



# MINUTES VILLAGE BOARD

Village Hall Auditorium  
9915 - 39th Avenue  
Pleasant Prairie, WI

A regular meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Village Board was held on December 16, 2019. Meeting called to order at 6:00 p.m. Present were Village Board members John Steinbrink, Kris Keckler, Mike Pollocoff, Dave Klimisch and Mike Serpe. Also present were Nathan Thiel, Village Administrator; Tom Shircel, Assistant Village Administrator; Jean Werbie-Harris, Community Development Director; Kathy Goessl, Finance Director; Dave Smetana, Chief of Police; Craig Roepke, Chief of Fire & Rescue; Matt Fineour, Village Engineer; Sandro Perez, Inspection Superintendent; John Steinbrink Jr., Public Works Director; Carol Willke, Human Resources Director; Craig Anderson, Recreation Director, Steven Linn, Communications Manager, and Jane C. Snell, Village Clerk. Seven citizens attended the meeting.

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

## 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

## 3. ROLL CALL

## 4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. **Consider approval of Final Resolution #19-47 authorizing construction of public improvements and levying special assessments against benefited properties in connection of the construction of public water main along 120th Avenue (East Frontage Road) and County Trunk Highway ML (CTH ML) in the Village of Pleasant Prairie.**

Matt Fineour:

Mr. President and members of the Board, a public watermain is being extended along 120th Avenue which is the East Frontage Road and County Trunk Highway ML by Riverview Group, LLC, as part of their Stateline 94 Corporate Park project. In accordance with the executed developer's agreement with the Village, the developer may recapture costs of certain portions of the watermain extension. The special assessment and right of recovery agreement set forth the amounts and terms of recoverable costs associated with the watermain extension. To service the development, Riverview, LLC, will be connecting to the existing water system starting at the main located at the north end of Premium Outlet Malls and extending south along the East Frontage Road to ML and then east along ML approximately 1,200 feet. The watermain extension is kind of shown on the map in yellow that extends down the Frontage Road and ML.

A right of recovery and funding agreement between the Village and the developer may be entered into wherein the cost over and above that portion of that portion properly chargeable to the developer may be subsequently recovered by the Village and returned to the developer which is referred to as a right of recovery. The right of recovery agreement will be taken up by the Board this evening under their agenda Item C under New Business.

A preliminary Resolution #19-29 was adopted on September 16, 2019 declaring the intent to exercise special assessment police powers in connection with the construction of the East Frontage Road and County Trunk Highway ML public watermain project. Upon adoption of the preliminary resolution, the Village Engineer prepared a special assessment report computing the assessment amount levied to benefitted properties. The assessment report includes the final plans, the cost of the improvements, the assessment method and rate calculation and the proposed schedule of assessments against each benefitted property. The assessment report is included in the Board packet and was also mailed out to each property owner listed on the assessment schedule.

As far as the cost of the improvement and the assessment method and rate of calculation, the watermain developer or right of recovery special assessment is based on a lot frontage of benefitted properties. The linear foot cost is calculated as the total project cost divided by the total watermain length. The cost was then divided in half to account for both sides of the road. The size of the watermain being constructed is 16 inches in diameter which is required for the area development due to the proposed and projected land uses of the area. No eight inch watermain equivalent cost reductions were applied in the assessment as all lots are identified as having potential future manufacturing land uses.

A frontage assessment rate is applied to each benefitted property. The frontage is the lot dimension abutting the public right of way of each benefitted property. The total project cost in this instance was \$2,498,217.18. The total length of the watermain was 7,870 linear feet. That comes out to \$317.44 per linear foot. When you divided that in half to take in consideration each side of the road it's \$158.70 per front footage. The right of recovery assessment is subject to the right of recovery and funding agreement between the Village of Pleasant Prairie and Riverview, LLC, for the public watermain extension.

The property owners may defer payment of the right of recovery assessment until the property connects to the municipal system or as a precondition of land division approval, whichever comes first. At the time the property owner connects to the watermain system, utilizes the water system or subdivides the property, the entire assessment shall become due and payable. After the right of recovery date obligation is expired for the funding agreement between the Village of Pleasant Prairie and the developer, any right of recovery assessment is still rightfully deferred, and unpaid will be deemed to have been paid in full. The right of recovery agreement is in effect for ten years. So in essence this is a deferred assessment. And after ten years if the assessment is still out there on any given property it goes away.

There are seven properties that are affected by this right of recovery that was shown on the map. The assessments range from a low of about \$34,918 to a high of \$241,413 depending on the front footage of the property. All properties in this area, the future land use in this area is deemed to be future industrial development. So at such time when they properties develop they have the ability to utilize that watermain. That being said, the right of recovery, again, being a new business. But if there's any questions I'd be happy to answer them. Again, this is for approval of the final resolution regarding the assessment.

John Steinbrink:

This is a public hearing. I'm going to open it up to public comment or question. Do we have a signup sheet?

Jane Snell:

Mr. President, we do have three signups this evening, the first one being Allen Day.

John Steinbrink:

Just give us your name and address for the record.

Allen Day:

My name is Allen Day. I live at 11013 122nd Street, Pleasant Prairie, Wisconsin. I do have a couple questions. One came up now in your discussion. So if I don't elect to hook onto the watermain for ten years my assessment goes away?

Matt Fineour:

That would be correct.

Allen Day:

And then at a later day when I did decide to hook up to the watermain, say it's 15 years down the road, then how much would I pay?

Matt Fineour:

If you hooked up, the assessment that is placed on the property would be deemed paid full after ten years. So the developer only has a period of or window of ten years to recover those costs. After that ten years the assessment basically goes away. When you develop the property let's say in 15 years, that watermain in front of your property you don't have to pay anything. However, if you extend it into your property for development or if it's not reaching to the extent of the end of your property you'll have to extend it to the end of your property at your cost.

Allen Day:

And then you made the comment about eight inch versus 16 inch. I would question that in that I own two parcels there, and I'm sure I can put a much bigger building on 50 acres than I can on two acres. Which two acres is not going to be able to take a building that needs a 16 inch watermain go by the front of it. That could take an eight inch service. So a two acre lot should be assessed less than a 50 acre lot. You can see my viewpoint on that. Another comment I have on this is so it sounds to me like, and I've got to honestly say I've had numerous conversations

with people involved with this watermain going back three years, that I'm subsidizing the people that are developing that property to get the watermain up their side of the property. Because he's getting the money back, but we're not getting nothing back.

Matt Fineour:

I'll make a comment on that. So the developer in this case, Stateline 94, has to pay for the complete watermain extension shown in yellow. So that's at totally their cost. If at such time within ten years you develop your property, you would owe a portion of that cost. If after 15 years or after 10 years you decided -- or let's say Stateline 94 did not go in today and you decided to develop the property today, you would be responsible for extending that watermain at your full cost and relying on the ability to recapture that money from other people that may or may not develop. So in this case the developer is taking the risk for his development, he obviously can afford it for this development, but at the same time if you develop your property he has a right -- you would need water for that development, you would have to pay into that at today's cost.

Allen Day:

Well, I can understand that for a person such as myself on the 50, but I can't understand that amount of money for somebody sitting on two acres which there's several lots there. And then the other question I would have is so the development is in a TIF district is it not?

Matt Fineour:

The development is in a TIF district.

Allen Day:

So not that I understand the TIF district 100 percent, but I guess in some of my conversations with people involved with this I was under the impression that they're going to get some of the money back reinforced from the TIF as the TIF money is applied to pay for the improvements to get the development there. Is he going to get some TIF money to help pay for the watermain, too?

Matt Fineour:

He has the ability to recapture money through the TIF, but it's not like what you're saying, it's not a double dip. He doesn't get money from the TIF and money from you to pay twice the watermain cost. The watermain is going to be either paid through by the TIF or capture or that method, but it is an assessment that if you connect to that watermain within ten years you owe some of that cost.

Allen Day:

Yeah, but I think you're missing my point here. If we don't connect he gets the money from the TIF.

Matt Fineour:

Only if the TIF can handle that cost.

Allen Day:

Has there ever been a TIF that you guys have done that hasn't paid for the improvements that were made to put it in?

Matt Fineour:

This is a developer TIF so this is not a Village TIF. So the TIF doesn't not essentially pay for the entire project.

Allen Day:

Maybe or maybe not.

Matt Fineour:

Maybe or maybe not depending on how successful his project is.

Allen Day:

So then how do we know that we don't -- let's just say we all hook up to the watermain as soon as you run it in front of our property. How do we know at a later date when he starts -- so who disburses the TIF money then that's collected -- let's say he does real good on the development and I sure as hell I hope he does because I do that --

Jane Snell:

Sir, your five minutes is up.

John Steinbrink:

All right, go ahead, Dick. It's a legitimate question.

Allen Day:

How do I know -- so let's say he does really well, we all hook up right way, give him the money, give you the money, give somebody the damn money. And then he does really well and he collects more than enough to pay for the watermain as part of the TIF? Do we get the money back then.

Nathan Thiel:

Can I jump in, Matt? With this TIF it's only by reimbursement. So he's only eligible for costs that he hasn't already recovered. So what would end up happening is he could only submit for a cost that he's actually paid out. Is that a fair way of saying it, Matt and Kathy? So he's not going to be able to double dip.

Allen Day:

So if he only collects -- if we paid in -- just say the whole thing is going to cost \$4 million, we pay in \$2 million, the most the TIF is going to give him is \$2 million?

Nathan Thiel:

Correct.

Allen Day:

To equal the total of \$4 million?

Nathan Thiel:

Correct.

Allen Day:

That's it. I have more questions.

Mike Pollocoff:

I can move to let him finish. Being as this is an assessment hearing I'd like to be able to let the affected property owner speak to get your seconds out.

Kris Keckler:

Second.

Mike Pollocoff:

I move that I guess.

Michael Serpe:

Talk into the microphone.

Allen Day:

Pardon me?

Michael Serpe:

Talk into the microphone.

Allen Day:

Everybody says I talk too loud. I hear that all the time. So now we're kind of going by some other property there that's not frontaged on this, but I could see at some point in time they would want the water, too. Say it's within the period and you haven't arrived at an assessment for them. When they go to get the water what do they pay and where does their money go?

