



MINUTES VILLAGE BOARD

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

A regular meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Village Board was held on October 21, 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 Jean Werbie-Harris, Community Development Director; Dave Smetana, Chief of Police; Craig Roepke, Chief of Fire & Rescue; Sandro Perez, Inspection Superintendent; Kathy Goessl, Finance Director; Rocco Vita, Village Assessor; Matt Fineour, Village Engineer; Sandro Perez, Inspection Superintendent; John Steinbrink Jr., Public Works Director; Dan Honore', IT Director; Carol Willke, Human Resources Director; Emily Kolosso, Media Specialist; and Jane C. Snell, Village Clerk. Eight citizens attended the meeting.

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
3. **ROLL CALL**
4. **CITIZEN COMMENTS**

Jane Snell:

Mr. President, there's no signups this evening.

John Steinbrink:

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

5. **NEW BUSINESS**
 - A. **Receive Plan Commission recommendation, consider and approve a revised Conceptual Plan for Creekside Terrace located north of the existing Creekside Crossing development.**

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. President and members of the Board, this is a request by Dan Szczap of Bear Development. This is for a revised Conceptual Plan for the development of 41 single family lots to be known as Creekside Terrace. This is the area that's the remaining vacant land north of the existing Creekside Crossing development.

Just a little bit of background information. The original Creekside development as you remember was to be developed between 2005 and 2010. At that time there would have been a total of 312 dwelling units to be developed in several phases. What basically happened is some of the area did develop as part of single family and condominium development, and it was going to have 158

additional condominium units in the vacant land area. But with the economy, the turn down and the recession that occurred everything was put on hold. What happened was the developer went into dire straights and the development went up for sale.

It was purchased by an affiliate of Bear Development. And they brought it back in 2015. And at that time the Village Board conditionally approved a concept plan that would have developed the vacant remaining lands for 64 single family lots and one two family lot. But unfortunately after re-evaluation by the developers they did not move forward with that single family, two family due to the high cost of Creekside Circle and the bridge and the public improvements and the approval expired.

So a few more years have passed, and we went through a number of iterations of how this area could develop. And in 2019 a Conceptual Plan was agreed upon by the Plan Commission and the Village Board. And it was option 3a as conditionally approved on March 18, 2019. And this development revision included 7 20-unit apartments which is on the far west side of the Creekside development, 54 single family lots and one two-family lot. Specifically that Vista at Creekside was approved by the Village Board and is under construction as we speak. And that part of the development did include 7 20-unit apartment buildings, clubhouse as well as the detached garage buildings.

So that brings us to the presentation this evening where Creekside Terrace is being proposed with 41 single family lots. Again, fewer than was originally proposed. But, again, due to the cost of public improvements they decided not to put in those additional cul-de-sacs inside Creekside Circle. And due to the floodplain in the northwest corner they chose not to do any subsequent floodplain boundary adjustments. And so you see lots on either side of Creekside Circle. In addition, on the very north end, northeast corner, they've identified two much larger single family lots, and then that Lot 41 in the very northeast corner is proposed to be single family, not a two family. So with respect to this final build out of the Creekside development, the minimum lot size is 12,500 square feet. Minimum lot width is 80 feet, and the average for all of the single family lots is just under 18,000 square feet.

At a previous Board meeting there was significant discussion about sidewalk and where sidewalks should be located within the Creekside development. So there are some sidewalks on either side of 91st Street just east of Old Green Bay Road. And those sidewalks would be constructed at part of the Vista at Creekside. The areas that are identified in green are proposed sidewalks to be constructed as part of the Creekside Terrace development. And then there's a sanitary sewer line that runs on a diagonal just off of Creekside Circle. You can see it's the blue line. That intended to be a pedestrian access. It's going to be gravel access, a walkway. It's also going to be access for the Village to be able to get to the sanitary sewer within that easement.

