

**VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE
PLEASANT PRAIRIE VILLAGE BOARD
PLEASANT PRAIRIE WATER UTILITY
PLEASANT PRAIRIE SEWER UTILITY
9915 - 39th Avenue
Pleasant Prairie, WI
July 7, 2014
6:00 p.m.**

A regular meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Village Board was held on Monday, July 7, 2014. Meeting called to order at 6:00 p.m. Present were Village Board members John Steinbrink, Kris Keckler, 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; Doug McElmury, Fire & Rescue Chief; Mike Spence, Village Engineer; John Steinbrink Jr., Public Works Director; Carol Willke, HR and Recreation Director and Jane M. Romanowski, Village Clerk. Six citizens attended the meeting.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- 3. ROLL CALL**
- 4. MINUTES OF MEETINGS - JUNE 2 AND JUNE 16, 2014**

Clyde Allen:

Motion to approve.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Clyde, second by Steve. Any additions or corrections to the minutes

**ALLEN MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 2 AND JUNE 16, 2014
VILLAGE BOARD MEETINGS AS PRESENTED IN THEIR WRITTEN FORM; SECONDED
BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

- 5. PUBLIC HEARING**
 - A. Consider authorizing public sanitary sewer extension improvements in the right-of way of Springbrook Road/CTH ML approximately 250 feet to the east of STH 31and Final Resolution #14-19 authorizing construction of public improvements and levying special assessments for said project.**

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, I'll begin initially by stating this project comes to us by reason of petition of one of the affected property owners. We've adopted a resolution calling for the hearing tonight and notified the property owners of the project, the project scope, the estimated project cost. The final resolution on this item as with other special assessment resolutions will be finalized if the project proceeds at such point as we have actual finished costs once the project is done because that, in fact, what would be assessment levied on the properties in final.

Tonight we're going to ask Mike Spence to describe the physical aspect of the project for the extension of sanitary sewer on Springbrook Road, how that relates to the ultimate master plan of how sanitary sewer would be extended on that road and then I'll describe some of the alternatives that exist to the special assessment. After that I'd like to request that the Board open up the public hearing to the affected property owners so that they can speak their mind or ask questions that they may have. So with that, Mr. Spence?

Mike Spence:

Mr. President and members of the Board, what I'm going to do is I'm going to go through the process that we went through in determining the assessment for this project. As Mr. Pollocoff said, we did get a request for a sewer extension for the property at the southwest corner of Springbrook Road and State Highway 31. So after we got that request and we got the authorization to prepare documents we looked at what would be required to serve this property to the southwest.

Currently there's an existing sewer on the east side of Green Bay Road, State Highway 31, where wastewater flow travels to the north and then to the west. There's a manhole at this northeast corner here. So in order to serve this property we looked at tying into this existing manhole and running a new sewer to the east just past where an extension would be of this parcel here to the east of their driveway. That's approximately 270 feet.

In doing an assessment project what we look at is, because we only can assess a property one time, so we looked at the property to the southwest. The line in blue here shows what we call front footage that's affected by the project. And the parcel to the northeast is this parcel, and this is the front footage that we would look for assessment as well. Now, even though the property does go further to the north we stopped the assessment here because of setbacks and so forth. This would not be assessable. So that was the starting point.

Then what we did is we looked -- what we do then is we have an overall plan to serve for sewer service in the Village. What's indicated here as area 3 is an area that would ultimately discharge to that same sewer. So it's because of the grades and so forth. So with that knowledge in mind we determined that a 10 inch sewer ultimately would be the right size sewer to serve that area. So we proceeded to cost out a 10 inch sewer, what a 10 inch sewer would cost would be here to install. And then because that has excess capacity, again, for the other area that I just mentioned, we reduced that price to an 8 inch sewer which is the smallest sewer that we would install.

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

So with that done then we looked at the total cost for an 8 inch sewer which is \$49,050. And we developed -- based on the linear foot of sewer we developed a rate to assess, again, the front footage. And so we divided the cost by the 230 feet, and then we divided it by two since there's two sides. So that assessment rate came out to be \$106.63 per linear foot. It should be noted that because this is a small segment you don't realize economies of scale because there's only two parcels that are sharing in this cost. So that's one of the reasons why the rate is higher.

So once we came up with that assessment rate of \$106.63 per foot, then we took the assessable front footage for each parcel, Mr. Rabin, Jerry and Anne Rabin is the southeast parcel so they have 153 feet. That multiplied by that rate gives you the \$16,000. Then we estimate the sanitary lateral cost at \$3,000 and a sewer connection charge of \$1,600. So that total assessment for that parcel would be \$20,992.23.

By the same token the northeast parcel has this much front footage. If you recall because it was a bigger parcel there's more footage, again, because we can only assess once. And the most likely way to serve up here this sewer would ultimately be extended here so there would be footage there. So that's why that footage is higher. Okay, so we took that footage, multiplied by the rate per foot, added the sanitary lateral cost, sewer connection charge, and you can see you come up with a charge of \$40,038.48.

Now, we looked at different options, and I'll go through this briefly, but I'll let Mike Pollocoff talk about it as well. We looked at if the Hammerbeck property was subdivided we wouldn't be assessing that eastern parcel. If the property was subdivided the only part that would get assessed would be this amount. And the subdivided property would not have an assessment on it. And the Hammerbecks would have to go through the process of subdividing the property, doing a CSM, getting a surveyor and doing those steps. But if you go back to that second assessment schedule you can see if reduced the assessment from \$40,000 down to \$24,000.

Now, there's one other option that I don't have a slide up here for, but we looked at the possibility of constructing this with Village public works forces, and we would be able to save some money by utilizing Village forces. And in that case this number goes down to \$19,013.72. This number goes down to \$21,795.58. So that's a quick analysis of how we did the assessment process. And I just should say that this process is really very similar to what we've done in other assessments. We generally do it, we believe it's most equitable to do it on a front footage method. So that's basically how we came up with the numbers.

Mike Pollocoff:

One thing you might notice, and it was on the map that Mike showed originally where it showed Springbrook and where the existing sanitary sewer was. It shows the sanitary sewer coming up from the south to Springbrook Road and then it goes west to the lift station that's over there by the cemetery. That main is I believe approximately 20 feet deep. It shallows up as it goes south. When we constructed that main, and that was funded by Tax Increment District #2 because it affects the capacity of the Corporate Park, we looked at providing sanitary sewer service to the only existing home, well, the only existing home by sewer service was the Rabin property.

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

When we were installing that main we had terrible ground soil conditions and ground water conditions. So we looked at seriously putting a riser which is a pipe that comes from the main and gets it up to a higher level, put a Y on the end of that so they could bring a lateral in. But we didn't feel the soils there were going to be stable enough to support that riser coming off the main. And when the riser comes off the main two things happen. Either it breaks off or it goes down into the main. And it would have been -- we could have done it, if you throw enough money into anything you can make something happen, but we would have had to basically take out all the soils out of that trench, stabilize it with stones and fabric. And that would just basically be for the one lateral plus Rabin's expenses probably to get into that assuming that we were willing to build it would have been high. For the Village to use it we'd go out of our way to make sure we're accepting or placing a lateral in a compromised position because the sewer rate payers will be paying for that ongoing maintenance and monitoring of those laterals.

At the same time the Village had prepared the master plan for sanitary sewer service in the area which you can visualize if you were standing down at the corner of Springbrook and Green Bay Road you're basically looking up hill. It goes all the way up hill to the subcontinental divide about 5500 block or something like that. And it gravities perfectly right down to Springbrook and down Springbrook to 31, and then at 31 it goes over to the lift stations. So we knew what the area was going to be serviced for because we wanted to make sure we sized that line going underneath Green Bay correctly. And we wanted to know what's going to be serviced in that whole area.