Matt Fineour:

What property?

Allen Day:

Well, you got the property around the corner the other way which you're not assessing.

Matt Fineour:

Right.

Allen Day:

You've got some property in the back there towards the Frontage Road which isn't being assessed because it's not frontaged on it. But it would at some point in time maybe benefit from the water. I can't see that map, that's too far away for me. Say if you took like the parcel on the corner where a motel is, he can benefit from the water. He's not frontaged. You got the house right there that you didn't pick up because he's not frontaged. But at some point in time maybe they want the water, too, but they're part of this. And I'm not in any way, shape or form trying to drag them onto the ship. I'm just asking the question.

Matt Fineour:

Sure. So any property that is not frontaged that may in the future want water will have to pay for another watermain extension themselves. So somebody on the road call it -- it looks like the hotel or the motel there if they wanted water they're going to have to pay for a watermain extension on their own. So to rephrase it another way, if the Village has a project and extends a watermain, the assessments that are placed in there they don't terminate. So when a developer extends a watermain in front of your property or somebody else's property, it actually is to your benefit

because you're not paying for it. There's a ten year period on it, and you have the ability -- if you wanted to wait out ten years you'd have the ability to have water there for free. Whereas if the Village were to put in that watermain or you wanted the watermain on your own you're going to be paying for that cost at some point in time. It won't be free. So anybody who has frontage that gets a watermain due to a development is really in a more beneficial situation than somebody else that is not in that situation.

Allen Day:

I'm not here to say I'm against it. That's not what I'm here to say. Going back to if they had to extend it, now if they're extending it, to extend it 300 feet, one, they don't have to come 16 inch now because they don't have to extend what they're going to use it for. And that's a lot cheaper because we already paid for it to come all the way from the hotel all the way down to here. We shared in that cost.

Matt Fineour:

You're sharing in only your frontage cost. So all that cost that the developer is paying where areas are not fronting the property, their own property, they're paying for that entire extension. So you're not paying for an extension way up past your property. You're paying for the extension in front of your property.

Allen Day:

I'm not going to agree with you because when you go through the breakdown of the unit cost on the estimates I'm sharing in the cost of boring underneath the sign bases, I'm sharing in the cost of boring underneath the box culverts. Traffic control on my street would be way cheaper than it would be on the frontage road.

Matt Fineour:

You are correct there it is an average cost.

Allen Day:

So I'm pretty astute at putting together a bid, and I'm pretty astute at breaking it down cost per lineal foot based on the conditions of where it's going in. So I would venture to say why don't we break it off at the intersection, and us on ML will pay for our part and what it actually costs to do it which is going to be 20 percent less than what you're charging us based on the estimate to come down the Frontage Road. Then I would be, in fact, paying for my part of the watermain. He needs all the rest of that to get the water on inside that building.

Matt Fineour:

Correct, he's paying half of that cost of that watermain.



Allen Day:

On ML.

Matt Fineour:

On ML.

Allen Day:

Okay, well, then I'd be saving him a few bucks, too, wouldn't I?

Matt Fineour:

If you could do it cheaper than him supposedly. But I mean --

Allen Day:

Okay, well, you've answered a lot of questions. The thing about the ten year sunset that's a good thing to know. Hook up fees you probably can't tell me what it is to hook up to it because you don't know what I'm going to hook up to it.

Matt Fineour:

Correct, it depends on the development.

Allen Day:

I appreciate you giving me a little bit more time. I'm just going to add that this is already under construction. You guys didn't wait for nothing from us to start it. It's already going in the ground, right?

Matt Fineour:

The developer is constructing the watermain, correct.

Allen Day:

So if there was some kind of snag here is he on the hook for the whole bill?

Matt Fineour:

If the cost of the watermain during construction is more than what the proposal is here, yes, he's responsible for that cost.

Allen Day:

And then who is monitoring all of this. I mean I'd like to say if we're doing it for you we know how that works. If we're doing it for Wis DOT we know how that works. Who is watching this? Who is the RE on this job?

Matt Fineour:

That would be the construction management here in the Village.

Allen Day:

And is that where the \$299,000 came from, the CRS? I don't know what CRS stands for.

Matt Fineour:

Well, the cost for the project has the bid cost plus a percentage for design and construction. So 15 percent for design and construction as far as engineering is concerned.

Allen Day:

So that's what they're saying it cost them to get the plans on the street?

Matt Fineour:

And inspection.

Allen Day:

And inspection.

Matt Fineour:

Yes.

Allen Day:

Does somebody have a breakdown of how much the plans cost and how much inspection is costing?

Matt Fineour:

The inspection will cost -- I mean that will come in at the end of the project. But it will be less than -- or actually it will be more than what is put there. Fifteen percent for both the design and construction is kind of -- I mean that's right in the ballpark. It's not high, it's not low.

Allen Day:

All right, thank you very much.

Jane Snell:

The next speaker is Michael Ries.

Michael Ries:

Hi, I just had four quick questions.

Michael Serpe:

Mr. Ries, name and address please.

Michael Ries:

Oh, I'm sorry. Michael Ries, 12718 116th Street, Kenosha. Is using the front footage is the standard to apportion the assessment the most fair way to do it? And have you considered other methods such as the percent of land that's developed? So if you have a ten acre parcel of which five acres is wetland and can't be developed, is that a different way or a different way of apportioning the amount of the assessment that you have to pay, why the linear footage as opposed to another method of assessment?

Matt Fineour:

Sure. The linear footage in the past it is what we considered the most fair of doing it. Take your lot, for example, I understand which is lot 1 there, it has probably some undevelopable areas to the north and maybe to the south. But let's say you were to develop lot 1 on your own there you would have to extend the watermain obviously to the south end of your property. You would have to extend it to full length of your property. That's by ordinance. That's just by the way development occurs. A development comes in and extends it to the far side of their property essentially. So even though you have some undevelopable land in there, you would still have to extend it the full length of the property. In this case in lot 1 if you were to extend the watermain you'd be paying the full cost of the watermain. Right now in this assessment you're only paying for half that cost.

Michael Ries:

You're not answering my question. I'm asking you if other methods were determined other than linear footage, if other methods of doing it, and you're saying that's the standard. Based on what standard?

Matt Fineour:

Based on basically you're trying to get to what's the most equitable. The other way of an assessment is if you were going to say that you're going to assess each parcel a certain amount based on what -- if you have lots that were very uniform, they were one acre lots and each one gets the same benefit of a service in a watermain, then you might be able to break it out into a cost per lot basis. That isn't so here so you have lots of different sizes, different characteristics. Frontage is the fairest way to spread out that cost. So if you have another alternative that you're looking at me could address that specifically.

Michael Ries:

My example of having a ten acre lot of which only five percent is developable, and so your water usage will be limited to half your property. So I don't quite understand your answer. It sort of was circuitous. And could you be very distinct in answering the one question I have.

Matt Fineour:

Sure. I guess the way I'd say it is you would still need to pay for your full frontage because you'd need to extend it the whole frontage.

Michael Ries:

So you're not answering the question. I'm basically asking if other methods were entertained to do the assessment.

Nathan Thiel:

I can speak to that. So I asked a similar question as far as could we do it via area, and there are other methods. But what in this case what Matt's trying to explain is that independent of how much area you have developable, via ordinance, per the ordinance you would have to extend it the full frontage anyway. So let's say, for instance, you had a lot that you only -- let's say it's this ten acre lot, and only an acre of it were developable. But your full frontage, let's say you had a really long frontage, it was a half a mile. Independent of only the acre of developable property, if you were wanting to just develop that acre part of your property, you would still have to pay the full half a mile of linear feet per ordinance. And so the point that Matt is trying to make, and I guess if that doesn't make sense I don't know how much clearly we can state it.

Michael Ries:

So I'm fairly north. To development my land I only need a foot of watermain to supply my land. I'm still paying for everybody else including --

Nathan Thiel:

No, you're only paying for the foot frontage on your parcel.

Michael Ries:

I'm just saying if I brought the watermain down so I could use --

Nathan Thiel:

You wouldn't be able to just draw it down a foot. You'd have to extend it all the way to the end of our parcel.

Michael Ries:

So you didn't use another method. That's my question. Second question --

Mike Pollocoff:

If I could just expand on that. I think we do use another method, but in case law --

Michael Ries:

I'm not trying to be argumentative, I just want to understand [inaudible].

Mike Pollocoff:

No, I know, it's a fair question. But in case law and water assessments in Wisconsin the watermain has been the classic use of the front footage method. By using the other methods that you've described before such as area or unit cost, the watermain, the nexus between how many feet there are on the frontage of your watermain and then how many feet of watermain you lay are virtually one for one. And with the watermain if you said you only needed 10 feet or 20 feet to gain access to your interior property that completely ignores the other aspect of watermain which is for public fire protection. And being able to have that interlock connection to other watermain to keep the pressure up.

A lot of these things have been looked at previously, and there are some where you do have to go through a process where you look at specifically weighing out like stormwater, how much area is being drained in a certain basin. Sanitary sewer, how much is actually serviceable, because the sanitary sewer might not need to cover a whole frontage. But water and streets, the relationship of foot of water being put in and you have a foot of frontage, that nexus is so accurate that it relates to each other so well, of all the types of assessments that could be used the front foot is pretty much ideal. And it ends up being more equitable and rational than addressing, well, I only need ten feet of water to get access so I can serve the interior of my main because at some point that main is going to run across that whole frontage.

Michael Ries:

Okay. My second question, if a property owner wants to defer paying the assessment until they hook up with the watermain or develops the property, what does the owner need to do to elect deferral. In other words, it doesn't look like deferral is automatic. So what does someone need to defer?

Matt Fineour:

In this case deferral is automatic [inaudible].

Michael Ries:

It is?

Matt Fineour:

Yup.

Michael Ries:

Good to know. Two more questions, I'm sorry. So if I sell the property will the sale along not trigger payment of the assessment? In other words, will the deferral right of transfer go to the new buyer or must the lien placed on the property be paid at the time of that sale?