Back in 2003 the Board had adopted a Resolution 03-42. And this had to do with the floodplain boundary adjustment within this development. In January of 2005 the original developer of Creekside Crossing obtained the required Federal Emergency Management Agency or FEMA permits to begin the floodplain adjustment work. The floodplain boundary adjustment work had begun, but it was not yet quite completed. It was going to be completed with this later phase at

Creekside. So it will be their responsibility to complete the floodplain boundary adjustment work because the permit is still valid, and they'll have to design it and get it approved, and all the work will need to be completed. So once that's done they will go back and they will get their final LOMR once that work's been completed.

One of the other elements that has modified over the years is the wetlands. There are two small wetland areas totally less than an acre that are proposed to be filled with the Creekside Circle development at 91st Street, again, in order to make this road a completed circle and to get access out to 91st, and these wetlands were approved by the DNR to be filled.

So before you you have the Creekside Terrace development. This is a matter that was before Village Plan Commission and the Board several times, but this is the final time. After the Conceptual Plan approval, they intend to immediately submit for a Preliminary Plat and finalize their engineering design plans and then go for a Final Plat. So they want to continue construction from completing the infrastructure work for The Vista. And then they want to go immediately into the area that is going to serve the Creekside Terrace development. The staff recommends approval subject to the comments and conditions as outlined in the staff memorandums, as well as the comments and discussion at the Village Plan Commission.

Michael Serpe:

Jean, I'm not against this at all. I'm pretty much in favor of the plan. The neighborhood at Creekside was somewhat against the sidewalk installation, but that's going to be put in at the developer's expense. But I don't know that we've come to a conclusion on who is going to pay for any trees, if any, are removed as a result of the sidewalk being put in. Now those trees are what, 12, 13 years old. They're pretty mature. I know who is not going to pay for it, the residents or this Board. So that pretty much leaves only one left. But I think that's got to be resolved. I don't know if you've talked about that or not. We may not lose any trees.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Yeah, the developer has asked the question as to whether or not the sidewalks have to be concrete sidewalks right in the right of way because there may not be enough room for them at that location. Can the sidewalk meander? They have to do their surveying work to identify precisely where all those trees are, how much land is actually available for them to construct any sidewalks within the right of way. And so what we are looking towards is getting some type of recommendations from them and then coming back. And as part of our process we will need to evaluate that engineering and public works. And CD will evaluate that, and we'll make a recommendation to the Board based on what we find. I don't know that it makes sense to cut down all those trees to squeeze in a sidewalk. Or can that sidewalk or pedestrian path meander if they get the proper easements from the association. So that's one issue that we'll need to get resolved as they continue to survey the property because it's off their side.

Mike Pollocoff:

I agree with Trustee Serpe that it's really going to be a cost to the developer to get that done. And it's really no different, and I'm sure they're going to be doing the engineering and design work for the sidewalks. And with the grade of the driveway access points are going to be along the way they have to accommodate driveway access points. I mean that's all a given that whatever is along that corridor they're going to have to come up with a design and then a remedy to address the sidewalks and the driveway elevations. So I think the trees are no different.

If it means we have to move the trees back behind the sidewalk which I think is probably preferable, then that's the new trees that come in. Unless they want to take the option of moving the tree back and bring the sidewalk in. I guess I'd leave that up to the. But when it comes to the final plan coming in I'd be opposed to putting -- I won't support putting the sidewalk up to the curb. It's not acceptable. Because then as soon as we plow the snow on the sidewalk and then the people can't walk on the sidewalk it defeats the whole purpose.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

But if they were looking at it and that's not an option, could they acquire easements and maybe put them behind the trees. But it might be outside the right of way, but then we would need easements.

Mike Pollocoff:

I think that would be fine. I think to avoid this problem in the future, we have places all over the Village where we have the trees too close to the sidewalks, and then the sidewalks start heaving when the tree starts growing. Maybe now would be the time to take a look at that and say, okay, where is the tree going to go? What's going to be the best place for the tree. I think our engineering standards say where the best place is for the sidewalk in relationship to the curb. So it's really the next question is what's going to be the healthiest environment for the tree to be able to sustain and live in and easy for the association to take care of and not have any added or future expenses down the road by the removal and replacement or removal and planting of a new tree. I think that's got to be the guideline that they need to look at as they put this thing in.

