VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE PLEASANT PRAIRIE VILLAGE BOARD PLEASANT PRAIRIE WATER UTILITY PLEASANT PRAIRIE SEWER UTILITY 9915 - 39th Avenue Pleasant Prairie, WI October 20, 2014 6:00 p.m.

A regular meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Village Board was held on Monday, October 20, 2014. Meeting called to order at 6:00 p.m. Present were Village Board members John Steinbrink, Kris Keckler, Steve Kumorkiewicz and Mike Serpe. Clyde Allen was absent. Also present were Michael Pollocoff, Village Administrator; Tom Shircel, Assistant Administrator; Jean Werbie-Harris, Community Development Director; Dave Smetana, Police Chief; Doug McElmury, Fire & Rescue Chief; Mike Spence, Village Engineer; Sandro Perez, Inspection Superintendent; and Jane M. Romanowski, Village Clerk. Three citizens attended the meeting.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER
- 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
- 3. ROLL CALL
- 4. **PUBLIC HEARING**

A. Consider the construction of 360 linear feet of water main on 63rd Avenue between 83rd and 84th Streets and Final Resolution #14-32.

Mike Spence:

Mr. President and members of the Board, the preliminary resolution for the extension of water on 63rd Avenue between 83rd and 84th Streets was approved on October 6th. As you can see in the drawing here this is a stretch of Village right of way where the water has not been connected between 83rd and 84th Street. And we have gotten a request for service from the individual on the east side of 63rd Avenue. And they've actually paid for an assessment. So in this particular case the only parcel that has never been assessed is the parcel in yellow there

So the project represents about 360 linear feet of water main and the assessment was calculated, and the assessment is based on linear front footage. So the assessment for that yellow parcel is estimated as \$6,919.55. And then the water service lateral is \$1,975 for a total of assessment of \$8,895.55. I should point out that this assessment, these numbers for the construction cost were based on contractor estimates. If the Village construction staff has availability they will construct this and that price would be reduced. So this is a conservative estimate. I have not heard anything from the proposed owner on this. They were sent notices as prescribed by ordinance. And the assessment is pretty straightforward. So I'd be glad to answer any questions.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

One question. Mike, from what I see here there's only one property that is not in line here, right?

Mike Spence:

Correct.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I don't understand why that property was not assessed [inaudible] before.

Mike Spence:

If you look at the map there, Steve, there's no way that they could have gotten water from the water main to the north or south. It's just an odd quirk of the geometry in the area there. In order to service that lot you have to have a water main, and there was no need to construct the water main at the time or there was no request for service on that particular stretch of street. So that water main wasn't put in at that time. So the property to the north was served by the water main on 83rd. The property to the east is served by that section that comes down from the north. And then the two parcels east and west to the south of that yellow here and here are served by this line.

In other words so there was no need at the time that these were going in to make this connection for whatever reason. I wasn't around, but everybody that wanted service got it from either this line or this line. And this property is not developed, and they want to build a house. So that's what precipitated all of this.

Mike Pollocoff:

Also as part of the CSM that was originally granted to that parcel they had a waiver of special notice for that parcel, and I think it was \$25 a foot in the mid '90s. So they agreed to do that, and they prepaid the cost of the water main at that point in time. So the Village's commitment to them under PSC rules is if they were willing to make that financial commitment, if all the money was at the Village, at such time as they're ready to go we would construct the main. The people that used to live at this parcel, I had visited with them at the time this was happening, and I advised them that this would be a good time to jump into the agreement and also have that, and they declined to do it. So that's why this is not at \$25 a foot, it's at \$60 a foot, but it's a different owner now.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Fifteen years ago, twenty years ago at least.

John Steinbrink:

Okay, this being a public hearing we'll open it up to public comment or question.

Jane Romanowski:

There weren't any signups tonight, Mr. President.

John Steinbrink:

Anybody wishing to speak on this item? Anybody? Hearing none, I'm going to close the public hearing and open it up to Board comment or question.

Michael Serpe:

The number here, Mike, is this 14-32 or 14-28?

Jane Romanowski:

It's 32. When she did the slide she didn't change it from a preliminary resolution.