The Village doesn't have a quota for putting sanitary sewers in. We don't have to get so many feet per year in. It's really by either demand or by order from the County Sanitarian. My experience is, and I think the Board can relate to this, if the County Sanitarian is going it typically it's some neighbors that are getting in a fight about something. They don't like their dogs, they've got an RV in the driveway, you name it, it could be anything. And then they start turning each other's septic system in for failures. And once that happens then the County Sanitarian goes through and he checks everybody. And there isn't a system in Pleasant Prairie outside of Carol Beach Unit W that's going to perk for a septic system. So then people are faced with an order. And it's usually at that point when they ask us to intervene and install a sanitary sewer.

So at some point -- but we're always building on, adding onto our system, we have to know what the areas that haven't been developed yet what's going to be coming from those areas so we can plan appropriately so that whatever we put in is going to be sized correctly. So we knew this is going in. We've known it for quite a while. But it's not our responsibility to take the steps to put it in. It's our responsibility to listen to the petitions of citizens or from the health orders from Kenosha County.

One of the options is there's a few ways -- I mean there's no doubt that this is an extremely high assessment either way, even under what we've identified as our lowest cost alternative which is having Village crews install the sanitary sewer. If we contract this out we're going to pay prevailing wage for contractors to do that work which is high. And Village employees are not -- State law prohibits us from our employees from being paid prevailing wage, they have to get less. So John, Jr. estimated 18 percent might be the cut. We won't pay sales tax on any of the materials that we pick up. So there's some savings in that.

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

The only option I could think of was to spare the Hammerbecks an assessment since they've got such a large lot and if they were unwilling to divide it would be to put in another main that would service the Rabin property, tie it into the manhole which is over by Hammerbecks. We'd kind of be running cross-country across the road, and then put it in a drop manhole so that it wouldn't have to be that deep. The problem is that main is still going to be in that \$93 or \$90 a foot range. We could charge Rabin for it but we wouldn't be charging Hammerbeck for it. But when the eventual Springbrook sanitary sewer goes in then the rate payers pay for that frontage in front of Rabin's because they would have already paid for this one main to just serve them rather than the ultimate plan which is one main that would serve everybody.

So there are ways to do this, but once you get away from the basic concept of one main going down Springbrook all you're doing is you're adding on capital investment which lessens somebody's cost, but at the end of the day the other neighbor or the rate payers would have to be willing to subsidize it to write off. In this case the Rabin main would be a stranded asset that we'd have to let go. The staff recommended dividing a lot so that we could -- it's not a loophole, it's the law you can only assess one lot for the service. And if the lot isn't getting services then it doesn't get assessed. There's more work with that because you have to survey it and get a CSM approved and go through that process. But that's one alternative.

The other thing the Village can do to mitigate this somewhat is if we start the project a little bit later such that we wouldn't send out the final notice for assessments until after October 1st that would mean we wouldn't send out a notice of assessment until October of 2015 which would make the first payment due and payable January of 2016. That gives people some opportunity to get ready for it. When the project goes in under the plumbing code for the State both Rabin's and Hammerbeck and Tinga's would be required to within one year abandon their line, abandon either the hold tank or the mound system because that's what we're dealing with here, a holding tank and a mound system.

The other option the Village has is right now we have the assessment over a ten year period, that the Board has granted 20 year payments amounts for special assessments. The interest rate there's been some statutory changes on the law for that. I think we're looking at depending on if the Board pulls the trigger or when that happens we'd probably be in the 4 percent to 5 percent range. That would be the interest rate that would be on the unpaid balance. And really it's going to be based on the utility's cost of securing money at the time. Right now it's pretty good, but as we get farther out we get less certainty about what we're going to do.

It's been a while since the County Sanitarian contacted us about issues and those issues were at Springbrook and 116th Street area. And they were able to be mitigated rather quickly without having the Sanitarian impose orders. And unless we know there's a public health problem, if we know there's sanitary sewer discharging to a waterway, one, we don't have legal authority to go out and look and we don't go out of our way to look. But if somebody notifies us of it then we're going to notify the County Sanitarian that that issue exists.

So as Mike indicated it's a difficult assessment because it's a smaller project. I don't know if we were to say the whole Springbrook got installed that's not going to cut it in half. You're still

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

going to have -- the construction on these projects is energy dependent, labor dependant. If at some point the whole Springbrook Road goes that would be a project we would contract out, we wouldn't do ourselves. Materials have gone up. In all my years here I've never seen the cost of sewer go down or even stay flat. That's just the way it is. But given that for both people it's a difficult high assessment. In fact, with Rabin there really is nothing we can do to mitigate that one. They have a significant amount of frontage for a smaller lot and that's where they're at.

With that, Mr. President, I'd recommend we open the public hearing and allow the parties to speak or ask questions.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you, Mike. With that I will open the public hearing for comment or question from the public. Jane, did we have a signup sheet?

Jane Romanowski:

Yes, we did. Pauline Hammerbeck.

John Steinbrink:

I believe Mr. Hammerbeck has some handouts here.

Pauline Hammerbeck:

Hi, Pauline Hammerbeck, 6724 Springbrook Road. So our family received notice for this public hearing saying that the sewer project comes at the request of a property owner, our neighbors the Rabin's, and that it will also address a failing mound system, ours supposedly. But we're here to let the Board know that we don't have a failing mound system, and we have no need of municipal sewer at this time. This project is actually redundancy for our household. Our own mound system is code compliant and it simply needs maintenance which we've been deferring for months now, since March actually, to wait until all the legal and financial implications of this proposed project came through.

And during this period my husband has sat and talked with a number of Village officials including Mr. Pollocoff to explain our position. And the delay on getting the much needed maintenance on our mound system as we've waited for the costs to come through has also come at an expense and inconvenience to our family as we've gone to pretty extreme lengths to conserve water and prevent any backups. We're bringing in a service to pump our tanks regularly, we're hauling laundry loads to the laundromat. We're collecting dish water so it doesn't go down the drain. Our three and five year old boys are only allowed low water soldier showers, and I'll spare you the details.

But we were pretty shocked when we saw the proposed \$38,000 special assessment come through which is what our family would be assessed just to build the Village sewer. That's a pretty high expectation particularly if you consider that this project really only stands to benefit a single

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

property owner because we have no need of it. And you need to understand we're not only on the hook for the \$38,000, there's also the \$1,600 connection fee, \$4,000 for our family to engage a plumber to build a line to actually connect to the sewer, \$1,000 for us to abandon our currently code compliant mound system. That's a jaw dropping total. That's \$45,000.

And as mentioned someone in the Village suggested we divide our property to help reduce the frontage that we be assessed for, but that still leaves us with a \$22,000 special assessment to build a sewer for the Village. Then we'd need to complete a \$1,200 property survey to divide the property. We'd have to pay a \$320 fee to do so officially with the Village. And then we're still on the hook for the \$1,600 connect fee, the same \$4,000 for the plumber, the same \$1,000 to properly abandon our currently code compliant mound system, one that actually could work for us for another 30 years if we were able to do the proper maintenance. And that still leaves us with a \$31,000 price tag, and that's our best case scenario here. It's hard to swallow as you might imagine.

So I can't imagine anyone thinking that burdening a family with a \$31,000 to \$45,000 financial outlay isn't anything but excessive. And to do so just for the benefit of a single property owner there are no health risks at stake. There's not a greater benefit to the community. There's no greater good to get on board with here. We ask that -- we know that the Village has the authority to levy these kinds of assessments and we understand that, but we just wonder whether you can agree with the moral authority to assess this assessment at this time. A \$31,000 to \$45,000 burden on a single family living in a \$224,000 home by the way.

I've been really hopeful coming here today. I can't imagine that any one of you wouldn't agree after hearing all this that this isn't the time, this isn't the scenario in which to impose this type of assessment. We ask that you save this project for when there's a greater benefit to the community and not just a single property owner. Obviously we would like to offer solutions. Some have been mentioned here tonight. Our preference would be for our neighbors to connect to the Green Bay Road lateral which was mentioned earlier. We'd love for the Board to revisit that scenario. Because at the end of the day moving forward with this proposal it's just simply too great a financial burden to put on our family, the Hammerbecks. Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you.

