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

9915 - 39th Avenue Pleasant Prairie, WI May 16, 2016 6:00 p.m.

A regular meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Village Board was held on Monday, May 16, 2016. Meeting called to order at 6:00 p.m. Present were Village Board members John Steinbrink, Kris Keckler, Steve Kumorkiewicz, Dave Klimisch and Mike Serpe. Also present were Michael Pollocoff, Village Administrator; Tom Shircel, Assistant Administrator; Jean Werbie-Harris, Community Development Director; Kathy Goessl, Finance Director; Dan Riley, Deputy Police Chief; Doug McElmury; Fire & Rescue Chief; Matt Fineour, Village Engineer; John Steinbrink Jr., Public Works Director; Brian Smith, Recreation Director; Sandro Perez, Inspection Superintendent and Jane M. Romanowski, Village Clerk. Two citizens attended the meeting.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER
- 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
- 3. ROLL CALL
- 4. MINUTES OF MEETINGS MARCH 21, APRIL 4, APRIL 18 AND MAY 2, 2016

Dave Klimisch:

Move approval.

Michael Serpe:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Dave, second by Mike. Any additions, corrections to the minutes?

Jane Romanowski:

Trustee Keckler indicated that there were a couple spots in two separate meetings that Dave was speaking and not Kris. And the transcriptionist kind of has a hard time with their voices. So he has corrected them, and I will make sure that those are corrected and distributed.

John Steinbrink:

All right. You will get your due credit. Those in favor?

KLIMISCH MOVED TO APROVE THE MINUTES AS CORRECTED FOR THE MARCH 21, APRIL 4, APRIL 18 AND MAY 2, 2016 VILLAGE BOARD MEETINGS; SECONDED BY SERPE; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

## 5. CITIZEN COMMENTS

Jane Romanowski:

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

John Steinbrink:

Anybody wishing to speak under citizens' comments? Hearing none I'll close citizens' comments.

#### **6. ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT** – None.

#### 7. NEW BUSINESS

A. Receive Plan Commission recommendation and consider Resolution #16-19 for support of a Floodplain Boundary Adjustment to remove 1,500 cubic yards from the 100-year floodplain and to create 1,615 cubic yards of 100-year floodplain to compensate for the 100-floodplain begin filled for the construction of a 65,664 square foot Public Works equipment storage building located at 8600 Green Bay Road.

#### Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. President and members of the Board, on May 9, 2016 the Plan Commission conditionally approve site and operational plans for the construction of a new 65,664 square foot precast fully sprinklered storage building for the public works department equipment at the Roger Prange Municipal Center located at 8600 Green Bay Road. The property is currently zoned I-1 Institutional District. There are some C-1 Lowland Resource Conservancy District on the property as well as some FPO or Floodplain Overlay District on the property.

The new storage building will house equipment and vehicles that are currently being stored outside due to lack of space in the existing covered storage buildings. Such equipment includes snowplow trucks, blow blades, light duty vehicles and other seasonal and general public works equipment. In conjunction with the new storage building the public works department will then also be relocating their residential recycling compost site operations to the former 73-1 site at 8000 128th Street.

So as part of this request the staff has prepared a floodplain boundary adjustment on the property. Specifically what they're requesting to do is to remove 1,500 cubic yards from the 100-year floodplain and to create 1,615 cubic yards of 100-year floodplain on the property. Upon the project's completion there will be a net increase of approximately 115 cubic yards of floodplain

storage volume over the existing floodplain storage. And, as you can see, the area that does need to be filled on the central part of the Prange property is needed for that storage building to be constructed.

This is a matter that was before the Village Plan Commission at their last meeting. A public hearing was held. The Village specifically is proposing then to amend the FEMA Federal Insurance Rate Maps which had an effective date of June 19, 2012. The boundary adjustment is consistent with the purposes of Section 420-131 of the Village Zoning Ordinance. It's not in conflict with any applicable rules of the Wisconsin DNR or with FEMA. The Village received technical approval from the Wisconsin DNR for this project on April 18, 2016 for the adjustment.

The Village staff is recommending that the requirement to obtain a CLOMR-F which is a conditional letter of map revision based on fill be waived for this project to allow the petitioner to move at this time. However, a letter of map revision based on fill or a LOMR-F will be required. And once the work is completed and we've got that LOMR-F a zoning map and text amendment and comprehensive land use plan amendment would be required to reflect the areas that have been filled and the new areas to be created as part of the floodplain boundary adjustment. With that if there's any other questions staff is here to answer questions that you may have.