Michael Serpe:

Okay, I'd move approval of Resolution 14-32.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Mike, second by Steve for adoption of final resolution 14-32. Any discussion on the motion?

SERPE MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION #14-31 – FINAL RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTIONS OF PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS AND LEVYING SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS AGAINST BENEFITTED PROPERTY WITH THE CONSTRUCTION OF 360 LINEAR FEET OF WATER MAIN ON 63RD AVENUE BETWEEN 83RD AND 84TH STREETS; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 4-0.

5. CITIZEN COMMENTS

John Steinbrink:

Anybody wishing to speak under citizens' comments? Hearing none we're going to close citizens' comments.

6. ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, I just wanted to let the Board know and any citizens that come that we're going through a process of construction of the new fire station and the lots that are adjacent to it and the access point off of 39th Avenue was closed on the 11th. So people need to use what's going to be our permanent access point which is off Springbrook Road and the north lots. This part is connected into the fire station construction, but it's really preparatory work for 39th Avenue improvements where the Village Hall access is going to be closed.

They're supposed to come in tomorrow and get some asphalt put in tomorrow morning before the Village Hall even opens up so that access point from the new lots to the front door is going to be easier to manage. And we've got a commitment from them to have as much of that work done in the old Village Hall lot and done before election so that's when we're going to have our big crush of people. And hopefully they can get the side streets ready as well. I think it's really going to depend on the weather. But we're encouraging everybody to really kind of save themselves if they vote absentee and come in during the day. It's a little bit dicey, but tomorrow it should be better to get into the Village Hall from those north lots. But those are the lots that everybody will use going forward.

When the main lot is done that road from Springbrook Road will come down into this existing lot and people will be able to park here. But if you recall the plans from the 39th Avenue project this area right in front of the patio here when we come out of the main door that's going to extend farther out. And cars will not be able to come onto 39th because we've had a number of near misses where somebody walks out on the side of the building and someone is coming down the parking lot this way or this door people are almost hit coming down the other way. So that will be pushed out. I'm not sure if that work is going to be done in time. But we'll definitely be able to get people into the election. The 39th Avenue project will start probably as soon as the weather will let us next year, and we'll be done before fall of the following year. I know it's a mess right now, but we're working on getting this thing closed up and ready for the election.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Mike, is there any chance to put a temporary light over there?

Mike Pollocoff:

Well, we are going to put as soon as we get power from the station we'll be putting poles up for the election and we'll be using temporary lights. That day we'll have the lights up running on generators for the parking lots in the morning and the afternoon.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Okay, thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you, Mike.

7. NEW BUSINESS

A. Consider Resolution #14-33 - Resolution Authorizing the Issuance and Sale of \$6,870,000 General Obligation Promissory Notes, Series 2014B.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, this is the bond for the improvements involved with the construction of the fire station and basically some rehab of the fire department's old apparatus floor and living quarters. That's the second part of the project that will go out next year. This year we're just doing the fire station. This is our first time where we are using the services of the financial consultant to help us in the process of doing the bonds. And then Mr. Schulz and Piper were the underwriters for this project. So before we consider the resolution I'd like Gene to describe what the underwriters did for us. And we have a recommendation from our financial advisor who couldn't be here tonight.

Gene Schulz:

Just to go over a little bit on the fluctuations in the bond market, I don't know if anybody here follows the bond market, but last week there was a little bit of what you call turmoil in the bond market. I believe it was Wednesday there was a fluctuation of about 35 to 40 basis points in the ten year treasury which is extremely unusual. Then on Friday the market kind of reversed again and came back to somewhat normal. I believe the ten year got as low as 191, and Friday it closed at 219. Today it has remained approximately the same. I did see a 1 basis point ticket of 2.18.

Trying to sell this issue was not real easy this morning. You call these markets volatile. The underwriter would call them unsettled at this point. A lot of people were not interested in making a commitment on these bonds. To give you an example -- the issue size, by the way, is \$6,865,000. The preliminary amount was the \$6,870,000. We priced an issue July 21st for Pleasant Prairie. The net interest cost on that issue was the 244, the net interest cost on this issue is at 224. So you've got a 20 basis point change to the good. And if we had priced this issue back in July the interest cost would have been approximately \$100,000 more.