Jane Romanowski:

Justin Hammerbeck.

Justin Hammerbeck:

I can't say it better than my wife did, I really can't. I think that pretty much lays out most of our position on this. This is a heck of a lot of money for us to pick up. We don't need this. When you look at the map what you see over there in the right hand corner on our property is a code compliant mound system. It needs maintenance. We've been waiting to do that maintenance

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

since about March when we heard that we might be forced to hook up to a sewer main that we're not asking for and that we don't want by the way.

As Pauline said it's to benefit one owner. And while we really do like our neighbors the Rabin's, and we care for them a great deal, they've got a situation on their lot that is not really our problem and we don't want it to be our problem. Like Pauline said there's not a health issue here. There's no sewage leaking anywhere. There's nothing like that. And while I sympathize for them I also - I'm glad you brought the map because I didn't bring an easel, but I also would rather see us try to hook into the western line. I know Mike talked about that, mentioned that that's not viable for a number of reasons. But we put a man on the moon at considerable expense, and I think that we could probably figure out a way to go in and do that.

We went in back in March, like Pauline said, there were workers out there, Rick Torino's crew was there digging around down there. He had said, I don't remember to whom, that he had left the lateral down there. He left a board there. The board was lost, moved, what have you. But evidently when we went back to look for the lateral it wasn't there. I would like to see us hook there so our neighbors can actually have the ability to have sewer.

But if we can't do that I'm not necessarily willing to pick up -- as Pauline said you can probably make us shell out \$30,000 to \$45,000. My problem is fixed on Sunday by having Billingsly Engineering at our yard to do the maintenance on our mound system, and it cost me \$10,000, and I've already put a \$3,000 deposit on that. So we're here to say that we think that the motivation for this right now, as Mike said, maybe there are economies of scale when the community needs it down the road, maybe there are, I don't know, but I know that we don't need for being ask to lay out a heck of a lot of money for this. There's no health risk. The compelling reason is to save expense on the lot to mitigate a situation there.

But we wanted to state our case. I think Pauline stated it perfectly well that we're not a part of this. We don't have a failing mound system. We've got a system that just needs to be completed and done and would have been done four months ago if it hadn't been for waiting for these costs and whatnot. That's essentially all that I have to say. We're hoping that you table this project or just flat kill it or find some other alternative. And we do as a family appreciate the opportunity to come here and state our case.

Some of the exhibits you've got the costs, and these are going to be the minimum cost to us. As you all know as projects go up rarely do costs go down. Oftentimes they go up. In fact we saw on one assessment that costs have already gone up from what we were given. I guess that was a part of the \$1,600 connection fee. You've got an invoice here from our guy that we contacted in March that said, hey, I can take care of your problem in less than a week for \$10,450. And we already paid the guy \$3,000. We were in the process of completing it when a sewer guy walked up to our house and say, hey, we can connect you for a lot less money. Well, it turned out that that was not the case.

Other exhibits back here just money that we've already paid to Pat's pumping, \$1,000 here over the last few months just waiting for this to come to fruition. We want to fix our problem, and we

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

want to do it in the most effective way for our family possible. And that's what we came here to ask consideration for today. Thanks.

Jane Romanowski:

Jerry Rabin.

Jerry Rabin:

Mr. President and Board member, Jerry Rabin, 6717 Springbrook Road. I've been at that address for 70 years starting out as a dairy farmer and have been there ever since. Twenty years ago when they widened Green Bay Road the State told us we had to abandon our house because it was too close to Green Bay Road. So we built another house further back from Green Bay Road. It just so happens that the Village was bringing a water line past the house so we hooked up to the water line at that time. And they said that the sewer line is coming. So we hooked up into a holding tank to temporarily hold us back until the Village would bring the sewer line down and we would hook up to it. It took 20 years and the Village brought the sewer line to the property last year. So we went to the Village and we asked to hook up to that sewer line.

In the meantime, for the last 20 years, we have paid Pat's Sanitary \$60,000 to service our holding tank, \$3,000 a year to empty the holding tank with a total of \$60,000. Now supposedly we can hook up to the Village sewer line. We already over the last 20 years paid \$60,000. It's going to cost us another \$20,000 for the assessment, for the lateral to fill up and remove our holding tank. So we're into approximately \$80,000 for the last 20 years. It's an inconvenience for four adults living in the house to use very little water. We spend a lot of time at the RecPlex bathing because we try to conserve water going into our holding tank.

We're looking forward to hooking up to this sewer line that is now there as of last year. And we want the Village to do it in a manner that is best for the Village for the future. And Mr. Pollocoff said that they want to extend it further east to service residential homes in the future and this is the best way to go. I mentioned to the Village Administrator do what is best for the Village. Run the sewer line what is best for the Village. Thank you for your time.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you.

Jane Romanowski:

There are no more signups, Mr. President.

John Steinbrink:

Anyone else wishing to speak? Anyone else wishing to speak? Hearing none I'll close the public hearing and open it up to Board comment or question. Mike?

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

Michael Serpe:

The flow on Green Bay Road goes from north to south?

Mike Pollocoff:

From south to north.

Michael Serpe:

South to north. And there's no possible way for the Rabin's to hook up to that line from the back of their home?

Mike Pollocoff:

Well, in fact we took a look today, took another look at it because my thought was if there's a manhole on the south end of their property maybe we could put in a drop to get it down to that main. I guess I disagree with Mr. Hammerbeck's evaluation of the lateral on the line. We've televised it. There isn't a lateral there. We went through incredible expense to put that main in given the ground water table and the soil conditions. And it kind of is an outcrop of that kind of slew that runs underneath Green Bay Road that runs kind of behind Rabin's property. That's where the soils were that bad.

If, in fact, we could have put a lateral in for Mr. Rabin back when that sanitary sewer was put in from the design plans that was there. But once we actually started digging it and doing it we were in a quagmire. It was a mess. So that's an option. It's still an option, but at that point the Village has got to re-excavate the main, do something to stabilize the trench over the main and get it out. It's still going to be an expensive project. But as I said before there's a lot of solutions, but those solutions are all tied with money. How much is it going to cost, I don't have that number. So if that was the case the Rabin's would have to pay their frontage assessment just like they see it today. Because when the sewer does go in we can't come back and charge you later on for the sewer you have. You pay for it when you get the service. As I said the other option is running across the street and tying into the manhole where the soils aren't as bad on that section of street. But then that's running another main across Springbrook.

Michael Serpe:

So it would be possible then to come to the back of Rabin's house and make a connection, possible.

Mike Pollocoff:

Possible, very expensive. Very difficult construction.

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

Michael Serpe:

How much more are we talking about?

Mike Pollocoff:

Well, we're probably at 20 feet, and 20 feet of digging in wet, runny sand and organic matter I think when we were putting that line in we were doing good to get 20 feet a day putting that in. And it's not just the cost of putting it in. The Village owns that lateral and that riser and the Y forever. So when that thing -- it won't be Mr. Rabin's to fix if it shifts or moves or settles, it's going to be the Village's. So we would have to evaluate what that would cost to put that in on that main and get it, you know.

Michael Serpe:

I have a question of Mr. Hammerbeck, if you would. You put a down payment of \$3,000 to repair your mound system.

Justin Hammerbeck:

We did, yes.

Michael Serpe:

Have they started that work yet?

Justin Hammerbeck:

No. Because pending this obviously if you put this project through I don't want to have a brand new mound on my property.

Michael Serpe:

That's what I'm getting to. So if we were to come to some type of solution here you could get your \$3,000 back?

Justin Hammerbeck:

Well, a thousand of it went to permits and things like that, okay? But a couple thousand of it I can have applied to take a line, I'm full disclosure here, up the side of my driveway to the pipe that comes out the east side of my house. And I'm going to have that engineer do the work because he's dynamite. So whether he's taking that \$2,000 that's not permit that's already spent to the Village or the County and applying it to the mound or to this I don't -- you know.