If it's in the park area I don't think it really matters if it meanders behind the trees there because there's a lot of land to work with and that can be nice. But I think along the way as long as we're adjusting the sidewalk for driveways and anything else we might as well adjust it for the trees. My preference would be to move those trees out, get the sidewalk in, have a good space between the sidewalk and the curb and get the tree back away from the sidewalk where it can thrive.

Michael Serpe:

Is there a problem with approving this tonight if we don't have that in place?

Mike Pollocoff:

I wouldn't think so. With my comments to Jean I think our last look at it will be the Final Plat. We'll see it again with the Preliminary Plat before then.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Typically we wouldn't necessarily have that level of detail at the conceptual plan. But as we move into the Preliminary Plat and their final engineering and they get towards final engineering we do need to get that information.

John Steinbrink:

Jean, the sidewalk as been talked about for quite a while. I mean this was in the beginning as one of the options here or there or whatever. Does the developer have an idea of where he would put it, or has he talked to the association about getting an easement? Or is this going to start from square one? I mean you can look at an aerial and pretty much determine where each tree is in reference to the road and right of way. It's not really rocket science.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

No, I think he was looking Conceptual Plan approval from the Village Board before they release their engineer to look at a street tree plan. Because they need to get all the grading and drainage and all the other infrastructure. They've been working on those design plans. So I don't think they were at a point that that was the next in priorities. I think we're releasing them now in order to get that information.

Mike Pollocoff:

I can make this a motion. But as Jean said they're looking for approval so they can start their engineering. I'll include in that the sidewalk design and the relocation of trees.

Michael Serpe:

Is that a motion?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes.

Michael Serpe:

I'll second.

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

I guess I need to ask one question. Is a pedestrian path acceptable as opposed to just a concrete sidewalk?

Mike Pollocoff:

If you're talking about like a three foot or four foot wide asphalt path?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

It would be probably a minimum of five feet. That's what our sidewalks are now.

Mike Pollocoff:

An asphalt path, is that what you're talking about?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Yes.

Michael Serpe:

Around Creekside?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yeah, to me that wouldn't be acceptable.

Michael Serpe:

That doesn't add to the beauty of Creekside. That detracts from it.

Mike Pollocoff:

That's the maintenance of the association. Then they'll have to seal it in however many years. Put the concrete in and be done with it.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

I'll give them that feedback.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second. Further discussion? Anything else, Jean?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

No.

John Steinbrink:

Those in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? Motion carries.

POLLOCOFF MOVED TO ACCEPT PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND APPROVE THE REVISED CONCEPTUAL PLAN FOR CREEKSIDE TERRACE LOCATED NORTH OF THE EXISTING CREEKSIDE CROSSING DEVELOPMENT; SECONDED BY SERPE; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

- B. Receive Plan Commission recommendation, consider and approve a Master Conceptual Plan for a Sherwin Williams store to be constructed within the Prairie Ridge development.**

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. President and members of the Board, this is the request of Kevin Vernick, and this is for the approval of a Master Conceptual Plan for a 4,000 square foot Sherwin-Williams store. And this would be on a new 1.27 acre lot within the Prairie Ridge development. This is generally located between 76th Street and Prairie Ridge Boulevard, and this is east of 91st Avenue in Prairie Ridge.

The Master Conceptual Plan you have before you has been tweaked since the last two uses have gone in. And we have made some adjustments so that the cross-connection between BMO Harris and then the Sherwin-Williams site will then connect to one last site to the south. We've also made some adjustments with respect to parking and layouts and everything so it works within this development depending on what may or may not happen to the south of this property. They have then taken this Conceptual Plan and put together a Site Plan. Again, it's about a 4,000 square foot Sherwin-Williams store. And, like I said, we are providing cross-access between the properties, and there will be one connection out to 91st Avenue for the store. The front of the

store is facing to the west. There's a secondary access facing to the south. And to the east is primarily where they're garbage dumpster, their dock and that additional area has been identified.