Matt Fineour:

The Village does not require that that payment be due by the sale of the property.

Michael Ries:

Okay, great. So two out of three is good so far for me. And the fourth one is a quick question. Has a right of recovery agreement been signed by the Village and the developer already? And has there been any changes to that agreement from the version that was previously provided to us?

Matt Fineour:

It has not been signed by either party.

Michael Ries:

I'm sorry, it has not?

Matt Fineour:

It has not. And it has not changed. I might have given your attorney a draft, it has not changed from that draft.

Michael Ries:

So it hasn't been signed yet?

Matt Fineour:

No.

Mike Pollocoff:

It's on the agenda later tonight.

Michael Ries:

Okay, number three, okay, that's all.

Jane Snell:

Speaker number three is Garrett Wood.

Garrett Wood:

Good afternoon, good evening. I'm Garrett Wood. I'm at 11501 122nd Street so I'm number 5 on your marker there. So I'm directly across from all the construction that's been occurring. I'll say it hasn't been extreme, but it's been pretty invasive I guess you could say as far as the noise and everything like that. So I'm having to deal with a lot of change in this area. So my questions are going to be a lot more about what are the construction plans, how is this going to impact me personally. I'm not so much worried about the water line. First off, I work in IT. I'm not a general contractor so some of the language being used doesn't convey the sense of impact of what it's going to mean to me as far as cost, the ten year plan. So I would like to get something that's a little bit more descriptive of what my responsibility is or what my options are, if that could be afforded to me.

Matt Fineour:

Sure. So if you're parcel number 5 there you have an assessment cost right now of \$38,886.40. And what that means is in this case if you have a house, you have a house there, if you don't have current water, if in the next ten years you want water and you hook up to that water --

Garrett Wood:

We got water, it's the good water. I don't necessarily [inaudible].

Matt Fineour:

It's well water, right, okay. So if in the next ten years you hook up to the watermain that's the cost that you will owe. If you decide not to hook up to that watermain within ten years, after ten years that monetary amount disappears, it goes away. So then you could hook up to that watermain at no cost after ten years.

Garrett Wood:

Okay.

John Steinbrink:

But you still have a hookup charge, correct? So there is a charge then.

Matt Fineour:

A hookup charge but you don't have to pay --

Garrett Wood:

Is that something we can get in writing so we can understand that and I can explain that to my family and that kind of thing?

Matt Fineour:

If you need a specific letter or something explaining the assessment we can do that for you.

Garrett Wood:

Well, yeah, that would be nice. So far as what I understand that yellow line looks like it's going right down the middle of the road. Where's the actual watermain going to be placed?

Matt Fineour:

The actual watermain on ML is on the north side of ML, so on the north side of the road within the terrace area and the grass area. That project there is some road work, they're kind of redoing the intersection slightly. It's not on your side of the roadway. It will be all on the other side. But the impact of the overall development is they will be reconstructing or redoing that road a little bit along ML putting turn lanes in for that development.



Garrett Wood:

Yeah, my understanding is it will be widened.

Matt Fineour:

It will be widened slightly, yeah. It's not a major reconstruction, but you're going to see work on the roadway.

Garrett Wood:

Yeah, it's kind of already being done because it's starting to be deteriorated by the size of the trucks that I'm sure are supposed to be coming across that section right across the four, five, six, seven houses, properties there. Are we going to lose some right of way? Is the roadway going to be widened to where we lose some of our property? Or is this going to be all on the north side?

Matt Fineour:

On your side there is no additional right of way being taken. As far as the road widening my recollection on ML is it is all to the north. I don't believe there's a widening onto your property. Or if there is it's still maintained within the right of way.

Garrett Wood:

All right. Do we have contacts for when things go wrong? So I've lost internet for a week at a time, people digging, cut through lines, and those kind of things. Who do I contact?

Matt Fineour:

You contact the Director of Public Works here, it would be John Steinbrink, Jr. And we can give you --

Garrett Wood:

Yeah. Eventually they find it but it takes a long time for them to find out the source. So I don't have any heads up when somebody is doing some work down there. I know things have to get done, the power lines and all that. Sometimes things aren't marked very well. But when I'm impacted I just need that ability to reach out and say, hey, something happened at this time. Yeah, if you've got a card that helps. And do we have an approximate time when the construction will start? Obviously it's going to impact my right of way getting into my property, those kind of things, because that's some heavy duty construction that's going to occur, right? They're tearing up the entire road.

Matt Fineour:

Right now obviously the whole site is under construction. They are constructing I believe the sanitary sewer at this point. The watermain itself -- I mean you're going to have other impacts. The watermain I don't think is a major impact to you. It's the roadway. I would say that's going to be next spring/summer time frame. They don't do the roadway in the wintertime. But I believe you're going to see construction out there as long as they can do it through the winter in some form or fashion.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

If you want to reach out to me, my email is on there, I can keep you up to date on a construction schedule as it gets a little bit closer.

Garrett Wood:

Okay. So the last question I have what is the hours of construction that's allowed within the Village?

Matt Fineour:

If my memory serves me I think its 7 a.m., an early start, and then I don't think they're going to work past dark.

Garrett Wood:

My experience is they show up, maybe they're not punching the clock, but it gets pretty loud at 6 a.m. in the morning and that continues on well into the evening.

Matt Fineour:

If there is a noise complaint then feel free to call. You can call John.

Garrett Wood:

I'm dealing with the sonic booms. Our whole house shakes quite a bit. So I don't know if there's anything that can be done about that obviously, but I just want to make sure that they're aware of the constraints of normal working hours.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

They do have time restrictions. We do have regular progress meetings with the developer. We're actually meeting tomorrow so I'll bring that up to them about the noise.

Garrett Wood:

I think a lot of it has to do with the back end of the gravel loaders that aren't secured. So as they go down that little ramp that they've built on the south side it slams pretty hard. All right, it's enough to wake the dead literally. All right, that's all I got. Thanks.

Jane Snell:

There are no other signups.

John Steinbrink:

Anyone else wishing to speak on this item? Anyone else? Then I'll close the public hearing and open it up to Board comments or question.

Mike Pollocoff:

Matt, on parcels 4 through 7 are those industrial or M-5?

Matt Fineour:

I'm not positive that they're zoned that currently. It is the future master plan for it to be industrial.

Nathan Thiel:

Mike, there was a question concerning the six inch watermain, and that was part of the discussion was there's still that benefit that is being had to those parcels, the thought process is that most likely if those parcels are going to be developed they'll be developed as an industrial, and they'll have that benefit to that six inch main.

Mike Pollocoff:

I don't have a solution to this, but if the last speaker, parcel 5, said, well, my well's out, good water is gone and I've got to take the municipal water, I don't intend on developing it, I just want to be able to hook up as a residential parcel, does he still gain the benefit of a 16 inch watermain versus a residential eight inch watermain? Now, we're going to put a 16 inch in, but should that be a risk that's transferred to the developer? Because right now the houses that are there the assumption is it will all be consolidated. But if somebody wants to hook up prior to that, which I tend to think they wouldn't because if they can hang on to a well for ten years they're farther ahead than paying the amount and hooking up.

But if for some reason they can't use a well anymore and they're going to stay there as a residential unit, I'm just questioning that maybe at that point then that 16 inch assessment would take place only if they were consolidated with another parcel. But if they were just going to use a water service for a residential line that that charge be for an eight inch just like any other residential user would be. I know it's a little convoluted. But I mean the developer gets the

benefit of having more come back to him based on the [inaudible] that these guys are going to go industrial. But if they don't go industrial and they have to use it then they've really taken the bite on that one rather than that guy. That's one thing I'd like to say.

And I think the other thing we've got to be honest about because we don't have any control over it is after ten years our rates are governed -- our charges are governed by the Public Service Commission. So if they come up with something that could be some kind of charge that we'd have to collect that would be out of our control. Right now there is no actual fee where you pay for the privilege of connecting like some communities have. Your connection fee is basically your physical cost of the service. There isn't that over and above charge. And we haven't had that one for quite a while. And there could be after ten years a future Public Service Commission could change that. I guess I'd want that in the record that everything that we have control over we're saying we're not going to charge after ten years, but there's some things we don't have control over.

Nathan Thiel:

And I think the only other thing for disclosure purposes the other thing that we don't have control over, while the Village doesn't require the assessment to be settled at time of sale, that's not to say that a financial institution or the buyer at that point in time would make those same requests. But clearly that would be something that would be necessary to negotiate during the sale.

Mike Pollocoff:

As long as people understand that ten year deferral goes with the land, it doesn't go with the person. And then at that point if it becomes part of the negotiations with the buyer and seller that's what it is. But we're not going to make a request for it.

John Steinbrink:

So there's no laterals being extended to these properties right now?

Matt Fineour:

No, there's no laterals being extended. And to your point, Mike, as far as the eight inch equivalent, what the cost for that is, I did have a discussion with the developer on that because I did mull that over as I was writing this assessment thinking is it more likely that the area is going to be developed all as one and people are going to end up selling their property for a bigger development. The developer would not be objectionable if somebody wanted to hook up earlier, one of those single family properties wanted to hook up earlier because it's also to the developer's benefit that they get something versus nothing, right? So that is a consideration that could be made if one of those single family hooks up before the ten year period that that assessment rate gets reduced down to an eight inch equivalent main. I don't think that would change the assessment. I think we could obviously put that in the report and note it for a future connection if one of those would happen that that would be the case.

Mike Pollocoff:

We may want to consider modifying or amending the resolution language that would allow that. If we're all on a trip together and the plane crashes whoever's left knows what the deal is.

Dave Klimisch:

So, Matt, if we do that, for instance property 5 currently owes the assessment just under \$39,000, if he were to hook up on a residential size how would that impact his assessment roughly?

Matt Fineour:

Right now you see the assessment is about \$158 a foot. The past eight inch equivalent main assessments have been around \$98 to \$100 a foot. So it will reduce it down into the 20 thousands versus 30 thousands.

Dave Klimisch:

What's the hookup charge?

