TO G. JOHN RUFFOLO FOR SCOTTY'S MOBILE HOME PARK, 5310 75TH STREET FROM 1/1/14 THROUGH 12/31/14 WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE TRAILER ON LOT 15 HAS TO BE DISMANTLED AND REMOVED BY 12/31/13 OR FINES WILL BE ISSUED; SECONDED BY YUHAS; MOTION CARRIED 3-2 WITH ALLEN AND KUMORKIEWICZ DISSENTING.

Vince Ruffolo:

Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you, Vince.

8. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Receive Plan Commission recommendation and consider a Conceptual Plan for the proposed Senior Lifestyle Community generally located south of Prairie Ridge Boulevard and east of 97th Court within the Prairie Ridge development.**

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. President and members of the Board, this is the request for the conceptual plan for the Senior Lifestyle project. And we don't have the slides. You had seen them at the Plan Commission hearing earlier this evening. The petitioner is proposing to develop a nine acre site for a 162 senior housing unit development with two phases. Phase 1 will include 96 units; phase 2 will include 66 units. The senior housing community will include central dining facilities, multipurpose rooms, a fitness center, arts and crafts. As part of their monthly fees residents will have access to meals and other services such as housekeeping, linen services, transportation, recreation, recreational, other type of services for the facility.

Again, this is a senior development that's proposed to be located west of the senior housing project that VK developed a number of years ago south of Prairie Ridge Boulevard between 96th Avenue and 97th Court. The petitioner specifically is requesting a conceptual plan approve this evening. The next steps in their approval process will be a conditional use permit, a planned unit development to address any dimensional variations to their project, as well as the detailed site and operational plans related to that conceptual plan.

Specifically the developer had presented at the Plan Commission meeting a series of illustrations and drawings as to how the facility was to be laid out. These are plans that we've been working on for several months with the Village staff along with the fire department and police department. Others have seen them that show us exactly what is being proposed. Again, it's intended to be a three story facility. They're looking for a maximum height of 45 feet which would be a ten foot variation from the ordinance. Again, that will be addressed at a separate point by the Village Plan Commission and the Village Board with the public hearings.

Village Board Meeting
December 9, 2013

They have adequate parking for the facility. They might need a slight modification for the second phase. Again, that will be part of the PUD. One of the biggest concerns that was raised at the Village Plan Commission meeting is that there are a number of private and public improvements that were completed, some were completed, some were not surrounding this development. We received an engineer's cost estimate to complete the public and private improvements for this entire area. And we do need to review that estimate to make sure that the letter of credit on file with the Village is still adequate in order to complete those public improvements and private improvements, as well as those in subsequent phases that this particular developer is not going to be completing at this time.

The staff and the Plan Commission recommended approval. We still have some things to work out a little bit with the architecture and some of the building materials and such, but it's all spelled out in the staff comments which they have agreed to all the comments and conditions at the Plan Commission meeting.

Michael Serpe:

Is that what the --

Jean Werbie-Harris:

No. If you'd like we could go through and pull up the slides real quick.

John Steinbrink:

Everybody was here for the Plan Commission meeting.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

We were all here, yes.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Exact same slides as previously shown.

Michael Serpe:

I concur with the Plan Commission's recommendation and move approval of the conceptual plan.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

Mike Pollocoff:

I'd also like to add the caveat on the letter of credit.

Village Board Meeting
December 9, 2013

Michael Serpe:

And that will come through with the developer's agreement?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

That's correct. There will be a developer's agreement, yes.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Mike, second by Steve, caveat by Mike. And everybody was here and did see the presentation. Thank you for the presentation. Motion, second. Further discussion?

SERPE MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND APPROVE A CONCEPTUAL PLAN FOR THE PROPOSED SENIOR LIFESTYLE COMMUNITY GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF PRAIRIE RIDGE BOULEVARD AND EAST OF 97TH COURT WITHIN THE PRAIRIE RIDGE DEVELOPMENT SUBJECT TO STAFF COMMENTS INCLUDING A LETTER OF CREDIT TO COVER THE ENTIRE COST OF THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE IMPROVEMENTS FOR THIS DEVELOPMENT AND FOR THE ENTIRE DEVELOPABLE AREA; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you, gentlemen.