They have presented their plans to the Village Plan Commission and the staff. And I've actually continued to work with Kevin with respect to a couple of minor tweaks with respect to the building's architecture. They are intending to purchase the property and move forward as quickly as they can this fall yet and into the new year. And this is a matter that has been before the Village Plan Commission. Just to clarify, this is a new store. It's not a relocation of a store that is a nearby city. They intend to operate Monday through Friday from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m., Saturday from 8 to 6 and Sunday 10 to 6. It's a very low traffic impact use because it's based on daily automobile trips as well as one weekly truck trip to the site. The store is intended to be under construction no later than February of 2020 and operational by June of 2020.

As part of this process a Certified Survey Map will need to be submitted as well a Zoning Text Amendment for the PUD specifically for signage. And then they'll be submitting Site and Operational Plans for the Village Plan Commission to consider. Because this is an area in Prairie Ridge where there were a number of easements, dedication and easement language in particular will need to be reflected on their CSM. And I'm working with Nielson Matson and Barber to put those documents together. This is a project that the staff recommends approval as well as the Plan Commission subject to the comments and conditions. And, again, I've just met with Kevin, and I think we've worked through all of those issues and concerns.

Dave Klimisch:

I see on the notes there's a driveway proposed heading west as noted by staff. Is that still being proposed to go onto 91st Avenue? Was that addressed, is that driveway staying onto 91st Avenue?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

There is one driveway from their property to 91st Avenue, that's correct. And it does meet the separation spacing based on the speed limit. And that's been evaluated by the staff including the Village Engineer.

Michael Serpe:

Move approval of the Master Conceptual Plan.

Kris Keckler:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

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

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? Motion carries.

SERPE MOVED TO ACCEPT PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND APPROVE THE MASTER CONCEPTUAL PLAN FOR A SHERWIN WILLIAMS STORE TO BE CONSTRUCTED WITHIN THE PRAIRIE RIDGE DEVELOPMENT; SECONDED BY KECKER; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

C. Receive Plan Commission recommendation, consider and approve a Lot Line Adjustment between the properties located 4063 91st Street and 9118 39th Avenue owned by Carol Hovey.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. President and members of the Board, the owners of the property located at 4063 91st Street, Tax Parcel Number 92-4-122-144-0071 owned by Thomas Peterson, and the property located at 9118 39th Avenue, Tax Parcel 92-4-122-144-0080 owned by Carol Hovey are proposing to adjust their lot lines. Specifically approximately 9,894 square feet of land directly south of 4063 91st will be detached from the property at 9118 39th Avenue and added to the property at 4063 91st Street.

The Lot Line Adjustment is shown on the screen. Again, the intent is to create a lot that has additional depth. Because right now that lot only has 106.99 feet, and typically we like to see lots at about 125 feet in depth in order to have the property setbacks. So the property owners are in agreement. Both properties are zoned R-4, Urban Single Family Residential District. And the Lot Line Adjustment will comply with the requirements set forth in the Zoning Ordinance as well as the Land Division and Development Control Ordinance. And the staff recommends approval as presented.

Kris Keckler:

Move approval of the Lot Line Adjustment.

Dave Klimisch:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

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

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? Motion carries.