Matt Fineour:

Plus whatever -- there isn't necessarily a hookup charge. That's only the main cost. Let's say somebody wanted to hook up, they'd still have to pay for their lateral cost from their house all the way to the main.

Michael Serpe:

I just have one question. Dick, you're wearing an orange shirt and a green hat. Are you a Bear fan or a Packer fan? I was just curious.

[Inaudible]

Michael Serpe:

I'd move approval of Resolution 19-47.

Dave Klimisch:

Second.

Mike Pollocoff:

As amended?

Michael Serpe:

Yes.

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? Those in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? Motion carries.

**SERPE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF FINAL RESOLUTION #19-47 AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS AND LEVYING SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS AGAINST BENEFITED PROPERTIES IN CONNECTION OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC WATER MAIN ALONG 120TH AVENUE (EAST FRONTAGE ROAD) AND COUNTY TRUNK HIGHWAY ML (CTH ML) IN THE VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE AS AMENDED THAT IF A SINGLE FAMILY HOOKS UP BEFORE THE TEN YEAR PERIOD THAT ASSESSMENT RATE GETS REDUCED DOWN TO AN EIGHT INCH EQUIVALENT MAIN; SECONDED BY KLIMISCH; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

- B. Consider approval of Class "B" Fermented Malt Beverage Retail License and "Class B" Intoxicating Liquor Retail License Application for Edgewater Bar and Grill located at 11900 108th Street.**

Jane Snell:

Mr. President and Board of Trustees, this is a new application for a liquor license. It's from Varin Restaurants Partners, LLC. I'm going to herein refer to them as Varin. Their managing partner, David Nankin applied for a Class B Fermented Malt Beverage retail license and a Class B Intoxicating Liquor License for the restaurant that is currently known as Chancery Restaurant. We were notified that they would be closing at the end of the month. And these folks have decided to take that premise over. In doing so they will be entering into a lease effective January 1, 2020. And they will be changing the name to the Edgewater Bar and Grill. They indicated there would be no renovations or modifications to the space. And they plan on retaining all employees at this time.

Background checks have been conducted and approved by Chief Smetana. They are proposing the agent of record to be Travis Gitter. All licensing requirements have been satisfied. If the Board approves the Varin application tonight they must satisfy the following items. They must produce a copy of the lease agreement, payment of prorated liquor license fee and publication cost, payment of delinquent taxes, fees, utilities, invoices or forfeitures. And the DeRosa current

agent George Flees will have to surrender their license. So at that point I'm recommending approval of the Varin Kenosha Restaurant Partners, LLC, application and the issuance of the Class B Fermented Malt Beverage and the Class B Intoxicating liquor license and the appointment of the agent Travis Gitter. The term of the license would be from the date of issuance which they're anticipating taking over and starting on January 2nd to the end of the term of June 30, 2020.

John Steinbrink:

This being a public hearing I'm going to open up public comment or question.

Jane Snell:

Mr. President, there were no signups.

John Steinbrink:

Once again, if you wish to speak now is the time. Please come to the microphone and give us your name and address for the record. Anybody wishing to speak? Anybody wishing to speak? Anybody wishing to speak? Hearing none I'll close the public hearing and open it up to Board comment or question.

Mike Pollocoff:

I move to approve the liquor license.

Kris Keckler:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second for approval of the Class B Fermented Malt Beverage license, Class B Intoxicating Liquor Retail license application for Edgewater Bar and Grill. Further discussion? Those in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? Motion carries.

**POLLOCOFF MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF CLASS "B" FERMENTED MALT BEVERAGE RETAIL LICENSE AND "CLASS B" INTOXICATING LIQUOR RETAIL LICENSE APPLICATION FOR EDGEWATER BAR AND GRILL LOCATED AT 11900 108TH STREET; SECONDED BY KECKLER; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

## **5. CITIZEN COMMENTS**

Jane Snell:

Mr. President, there were no signups this evening.

John Steinbrink:

Anyone wishing to speak under citizens' comments? Hearing none I'll close citizen's comments.

## **6. ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT**

Nathan Thiel:

Village Board and President I have just a few items that I wanted to pass along. First just by way of update Tom Shircel and I had an opportunity to recently be in a phone conference with We Energies representatives just to get an update on where they're at. There's still no definitive new as far as the demolition of the power plant. Things were pretty ambiguous as we asked questions. But what they did explain or they did share or what they were willing to share is that they are currently in a planning process. They've begun the planning process for what to do at the site. They intend to be in this process for another six to nine months, and then hopefully be in touch with us with further information down the road. So I just wanted to inform you that we continue to try to maintain contact with We Energies. And as we receive updates we'll let you know.

The second item is a bit more fun. As the Village was working with the Historical Society you may have noticed actually about a month ago or two months ago the Historical Society put out an article include the Twelfth Night, a tradition that Pleasant Prairie had in the 1980s which they had a bonfire with the discarded Christmas trees or holiday trees for the year. And in talking -- now that the Village collects enough holiday trees or Christmas trees at the end of the year we thought about reviving that tradition.

So in talking to staff and in reaching out to DNR and so forth, between the Village and also the PPCVB we are planning on reviving that event the Twelfth Nigh on the 6th of January. So I would note that the 6th is also our Board meeting. So instead of having a Board meeting we're going to have a party instead. We'll be hosting the event out at Lake Andrea near the Wruck Pavilion. So there will be the fire, of course, a little bit of a ceremony in advance, and then also some singing, hot chocolate and goodies to share. So we would invite anyone, the public to come and join us. We'll have a press release going out later tonight. Again, the Pleasant Prairie Convention and Visitors Bureau is assisting us in sponsoring this event. And we're really excited. So it will be at 6 p.m. on January 6th at the Wruck Pavilion.



And thank you for reminding me, the last item I had is that our next Board meeting then would be January 20th. And at that point in time moving forward we'll be at the 5 p.m. time frame. So if you show up at 6 p.m. you're going to be late. But on January 6th we'll have the 6 p.m. event. Any questions?

John Steinbrink:

I've been told there will be no artificial trees burned?

Nathan Thiel:

No, no artificial trees. But there will be singing. And yours truly and my family will be out there. So if you want to hear my beautiful vibrato you can come out.

Mike Pollocoff:

We're moving our Board meeting to five, so maybe if the Administrator sees to it that we have a short agenda we could conduct some business and get out to the site.

Nathan Thiel:

That is true. I think with the holiday and so forth we figured that there wouldn't be a lot of information. But you're right, Mike, we could actually hold a Board meeting, too, if need be.

Michael Serpe:

I'd rather sing.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you, Nathan.

Nathan Thiel:

I don't know if I'd rather hear you sing.

## **7. NEW BUSINESS**

### **A. RecPlex Financial Review and 2020 Budget Presentation.**

Laura DeLaRose:

Mr. President and members of the Board, I am here to present the 2020 RecPlex budget that we are recommending for review and file. The budget document contains a transparent financial overview of the RecPlex's plan for 2020 to provide the best programs and services that make the

RecPlex a premier facility. Presented here the operational revenue for the RecPlex, I have provided 2017 and 2018 actuals as a comparison. In addition, I have presented the 2019 budget and estimated year end amounts along with the 2020 recommended budget.

Beginning with revenue we have memberships. Memberships include monthly, annual, specials and day passes. We have experienced some challenges with maintaining and recruiting new members this year. But we are confident with the promotional advertising and marketing strategies that we will put into place we will be able to retain and gain additional memberships in the 2020 year.

Program divisions include all of the program areas within the RecPlex. Our greatest program area is youth which includes after school programming, day camp and preschool. These programs brought in over \$1.9 million in 2019 and are budgeted to bring in more than \$2.1 million in 2020. In addition, ice programming brings in approximately \$1.7 million, and our therapeutic rec programming accounts for \$1.2 million. Rental revenues which include indoor rentals, outdoor rentals and birthday parties and field trips bring in an average of \$1 million gross revenue each year.

For the 2020 year we anticipate continuing growth with advertising and sponsorships. Multiple partnerships are continually being established to help continue to grow this area. Our marketing department cultivates and oversees these relationships. Lastly, the revenue generated from our operating divisions which is guest services and kids court is expected to bring in roughly \$49,000 in 2020.

So overall the RecPlex total operating revenue projected for 2019 is \$11.7 million. And we are budgeting for an increase of approximately \$905,000 for 2020. With the promotional advertising and marketing strategies that we've put into place and the increase in programming fees we feel this increase in revenue is obtainable. So as you can see on the presented graph our biggest revenue source is from program divisions followed by memberships.

Moving on to operating expenses, the operating expenses are broken into major categories. Operating division expenses include administration, aquatics, fitness, guest services, kids court and marketing. These operating divisions support memberships and assist with the program divisions. Operating division expenses accounted for over \$2.9 million in 2019. Our largest operating division facilities has been separated out since it accounts for over \$2.5 million in 2019. This amount includes maintenance of the facility which also includes gas and electric which is budgeted at \$786,000 for 2020, maintenance employees and our new third shift contracted cleaning company.

Programming division expenses in 2019 total \$4.2 million compared to the \$6.5 million in revenue that was generated. Therefore, programming divisions netted a \$2.3 million gain that contributes to the operating divisions that support them. Rental expenses totaled \$79,000 in 2019 which is approximately eight percent of the \$967,000 of revenue that was generated. Depreciation is a noncash expense which allocates the cost of our building and equipment over its useful life, and this total is a little over \$1.3 million. So overall total expenses that are being budgeted for 2020 are about \$11.9 million, and this is up \$800,000 from our 2019 estimate. As

you can see on the presented graph, program divisions are understandably the highest expense category just like they were the highest revenue category.

So overall for 2019 and 2020 we are projecting a net operating gain. These operating revenues and expenses that make up this net gain are monitored by myself, Craig and RecPlex staff. To help managers stay on track meetings are scheduled several times through the year to review financials and projections. As with any enterprise fund we are mainly concerned with cash flow. Our goal is to make sure we have a positive cash flow or to maintain our cash balance.