B. Consider purchase of comprehensive backup and storage units for the Information Technology Department.

Dan Honore:

Mr. President and members of the Board good evening. Office of Information Technology is requesting approval to purchase three devices that will significantly improve the reliability and performance of the Village's data backup environment and data storage environment. The storage right now that we have is approximately ten years old. It's at least two years out of its end of life, past its end of life. The backup devices that we are using are tape devices. The newest one is still a viable environment, and we would redeploy that in other means. The other devices that we use for backup are older technology and would most likely look at selling those after market if we can.

The first device that we'd be looking for is a storage area network. Basically it's a cabinet that has a lot of hard drives in it, solid state drives, newer technology. Manufactured by Fusion-io. This device would sell for a total of \$58,600. That's including five years of maintenance for the price of three years if we pay for this all at one time. The storage for that will provide us plenty of growth with at least three to five years into the future based on what we currently have as well

Village Board Meeting
December 9, 2013

as what we're estimating with the newer programs that we're bringing on board such as Munic [phonetic] for finance and human resources.

The other two devices are the backup devices which are manufactured by Unitrends. One device would be located here in the Village most likely at Prange. The second device would be located downtown at the Kenosha County Data Center. That would become our disaster recovery device. So should something happen to the Prange building itself or that backup device we could always sail over to the one that's at Kenosha County, and we would have our data safe and secure in that building.

Those two devices together at the time I put this together totaled \$52,573.92. Since this I had secured another \$4,000 off of that. So tonight, again, we are asking for authorization to purchase one Fusion-io N5-100 storage area network for the one-time cost of \$58,600 with no recurring annual maintenance for five years. We are asking for authorization to purchase two Unitrends 824 appliances for a one-time cost of -- no more than \$52,573.92 and a recurring annual maintenance beginning January 1, 2015 of \$7,780.92.

Michael Serpe:

I have a question. How does this come in compared to the budget?

Mike Pollocoff:

We've got room in the budget for this. And the bid prices you can see on the storage it was pretty tight. And for the backup there was one that was smaller but it was 24 terabytes versus 32 so it didn't get done what we needed to get done. So this will come in under budget.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Under budget?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes.

John Steinbrink:

Clyde?

Clyde Allen:

Thank you. Just a clarification. You had mentioned the purchase of the storage unit was \$58,600, and you mentioned that it was five year maintenance. Our screen shows three year maintenance.

Village Board Meeting
December 9, 2013

Mike Pollocoff:

It's at the cost of three years.

Dan Honore:

The incentive that we get is the five years of maintenance for the cost of three years. So in other words we pay for what three years would cost but we get five years out of it.

Monica Yuhas:

So moved.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

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

YUHAS MOVED TO APPROVE THE PURCHASE OF ONE FUSION-IO N5-100 STORAGE AREA NETWORK FOR \$58,600 AND TO PURCHASE TWO UNITRENDS RC824 APPLIANCES FOR A TOTAL OF \$52,573.92 AND A RECURRING ANNUAL MAINTENANCE FEE FOR THESE UNITS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$7,780.92 BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 2015; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

C. Consider construction management services agreement for the proposed Fire Station No. 1 project.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, I'm proposing that the Village enter into an agreement with Riley Construction to provide construction manager services for the reconstruction of Station 1. And the construction manager is just to follow up. They're involved in the beginning helping to make sure that the design that's prepared is going to be cost effective from a construction standpoint, that the Village is getting the best dollar we can. And then they'll provide that service all the way through the completion of the project.

Because in this case Riley Construction will be the construction manager they do not get access to the bidding. They don't get an automatic selection for work to be done. All work that's on the project, whether it's electrical, plumbing, masonry, whatever, if they want to do that work they have to competitively bid with everybody else. And the Village awards those bids. So the bid documents, the plans, the specifications are prepared by the architect, and Riley they make sure that they're right. But they don't get access to any of the contract work unless they're the low bidder. The example is RecPlex and the aqua arena and at the rehab at the police station there

Village Board Meeting
December 9, 2013

was some items that Riley was not the low bid on and they didn't get that work. So who ends up actually doing our work will be a process of the public bidding process.