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

Michael Serpe:

Here's what I'm getting to. If you were prepared to spend \$10,000 on repairing your mound system --

Justin Hammerbeck:

Sure.

Michael Serpe:

Believe me this is not easy for us to work on. Another I think \$11,000 would be his plus over the course -- you add another \$11,000 over the course of 20 years you would have a permanent system that you wouldn't have to worry about again. It's just something to think about here.

Justin Hammerbeck:

Sure. And as I said in the beginning our purpose here isn't to prevent the Rabin's from fixing their situation, not at all. Our purpose here is to not pay something that we don't need to pay. If you take a look at this sheet, and I'm sure you looked at it already, it's got the assessment from Mike Spence if we divide our property or we don't, okay? And the bottom line there it's either \$30,000 if I'll actually subdivide my property so it's essentially unsaleable to anybody that wants to build a bigger place on it down the road I think, I'm not sure about that.

But if I'll subdivide it then my all in cost here with connect fees and all that stuff is \$30,000. By all means, and I don't think my wife would disagree, if there's some way to get the cost of this project down then we're not having this conversation anymore, it's different numbers and things like that where we're paying less. And, yes, to your point would I rather pay it over 20 years? Sure I would. I would probably be inclined being a family that doesn't like to be in debt we'd find some way to pay it off as fast as we could if that answers your question. I'm not sure.

Michael Serpe:

It does, it does. Prior to this we were at a 9 percent rate over 10 years or 20 years, whatever. Now it's down to Mike said 4 or 5.

Mike Pollocoff:

It's the cost of money. It just depends on what --

Michael Serpe:

I just don't want to see you spend \$10,000 on a mound system that they say is going to be good for a number of years --

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

Justin Hammerbeck:

Thirty.

Michael Serpe:

-- and let's say seven or eight years from now it comes back and it's going to cost you another \$10,000 to fix it again. And with that money we could have been done with the sewer system forever.

Justin Hammerbeck:

I see your point, but the last system lasted for 30 years, or 25 to 30 years. We've got good soil samples from the County that say that the soil is excellent. Once this thing is rebuilt it's going for 25 or 30 years. Now take that for what it's worth. Anything can fail at any given time, but that's what I'm looking at. Do I want to spend \$10,000 for 25 to 30 years' worth of utility, or do I want to spend \$30,000 to \$45,000?

John Steinbrink:

Mr. Hammerbeck, let me ask Mike a question. If he puts that in doesn't he have to sign an agreement that says if a sewer comes by he has to abandon and hook it up whether it's one year old or 30 years old.

Justin Hammerbeck:

Yes, I do, that's why --

John Steinbrink:

So if you spend this money and then for some reason sewer in five years goes by.

Justin Hammerbeck:

Yes, Mr. Steinbrink.

John Steinbrink:

We've seen that happen. That's why --

Justin Hammerbeck:

Sure, I'm fully cognizant of that. But as of now, and I called the Village before we even started work on the mound, there are no plans now whatsoever to run sewer up Springbrook Road. And if you go from house to house and you ask the people if they'd rather have the sewer or the mound most of them are going to tell you, because I've talked to several of them that they're only

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

going to want the mound. They're not even going to want the sewer. There's a buildable lot, there's a nice lot that's directly east of us which my neighbors have, and at some point hopefully that will be developed and built on. And at that point you're going to have to put this sewer in. I don't know when that's going to be. Only God knows when that's going to be. Who knows if we go into another crash or if we go into a real estate boom. If I have to take a risk of spending \$10,000 to not have Pauline doing what she's been doing in the house and gambling as to when we're going to put in the sewer, if it takes another 20 years that's a good gamble to me. If it takes five I'm out \$2,000 a year for the next five years.

I think what's missed here is I just can't believe that the project costs this much. I'm familiar with backhoes. I grew up on a farm. I've dug trenches, I've dug ditches with shovels. I'm familiar with what pipe costs in general. We're only talking about a pipe that runs from the manhole where those green lines intersect on the northeast corner of Springbrook and Green Bay up to just east of my driveway. We're talking about \$60,000 worth of costs. I'm not familiar with public works projects obviously. There's got to be some way that the Rabin's can pay less and I can pay less to put that in, or we defer it until such time as others further up the road can split that cost with us.

Michael Serpe:

I have to ask a question here. Public works has done projects in the past where they came in less than what was anticipated. And if they come in less we charge less as well.

Justin Hammerbeck:

Of course, yes.

Michael Serpe:

And, John, I'm not going to put you on the spot, but is there a chance that this project could come in less than what we're looking at?

Mike Pollocoff:

I think realistically -- I mean John gave us a number of 18 percent is what he thought it would be. Remember this is our time to be straight with the property owners on this assessment. If not, if it comes in higher then we have the whole hearing all over again. So the way the process is set up is that the numbers we give you are conservative in the sense they're high, and then whatever the actual cost is is what we come down. We've had a couple of these in my years here and they're ugly because everybody remembers what they got assessed and that's all they're willing to pay. But if the project costs more we have to go back to the people for more.

We've done well as Mike as indicated, but this main is 20 feet deep. You're digging a really deep main where you're connecting, and you're coming back and it's not like coming up a real quick slope, it's gradual because it's going all the way to the subcontinental divide. That's one of the things that's making it expensive. And plus it's not a lot of unit cost spread around. It is just

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

some people. But I can tell you that we planned for that sewer to come in there. I mean to not have planned for it when we designed the other sewer that's going to connect into it would have been irresponsible.

The fact that we planned for it, though, doesn't mean that we have a set date when we're going to do it. Anybody that asks me if there's a sanitary sewer running in Springbrook I'm telling them yes. I don't when it's going to be. And I know that everybody along the way, and all the years I've had sewer hearings I've never met anybody that really wanted to pay their assessment or didn't want to keep their mound system or didn't want to keep their septic system or didn't want to keep their holding tank because sewer has always been expensive. Even back when it was \$25 a foot it was expensive for the people back then. That's what it is. That's what it is. It is that expensive because of the short length and the dept that we're going to have to dig it at.

Michael Serpe:

If they did split that property off we would then stop at that property line? If they split their property would we stop at the property line where the split would take place?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right.

Michael Serpe:

So that would save them a considerable amount of money.

Mike Pollocoff:

That's what this reflects here, right. Mr. Spence?

Mike Spence:

In talking about the cost because of what Mike Pollocoff just said we're very conservative in our estimating because we don't want to go back. And I can tell you we do have a 10 percent contingency in the number. So if the costs are cost to what we estimated that would be a 10 percent reduction there but we can't predict that if we run into something. So when I do the estimate I try to make it as conservative as possible.

Michael Serpe:

Is there a better time of the year to do this project because of the depth?

Mike Pollocoff:

This is the best time.

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

Michael Serpe:

Right now.

Mike Pollocoff:

Well, right now through before we get into late fall.

Justin Hammerbeck:

I have to go off these figures, the ones that came in the mail.

Mike Pollocoff:

Right, that's what we want you to go off. You have to recognize those could be possible.

Justin Hammerbeck:

Pauline and I are making our arguments. It's just that when you look at those numbers in red, one is \$45,000, one is \$30,600, but our very minor situation is fixed for \$7,000 more out of our pockets. We'll leave it in your hands hoping that our neighbors are able to find some way to mitigate their situation but also not wanting to pay an extreme amount of money here after tax dollars applied to a project we don't want or need. We like the sewer system. It's green, it's clean, it's efficient, it's cheap. We like being on a well. We're not hooked up to city water. We like the way that our lot is, and it's the way that it was when we bought it. So we're not looking for this. We wanted to make that known. And we wanted to make it known also that this is not money that we part with lightly.

John Steinbrink:

One thing I would say is do you have your well tested often?

Justin Hammerbeck:

We do.

John Steinbrink:

So that's a good thing because the aquifers in that area are not the best.

Justin Hammerbeck:

I have a three and a five year old that drink out of the faucet.

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

John Steinbrink:

That's a good thing then.