# Michael Serpe:

I have one question but not on the floodplain. Any progress, John, with Wisconsin Energy on the beaver problem on the creek?

### John Steinbrink, Jr.:

We do have emails in contact out to We Energies on it, and it's a work in progress for them. It's one of those situations where as soon as they remove one beaver dam they always tend to build it back. So We Energies has entered into a couple different contracts with some local trappers, and then working with the DNR for permitting and relocation hopefully to eliminate the problem. But it's a pretty severe issue out in that P-4 area. And it's something that we are addressing, it just takes a little bit of time. And I can update you on a regular basis.

## Michael Serpe:

I'd move approval of Resolution 16-19.

Kris Keckler:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

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

SERPE MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND ADOPT RESOLUTION #16-19 FOR SUPPORT OF A FLOODPLAIN BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT TO REMOVE 1,500 CUBIC YARDS FROM THE 100-YEAR FLOODPLAIN AND TO CREATE 1,615 CUBIC YARDS OF 100-YEAR FLOODPLAIN TO COMPENSATE FOR THE 100-FLOODPLAIN BEGIN FILLED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 65,664 SQUARE FOOT PUBLIC WORKS EQUIPMENT STORAGE BUILDING LOCATED AT 8600 GREEN BAY ROAD; SECONDED BY KECKLER; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

B. Receive Plan Commission recommendation and consider approval of a Lot Line Adjustment with the adjacent property to the north located at 9109 River Road.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. President and members of the Board, the owners of the properties located at 9301 River road identified as Tax Parcel 92-4-122-181-0102, and 9109 River Road identified as Tax Parcel 92-4-122-181-0101 are proposing to adjust their lot lines. The north lot line of 9301 River Road is being adjusted to add approximately 3, 264 square feet from the property at 9109 River Road. By adjusting the common lot line it will allow the owner of 9301 River Road to construct a detached garage. Both properties are zoned A-3, Limited Agricultural District, and both have portions in the FPO Floodplain Overlay District, and a portion of the property at 9109 has some C-1 Lowland Resource Conservancy District.

Both of the properties will continue to operate under the current zoning ordinance. In fact, one will be a little less nonconforming. The lot line adjustment does not create any new lots but just adjusts the lot line between the two lots in order for a new garage to be built. This is a matter that was before the Village Plan Commission at their last meeting. The lot line adjustment complies with all the requirements set forth in the zoning ordinance as well as the land division and development control ordinance. And the staff recommends approval as presented subject to the comments in the staff report.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:	
Move to approve.	
Dave Klimisch:	
Second.	
John Steinbrink:	
Motion by Steve, second by Dave.	Any further discussion?

KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND APPROVE THE REQUEST FOR A LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT WITH THE ADJACENT PROPERTY TO THE NORTH LOCATED AT 9109 RIVER ROAD; SECONDED BY KLIMISCH; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

C. Consider approval of an Agreement between and the Lake County Forest Preserve District, State of Wisconsin-Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, University of Wisconsin-Parkside, The Chiwaukee Prairie Preservation Fund, Inc., and the Village of Pleasant Prairie related to the protection and management of the Lake Plain, including fire management activities.

#### Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. President and members of the Board, as you know last fall the Chiwaukee Lake Plain area, which is that area south of the Kenosha Dunes extending south of the state line well into Illinois, was designated an international wetland of importance by the Ramsar Convention. It's a very significant stand of wetlands and wildlife habitat area. A lot of very diversified plant life in that particular area.

As part of that award and our ongoing commitment to the partnerships that we have established over the last several years, the Lake County Forest Preserve, State of Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, UW-Parkside, The Chiwaukee Prairie Preservation Fund and the Village of Pleasant Prairie are again entering in agreement that talks about the preservation, protection and management of the Chiwaukee Prairie obviously and the Lake Plain down into Illinois as well as specifically identifying some of the protection and management activities for each of the parties as well as the different types of activities as it relates to the controlled burns, or the prescribed burns I should say, for the various areas.