While we have a net operating gain for 2019 and 2020, we still have to take into consideration other non-operating amounts that affect cash. To start I have carried over the net operating gain which is merely operating revenue minus the operating expenses presented from the previous slides. We then have a transfer from the Pleasant Prairie Water Utility from cell tower leases which is approximately \$119,000. For 2020 we budgeted for salary attrition in the amount of \$245,000 which is approximately five percent of our 2020 budgeted salaries. We have averaged around 6.39 percent attrition over the last three years.

Also for 2020 we have decision packages totaling \$26,000, and those will be discussed a little later. The non-operating loss amount includes debt service payments which is offset with amortization of bond premiums and bond interest subsidies. In addition, this amount includes any interest we have earned. So our net overall gain after taking into consideration non-operating amounts is \$260,000 for 2019 and \$694,000 for 2020. In addition to non-operating amounts affecting cash, there are capital purchases in the amount of \$305,000 that need to be subtracted out. We also have a cash flow adjustment which includes adding back a depreciation which is approximately \$1.3 million, and the subtraction of our principal debt payment of \$1.8 million.

With the challenges we have experienced with memberships in 2019, we are using cash reserves that have been accumulated over the past year. For 2020 we are proposing to use cash reserves to offset a portion of the capital purchases. Decision packages for 2020 total \$26,000 as I had mentioned earlier. We have an allocated expense of \$11,800 from general government. Two of our decision packages for 2020 will include personnel changes. The first is a promotion of a business clerk which will help satisfy staffing issues and increase responsibilities for efficiencies at [inaudible] and staff member communications. This decision package will cost roughly \$1,700.

We will also be converting two part-time sports positions into a full-time athletic and recreation supervisor. Hiring this full-time supervisor will help in the generation of additional field house revenue. With the increase of concession pricing and additional field house revenue, this decision package will generate \$30,000 of revenue. Our last decision package request is a marketing customer service program. This program will help to manage sales leads for membership campaigns and recreation program registration from past and current databases. This decision package will cost \$36,000 and is projected to bring in an additional \$61,000 in revenue which will net \$25,000. I will now let Craig discuss the capital requests and improvements.

Craig Anderson:

So capital requests for 2020 are minimal. The first request is to help kickoff the 20th year anniversary of the RecPlex with the planning and design of new water park components to refresh our indoor water park and possible mural upgrade. We need a refreshed environment to continue to retain current users and attract new which will help for parties, rentals and also our family member use.

Our second request is for the replacement of the first two out of 13 rooftop units that need to be converted over to DX cooling gas heat rooftop units. Starting in 2020 they will no longer be producing R22 freon which is what our current units run off of. We also will be continuing with replacing lights throughout the facility to LED fixtures. Lastly, we'll be replacing major groupings of cardio equipment over the next three years. These groupings include treadmills, incline trainers, AMTs and ellipticals. About 90 percent of our cardio equipment is beyond the anticipated life span are breaking down frequently. This is the life blood of our membership.

Several improvements over the past three years have been made to the facility for efficiency, safety and overall facility improvement due to age. Listed are some of the major improvements. Addition of the field house bathrooms, new HVAC units installed for locker rooms, fitness rooms and the front lobby area. Our four north baseball fields were restored to properly drain which is encouraging for this upcoming year with tournaments that will be played out there along with a partnership with Phenom baseball.

The exterior painting of the building, indoor water park pool pack which yields much improved air quality, new turnstiles and locations, new field house curtains and court striping, new men's and women's lockers and also the aqua arena lighting being replaced which was much needed and was donated by the Patriot swim team board. Also several effective membership and programming initiatives have been undertaken or will be. Our tiered loyalty program for members has been very well received, and we look to expand that. Recruiting new members by partnering with the social media firm which we did this last fourth quarter in 2019 and has worked out very well.

Program pricing and benchmarking analysis which is a formalized process for making sure that our programs are yielding revenue. The family rebrand which all of you are familiar with which yields more programming dollars for us. The new 2020 Play-by-Play format that's out right now it's more family oriented, and it's really pages by ages. So it's not by areas they were in the past. We have a new committee structure to effect organizational needs. Some of those committees are recruitment, retention, program, communications, technology, safety, facilities and oversight. What's neat about these committees is that they're made up managers, middle management and front line staff who serve on these committees and serve across department lines.

Expanded partnerships, Phenom baseball, our Patriots aquatic team board which I've briefly explained, team Phoenix we're going to be partnering with them in 2020, our new agreement with Froedtert and our new agreement with Aurora. Looking at staffing models for all areas that will be sustainable. This is a big area for us and all of our program areas currently. And then lastly in addition to these major improvements several smaller improvements have been made to help with

appearance and cleanliness. In 2019 we contracted out our third shift cleaning to an outside company. We replaced chipped and damaged countertops, painted concrete islands in addition to the stairs and handrails, and also in addition to several other areas within the facility to remove the looks of facility aging. We look to expand this greatly to all areas of the facility through 2020.

Laura DeLaRosa:

With the major improvements that were made in 2019 that Craig had mentioned, we borrowed an addition \$3.2 million. This slide represents the total principal and interest payments for over the next ten years with the RecPlex. The orange represents the principal amount, and the blue represents the interest. We are projected to pay off our current debt by 2029 with no additional borrowing. In 2023 our debt payment drops \$300,000 to give us an opportunity to borrow and only extend our debt out a few years depending on the amount borrowed.

So where does the RecPlex cash balance stand now? For 2018 we ended at approximately \$480,000. This was due from us spending \$2.6 million of our cash reserve for projects that we borrowed for before we received the funds in 2019. We issued bonds for a little over \$3.2 million in 2019. With the addition of revenue from base activities and reduction of debt and capital purchases, we are projecting the end of the year with a cash balance of over \$2.9 million, the highest cash balance in seven years. For 2020 our cash reserve will reduce down to \$2.6 million due to the use of the cash reserve for a portion of our capital purchases. Our average cash balance for the last seven years including 2019 estimate is \$2 million. Since the RecPlex is not funded by taxpayer dollars, we are only requesting a motion to file and receive. We are here to answer any questions you may have.

Michael Serpe:

I have one. How much are we spending on marketing approximately?

Craig Anderson:

Roughly with the social media that we did that's to the tune of about \$60,000. I would say probably about \$180,000.

Michael Serpe:

Are we doing a lot of that in house, or are we contracting?

Craig Anderson:

Yes.

Michael Serpe:

We are.

Craig Anderson:

We have two staff people that do that. So the majority of our marketing is that way. What we really did this year going into 2020 we pilot tested for this last quarter was using a social media firm. We really kicked off social media when I was first hired. And we did big leaps and bounds in terms of followers and those type of things. But it's really the analytics now and then figuring out what works best, and having help with reaching a more diverse group with different creative membership packages.

Michael Serpe:

The competition is still out there. We realize that, and I think you're doing a great job with the staff you have. It's still a class A facility like no other.

Craig Anderson:

We have a great staff.

Michael Serpe:

So keep up the good work. I have to get out there more often also.

Dave Klimisch:

I have a couple questions. On the cash reserve and how that relates to the bond rating, do you have a rating for bond purposes for borrowing? And is there a written policy for your cash reserves like a percentage that you try to keep it within?

Kathy Goessl:

The bond rating is associated with the Village. We issued GO debt so it's the same as the Village. And they don't really look at the RecPlex, they look at the general government to issue our GO rating which is a double A plus. The second question was?

Dave Klimisch:

Is there a written policy? I know the Village has a written policy for cash reserves. Is there a policy on what kind of guideline for cash reserves at the RecPlex?

Kathy Goessl:

We do not have a policy for the RecPlex itself for cash reserves. We're just trying to maintain it. We're looking at trying to put a policy together with us using cash reserves for capital, making some kind of policy that we don't go under. But we haven't determined that number yet. We were very happy after the last couple years with all the lawsuits and stuff and all the cash going up and down. To end this year at almost \$3 million is a good ending to 2019.

Dave Klimisch:

Like you said, that policy would not impact the bond rating off of the Village?

Kathy Goessl:

Yeah, the rating agencies don't look at the RecPlex. They don't look at even sewer or water or anything because GO is based on the actual general government. So they very strictly look at fund 100 operating and the capital and ask a lot of questions in that area. That's why we're very cautious about how that ends the year. Even one year it ended maybe \$50,000 a deficit, and they were very concerned about that in the general government. So general government we're really strict with in terms of making sure we maintain that bond rating.

Nathan Thiel:

Dave, to your point just to give context, basically at the \$2.5 it's still north of 20 percent for the cash fund balance. And that is something that we were looking at and considering. And I think that there was a bit of relief knowing that our cash fund balance was strong or ended strong this year given -- note that the beginning of this year it was pretty weak, and that was because we had completed a lot of capital improvement projects and we hadn't yet borrowed or we hadn't yet captured the borrowing to pay for those projects. And so I think everybody from the financial side felt better when they saw our fund balance at that \$2.9.

Kathy Goessl:

And that borrowing was done intentionally. We delayed it due to the -- you can see our bond schedule went out ten years. And to be able to issue a ten year bond we had to wait until '19 to get it out ten years, otherwise we would have to refinance toward the end of it. So we had enough cash reserve we knew to take into account that initial capital expenditures, and then we borrowed this year. So that's why the timing was as it was.

Dave Klimisch:

And one more question. The roof top units this is the first two of 16 that are being replaced?

Craig Anderson:

Thirteen.

Dave Klimisch:

Do you know the gain in efficiency that it's going to have?

Craig Anderson:

I don't.

John Steinbrink:

Qualify for energy rebates?

Craig Anderson:

I don't believe so. I know Junior over at DPW just put one in.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

We are in contact with Focus on Energy. So anytime that we do an energy saving we run it by Focus on Energy and then work on whatever monies we can retain from them.

John Steinbrink:

Anything to add, Sandro?

[Inaudible]

Sandro Perez:

Sandro Perez. Yeah, the 2015 IEC has raised the SEER standard this year which is the standard for air conditioning. So just those few points that raised, one, you're going to a more efficient coolant like you said. Just in maintenance costs if they were to have any issues with that R22 is nonexistent. So just the price per pound is astronomical. So you'll see that on a maintenance cost alone. But, again, we're talking equipment that's 10, 15, even 20 years old that's getting replaced. So that efficiency value from that standard, back then to the standard now in the 2015 energy code you'll see some savings there. Plus if we get lucky enough were Focus on Energy is running a promotion during that time, which they're always having some kind of promotion, it's just a matter of how much. So you'll get some money in Focus on Energy, but you'll see some of that savings as energy efficiencies and savings in maintenance.