Justin Hammerbeck:

And no problems so far. And we do test the water, and we had it tested when we bought the place and it was good. But I appreciate that.

Mike Pollocoff:

One thing that I could recommend to the Board is I can't give you a number because we haven't worked it up to be what it would cost to connect Rabin's into the existing sanitary sewer. It would leave their assessment the same as it was. It would probably make their -- they place their holding tanks and even laterals on reliance on what we had indicated where the sewer was going to go. Now it won't be there at that point. So I could indicate what it would cost to stabilize the trench at that sewer, come up with a viable riser and lateral location to get that done. Some of that cost could be passed onto the Rabin's. The rate payers would be paying for the rest of it to lower the assessment rate and relieve Mr. Hammerbeck from having the sewer on his property. So it would be a fairly large project to get the one lateral in but I can't tell you how large that is. I don't have that number. So if you'd want to table it, table the action until you got those numbers I could prepare that.

John Steinbrink:

Was there a manhole to the south then?

Mike Pollocoff:

The manhole to the south is on the other side of the stream south of Rabin's lot line.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I have a question for Mike. Assuming that five years from now a sewer line is run [inaudible] in Springbrook Road to Green Bay Road. Now, the Rabin's got the connection from Green Bay. That's the assumption. Okay, when the line goes in front of both of the properties if one of them already pay he doesn't have to pay again. Who is going to pay for that portion?

Mike Pollocoff:

Rabin, if you look at the numbers just in round numbers if they paid \$20,000 they would have to pay that \$20,000 now because we wouldn't let them connect to the sanitary sewer. So that would be held in the sewer fund so that whenever that main went in that money would be available to pay the Rabin's share. Because we're not putting a main in front of their property but I have to assess them because if we go the alternative I have to assess them before they connect.

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

That's where I'm going to, yes.

Mike Pollocoff:

And it's a roll of the dice.

Justin Hammerbeck:

Could I ask the Board one question, specifically Mike? And I'm not sure where you're going with that, where the manhole is on the south of the line or whatever. But if we were able to connect the Rabin's to the existing line if that's what you're discussing, and eventually we do put that line down Springbrook Road going to the east, going to the northeast, is my property then assessable for the full cost of that? Or would the assessment be the same --

Mike Pollocoff:

Just as it is today it's assessable for the benefit you derive, it would be the benefit derived at that time. The statutes define benefit a little bit differently than maybe you and I think of a benefit. The way the code is set up is that sanitary sewer is the ultimate way of treating wastewater where it goes to a treatment plant and it's treated. And the benefit you would have and you don't want to hear this is that you get rid of that mound because that's a temporary measure or you get rid of that holding tank, that's a temporary measure. So the public's good is being served under that clean water regime by having only wastewater, sanitary sewage, go to a public treatment plant and have it treated rather than having it treated privately through a mound or being conveyed to a treatment plant. So that ends up being the benefit that's conferred upon you. And then the real question that you're probably having is you're saying I don't think I'm getting that much benefit.

Justin Hammerbeck:

That's what my attorneys and myself is that when we talk about benefit it's a gray word, and when you've got a great system that you like a lot --

Mike Pollocoff:

But you and the people that had the house before you signed a statement saying that is a temporary system. That's how the State set it up otherwise they would never get these private systems abandoned. That's why I say the definition of a benefit, your benefit is I've got a mound system and I don't have to pay you guys anything and I'm on my way. But the benefit for the public is that sanitary sewage goes to a wastewater treatment plant and gets disposed of and treated that way. So it's two different concepts of benefit. I understand exactly what you're saying, I just want to be straight with you how we define benefit.

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

Justin Hammerbeck:

Sure. I feel like I've taken up all the Board's time already, and there are a lot of people behind us. So I think Pauline and I have stated our case adequately. Like I said we leave it in your hands. Please just when you make your decision take a look at this again. These are real numbers. There might be some reduction in there as Mike said, but it's not going to be significant when we're talking about a family of four over there. But, again, we certainly don't wish our neighbors to be inconvenienced as they said. They've been waiting for this for 20 years and we understand.

Michael Serpe:

For what it's worth I really appreciate how you and your wife approached us tonight. It's very, very professional and we don't get that a lot, believe me.

Justin Hammerbeck:

It's all her, I'll give her all the credit or I'd be yelling and shouting.

Michael Serpe:

I don't know what the costs are going to be with this, but I would be willing to table this until we find out what the costs would be to hook up in the south part of Rabin's property and then bring this back. What do you think, another month?

Mike Pollocoff:

We could have it ready by the next meeting.

Michael Serpe:

The next meeting. I would move to table and then research the option here.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I second that.

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion and a second for tabling. Any discussion?

Jane Romanowski:

July 21st at six o'clock.

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

SERPE MOVED TO TABLE THE PUBLIC HEARING TO JULY 21, 2014 AT 6 P.M. TO CONSIDER AN ALTERNATE ROUTE TO THE RABIN PROPERTY ONLY FOR THE PUBLIC SANITARY SEWER EXTENSION IMPROVEMENTS PROPOSED IN THE VICINITY OF SPRINGBROOK ROAD/CTH ML EAST OF STH 31; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

6. **CITIZEN COMMENTS (PLEASE BE ADVISED PER STATE STATUTE SECTION 19.84(2), INFORMATION WILL BE RECEIVED FROM THE PUBLIC AND THERE MAY BE LIMITED DISCUSSION ON THE INFORMATION RECEIVED. HOWEVER, NO ACTION WILL BE TAKEN UNDER PUBLIC COMMENTS.)**

Jane Romanowski:

We have signup tonight for Elizabeth Kiroke.

Elizabeth Kiroke:

I really just have some comments that go along with Item B under New Business. I represent the ownership and the management of the Prairie Ridge Market Place located at 9000, 9020 and 9080 76th Street. And we understand that the sign in question does belong to the association and it is for businesses within the Prairie Ridge Development. But we feel that advertising other tenants of the entire development on that monument sign could be very confusing to those driving in and looking to actually locate tenants.

The first reason is the sign at the top is labeled Prairie Ridge Market Place which is the name of the center owned by Berwick Properties, Inc. It's also adjacent to the Prairie Ridge Market Place. People pulling in and seeing another tenant's name on there that's not in that general vicinity are probably going to be confused and wonder where they need to go at that point once they get to 76th Street and 91st from Highway 50.

We also are working with three new tenants that are going to be moving into the Prairie Ridge Market Place. All are anticipating being on that sign. We have Dermatology Associates of Wisconsin, Valeri Orthodontics and Knight Barry Title that will all be moving in within the next two to three months. It seems logical that they would be marketed on that sign as in the past the tenants of the Prairie Ridge Market Place seemed to be the only ones that were on that sign.

We also still have two vacant suites that we're trying to lease out. We have some good leads on both of those as well, and that would leave no room for them to be on there. The landlords work really hard to get in new tenants. When we first took over this bank owned property we had I believe three tenants, and now we've at least doubled that and exceeded that. So mainly I just wanted to get that out there. Our goal is to work with the association along with the Village and get their assistance in trying to work for the best for all for that area.

John Steinbrink:

Just a quick question. This was a public hearing --

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

Jean Werbie-Harris:

At the Plan Commission meeting.

John Steinbrink:

Did you receive notice on it?

Elizabeth Kiroke:

Not that part of it. We received notice on the one that pertains to the Prairie Ridge Market Place but nothing about that association sign.

John Steinbrink:

Okay, Jean?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Typically when there's a PUD overlay and it's not specific to a particular property but it's a general PUD for the association we've not typically notified everyone within that entire area regarding that text change. You know what, I can go into some of the details when the item up on the Board's agenda.

John Steinbrink:

Right, this isn't the right time to do that.

Elizabeth Kiroke:

Okay, I wasn't aware.

John Steinbrink:

Just curious if you had received notice and how come you didn't come to the public hearing and stated that before the Planning Commission. Alright, thank you. Are there any other speakers?