This is an agreement that has been reviewed by the other agencies. Our Fire Chief as well as our Director of Public Works have also reviewed this document. And if you have any questions for myself, the Fire Chief or Public Works Director I'm sure they'd be happy to answer those questions. But we find that it follows all of the guidelines and the regulations and things that we've talked about in the past with previous agreements, and it addressed the concerns. I know that the Administrator had a few concerns with respect for the fire department, and the chief has reviewed the document to make sure that it doesn't say anything that would bring any concerns to the Village.

# John Steinbrink:

Jean, the Lake County Forest Preserve they do all the regulation for that, not the State of Illinois Department of Natural Resources?

#### Jean Werbie-Harris:

That's correct.

John Steinbrink:

So it's a little different than Wisconsin.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

That's correct.

#### Mike Pollocoff:

As Jean indicated I reviewed this document specifically as it relates to -- I guess my first look was related to the responsibilities to be placed on the Village Fire Department either to participate or have the ability to approve any work that's going to take place on there. And if you look at the agreement page 2, the objectives are for everyone's mutual benefit to restore, restoration and collaboration between the parties for the protection of the Lake Plain including fire management activities. Parties will focus on common threats and working together to achieve a positive ecological impact for the Lake Plain.

And I'm saying this is not a reason to reject the agreement, but I think I want the Board to enter into this with this in mind is that under cooperative activities each party may but isn't obligated to conduct the following activities, mowing, cutting, treating woody invasive plants, mowing, cutting, pulling and/or treating herbaceous invasive plants, doing the surveys and collecting seeds and all that stuff.

In the Chiwaukee Prairie areas there is still a significant amount of private ownership in that area that is intermingled in a random way with all the ownership that's either by the University of Wisconsin, DNR, what was the Chiwaukee Prairie Group. And my concern is at some point we're bringing in other state agencies that are going to have the ability to be initiating work in there, and that activity would take place outside the police powers of the Village to make sure that that happens in a manner that we want it to happen.

Nothing obligated anybody to assist with or undertake any activities. However, if a party undertakes an activity will do so in compliance with the agreement. So my concern is if one of the other parties from either Illinois or even DNR undertakes an activity that we've decided not to do, and if there's a problem with citizens or property owners down there, then they're not going to go to the Forest Preserve or they're not going to go to Illinois and they're not going to go to the DNR, they're going to come to us.

And I think one of the fundamental underpinnings for that whole area there was that the plan that allowed for the preservation of the prime wetlands in that area was that that should occur on a willing buyer, willing seller basis and that everyone's property rights would be preserved until the end. And if you think back to how we kind of struggled to address the hunting situation, to the extent that you could down on any of those parcels and really know whose property you're on in the prairie, you might not be on someone else's property. And I think I question whether or not all the groups that are going to be turned loose on this to go in the area are going to have some

knowledge of it, let alone going next to abutting properties for people who have a home there or live there. They're used to research going on in the prairie and all those things.

It's just I think with this agreement the way it's structured now I think the Village is giving up some of its police power to manage what happens down there. And it's going to be -- if the parties do it in their best efforts in this agreement we're allowing the other parties to conduct these activities, that's a problem. I mean it is easier for the Fire Chief to say we have this in the agreement. You're not going to go down there and burn unless he's approved it. He can manage that situation. The other activities they're going to be able to go down there and do that whenever they want. And I'm not saying I don't want that to happen, but I don't want to have someone think from the Village's perspective I don't want somebody's property rights trampled on because we have an agreement among four environment agencies and the Village that this is all what we want to have happen.

There's more people outside of the area that want to have this thing take place and happen in actuality than there is people inside the area. The people who are living there they live there because they like it the way it is. We know that when someone starts using that land, all that land that's theirs that's when we end up having a problem. I've been struggling with this because I think that one of the phrases was where they're going to reflect the guidance and approval provided that the property owned or has management responsibility and that's great. But once they're out there I defy anybody in this room or anybody who is here to go out there and really know where the property lines are in the prairie or where a person's property with their home stops and doesn't stop.

So I think it's a concern the Village has to worry about. With that aspect of what goes on out there we don't have the same strength in the language as we do for the fire activities that take place. The Chief has been working long and hard for those people to coordinate how burns are conducted and who can conduct them and to what extent we're involved. But the other ones we're trusting on those guys to be good neighbors, but none of them are accountable to us.