Nathan Thiel:

To your point, Dave, though, what does it cost just to keep the lights on? I know we were looking at this number and I forget it off the top of my head, but it was north of a million. So just to keep the lights on was a significant cost. Was it a mil or was it two? I forget. That's a wide range I know, but I know that it was a lot of money. I think it was a mil.

Dave Klimisch:

Out of a \$6 million budget?

Nathan Thiel:

\$12 million.

Michael Serpe:

This is our 20th year?

Nathan Thiel:

Correct.

Craig Anderson:

October.

Michael Serpe:

Are we going to do something special to celebrate that, maybe offer something to get more people to come to the RecPlex, give them a day pass let them see what's going on?

Craig Anderson:

We'll run a membership special, but we're also looking at trying to make a facility improvement to the facility but let participants have some feedback into what is provided.

Mike Pollocoff:

It's a big operation. From a personnel standpoint it's our biggest operation. And it is expensive. I remember at one point I couldn't believe how much we spent on toilet paper. It was just what are all these people doing? So just those small costs, it's not small like electricity, gas, toilet paper, water, and this is a big house to keep running, and I think these guys do a really good job at it. And RecPlex has made the greater Pleasant Prairie area, and I'd include we'll let Kenosha be in that area, it really has created more of a fitness environment than ever existed before.

When RecPlex first came up the only thing that existed at that point was a broken down YMCA downtown. And now there's fitness outlets all over the place which is good. We compete with them and that's good, but I think the extent to which the staff out there has grown the facility, the programs for childcare, the athletic sports for children, the special needs program, nobody does as intensive a program in special needs and a recreation environment as RecPlex does. And there's a lot of good things happening out there. One of these days we'll have to count how many young people in our community got their first job at RecPlex. And we've started off a lot of people who have worked there, and they've gone as far away from recreation as they could after that.

There's been a lot of people that have accomplished a lot of things in related fields. I know there's been a number of people that were in the Discovery program that actually went into occupational health therapy and occupational therapy and things like that. So it's been a good facility for us. You guys have a big job ahead of you, and I know you'll get it done.

Michael Serpe:

Just one other thing. I keep on thinking about when I do go out there on weekends it's just jammed wall to wall with kids and families and everything else. The kids are participating in programs, the family is there to watch, I don't think there's a charge for the families to come in and watch. But at the same time they're bringing in sometimes in inclement weather they're bringing in salt, they're bringing in mud and they're using the facilities. Those facilities have to be cleaned. And we just spent a whole lot of money on building new facilities in the field house to accommodate them. So I'd like you to really look at maybe looking at the program rates to include or get back some of that money it's costing us to maintain that facility because it's expensive.

Craig Anderson:

We can include that in our program pricing formula cost sheet that we have. Because there is now a facility administrative fee that's now being included in program pricing, and that will go into 2020.

Michael Serpe:

Keep up the good work. Job well done. I move to approve the budget.

Craig Anderson:

We have a great staff.

John Steinbrink:

It's to receive and file. You want this just received and filed, correct?

Michael Serpe:

Okay, receive and file.

Dave Klimisch:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second to receive and file. Those in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you.

**SERPE MOVED TO FILE AND RECEIVE RECPLEX FINANCIAL REVIEW AND 2020 BUDGET PRESENTATION; SECONDED BY KLIMISCH; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**B. Consider approval of 2020 Sewer and Water Utility budgets:**

- 1. Resolution #19-48 relating to the adoption of the 2020 Sewer Utility Budget.**
- 2. Resolution #19-49 relating to the adoption of the 2020 Water Utility Budget.**

Kathy Goessl:

Mr. President and Village Board, I'm here to present the Sewer and Water Utility in conjunction with John Steinbrink, Jr. I'm starting with the sewer utility budget. This side shows you the 2019 budget, what we're proposing for 2020 and the dollar change and percent change. The operating revenues are down across the board for 2020 by \$1.2 million. A customer rate reduction was effective October 1, 2019 as a result of a rate study.

Operating expenses there's an increase of \$130,000 when compared to the 2019 budget. Treatment expense is up \$284,000. Interest expense is down, though, to offset that by \$78,000. Personal transfer is down \$61,000. Fencing for lift stations \$33,000 is not in 2020. Nonoperating expenses interest income on investments is \$200,000, up \$100,000, plus capital contributions of \$100,000. Decision packets of \$14,000 will be discussed on another slide.

This is a graph of our operating revenue breakdown, and our biggest revenue source, well, residential is \$2.5 million which is our biggest revenue source or 47 percent of our sewer revenue. Commercial is \$871,000 or 17 percent of our revenue. Industrial is \$1.9 million or 35 percent of

our revenue including industrial surcharges of \$1.2 million in that number. Public authority is \$49,000 for 2020.

Operating expenses, breakdown of operating expenses, treatment is the biggest expense that the utility has at \$2.4 million for 2020 or 44 percent. Kenosha Water Utility charges the Village for sewer treatment. Personnel is point 9 million or 16 percent of the cost of the utility. It includes all the operational labor, clerical and administrative. Depreciation is \$1.4 million or 26 percent. It's recognized in the cost of the infrastructure over its useful life. It's a noncash expense when recognized. Infrastructure was either donated by developers or installed and paid by special assessments. Other is 11 percent of \$627,000 for 2020. It includes electric of \$77,000 and contractual services, supplies and phone. Internal service fund charges, ISF is 3 percent or \$174,000. It's the use of the vehicle and equipment operated and maintained by our fleet internal service fund.

We have two decision packets. The first one is directly related to the utility. It's safety equipment for our crews of \$4,000. And then we have the allocation of the general fund decision packets of \$10,055 for a total decision packets recommend of \$14,055. The next slide John will go over in terms of \$3.9 million of capital being recommended.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

For the sewer utility capital the first one that we have is a sewer rehab to reduce inflow and infiltration of \$3.3 million. That's taking all of the clay mains that we have within the Village which were installed many, many years ago, and they have a lot of infiltration, and completing a lining project with them. Very similar to what we did in the Cooper Road basin area.

The paving program sewer adjustments or anytime we have to go through the paving program and get into a subdivision making sure that the sewer is up to specification, it doesn't leak, more so within the manholes, the lids and the casting and the rings. Rebuilding a lift station for \$165,000 will be Slaters lift station. The Highway 50 sewer rehab is some planning money to investigate and put a plan together for the sanitary sewer as it's going to affect the Highway 50 project. Security fencing around a lift station, we do one lift station per year. And repave a sewer site we also do one of those every year.

For the combined sewer and water utility we have a joint capital recommended which is SCADA historian upgrade. SCADA is our control system that provides all the monitoring for the infrastructure, pumps, lift stations, water and sewer utility. It's a very complex system, and we're always doing upgrades to it to make sure that we can properly monitor our infrastructure.

Kathy Goessl:

The next slide here shows principal balance outstanding. With our cash reserves in the sewer fund being at the level they are we are able to pay off the balloon payment of \$2.2 million in 2020 for sewer. That will bring the sewer 2020 balance to zero. And all the other funds, enterprise funds, water, clean water, fleet and sanitation currently do not have any debt either. So after next year we'll be debt free in all our enterprise funds.

The cash balance for sewer, for 2019 we are having a net operating gain of \$1.2 million to contribute to the increase in cash. For 2020 we're recommending \$3.9 million for capital including the sewer rehab to reduce me and me plus making the final debt payment of \$2.2 million reduced by operating increases causing a net reduction in cash for the 2020 proposed budget bringing our cash balance down from \$11.6 million down to \$7.1 million. So that's our presentation for sewer. Do you have any questions on the sewer budget?

Nathan Thiel:

Kathy, can I just make one comment? The rehab was an item that we had discussed the previous year and had approved it to be completed this year. The reason we did not proceed forward with that project this year is we're currently in conversations with KABA, they have a project regarding their CDBG funds or funding. There are some new requirements by the state. And what we are discussing is the ability to be a partner allowing them to use a project of ours in order to recapture and make sure that they don't lose those CDBG, they don't just have to return those CDBG funds back to the state. And so that was in part the reason why we delayed that project this year and why we're proposing it the next year.

One thing that I would say is that that project will also most likely be in tandem with other capital improvements projects. So we're looking forward to being a strong partner and advocate with KABA. I think they're really appreciative of our willingness to partner. And kind of instead of them having to partner with multiple communities and municipalities in order to try to recapture all the CDBG funding that they have, most likely they'll be able to utilize the Village with multiple projects to secure that funding for themselves. So I wanted to note that because you'll be seeing this in the future in 2020.

Mike Pollocoff:

Kathy, on your screen on the sewer operating expenses where you had a large increase in the treatment expenses for next year, is that predicated on a rate increase?

Kathy Goessl:

A large increase in the --

Mike Pollocoff:

In the sewer treatment expense, what we're paying to Kenosha for the --

Kathy Goessl:

No, it was netted out against other expenses so we're looking at only an increase of \$130,000 in operating expenses, and we're not recommending a rate increase for this utility.

Mike Pollocoff:

Is Kenosha adjusting theirs, any rate --

Kathy Goessl:

I didn't hear any rate changes from the City of Kenosha yet. We haven't gotten notification of anything. That was basically just due to flow issues. We have more customers on line, and we had a little bit of issue the year before in terms of one of our customers sending a lot of high strength to the system. So we were up the year before. We brought that actually down a little bit in terms of the treatment expense. But now this last year for 2019 we had a lot of rain so that really popped the expense up more. So those two things can influence the rates or the flow a lot in terms of the strength and the amount of water we send to them. But there's no rate increase from the City of Kenosha involved in these numbers.

Dave Klimisch:

Debt free in 2020 has a nice sound to it.