Jane Romanowski:

No, there aren't.

John Steinbrink:

Okay. Anyone else wishing to speak under citizens' comments? Hearing none we'll close citizens' comments.

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

7. ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

Mike Pollocoff:

I've said enough tonight, Mr. President.

John Steinbrink:

Your words are golden and we always wait for them.

8. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Receive Plan Commission recommendation and consider Ordinance #14-20 to approve a Zoning Text Amendment on properties located at 9000, 9020 and 9080 76th Street known as Prairie Ridge Market Place to amend the Prairie Ridge Planned Unit Development to remove the requirements that all wall signs shall be Cardinal Red.**

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. President, this is a request of ordinance text amendment 14-20, and it's at the request of Berwick Properties. They're the owner of Prairie Ridge Market Place which is located at the southwest corner of Highway 50 and 88th Avenue just east of 91st Avenue in Pleasant Prairie. They own three buildings at that sight, 9000, 9020 and 9080 76th Street. Again, the purpose of their request is to modify the PUD, the signage PUD, that was granted for the Prairie Ridge Market Place properties a number of years ago.

Specifically all of the wall signs in that development are identified as cardinal red in color. Specifically there have been a number of tenants over the years that have gone in and out that wanted to modify those by having the Zoning Administrator make that change. And what I indicated to the previous owner and to Mr. Mills is that if you want to change the PUD just make a request and we'll modify it so that individual tenants that go in there can use their own corporate logo, colors and it can be identified with them. Initially when it was put in V.K. and Ajay Kuttemperoor wanted everyone to have the same color which was the cardinal red. Obviously that doesn't work with a lot of businesses if they have different colors incorporated as part of their development. So what we're doing is we're taking a look at the wall sign regulations as they apply to Prairie Ridge Market Place. And there actually have been a few minor modifications to the sign regulations as well. And so the staff also took the opportunity to make those modifications in their signage PUD so that their PUD is consistent with the sign regulations of the Village.

So the first change it Item F as shown in your packets and on the screen. All wall signs shall be internally illuminated or halo type illumination. The following types of signs or sign illumination shall not be permitted unless approved by the Zoning Administrator or on a case-by-case basis. No external neon outlining illumination, and there's no background painting of the building

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

facade in order to incorporate someone's sign. The next modification or change is H, only channel type or pin mounted letters shall be allowed and a symbol or company logo may be allowed. No sign raceways are allowed and no visible electrical crossovers are allowed. Again, this is to fall in line with the current sign ordinance.

Now, the two signs that were requested by the petitioner to modify their specific PUD are I and J. The first had to do with the cardinal red color to modify it so that if that provision is removed they can use any color. And then J, a symbol or company logo may be a different color, we just decided to eliminate that provision as well. And then finally L, all exterior building walls and facades where former signage was placed shall be patched and repaired and repainted as needed as a condition of a new sign permit approval. All exterior building walls and facades shall be maintained in a good state of repair at all times.

This was a matter before the Village Plan Commission as a public hearing. And, again, we received no objections and no comments with respect to these modifications, one, to incorporate the current sign regulations in their signage PUD. And, number two, to incorporate their request to remove the cardinal red and the logo requirement. The staff and the Plan Commission recommended approval as presented.

Michael Serpe:

Move approval of 14-20.

Clyde Allen:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

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

SERPE MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND ADOPT ORDINANCE #14-20 TO APPROVE A ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT ON PROPERTIES LOCATED AT 9000, 9020 AND 9080 76TH STREET KNOWN AS PRAIRIE RIDGE MARKET PLACE TO AMEND THE PRAIRIE RIDGE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT TO REMOVE THE REQUIREMENTS THAT ALL WALL SIGNS SHALL BE CARDINAL RED; SECONDED BY ALLEN; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

- B. Receive Plan Commission recommendation and Consider Ordinance Nos. #14-21 and Ord. #14-22 to approve a Zoning Map and Text Amendments on the property located at 9191 80th Street to rezone the property from I-1, Institutional District to I-1 (PUD), Institutional District with a Planned Unit Development Overlay District; and to amend the Prairie Ridge Planned Unit Development to allow Extended Love to place their name on the off-site entry monument sign within the Prairie Ridge Development adjacent to STH 50.**

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. President and members of the Board, this is a series of two ordinance amendments, 14-21 and 14-22. And this was at the request of Extended Love. It's a daycare facility that's identified with a red star. They're located just south of 80th Street at the end of 91st Avenue extended. They're some distance from Highway 50, however they are a commercial business that are located in the Prairie Ridge Development.

When Prairie Ridge was developed starting in 1996 to 1998 we worked with VK Development in order to identify commercial businesses within the entire Prairie Ridge that there would be specific locations along Highway 50 where monument signs would be located, where businesses located south of Highway 50 could have their name. And so there was one located at 91st Avenue and Highway 50, 94th Avenue and then again over at 99th Avenue. And since we've added some at Prairie Ridge Commons, and at the corner where Target and Cheddar's is located there's actually another monument sign at that location.

The intent at that time was that, again, to give some visibility for any of the users within the Prairie Ridge Development along Highway 50. This sign that's located at 91st Avenue and Highway 50 was never intended just to be for Prairie Ridge Market Place. These were all associated owned signs, and it was, again, just to try to bring visibility to those that were further south away from Highway 50. One of the concepts initially was that there was going to be another sign located at the southwest corner of H and Highway 50, but the developer didn't own that land. That was owned by Mr. Willkomm, and at that time he wasn't interested in selling so that sign never went in.

So when the sign first went in at 91st Avenue Prairie Ridge Market Place was put at the top. There were a couple of uses in there, but it wasn't overly successful so there weren't a lot of other users there. So other uses could have gone on that particular sign. M&I Bank could have gone on that sign. Just like the one at 94th Avenue Holiday Inn Express is on that particular sign. Again, they're a considerable distance south of Highway 50.

So at the time that Extended Love came forward to us a few months ago they indicated that they had some interest with when Cobblestone Development was building that they would not be seen at all from Highway 50. And so they had some interest in finding out if they could go on that sign. Well, the way the signage PUD was written back in the late '90s was that at that time Prairie Ridge specifically identified the commercial uses north of Prairie Ridge Boulevard could all go on these signs. Anyone that negotiated it with the developer could go on those signs.

Well, at that time Extended Love was not interested in going on that sign or because there was not much development out there they had no need to be on that sign. But since new development was going in and now as you know there's going to be another use north of that they asked if they could go on one of these signs. So they had started going through the process. We told them that the signs were owned by the association, they had to have the association representative sign off on the applications. Because the sign PUD was for their property where the star is everyone within 300 feet of that property was sent notification. We did send it to everyone within 300 feet

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

of where the sign was located. We did it where their property was located because they're the ones that are getting the PUD for the signage.

So basically I've had conversations with Steve Mills, with David Gallowich from the association. They've contacted Peter Molter, and I believe Marty Mills is also on the association Board. So there has been considerable conversation actually today that they would like to still accommodate Extended Love at this location. But I think that the dialog is now open amongst all of the developers in Prairie Ridge as to where the most appropriate location would be. Whether or not another sign will be installed for just Prairie Ridge Market Place or that label Prairie Ridge Market Place is taken off the top and additional user can go there. If Extended Love can bounce over to the Holiday Inn. Again this is all really a developer driven signage request to the association, but there had not been good communication amongst all the developers. Again, when we started this we had one developer, and now we've got multiple developers, multiple interests.

So the conversation that I had today with both Steve and with David Gallowich is that they will work it out. They will make sure that any tenants that would like to get access to Highway 50 that they get that signage location. This is just a small photograph you can see of where Extended Love is requesting to go. Again, Prairie Ridge Market Place that's a huge sign. And, again, it was mainly because there weren't any other uses out there that they did that sign so big. They don't need to have it there. And then Plato's Closet and I can't read, I think Seebeck's is on there and Jimanos Pizza, I can't read the other one, Cardinal Stritch and then Extended Love. So whether or not they go on this particular sign or they go to the one over at Holiday Inn they needed to have the signage PUD to be on one of the signs.