# Michael Serpe:

Should we be looking at this a little bit closer and maybe meeting with Illinois and get some better agreements here on who is going to do what and how it's going to be done? This could affect budgetary items I take it?

#### Mike Pollocoff:

Well, we get the latitude to say we can't participate in it, but in this agreement then they can go ahead and do it. If we don't participate in it from a budgetary standpoint they still have the ability to go ahead and do it then if we decide not to do it and pull out.

# Michael Serpe:

Would you feel better looking at this a little further before we have it come back to us?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yeah, I don't know, Jean, if you have some time frame you're trying to get this through by?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

All the agencies are looking at it over the next two weeks. So if we need to run it by our attorney we can certainly do that and come back at the June 6th meeting, and that gives us enough time to re-look at this and address any concerns about property rights.

#### Mike Pollocoff:

At some point this land is going to be all acquired, and then it's going to be either all DNR land or national park or whatever and it will be managed that way. But in the meantime they've been working on acquiring this land for 30 years and they're still not down. And the downside to not working through this quickly is you still have private property owners out there that are paying taxes no different than any other property owner in the Village.

# Michael Serpe:

I think Mike has raised enough concern here I think we should give this a little more thoughts.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Yes, I agree with that.

Michael Serpe:

I would move not to approve and turn this back to the staff for further evaluation.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

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

#### Dave Klimisch:

I'd like to ask that if possible in that review period we entertain some notion of six months or one year review of how the agreement's gone over a period of time. I did notice that any party can withdraw from the agreement at any point. But my concern is still mirrored in the shared resources. And even though it should be at the betterment and the most efficient use of that, one of the other organizations may deem that the most efficient use is to use somebody else's or at least apply to use it and take advantage of them in that fashion.

#### John Steinbrink:

Other comments or questions?

#### Steve Kumorkiewicz:

You know [inaudible] proximity that we can [inaudible]. Too many parties here that we're not going to have any control of. [Inaudible].

#### John Steinbrink:

Mike or Jean, do you know how they handle their hunting situation down there because species travel pretty freely across the borders.

#### Jean Werbie-Harris:

My understanding is that there is no hunting.

#### John Steinbrink:

No hunting down there, okay.

## Dave Klimisch:

When I was reading through the site maybe I missed it, but I did not see a section on how we handle disagreements. If the DNR or if Parkside wants to do an action and we disagree with it can they still do it?

#### Mike Pollocoff:

Yes, they can.

#### Dave Klimisch:

Anybody can do anything?

# Mike Pollocoff:

Well, it's not anything, but you have to do whatever is prescribed in here. But if we were to decide to not participate in it then we are agreeing in this agreement we have no obligation to do anything. However, if another party decides to do it then they can go ahead and do it. So if we say we can't afford it or we don't want to do it, then the other party has the option to undertake any activity as long as it's in compliance with the agreement.

And I think at the heart of the agreement, I mean the problem is the agreement as it sits here and there's the implementation of the agreement out in the field, and that's where I'm concerned. You're going to have people out there working, and like I say it defies anybody's expectation of what somebody can do in the field to really know where they are in the prairie in relationship to any property. Some of the things they may be doing on our property wouldn't be permitted because we still own property out there. I guess that's a long answer to your question.

But it does provide that they can do it. Our way to get out of the agreement is the first time we run up to one of these problems is to pull away from the agreement and all bets are off. But I don't think that's productive either. There's got to be a way -- because we're the only government in that agreement that has this responsibility for the property owners. The Forest Preserve has that obligation down there. DNR has the obligation for the State use. But Chiwaukee Prairie Rescue Coalition has no obligations to any property owners.

I think when it comes right down to it we're the ones for public safety are going to be charged to use our police powers. We're not cops, but our public safety and welfare powers to make sure that what gets carried on in there happens in a manner that protects everybody's due process, that protects their property rights and their interest that they're not damaged. At least there's a process where that can be managed. This is in my opinion too loose. It creates mischief.

#### Dave Klimisch:

From what you're saying it makes sense we're giving up a fair amount. We're opening ourselves up to a fair amount of liability. I don't know what we're gaining. Is there a dollar value that we're gaining?

#### Mike Pollocoff:

No, what we're gaining is that the prairie is being managed.

#### Dave Klimisch:

And currently we do that as a Village?