KECKLER MOVED TO ACCEPT PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND APPROVE THE LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT BETWEEN THE PROPERTIES LOCATED 4063 91ST STREET AND 9118 39TH AVENUE OWNED BY CAROL HOVEY; SECONDED BY KLIMISCH; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

D. Consider and adopt ordinance #19-38 amending membership for the Plan Commission.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. President and members of the Board, this is Ordinance 19-38. There has been some recent discussion about bringing in an extra alternate on the Village Plan Commission to make sure that as we move forward with our decision making that we have adequate alternates available to the Village as projects are presented. And so this is a modification of Section 18-2 with respect to membership. And specifically the Plan Commission has seven regular members. And what we're asking is that there would be up to three alternate members that could take their place on an evening when one of the regular members was not in attendance. So currently we have two alternates, and we're requesting to modify it to say up to three alternates. And then what happens is the third alternate votes whenever three or more regular members are no available or not in attendance.

Michael Serpe:

I don't see a problem with this. But we haven't had a problem in the past have we?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

We haven't. But there have been some things that have been changing. We had one Plan Commissioner retire recently quickly. And we've have some others that are talking about it. And so as we have a lot of projects that are going to be advanced to the Village over the next several months, we want to make sure there's a full complement of Plan Commissioners in the event of holidays and vacations and such.

John Steinbrink:

And it keeps them up to speed.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Correct.

Michael Serpe:

I'd move approval of 19-38.

Dave Klimisch:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

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

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? So carries.

SERPE MOVED TO APPROVE ORDINANCE #19-38 AMENDING MEMBERSHIP FOR THE PLAN COMMISSION; SECONDED BY KLIMISCH; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

E. Consider and approve a Memorandum of Understanding Agreement for the Mainstreet Market Transportation Economic Assistance Grant between Bear Development, LLC, Froedtert South, Inc, and the Village of Pleasant Prairie regarding the transportation economic assistance grant reporting requirements and job guarantee financial obligations.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. President and members of the Board, this Memorandum of Understanding Agreement or MOU is between Bear Development, LLC, as well as the Froedtert South, Inc., and the Village of Pleasant Prairie. This is a Transportation Economic Assistance Grant reporting requirement document. It's known as a TEA grant document. It's for two purposes. One, it addresses how the grant reporting requirements will take place for the benefit of the Village so that this information can be forwarded up to the State DOT. And it also provides a job guarantee for the financial obligations.

Similar with another project that we recently approved, the Stateline 94 project, we wanted to make sure that there was a guarantee that was placed before the developer that the money that was provided as part of the grant that in the event that at the three year reporting requirement and

seven year reporting requirement that the company had the required jobs per the original grant application. And it guarantees to the Village that if for some reason that some of the jobs would have been cut back, that the developer will be financially responsible to reimburse the Village because the Village is responsible to reimburse the State for that grant obligation if the job count is not met and maintained. So the purpose of this agreement then is to provide that obligation and to guarantee to the Village that we do not have any financial obligations for the job requirements.

Mike Pollocoff:

I'd move approval of the Mainstreet Market TEA MOU as presented.

Kris Keckler:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

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

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? Motion carries.

POLLOCOFF MOVED TO APPROVE THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING AGREEMENT FOR THE MAINSTREET MARKET TRANSPORTATION ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE GRANT BETWEEN BEAR DEVELOPMENT, LLC, FROEDTERT SOUTH, INC, AND THE VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE REGARDING THE TRANSPORTATION ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE GRANT REPORTING REQUIREMENTS AND JOB GUARANTEE FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS; SECONDED BY KECKER; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

F. Consider and approve the State/Municipal Agreement for the Mainstreet Market Transportation Economic Assistance Grant regarding the acceptance and obligations regarding the transportation economic assistance grant.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. President and members of the Board, the previous agreement was between the developer and the business and the Village. Now, this is the State municipal agreement between the Village and the Wisconsin DOT. So we have to provide them some guarantees and obligations as part of the State municipal agreement for receiving and accepting this TEA grant award. And this has to do with general conditions with respect to the design plans, infrastructure, the bidding of the

documents, the real estate acquisition, all the things related to the public improvements. It also addresses the jobs guarantee that is provided as well. And it is an obligation of the Village in order for us to accept the TEA grant award to understand and agree to the obligations that are set forth as part of the grant. So this, again, is a document that we just approved for the Stateline 94 project and any other TEA grant award that's provided to the Village. It really starts the final approval process. There's still one step that Bear Development needs to complete, and that is the final environmental assessment for the project. And this document allows them to make that final step of that work over the next several months before the grant is awarded.