So I think at this point the staff is recommending that the zoning map and the text amendment be approved to allow Extended Love to continue to work with the association, work with the developers and get their appropriate sign at one of those locations. They are just south of 91st so they identified that location. But the other location which is at 94th Avenue I think that just has Holiday Inn Express on that particular sign.

John Steinbrink:

Jean, does Extended Love pay a fee to the association or will they be paying a fee?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

They do. They all pay commercial association fees. They all pay the same fee, every one of them out there.

John Steinbrink:

Have they been paying that already?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

They have been paying it the whole time that they have been out there just like St. Anne and all the rest of the commercial related uses out there. They all pay the commercial association fees for maintenance out there. And I would really prefer to have them work all these logistics out and accommodate the commercial. Because if one is successful they'll all be successful bringing traffic and uses to the area.

John Steinbrink:

They're so far off from this location in back it could be hard to find.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

It is, but it's all part of the Prairie Ridge Development. It goes all the way down to 88th Street. And so that highway visibility with signage is very important along Highway 50.

Michael Serpe:

I agree with you, John, it's a long way off. Jean, how many more acres of developable property do we have for commercial? There's a considerable amount left.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

In Prairie Ridge --

Michael Serpe:

We have Costco coming in, it's out of the bag now.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

They're taking 17 acres. We've got land to the east of 91st Avenue that's vacant.

Michael Serpe:

I guess there's quite a bit of land.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

St. Anne has some. Steve Mills has some. The vacant land north of 76th Street. We have all of the vacant land from 94th Avenue to Hospice Alliance.

Michael Serpe:

I know, and that's what I'm getting to. And somebody is going to want signage once they develop.

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Some want signage and some don't. M&I Bank didn't. Costco does not. So it really just depends.

Michael Serpe:

John brought it up and I brought it up at the Plan Commission meeting about the distance from Highway 50. Extended Love is a great little business, there's no question about it. But it's easier accessible from Highway C than Highway 50, and Highway C is a long distance from Highway 50.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

I understand that, but it's part of the commercial development of Prairie Ridge. And they're covered by all of the commercial covenants of Prairie Ridge.

Michael Serpe:

Okay, you had the meetings and they said they would work with them?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Yes.

Michael Serpe:

And that's going to be more signage eventually, right?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

I think there will be another monument sign on that Prairie Ridge corner of 50 and 88th.

John Steinbrink:

Extended Love is probably going to be a destination, because if I was to pull in there I'd drive up and down looking for it in one of the storefronts there and never find it.

Michael Serpe:

We need individual motions on these?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

No.

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

Michael Serpe:

I'd move approval of 14-21 and 14-22.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Mike and second by Steve for adoption of 14-21 and Ordinance 14-22. Any discussion?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

One question for Jean. Jean, how tall is the monument that we have in the Prairie Ridge Market Place that says Prairie Ridge in the top? That's the main one. How big is that one, how tall.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

It's at least 20 feet. I think it's at 20 feet.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I thought how tall it can be is 16 feet [inaudible] the ordinance [inaudible].

Jean Werbie-Harris:

I'm sorry, excuse me?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Sixteen feet was the maximum that we allow?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Sixteen feet, yes, but because this was part of a signage PUD that we adopted back in 1998 we had identified that the monument signs would be able to go up a little bit higher.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Okay.

John Steinbrink:

Further discussion?

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

Kris Keckler:

So with the existing monument that's right there what's the option if we ever run out of available signage space on there for additional businesses?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Well, one of the options that I discussed with Mr. Mills the other day was that there be another monument sign because one was originally proposed at the very southwest corner somewhere in this area. There was one that was proposed initially there, and maybe that would be the signage for just the Prairie Ridge Market Place, and then this sign would reflect all of those uses that are south. So they indicated to me that they would work it out. I trust the private market would do that and work it out with respect to the available spaces. I mean the Holiday Inn Express I think they're the only ones on the one sign at 94th Avenue, so possibly their sign gets amended, and then at least two, three, four other signs could be located on that monument sign.

Kris Keckler:

Okay, thanks.

John Steinbrink:

Further discussion?

SERPE MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND ADOPT ORDINANCE NOS. #14-21 AND ORD. #14-22 TO APPROVE A ZONING MAP AND TEXT AMENDMENTS ON THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 9191 80TH STREET TO REZONE THE PROPERTY FROM I-1, INSTITUTIONAL DISTRICT TO I-1 (PUD), INSTITUTIONAL DISTRICT WITH A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY DISTRICT; AND TO AMEND THE PRAIRIE RIDGE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT TO ALLOW EXTENDED LOVE TO PLACE THEIR NAME ON THE OFF-SITE ENTRY MONUMENT SIGN WITHIN THE PRAIRIE RIDGE DEVELOPMENT ADJACENT TO STH 50; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

C. Consider award of contract for construction of 88th Avenue Sanitary Sewer Project.

Mike Spence:

Mr. President and members of the Board, this project is the construction of a new 18 inch sanitary sewer along the east side of County Trunk H or 88th Avenue starting at just south of 165 for about 3,000 feet to the south. This particular sewer would provide sewer to the Niagara Bottling facility which is located right here. So previously we awarded a contract for the design of this project. And on June 26th we received three bids for the construction of this project. The three bids were from DK Contractors, Inc. out of Pleasant Prairie, Tomasini and Super Excavators.

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

The bid by DK Contractors was \$644,610. The engineer's estimate for this project was \$634,000. So the bid was just slightly over the engineer's estimate for this project.

This project also includes some ancillary work relative to the Niagara project. We're going to be moving the access road at the Liberty -- there's a shared access currently at the Niagara site and Liberty, and as part of this project we're proposing to move that access to the north so that there's a separate access for Niagara. And then when Niagara Bottling comes in they'll be building their own access. In addition, there will be an emergency fire access on the east side of the property to provide emergency access.

I have also requested bids for those two items from another contractor as potentially a change order. So what I'm asking tonight is to award the total. But if we can get a cheaper project we would amend the purchase order and the contract just to include the sewer. So with that I recommend that the contract be awarded to DK Contractors. I'd be glad to answer any questions.

Mike Pollocoff:

So if the Board is inclined to approve this they would need to accept the engineer's recommendation for DK Contractors and then hold in abeyance the alternatives until we evaluate it with some other bids.

Mike Pollocoff:

Maybe one more time.

Mike Pollocoff:

The recommendation would be to approve the engineer's recommendation to award the sanitary sewer contract to DK Construction and hold the alternate bids in abeyance.

John Steinbrink:

The alternate bids being the access road?

Mike Spence:

Correct.

John Steinbrink:

I see Ryan Construction out there now. Are they grading the site or something?

Mike Pollocoff:

They're Niagara.

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

John Steinbrink:

And who pays for the access road then?

Mike Pollocoff:

The TIF District. I think we can get prices from -- we have a contract with Payne & Dolan to do road work. Cicchini is going to be doing something for the fire station. We can get some other bidders to take a look at it.

Mike Spence:

I was expecting hopefully before the meeting to have another estimate. But I have asked the contractor doing the Village site work. His sub is Cicchini, and he hasn't been able to get a price from them. So I was just hoping that we might be able to save some money. So that's why --

John Steinbrink:

So what is the spec on this? What are we looking for? To hold a fire truck so we can get in there is that the main thing then?

Mike Pollocoff:

There's two things. One is an emergency access lane between Niagara and the Liberty property in the back end so that fire department can go back and forth between the two properties or they'll have to come all the way out to 88th. And then the other one is relocating -- right now Liberty and Niagara share the same access point on H. So Niagara is bring in 300 trucks a day. Liberty is about 60 trucks a day. We could leave it that way. In fact I told both property owners if they don't work with us on this we'll just leave it that way. But it's going to be a conflict and a problem. So the TIF District made the determination that in order to support the Niagara project we'd separate those so that Liberty will have a straight in and out to their property. All things being equal that's how we approved it originally. And I think WisPark was saving some money so they split it up with another parcel and allocated some of the cost of that driveway to the Niagara property and didn't charge as much to Liberty.