Mike Pollocoff:

I remember years ago I never thought we'd see this utility out of debt. We were swimming in debt, swimming in sewage debt.

John Steinbrink:

A helpful volume, right?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yeah, volume is always good.

Kathy Goessl:

Okay, I'll go onto the water utility budget. This is the water utility budget in summary. It shows operating revenue and expenses compared from the 2019 budget to 2020 proposed. Operating revenues are up for 2020 \$1.2 million across all categories due to a rate increase authorized by the Wisconsin Public Service Commission in the fall of 2019. So you saw on the sewer slides the revenue was down about \$1.2 million around that, and then this is up. So we pretty much offset. So a lot of our customers are not seeing much of an increase that we implemented October 1st and through November of this year.

Operating expenses are down \$350,000 compared to 2019 budget. The majority of the decrease is the maintenance of that distribution reservoir. We painted a water tower in 2019 for \$355,000. We do have a decision packet to paint another one, but that's not in the base budget. Nonoperating revenue interest income is down \$5,000, mainly interest on late payments for

\$4,000. Transfer is utility tax transfer to the general government of \$977,000 and cell phone revenue transfer to the RecPlex TR program for \$120,000. Utility tax transfer is up \$77,000.

And then we have the decision packets we'll talk about shortly. Here's the same graph in terms of our different revenue sources for the water utility, the largest being industrial at \$2.4 million or 38 percent up from 2019 \$900,000. And then we have the second category that's the highest is residential of \$1.7 million or 26 percent up \$136,000. And then we go to public fire protection of \$1.1 million or 18 percent up some. And then the other categories are at the low end, multifamily, commercial and public authority.

Operating expenses our biggest expense similar to our sewer utility is purchased water. Treatment is costing about \$2 million or being budgeted for around \$2 million. Around 43 percent of our budget is purchased water. Kenosha Water Utility charges the Village for the water we purchase, and we're budgeting about the same as last year. We have not heard of any rate increases for them at this point either. Personnel .7 million or 16 percent of our budget also includes operational labor, clerical and administration.

Depreciation same as sewer is \$1.2 million or 26 percent. It's recognizing the cost of infrastructure over its useful life. Other is 13 percent or \$576,000. It includes electric of \$131 similar to the 2019 budget and contractual services, supplies, phone, etc. 2019 is higher because of the painting of the Ladish water tower. ISF or fleet internal service charge is 2.5 percent or \$117,000 in 2019 down to \$99,000 in 2020. It's for the use of our vehicles and equipment operated and maintained by the fleet internal service fund.

We have two decision packets that are being recommended. We're looking at painting the Sheridan Road booster station for \$240,000. And the other one is the general fund allocation of their decision packets of \$4,809 for a total of \$244,809. Now I'll turn it over to John to talk about our capital recommended.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

The Public Service Commission has a schedule of when meters need to be replaced. So that's why we have the first three or four items for capital. So that takes into account the age of the existing infrastructure meters that we have and then assigning a dollar amount for replacement for them. The Traverse City hydrant replacement are older hydrants that are no longer available. And they tend to leak over time when you exercise them, when you flow them, do any work with that. So we don't have a schedule which ones we will be replacing, but normally a couple of them go every year so we budget a little bit of money for them. It will just be used if one of those hydrant types fails.

Paving program water adjustments is, again, part of our paving program. Anytime we go in a subdivision if we need to do anything with the water valves and water system within the subdivision that's the best time to make those repairs before we do the paving. We do budget money for water meter and readers the MXU repairs. So we have some money allocated for that. We are looking to pave the booster station one site that we painted a couple years ago.

And a water tower control room is something that is new for the utility. With the Prairie Highlands water tower one of the things during engineering and design that they came up an idea is on the base of it making a small room around the stem where you have all of your controls. A water tower does not have water all the way down at the bottom, it's just held up in the very top component of it. Well, down below you have all the controls and valves and sampling ports, and we always have a struggle to keep everything from freezing. So we wrap it in blankets, and we run electric heaters. It gets very expensive, and it's not a very nice environment within there. So they do have a control room within there, and it's really just like a small 10 by 10, 12 by 12 room, a small heater in there. And then you do your sampling port, your SCADA controls are in there, and we should have a lot more reliability within all of that infrastructure by having it in a more controlled environment.

And then for the one-time component is installation of an antenna for remote water meter reading for \$75,000, looking to put an antenna on top of the Lakeview lift station. Probably for the last ten years we've been upgrading our readers and our radios to accept this program. Back in the day, I don't know how long a day was, maybe ten years ago, the water meter guy really it was a full time job. He had to go house to house to house, walk from the sidewalk or on the street, read the meter outside the house, go back out to the street, walk to the next house and so on and so forth for well over 4,000 homes. And it takes a long time, and it's really inefficient especially when the weather's bad, when there's a mean dog in the yard, something like that.

Now we're doing it just by driving by around certain areas and we can collect all that data. We probably spend about two and a half, three days reading meters a month. So it went from a full-time job where you did have some inaccuracies because of all the mechanical work that had to be done to a more technical system. And now to a point where hopefully within a year or so once all the bugs are worked out we won't be reading any meters at all. We'll just be going out and doing the maintenance on the meters and the radios.

And then the next thing we have is integrating pressure reducing valve pressures within our SCADA system. Right now we have a couple of pressure zones, and we just are hoping that the pressure reducing equipment works. We normally find out after the fact when a water heater blows up or something happens within a home that we did have a fail within there. And now we can monitor that once this project is complete within our water utility infrastructure.

Kathy Goessl:

So for the water utility our cash balances end the year for 2019 estimate of \$5.8 million. We're looking at 2020 an increase in cash balance of \$1.4 million to end the year with \$7.2 million, almost 3 million. This chart shows the capital asset values at the end of the year for all of our utilities, not just sewer and water. For 2018 our asset value of \$124 million across the board is down from \$126 million in 2017 due to additions not keeping up with our depreciation of \$3.6 million. So we have a slight decrease here in terms of our year end capital asset value.

And we also like to compare -- well, these are cash values across the board for all of our utilities. Sewer's large decrease of \$4.5 million for capital and final debt payment, went from \$11.6 to



\$7.1. Also a decrease in clean water of \$.2 million. Water is increasing \$1.4 million as I mentioned a couple slides ago due to the rate increase. There's small changes in the other funds. Overall we're expecting to end 2019 with \$21.5 million and 2020 with \$18.2 million down overall \$3.2 million mainly due to the sewer related capital expenditures and debt payment.

This compares our cash in 2018 to our capital assets value, how much cash do we have to replace future infrastructure. The asset values are the blue bars, and the cash is the orange colored. In 2018 across all enterprise funds in the graph cash is \$17.3 million or average 14.3 percent of our capital assets values at \$120.7 million. Of the three larger enterprise funds, the sewer utility has the best cash to asset ratio of 18.7 percent.

So we're not recommending any rate changes for 2020, but we did have some rate changes in 2019. Sewer had a rate decrease approved by the Village Board in September of 2019, and it was effective 10/1/2019. And sewer had an offsetting rate increase which was approved by the Wisconsin Public Service Commission on October 4th and became effective October 7, 2019, the first meter reading date after the Public Service Commission approval. So any questions on the water budget or either cash position or asset value? Otherwise I'm looking for approval of our two resolutions to adopt the 2020 budgets.

Dave Klimisch:

Move approval of Resolution 19-49 for the sewer utility budget -- I'm sorry 19-48 for the sewer utility budget.

Michael Serpe:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? Those in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? Motion carries.

Kris Keckler:

Move approval of Resolution 19-49 for the 2020 water utility budget.

Mike Pollocoff:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second for adoption of the water utility budget. Any further discussion? Those in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? Motion carries.

**KLIMISCH MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION #19-48 RELATING TO THE ADOPTION OF THE 2020 SEWER UTILITY BUDGET; SECONDED BY SERPE; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**KECKLER MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION #19-49 RELATING TO THE ADOPTION OF THE 2020 WATER UTILITY BUDGET; SECONDED BY POLOCOFF; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

- C. Consider approval of Right of Recovery and Funding Agreement between the Village of Pleasant Prairie and Riverview Group LLC for the public water main extension along the East Frontage Road and CTH ML.**

Matt Fineour:

Mr. President and members of the Board, this is the second part of the right of recovery and funding agreement. The public hearing was actually for the assessment portion of it. And Item C here is actually the agreement between the Village and the developer. I already kind of went through the project as far as the watermain extension, and the agreement allows for that recovery by the developer for a ten year period after the adoption -- not the adoption but the approval of this agreement so the developer will have a right of recovery until December 16, 2029 for the special assessments. Again, the right of recovery will be recorded against each property. That way when the property does get sold the information is there for any future landowner or during the sale. If there's any questions I'd be happy to answer them.

John Steinbrink:

Mike, you had some additions to this? Is this the appropriate time to put them in?

Mike Pollocoff:

The amendment would be that if the parcels identified 4 through 7 should connect as residential users prior to the ten years deadline for connection that those connections be allowed at the rate to be established for an eight inch equivalent watermain. And if they aren't, they aren't. It seems like it's unlikely, but if somebody does need water and they can't get water and they're connecting to us and they're still in a residential setting that they'd be able to access that watermain at a rate for an eight inch equivalent watermain, and that developer would only be reimbursed that portion.

Kris Keckler:

I get that and concur with it, but I just wanted to clarify so if that reduces the potential for the residential hookup that shortage then isn't disbursed back to the nonresidential assessments. It would be just taking a hit by the developer?

Mike Pollocoff:

The developer, yeah.

Nathan Thiel:

So a question and just a point of clarification. Let's say, for instance, the resident hooks up residential, and then later sells the property to someone who is going to develop at the industrial level, would the requirement, and this may be more of a question for Matt, would that assessment that's been assessed would that be completely dissolved? Or would that still remain on the books and be required at the time of a future development on that parcel?

Matt Fineour:

The way that I would see it working is once they pay the assessment, so if it's at a residential rate and it's deemed paid in full, so if within ten years they sell it and it goes to an industrial land use, there is no more recovery.

Mike Pollocoff:

But the developer does get the money sooner than he would have.