Mike Pollocoff:

We've done quite a few of these, and I think we've got them down [inaudible]. By our previous action the Village is protected from the developer not performing. So I'd move that we approve the Mainstreet Market SMA.

Michael Serpe:

SMA.

John Steinbrink:

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

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? Motion carries.

POLLOCOFF MOVED TO APPROVE THE STATE/MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT FOR THE MAINSTREET MARKET TRANSPORTATION ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE GRANT REGARDING THE ACCEPTANCE AND OBLIGATIONS REGARDING THE TRANSPORTATION ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE GRANT; SECONDED BY SERPE; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

G. Presentation of the 2020 General Fund Budget.

Kathy Goessl:

Mr. President and Village Board, I'm here to present the general government operating fund budget including operating and capital and debt. The budget was discussed in open at a working session on September 12th. And at that meeting we discussed the decision packets and capital requests. There were some minor changes that were recommended that is implemented in this budget presentation.

This is a summary of the operating revenues of the general government operating budget. You can see overall there's the increase of \$836,468 or 4.8 percent which the majority of the increase is due to property tax. Property tax has increased by \$303,000 because of growth. There's also a transfer of the levy of almost a half million from capital, and also an increase of \$60,000 due to a decrease in personal property taxes aid that the Village receives from the State of Wisconsin. Other taxes includes mobile homes, hotel, property tax penalty, ag use penalty and other taxes. The increase in this category is due to an estimated pilot program that we will receive from American Eagle around \$29,000 for a tax exempt senior care facility in the Village.

Intergovernmental revenue is down. This includes grants, shared revenues, exempt computer aids and state payments for municipal services. This also includes a new video service provider aid of a half a percent of revenue collected last year from franchise fees. License and permits includes building permits, licenses including liquor and bartenders and dog licenses, property record maintenance fees and zoning permits. A decrease in building permits of \$60,000 offset by an increase in fire department permits of \$6,000 and zoning permits and CD billing of \$25,000.

Fines are proposed the same as the 2019 budget level at \$363,000. Public charges for services, franchise fees are down \$30,000 due to the aid being received from the State of half a percent. Also down is street lighting and police department earnings \$17,000, offset by an increase in fire and rescue earnings of \$16,000 and public works of \$5,000. Intergovernmental includes assessing contracts which are down \$13,000. And the school officer billings to Kenosha Unified School District up thirty three from the 2019 budget.

The last category is other revenue. And this includes cell tower leases, interest on investments. This is increasing due to interest on investments anticipated to be up \$25,000 and miscellaneous receipts which include purchase card rebates down by \$7,000 to allocate to the RecPlex their portion of their purchase card rebates. Utility fund transfer we're budgeting the same. This is taxes paid to the general government from the Pleasant Prairie Water Utility. Overall a revenue increase of \$836,000 mainly for shifting property tax from capital here to the general government. Here's a graphical of the revenues. Property tax as you can see accounts for 54 percent of the revenue at \$9.9 million followed by intergovernmental at 14 percent or \$2.5 million. And the public charges for services 11 percent or \$2 million.

We switch now to the expenditure side of the general government operating. There's five different categories. These are base budgets without our decision packets. General government includes ten different departments including Village Board, administration, Village Clerk, finance. Some are up, no big changes. The majority overall are down \$2,000. So it's pretty much even for these budgets of ten different departments. Public safety includes police, fire and rescue, inspection and public safety communications. All departments up for a total increase of \$329,000 or three percent mainly in the personnel category.