The charge for this is 2 percent of the total project cost. There are some additional fees that would take place if we had them do additional work above and beyond that where we're going to use their equipment, use their trucks, use any of their construction equipment in helping get the jobs done is at a price. But the basic work is at 2 percent. That's one of the reasons we're getting -- that is a good rate. That's probably 2 percent lower than others. They have done a lot of work for us. And they've been a trusted advisor for the Village on construction projects, and we've had really good success with them. With that I recommend that we authorize the Administrator to execute a contract with Riley Construction for the relocation of Station 1.

Michael Serpe:

So moved.

Clyde Allen:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

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

SERPE MOVED TO APPROVE A CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH RILEY CONSTRUCTION FOR THE PROPOSED FIRE STATION NO. 1 PROJECT AS PRESENTED; SECONDED BY ALLEN; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

D. Consider Resolution #13-28 relating to an amendment to the 2013 budget.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, the Finance Director is recommending that we authorize a fund transfer between categories which requires Board approval. In this case Municipal Court revenues have exceeded projections by \$6,436. And to produce that we spent more money in salaries, some consultant services for jail fees, printing, credit card processing fees and [inaudible] insurance had increased. So the net change to the budget is zero. But we need to make a transfer between revenue for expenditures to fund that out. So we're requesting that the Board authorize Resolution 13-28.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

So moved.

Monica Yuhas:

Second.

Village Board Meeting
December 9, 2013

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Steve, second by Monica. Further discussion?

KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION #13-28 RELATING TO AN AMENDMENT TO THE 2013 BUDGET; SECONDED BY YUHAS; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

E. Consider a Partnership Agreement between the RecPlex and the Wisconsin Juniors Volleyball Club.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, RecPlex has entered into a five year agreement with the Wisconsin Juniors Volleyball Club which is a girls volleyball club. And, Carol, go for it.

Carol Willke:

Mr. President, what the RecPlex is looking for is to continue the agreement that we have with the Wisconsin Juniors Volleyball Club. We've had a successful partnership with them for the past eight years. They have brought the level of volleyball that the girls and some young women, it goes up to the age of 18, the volleyball that they produce out there is pretty phenomenal. And we have been extremely happy with our relationship with them, and would like to extend it for an additional five years. So with that if you have any questions I'd be happy to answer them. Otherwise the recreation department is requesting that you authorize this agreement.

Clyde Allen:

Motion to approve.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Clyde, second by Steve for approval. Any further discussion?

Monica Yuhas:

Carol, real quick, just how many teams do they have out there?

Carol Willke:

I wish I could answer that for you. I can't. They are out there five nights a week anywhere from two to four hours a night. They start from third graders and go up to high school.

Village Board Meeting
December 9, 2013

Mike Pollocoff:

[Inaudible] usually on a weeknight.

Carol Willke:

I'm sorry, what?

Mike Pollocoff:

They use about three or four courts a night?

Carol Willke:

Yeah. Starting after the first of the year they'll have their Sunday volleyball tournaments. Some of them have eight courts. President's Day weekend they take the entire field house. It's pretty impressive to watch them play, some of the ladies. And a lot of them go on to play college ball. If I had to guess I'd say probably 20 or 25 teams.

Monica Yuhas:

Impressive.

John Steinbrink:

Trustee Serpe said the Board is willing to take them on.

Carol Willke:

Maybe we could do that as a charity event.

John Steinbrink:

Quite charitable. We had a motion and a second I believe. Any further discussion? Those in favor?

ALLEN MOVED TO APPROVE A PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE RECPLEX AND THE WISCONSIN JUNIORS VOLLEYBALL CLUB; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

Village Board Meeting
December 9, 2013

9. VILLAGE BOARD COMMENTS

Michael Serpe:

I have one. We had a good year. The Village had a good year this year. I think our services were as good as they've ever been. I think in spite of the cuts that we always have to endure from the State every year we managed to continue to supply good services to the people. And with that I wish everybody a very merry Christmas and a happy new year and see you in 2014.

10. ADJOURNMENT

ALLEN MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING; SECONDED BY YUHAS; MOTION CARRIED 5-0 AND MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:45 P.M.