Matt Fineour:

Exactly.

Mike Pollocoff:

The chances are he might not have received anything if they waited ten years. Like I say, it might be a slim chance, but I think it's a fair appropriation for those lots that are only of residential size

right now. I think as we amended the resolution for the assessment it would have to mirror on that as well as it does in here.

Michael Serpe:

Since you got us all screwed up why don't you make that motion?

Mike Pollocoff:

I move that resolution -- I mean the right of recovery and funding agreement between the Village and Riverview Incorporated be amended to provide for right of recovery for parcels 4 through 7 be permitted to occur at an eight inch main residential equivalent for any connection that occurs prior to the end of the right of recovery period.

Kris Keckler:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion and a second. This is on the amendment or the whole resolution?

Mike Pollocoff:

The whole resolution.

John Steinbrink:

Further discussion? Those in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? Motion carries.

**POLOCOFF MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RIGHT OF RECOVERY AND FUNDING AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE AND RIVERVIEW GROUP LLC FOR THE PUBLIC WATER MAIN EXTENSION ALONG THE EAST FRONTAGE ROAD AND CTH ML; SECONDED BY KECKLER; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**D. Consider approval of the purchase of an Ambulance and a Fire Engine with pump and water tank.**

Chief Roepke:

Mr. President and members of the Board, for your consideration this evening is part of the vehicle replacement purchase of a rescue engine, what we're referring to as a rescue engine and an ambulance. If you recall back late in December of 2018 we delayed the process based on results of a fire study that we started approximately late April, finished about late October. We started those discussions again and basically took -- in the rescue engine situation we basically took a closer look at cost reductions as we had to take a price increase for 2019. So we basically went line-by-line through the proposal and came up with a Pierce proposal of \$732,963. So that's what's before you this evening.

One of the interesting things about this purchase is this really is a diversion from historically the type of vehicles that we've purchased in the past from a fire suppression vehicle just because of the fact that the community has changed, the water supply is one of the best water supplies in the region, and we just don't need the pumper tanker engine type in the past. So the recommendation of the fire staff is to work with Pierce for that amount to acquire the vehicle.

Nathan Thiel:

Mr. President and Board members, I would add with this engine, one, that it is in alignment with kind of the study that we -- or not kind of, it is alignment with the study that the consultant McGrath had proposed. Both the Chief and I had many discussions working to look in making sure that the equipment was reflective of means. And I know that it's significantly under budget than what we had originally proposed or brought forward in 2018. So I just want to applaud the Chief and his staff and the efforts made to take a look at the capital equipment.

Chief Roepke:

Thank you. As far as the ambulance is concerned the fire study also recommended a replacement of the third 2010 Med Tech ambulance. We've looked at replacing the 2010 with essentially a carbon copy of what we have today. So essentially kind of a diversion from the big International chassis to the Ford F-550 which is a much better ride, four wheel drive, and the module that we utilize is much more efficient in the utilization of interior space. So the only diversion from that is a difference change in what we refer to as the patient loading system. It's a little bit of a diversion of what we have in the first two ambulances, but it's really what the industry standard is looking at today and in the future. That proposal amount through Foster Coach is \$259,238. We've worked with Foster Coach probably for the last 25 years in the acquisition of our ambulances. If you have any questions I'll entertain them.

John Steinbrink:

Chief, on the engine that was going to be just a pumper and not a tanker?

Chief Roepke:

There is a tank. There's a 750 gallon tank.

John Steinbrink:

So it will carry water.

Chief Roepke:

So it's much smaller than what we're used to in the 2000 or 1750 category. But, again, based on the water system and the availability of water throughout the Village we just don't need that large tank. And one of the major factors, too, is it goes from a dual axle to a single axle. So all the positives that go along with that will benefit.

Michael Serpe:

Chief, the ambulance, the International compared to the Ford maintenance-wise?

Chief Roepke:

The maintenance for the Ford has been a lot better in respect to the fact that we can do right locally to Gordie Boucher and have an oil change done or some work done. Where historically we'd have to go up to Highway 20 and National or go to our apparatus mechanic to take care of that.

Michael Serpe:

Which vehicle is costing you more, the International or the Ford?

Chief Roepke:

I think down the road I think the Ford will cost us less just because of the fact that it's essentially a pickup truck chassis if you will.

Nathan Thiel:

One thing I would add, with regard to the ambulance one of the highlights that came out in the study was the thought process of re-chassisising or replacing the box, re-chassisising the box every ten years rather than replacing with a whole new ambulance setup. And we did have a discussion. But we've already kind of gone down the road of moving towards these Ford models, it wouldn't make sense for us to continue to basically re-chassis this third vehicle. So just that we're understanding we couldn't take that box and put it on a new Ford chassis. But moving forward the intent is within the department -- sorry, you can finish, Chief.

Chief Roepke:

So in the example so the third ambulance right now is on an International chassis and Med Tech box and Med Tech module. Med Tech no longer exists as an ambulance entity. So there is no parts availability mounting for that sort of chassis on a Ford chassis. There's a number of things that would have to be redone that really just from a cost effective perspective just wouldn't make sense to go from a Med Tech. Now as we speak to the future going from a Ford chassis to a Ford chassis with the same module, several agencies I spoke with just finished with remounts or re-chassis and they're very happy with it.

Kris Keckler:

Move approval of the ambulance and fire engine.

Dave Klimisch:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second. Further discussion? Mike?

Mike Pollocoff:

I have a question. On the engine we're paying 100 percent down.

Chief Roepke:

I'm sorry.

Mike Pollocoff:

On the engine the proposal as it's listed we're going to pay the total amount at contract signing.

Chief Roepke:

Yes, that's my understanding. I've been in touch with Kathy and that's my understanding.

Mike Pollocoff:

Did they give us a price on a performance bond?

Chief Roepke:

They did not.

Mike Pollocoff:

Because with all the money out the door I guess I'd like to know what --

Chief Roepke:

We can work through that.

Mike Pollocoff:

I just think a performance bond -- we've seen other fire departments, and one of the reasons they don't get their truck is -- I don't think Pierce is going under water, but to know what our exposure is on it to find out -- their unit prices they have a line item for a bond. It identifying [inaudible] needed. I agree with the motion, but I'd like to give the Chief the latitude and the Administrator if they feel the price of the performance bond is still -- we don't go over that amount, to evaluate that option to get a bond on the truck in case they don't perform.

Chief Roepke:

Okay.

Kris Keckler:

So amended.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second to amend. Those in favor of the amendment? Those in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? Motion carries. Now we have the motion as amended. Further discussion? Those in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? Motion carries.



Chief Roepke:

Thank you.

**POLLOCOFF MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE PURCHASE OF AN AMBULANCE AND A FIRE ENGINE WITH PUMP AND WATER TANK AS WELL AS PROVIDE THE FIRE CHIEF AND THE ADMINISTRATOR THE LATITUDE TO NEGOTIATE THE PRICE OF THE PERFORMANCE BOND; SECONDED BY KECKLER; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**E. Consider approval of 2020 Mobile Home Licenses.**

Jane Snell:

Mr. President and Trustees, before you tonight is the annual renewal applications for our four mobile home parks that are within the Village of Pleasant Prairie. That would be City View Mobile Home Park at 4303 74th Street, Westwood Estates Mobile Home Park, 7801 88th Avenue, Timber Ridge Mobile Home Park, 1817 104th Street, and Scotty's Mobile Home Park, 5310 75th Street. There are no current delinquent taxes, fees, utilities, invoices or forfeitures.

Background checks have been done and approved by the police department, and all licensing fees have been paid. Both the building inspection and community development departments conducted their inspections and passed the City View, Timber Ridge and Scotty's Mobile Park. Westwood Estates as outlined in the memo that was attached to the Village packet indicated there were five out of the 344 mobile homes that failed the building and/or zoning inspections. The community development department has sent out a code violation warning letters to two of the eight, and they will go through that process.

I am currently recommending that the mobile home parks as presented for City View, Timber Ridge, Scotty's and Westwood Estates for the period of January 1, 2020 through December 31, 2020 subject to the provisions of Chapter 221 and the municipal code. In addition, Westwood Estates Mobile Home Park license is subject to the resolutions of their code violations as reflected in the report from the CD.

Dave Klimisch:

So moved.

Michael Serpe:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second. Any further discussion? Those in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? Motion carries.

**KLIMISCH MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF 2020 MOBILE HOME LICENSES;  
SECONDED BY SERPE; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**8. Consent Agenda**

- A. Minutes of Meeting - December 2, 2019.**
- B. Election Inspectors for the 2020-2021 term.**
- C. Arbor Ridge Letter of Credit Reduction No. 3.**
- D. Certified Survey Map to subdivide property located at 4016 93rd Street into two parcels.**
- E. Certified Survey Map to subdivide property located at 10636 39th Avenue into two parcels.**
- F. 3 year time extension of the Conceptual Plan for the proposed Bethany Church Campus development to be located at 11019 Wilmot Road.**
- G. Resolution #19-50 for change of address of the parsonage home for the Good Shepherd Church located at 4311 104th Street.**
- H. Plan Commission Member Appointment.**

Mike Pollocoff:

I move approval.

Kris Keckler:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second of approval of Items A through H. Any discussion? Those in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? Motion carries.

**POLLOCOFF MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS A THROUGH H; SECONDED BY KECKLER; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

**9. VILLAGE BOARD COMMENTS**

Michael Serpe:

Just one last one. It's been a pleasure working with everything this year. A lot of success for the Village that we all experience and enjoy. And I want to wish everybody a merry Christmas. And looking forward to another good year in 2020.

Mike Pollocoff:

I second that.

John Steinbrink:

Let the record note that's probably the first Village Board comment from Trustee Serpe without pushing adjournment.

Michael Serpe:

Can I do it now?

John Steinbrink:

No. Further Board comments?

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

Mike Pollocoff:

Move to adjourn.

Kris Keckler:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second for adjournment. Those in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? Motion carries.

**POLLOCOFF MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING; SECONDED BY KECKER;  
MOTION CARRIED 5-0 AND THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 7:58 P.M.**