So I always say if you can't be smart be lucky. We didn't do it because of interest rates obviously. We had some problems in determining the project costs. So it was delayed until October 20th. So from that standpoint Pleasant Prairie's taxpayers made out very well. But when it came to marketing this issue this morning -- the bottom line is Pipe Jaffray only sold 600,000 of them. So they made an underwriting commitment based on scales that are included in the resolution. So if the market really goes to haywire on Pipe Jaffray they could lose a lot of money. But that's one of the advantages I guess of doing a negotiated sale. If you get into a market where it's difficult, if you did a public sale, you would be perhaps thrown to the wolves because

no public underwriting would commit \$6 million to an underwriting without the bonds being sold.

I took comfort and Pleasant Prairie should take comfort they did hire a financial advisor. So on the call this morning, what we call the pre-pricing call, at least we had what I consider an independent person who's got a vast knowledge of interest rates. So he was able to converse with the underwriter who is headquartered out of Minneapolis. So the issue was probably repriced two or three times this morning. But it got to the point where if we had to make a commitment and the financial advisor is very confident that the pricing was a good pricing based on other issues that were offered in the marketplace, so net interest cost of 224 is probably one of the better issues that Pleasant Prairie has ever done. I just read the email that the financial advisor had sent to Mike, and he said the pricing went smoothly. Well, it wasn't really that smooth.

Mike Pollocoff:

It was smooth for us.

Gene Schulz:

But he's meaning the pricing as far as Pleasant Prairie goes I think is good. So that's the story on interest rates. If we had priced it by chance last Thursday we would have probably priced it at 10 to 15 basis points better. But one of the problems is you can't price those things unless you're going to approve the sale that day. So we were stuck with waiting until Monday. And, who knows, maybe tomorrow the market really gets great, and this could also go downhill fast. So I think Pleasant Prairie has got a good rate, but we talk about the rules have changed.

If you were to ask me should we approve this resolution tonight I think John overheard me and I said I can't really tell you that. I can tell you I think the rates are good. The financial advisor is the only one who has the fiduciary responsibility to recommend approval. And I believe he did in the email to Mike. If there's any other questions I'd certainly be happy to answer them.

Mike Pollocoff:

This came out pretty well. Like Gene said in some ways we're lucky, but in some ways we saw our original construction costs and we didn't like those numbers. We re-worked the bid, restructured how we did it, went out to bid again, and we shaved about \$400,000 off the cost by getting what we did. And then the savings here is going to help. I'd recommend that based on the advice from our financial advisor and what I think is a really good rate we received that the Board adopt Resolution 13-33 tonight for the issuance.

Michael Serpe:

This will cover all of our future expansion and renovation projects?

Mike Pollocoff:

For the fire station and rehabbing the old fire station.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I move to approve Resolution 14-33.

Michael Serpe:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Steve, second by Mike. Discussion?

Kris Keckler:

I just wanted to ask several months back in some of the initial planning phases you had to reduce some of the portions or at least alter some of the project plans. Does this allow you to revisit any of those amenities or other features that were originally removed?

Mike Pollocoff:

We could. I think one of the things that going through the value engineering process when we took a look at where we could save, when we went through that we said these things are things that we should be able to save money on. We did cut part of the building size down. Architecturally we shaved back some of the lannon stone. There were a number of things we did. Some of the electrical work we found different ways to do it that was going to save us money. So I think those are all still good savings.

If we do have money left over at the end because we haven't bid out the rehab of the apparatus floor downstairs, and to be co-compliant we need to put an elevator in the building, that's going to cause some work to happen in this building, we have a number I think it's about 1.1 or 1.2 to do that. So any saving we have there we should allocate that as a contingency to get us through this next project once we have our bids. That would be it. But I think we already did reduce the cost for that. We're not asking for as big a bond as we would have asked for if we had kept our prices. That was really our goal all along was to drive down how much we were going to borrow to remove that from the project. So we're not borrowing it and it's not gone.

John Steinbrink:

Further comment or question? We had a motion and a second.

Jane Romanowski:

Need a roll call.

KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION #14-33 - RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE AND SALE OF \$6,8650,000 GENERAL OBLIGATION PROMISSORY NOTES, SERIES 2014B; SECONDED BY SERPE; ROLL CALL VOTE – STEINBRINK – AYE; KECKLER – AYE; KUMORKIEWICZ – AYE; SERPE – AYE; MOTION CARRIED 4-0 WITH ONE ABSENT.

B. Consider Ordinance #14-32 to amend Chapter 348 of the Municipal Code relating to Vehicles and Traffic.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, we received a petition a little over a month ago concerning speed limits on 104th Avenue and a request for a stop sign. I think it was a little bit difficult to discern what they were looking for, but I think initially they were looking for two stop signs, one at 79th and one at 77th. I visited with the police department, and Chief Smetana examined as well as I did. And the bulk of 104th Avenue south of 79th shy probably 300 feet the current speed limit is 25 miles per hour. And that speed limit was put in place because there's a Pleasant Prairie ballpark there and to slow that traffic down as they approach that park.

The other thing that would assist in at least starting off at 25 mile an hour speed is if we put a four way stop at 79th Street which is the only access basically out of Chateau Eau Plaines, and it's a major access into Prairie Ridge Shopping Center and the subdivision. So our feeling is if we have that 25 mile per hour speed limit start on 79th Street proceeding south, so we'd extend it up a little bit farther from where it is right now, and then keep it at 35 miles an hour between 79th Avenue and Highway 50, we think that's the best thing to manage the traffic in there.

104th is an arterial road. It's a former County road, so we can't discourage traffic in there because people are going to still want to go there. I think it still may be a traffic enforcement issue to get people down to 25. But we think the stop sign would help with that intersection. So we're recommending that Ordinance 348 be amended to paragraph B (2) to be 104th from Highway 50 south to 79th Street. And we're also putting in some language changes that are more reflective with the current organization to say superintendent of streets to the director of public works and then installation of stop signs at A (6) in order to give adequate warning to users on 104th Avenue and 79th Street in Pleasant Prairie a four way stop.

Michael Serpe:

I agree with that. And I went down 104th last week. A lot of the residents are putting up their little slow down. They're real effective hints for people to slow down, and I kind of like that. But unfortunately you're going to get people that are not going to pay attention to that, and those are the ones that hopefully the police department can make believers out of. But I support this. I don't know if I'm getting old, but it seems to me that there are a lot of aggressive drivers out

there today, more so than I ever remember in the past. Some way or another we've got to start slowing these people down.

Mike Pollocoff:

Really when Highway 50 starts reconstruction for adding lanes on 104th is really going to come under some pressure for people to use that to get out to C, to get out to the Interstate. So if we have this in place ahead of time I think it will save some headaches.

Michael Serpe:

I'd move approval of Ordinance 14-32.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

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

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Yeah, Bain Station, are we going to have stop signs in that area?

Mike Pollocoff:

John and I met with Gary Sipsma, and he's open to keeping them up for about a month. We've also put it on our open town hall site to get opinions from people for the next month, and I think that ends at the end of the month. So once we get those results back we'll get them to the Board and to the County Exec and Gary Sipsma. I want to say it was 60/40 in favor if not more in favor of keeping the stop signs.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Good idea.

Mike Pollocoff:

Those ones on Bain Station are really important. So we'll get those results back, and then we'll sit down with the County, and we'll come up with that resolution for the Village Board to make a request to Kenosha County to put the stop signs up. They have to approve the placement of the signs.

John Steinbrink:

Because of the construction on 50 Bain Station Road is carrying almost as much traffic at times as H is. It's a good thing they're there right now, because it would be a real conflict when you cross there.

Mike Pollocoff:

It's a lot easier to move through, especially at Bain and H and Bain and C than it was before.

Kris Keckler:

I did have a question and whether or not we have details on it or not. For 104th if I remember several months back we had the police department's automated speed limit system out there. But do we have any as far as number of tickets as far as along that area for speeders or reckless drivers or anything. Not to get specifics, I just didn't know if that from a statistical standpoint aside from the residents coming and speaking about it.

Mike Pollocoff:

We can pick on the Chief's memory.