Kris Keckler:

Move to accept administration's recommendation as outlined.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

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

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

KECKLER MOVED TO AWARD A CONTRACT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF 88TH AVENUE SANITARY SEWER PROJECT TO DK CONTRACTORS IN THE BASE BID AMOUNT OF \$582,460.00 EXCLUDING THE BIDS FOR ALTERNATES #1 AND #2; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

D. Consider award of contract for Professional Engineering Services for a Water System Study for the Pleasant Prairie Water Distribution System.

Mike Spence:

Mr. President and members of the Board, the Village currently purchases approximately 2.25 million gallons of water every day from the Kenosha Water Utility. At the Kenosha Water Utility production plant they pump water to the Village's storage facility located at 165 and Sheridan Road. One of the things that we've been looking at, and this is related also to the Sheridan Road project that we talked about at the last meeting, we've been operating our system essentially with one connection point for a number of years. We haven't had the need to use any of the emergency connections that are connected to the Kenosha Water Utility's system.

So in order to further evaluate the operation of our system I asked for a proposal from GAI to review our firefighting needs and the redundancy of our system and the reliability. So I received a proposal from GAI to do this. This proposal would be done by the same individual that worked with the Village on the rate study. The whole point of the study would be to, again, model our system and look at indeed whether or not or confirm that the operation of our system with one connection point really makes the most sense. So at the end of this study we would have a recommendation that basically could say that the way we're operating our system is valid, we have no need to continue to have the other interconnects and, therefore, we move to disconnect the other points from the Kenosha Water Utility.

Mike Pollocoff:

There's two things we're trying to accomplish here. One is as part of our rate case that we had with the City of Kenosha the City of Kenosha Water Utility argued that the Village as not capable of providing enough public fire protection for the Village and that we needed those additional points of service from the City which we pay additionally every month for. And so at the hearing it was the recommendation of the Commission is that if, in fact, we felt that way DNR was not going to sign off on the fact that we were capable of managing our system from this one single source and we would have to get that done. So we need to have the DNR sign off on the fact that the single source system that we've designed and constructed is viable and show them what we've been able to do as far as providing service, that we can fight fires and do all those things.

That basically along with the work that's going to happen with the Sheridan water main we're paying \$175,000 a year for something we get no use out of. And that's really what it means to us. So if you think of the life of a rate to the extent we can get this thing done that's what we need to do. So the individual from GAI did a good job in getting our case refined and honed in for us. An extremely bright guy. And we need somebody that's going to be able to prepare that plan and

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

present it to the DNR and then also have it sustainable and presentable to the Public Service Commission when in fact that happens. So I think for \$29,000 what it could mean to the rate payers to cut that much out of our water rate charges would be significant.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

How many points we got right now, the one in Cooper Road --

Mike Pollocoff:

We have Cooper Road, 32nd and 88th.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

So we're going to eliminate three of them?

Mike Pollocoff:

We would, that's what we would do.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

And you said \$170,000 a year?

Mike Pollocoff:

\$175,000.

Clyde Allen:

I make a motion to approve.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Clyde, second by Steve. Further discussion?

ALLEN MOVED TO AWARD A CONTRACT FOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR ENGINEERING EVALUATIONS AND FINANCIAL ANALYSIS OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE WATER UTILITY'S FIRE PROTECTION CAPABILITY TO GAI CONSULTANTS INC. IN THE AMOUNT OF \$29,000; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

E. Consider Marketing and Service Contract Amendment No. 5 with Kenosha Area Business Alliance, Inc. (KABA).

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, this agreement is in addition to the ones we've already done with the Kenosha Area Business Alliance wherein we provide KABA with in this case is going to be \$1 million, and they in turn take that money and loan it out at a low interest rate to companies that are looking to locate here. Those companies in turn then pay that money back and it goes back into the revolving loan fund with interest to be reloaned again.

There have been a number of good businesses that we've been able to use this as an incentive. And it helps that KABA be the agency that's evaluating the business's finances. It gives the business -- it's a more smooth transition rather than subjecting their entire financials to public records, that's why we have KABA do it. Also the other part of this that I think is just as essential is part of this agreement is they do the same things they've been always doing is helping us when we're planning to meet with a new company. They go out and work on our behalf to talk to companies that are locating here. And we've had a really good working relationship with them all along, but we've really had a good working relationship with Todd Battle. These funds were allocated in the project plan for Tax Incremental District #2 and then with #4, and I'd recommend that the Village President and the Clerk be authorized to execute the contract.

Michael Serpe:

So moved.

Clyde Allen:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

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

Kris Keckler:

I would just like to reiterate I've witnessed them in action in a couple of instances both through Kenosha Unified and also the City of Kenosha, and I think it's a really good partnership and a good feature. Actually Todd Battle was just interviewed on Channel 12 yesterday about the economic growth in the region, and it's really nice to see that featured and the prospect for additional businesses coming into the area. So I think it's a really good partnership.

John Steinbrink:

Further comments or questions?

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

SERPE MOVED TO APPROVE MARKETING AND SERVICE CONTRACT AMENDMENT NO. 5 WITH KENOSHA AREA BUSINESS ALLIANCE, INC. (KABA); SECONDED BY ALLEN; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

F. Consent Agenda

- 1) **Approve Resolution #14-18, Amendment of the 2014 Budget.**
- 2) **Approve Operator License Applications on file.**
- 3) **Approve Renewal Operator License Applications on file.**

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Move to approve.

Michael Serpe:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Steve, second by Mike. Any discussion?

SERPE MOVED TO APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS 1-3; SECONDED BY SERPE; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

9. VILLAGE BOARD COMMENTS

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Yes, I'm going to make one comment. After the County put a light on the stop sign in the southeast corner by the Historical Society illuminated the stop sign and works. So people ran it and now they stop there.

John Steinbrink:

On 39th and 116th?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

39th and 116th southeast corner.

John Steinbrink:

It was a problem area. Last night was Pleasant Prairie night at the Kenosha Kingfish. Unfortunately the Kingfish didn't do well, but there were a lot of dogs there and we were represented by the [inaudible] threw the ball out. And the 5th inning that was one of our Miss Pleasant Prairies.

Village Board Meeting
July 7, 2014

Mike Pollocoff:

There was Little Miss Pleasant Prairie and Tiny Miss Pleasant Prairie.

John Steinbrink:

And she belted out Take Me To The Ball Game so it was pretty good. And I think July 19th we have it coming up with the RecPlex will be selling tickets. Do we get something out of that for the RecPlex then?

Mike Pollocoff:

I'm not sure what they talked RecPlex out of or RecPlex talked them out of.

[Inaudible]

Mike Pollocoff:

There's one thing I'd like to add. I probably should have put it in my report. There was a notice published it was a thank you, a public thank you to Village employees and more particular Invest, the employees' giving entity where they collect money, donate their own money to do various projects. And they were able to on their own time construct a greenhouse at the Kenosha Area Achievement site. They got the foundation donated by WisPark. A lot of the people that you see out here in the audience were out there in March. It was damn cold, it was too cold to be out there, but John, Jr. led us in getting the greenhouse up there, and it's a greenhouse that they use to start their plantings early. So this is a real viable tool for individuals with disabilities to be able to do some meaningful work and to get it done in an earlier manner. It means they get more product to market, but they're actually doing things that they enjoy. So Invest did a good job and the people involved in that working and putting that together and getting it done. So I want to congratulate them on it and thank them for doing that.

Kris Keckler:

I'd like to commend the RecPlex for putting out another nice triathlon even though we had a slight weather delay. And thank Mike Serpe for volunteering me for the 4:30 to 6:30 a.m. shift at the booth.

John Steinbrink:

That will be a learning lesson there.

10. ADJOURNMENT

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