### Mike Pollocoff:

No, we don't manage it. I mean we allow it to be managed. We allow for the burning. We've zoned the snot out of it. We do manage that prairie to make sure it's not damaged or infringed on, but that was just technical speak for zoning. And we do a lot of work out there. But the thing is we do it, and it happens in an orderly manner where everybody's rights are protected. We don't let anybody else go do it unless they've done it. And probably the lion's share that worked through the curves happens with the fire department, and the Chief oversees that to make sure that the public is protected.

Dave Klimisch:

So what are we gaining from this?

### Mike Pollocoff:

Well, hopefully you're gaining the fact that you've got more people that are managing the prairie that the nature of the prairie doesn't change at the state line. And the people in Illinois from their perspective have a vested interest to make sure that the Pleasant Prairie is protected. If you think about some of the development proposals that have occurred along Sheridan Road they were here in numbers to make sure that no development happened and they were protecting turtles, they were protecting some threatened species, some groundwater sources.

I mean all the things that we're in charge of protecting they now became a player at the table in those hearings to stop zoning from occurring. With this they have even more standing because now they're part of an agreement with us saying this thing is going to be protected and it won't be developed, and we really limit the amount of things that are going to happen there which our zoning ordinance does regulate that. But, like I say, that does it in the framework of public notice and public protection of property rights. In this we kind of move it back to them and they say, well, if we say no then they can go ahead and do it. And I don't want to be around to clean that mess up, and I don't think anybody on the Board does either because at that point we can't explain anything other than we've signed an agreement saying that they could do it if we don't.

## John Steinbrink:

Other comment or question? We have a motion and a second.

SERPE MOVED TO NOT APPROVE AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN AND THE LAKE COUNTY FOREST PRESERVE DISTRICT, STATE OF WISCONSIN-WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-PARKSIDE, THE CHIWAUKEE PRAIRIE PRESERVATION FUND, INC., AND THE VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE RELATED TO THE PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT OF THE LAKE PLAIN, INCLUDING FIRE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES AND SEND IT BACK TO STAFF FOR ADDITIONAL REVIEW; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

D. Consider an Assignment of maintenance and repair obligations and on-going obligations under the Development Agreement between the Village of Pleasant Prairie and Water Street Land, LLC regarding Prairie Ridge West Commercial Development.

#### Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. President and members of the Board, the Prairie Ridge West Commercial Development was developed by Water Street Land, LLC. Primarily this was done back in 2013 about three years ago. This is the area that's at the southeast corner of 104th Avenue and Highway 50 just north of

77th Street. There was a 9.2 acre development at that location which involved the development of a number of uses there including the Cheddar's, The Plaza, Olive Garden, the Regner Vet Clinic, and there's one currently vacant parcel.

Specifically, they were required to enter into a development agreement with the Village in order to construct certain public improvements as part of their planned unit development. And the original developer, Water Street Land, LLC, was actually the bank that had acquired that property from the previous landowner. In the development agreement it allows for the assignment of the maintenance and repair obligations for any improvements that are on that site such as private related improvements, the stormwater retention basin, the wetland areas and maintaining those areas.

And so the purpose of this assignment is to transfer these obligations from Water Street Land basically to the association, the sub-association that was created, and to make sure that any and all obligations that were part of that development agreement from a private perspective that they now rest with that association. The staff recommends approval of that assignment of maintenance and any future repair obligations and any other ongoing obligations that might exist for that particular area.

<b>a</b> .	**		
Steve	Kumo	rk16	W1C7

Make a motion to approve the agreement.

Kris Keckler:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

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

KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO APPROVE AN ASSIGNMENT OF MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR OBLIGATIONS AND ON-GOING OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE AND WATER STREET LAND, LLC REGARDING PRAIRIE RIDGE WEST COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT; SECONDED BY KECKLER; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

E. Consider an Assignment of Rights and Obligations under the Agreement regarding Digital Security Imaging System regard Prairie Ridge West Commercial Development.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. President and members of the Board, similar to the previous item on the agenda this is an assignment of rights and obligations under the agreement. And this is for the DSIS or the digital security imaging agreement. And this is regarding Prairie Ridge West Commercial Development,

again, that same area at the southeast corner of Highway 50 and 104th Avenue. There were a number of obligations that were initially with the original developer. And now that there is an association and the DSIS camera system is up and operating each of them have obligations as a collective group to maintain that system and to make sure that it continues operating and functioning per the DSIS agreement that not only the bank signed initially but they signed as well individually as part of the approvals of their developments. So these obligations under the DSIS then would officially be transferred to them individually and collectively as an association. The staff recommends approval of the assignment of rights and obligations under the DSIS agreement. Again, we are in the Prairie Ridge West Commercial Development.