Chief Smetana:

I can tell you that speeding is an issue out there. In order to switch things up a little bit the initial response out there was to try to educate the public. With that speed trailer we utilized that. We also work on that with traffic stops. Not necessarily issuing citations on every traffic stop in the beginning but just trying to educate people. That along with the residents' work out there in putting those signs up and trying to educate the public that's driving past there. Now our efforts have kind of gone into early morning hours as well. So we've sat out there from about 5 to 7 every morning, and we've issued multiple citations every day. So I think it's going to be a while before the public is educated enough to slow down to 25 miles an hour. And it's not 5 over or 10 over, it's 15, 20. So they're moving through there.

Kris Keckler:

Thank you, and I appreciate that. I don't travel on it often enough. But I use the park over there and remember when your traffic trailer was out over there as well. I just didn't know how many stops you guys were making.

Chief Smetana:

We utilize that on C as well. I think my last count from the beginning of July was about 25 traffic stops either on 104th or just a block variance off one way or the other.

Kris Keckler:

Hopefully they'll be educated real quick.

Chief Smetana:

Right. Yeah, it's an expensive lesson.

Kris Keckler:

Thank you.

Chief Smetana:

Okay, thank you.

Michael Serpe:

Mike, the speed indicators that we have on the RecPlex, Terwall Terrace, what do those cost?

Mike Pollocoff:

I think they were \$1,200 apiece.

Michael Serpe:

Those are effective as well.

John Steinbrink:

And those are solar.

Mike Pollocoff:

They're solar.

Michael Serpe:

And they're solar, right. Okay, just a thought for the future. Might be something else we can add to it.

John Steinbrink:

We had a motion, we had a second. Further discussion?

SERPE MOVED TO ADOPT ORDINANCE #14-32 TO AMEND CHAPTER 348 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE RELATING TO VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 4-0.

C. Consider Disallowance of a claim for damage to a vehicle by a parking gate at the RecPlex.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, we received information from our insurance company concerning a claim filed for a Julie Serritella for damages at RecPlex. She had a gate come down on her car as she was leaving the parking lot. And this has happened before, but typically the gate responds to the transponder that's either hanging from the mirror or if there's one placed on the windshield. When we reviewed the video of that access point the transponder was being waived. So I think it went up and with the waiving it starts coming down. So it wasn't a proper use of that device. So in this case the insurance company is recommending we deny it.

We have paid these at times when we've had them malfunction where it just didn't work and, again, when we look at the tape of the area it just came down for no apparent reason on the car. But typically it's on a timer. There's a pressure plate or something they cross that sets it off. So, anyway, the insurance company is recommending we deny this claim, and I concur in the recommendation.

John Steinbrink:

The instructions on those tell you to affix them as to where on your windshield.

Mike Pollocoff:

Even if it's just a hanging type, just hanging on the rearview mirror. If it's close enough if it's fixed it will give a constant response or signal.

Kris Keckler:

Move to accept the recommendation.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

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

KECKLER MOVED TO APPROVE THE DISALLOWANCE OF A CLAIM FILED BY JULIE SERRITELLA FOR DAMAGE TO A VEHICLE BY A PARKING GATE AT THE RECPLEX; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 4-0.

D. Consider Operator License Applications on file.

Jane Romanowski:

Just one application for Hannah Barnes tonight. Recommend approval.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

So moved.

Kris Keckler:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Steve, second by Kris. Any discussion?

KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO GRANT AN OPERATOR'S LICENSE TO HANNAH BARNES; SECONDED BY KECKLER; MOTION CARRIED 4-0.

8. VILLAGE BOARD COMMENTS.

John Steinbrink:

The forecast looks good for Sunday, trick or treat, so we'll be through that. Hopefully we won't have the problems we've had other years.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I heard a good comment concerning trick or treat on Sunday because it's in daylight and the parents are home. If we change it to the legal day there are more problems because of school activities, the parents are working, all kinds of comments, people from the city. So I think that we [inaudible].

John Steinbrink:

Jane, and the hours are what?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

3 to 6.

John Steinbrink:

Without the time change we should be fine and there will be no [inaudible]. Further Board comments?

9. ADJOURNMENT.

SERPE MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING; SECONDED BY KECKLER; MOTION CARRIED 4-0 AND MEETING ADJOURNED AT 6:30 P.M.