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

SERPE MOVED TO APPROVE AN ASSIGNMENT OF RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE AGREEMENT REGARDING DIGITAL SECURITY IMAGING SYSTEM REGARD PRAIRIE RIDGE WEST COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT; SECONDED BY KLIMISCH; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

F. Consider a Professional Engineering Construction Management Services Agreement for the construction of public improvements for the proposed Majestic Badger Logistics Center to be located on 88th Avenue north of 95th Street.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Mr. President and members of the Board, Majestic Development is starting their groundbreaking, and it's the Village's responsibility to inspect all of the Village improvements or County improvements not limited to sewer, water, storm, paving, beam guard, striping and other roadway improvements. The Village has decided to go out and post an RFP for the inspection services. And we did receive one proposal back for the work. R.A. Smith National was the one participant. They have done quite a few other projects within the Village. They submitted a bid at \$10,273. And it was very close to what the engineer's estimate was. And, like I say, they have done a lot of good work within the Village. There is not cost to the Village for this pass through as part of the development. And staff does recommend approving the contract with R.A. Smithy National.

#### Kris Keckler:

Move approval for R.A. Smith for \$10,273.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Kris, second by Steve. Further discussion?

KECKLER MOVED TO APPROVE A PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH R.A. SMITH NATIONAL FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE PROPOSED MAJESTIC BADGER LOGISTICS CENTER TO BE LOCATED ON 88TH AVENUE NORTH OF 95TH STREET IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$10,273; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

G. Consider a Professional Service Agreement related to potential 47th Avenue drainage improvements in the vicinity of 116th Street.

#### Matt Fineour:

Mr. President and members of the Board, this is a professional service agreement with Clark-Dietz to provide a topographic survey along 47th Avenue around 116th Street designated around where that red boundary is, that would be the survey area. The survey is to collect topographic data as well as any existing utility data out there in order for us to further evaluate drainage solutions for that area and come up with a storm sewer design. This professional service agreement is with Clark-Dietz for \$10,000. I would recommend approval.

## Michael Serpe:

I don't know if any Board members went out to 47th Avenue and 116th, but they've got a problem out there. The timing is right for this and I move approval.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I second this.

John Steinbrink:

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

#### Steve Kumorkiewicz:

[Inaudible] come out to this point today, I go by very often that area and I see what's going on. Something has to be done definitely so I'm glad that we're tackling this problem.

## Michael Serpe:

When do you anticipate this coming back to us, Matt?

### Matt Fineour:

The survey will probably take a couple weeks, and then probably a couple weeks after that to get a preliminary design done.

# John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second. Any further discussion?

SERPE MOVED TO APPROVE A PROFESSIONAL SERVICE AGREEMENT WITH CLARK DIETZ TO PROVIDE SURVEY AND CADD SERVICES RELATED TO POTENTIAL 47TH AVENUE DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS IN THE VICINITY OF 116TH STREET IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$10,000; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

#### 8. VILLAGE BOARD COMMENTS

### Michael Serpe:

I have one. Erin Winch from the RecPlex Therapeutic Recreation put out a notice today. They're looking for volunteers for the upcoming triathlon on June 25th and 26th. So if anybody is interested in having a little fun, spending a little time and watching a whole bunch of athletes do their best feel free to volunteer. We can use your help.

#### John Steinbrink:

Jean, you have a special person here. Maybe introduce her to the Board. I mean we've sort of all met her, but in case somebody did miss meeting her.

#### Jean Werbie-Harris:

The Village has hired a new planner for the Community Development Department, Kristina Tranel most recently from Florida, originally from Iowa, is joining us as our new planner for our department and with the Village.

#### John Steinbrink:

Great, welcome.

## Michael Serpe:

It's very cold in Wisconsin in the wintertime.

John Steinbrink:

Remember she was from Dubuque first. Further Board comments.

# 9. ADJOURNMENT

SERPE MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING; SECONDED BY KECKLER; MOTION CARRIED 5-0 AND MEETING ADJOURNED AT 6:40 P.M.