Public works includes public works the roads, engineering and street lights. All departments up for a total increase of \$92,000 or three percent, again, mainly in personnel. Parks down ten due to a one-time expense in 2019 along with some small reduction in personnel and contractual

services offset by an increase in fleet. Community development is up due to increase in wages and benefits \$23,000. Overall we're increases expenses \$416,000 compared to the 2019 budget. Again, here's a graphical representation of these areas. As you can see public safety makes up the majority of our cost at 57 percent or \$10.3 million, followed by general government which includes 11 separate departments at 21 percent or \$3.7 million.

Here's our breakdown by categories. We are a service government like all governments, so the majority of our costs are in wages and benefits. Very little are in other expenses. Personnel is \$14.3 million or 79 percent of our operating budget. Over half of the benefits is health insurance at \$2.4 million of the \$4.4 million of our benefits. Here's other major operating expenses of the general government. They include fleet charges at \$612,000, software maintenance of \$477,000, electric at \$419,000 minor equipment at \$219,000, topped off by salt at \$208,000. Top five of the 2020 proposed total \$1.9 million, and it's up only \$24,000 or 1.2 percent compared to 2019.

Here are the decision packets which we went over at our working session. So the majority of these we have discussed before. We have an increase in billable rate for CD. We have a full-time assessment personnel going to part-time. And then we have fire and rescue having some revenue recommendations. So those top three are all positive numbers in terms of bringing in revenue or reducing costs. And then we're looking at a part-time deputy clerk. The clerk's office is in need of a dedicated part-time deputy clerk to assist with administration and election tasks to enable the clerk to focus on efficiencies and projects and to enable the office to continue to offer outstanding services.

Another one, the biggest one we have here for an increase in cost is adding two fire medic positions. The request was for three positions starting January 1, 2020. The dollar amount that we were able to fit in the 2020 budget was two fire medic positions starting April 1, 2020. And there's one vacant position currently in the fire department which will be filled at the same time these positions are being hired so they have three additional people they can bring on staff next spring. Part-time staffing recommendations is to hire six positions working a 24-hour shift every week all year to help staff and fill in when the full-time positions are on vacation or holiday.

There's a wage increase for part-time public works employees and a pay increase for part-time park employees for the spring and fall, not the summer. It's very hard to obtain these positions or get people to work these positions. The department was requesting a \$5 per hour raise, and we're recommending to cut that in half and do a \$2.50 per hour raise to help retain or to get new employees for those positions that are lacking at this point. And then IT is a network administrator. They requested a full-time position and a promotion. We are just recommending the promotion piece of the request. These are reoccurring totaling \$175,893. These will, as it says, reoccurring. So every year they will continue to be put on the budget. These are the most difficult to fit in the budget. So that's our initial recommendation.

And these are decision packets one time. These are all the ones over \$20,000. We did go over all of these at the working session. So if you have any questions on these. These total \$321,613. We did take some of the stuff out of the base budget that occur only every number of years instead of every year. We also took some stuff out of the budget and put it in here for stuff that we could do one time, and next year if we don't have the money we don't have to do it again the

following year. So we've worked to help provide things at this time with the surplus we have gained from last year.

These are all under \$20,000 one-time expenses. Again, we went over these on our list. I've grouped them together by department. There's actually a total of 19 requests in this area. You can see the number of requests in the middle, how many packages there are per each department. And then I summarized on the one side the decision packet titles and the dollar amount of the total packages together. So if you have any questions on these. But these total \$179,949, and it's a total of 19 packages they're recommending.

Mike Pollocoff:

I have a question. Could you give me a little more in depth description of the promotion of number one on that list under administration, what that all is [inaudible].

Kathy Goessl:

There's two different programs there. It's the promotion of the Villages vision, mission and culture. It's the package that Nathan put together in terms of the different -- our vision and our mission and promoting it to our employees. Because currently the Board knows about those and the department heads know, but it's a promotion of those two, our employees and interact them into our work environment. And recodification is a separate package with the Village ordinances.

Michael Serpe:

I have a question also. On the one-time over \$20,000 we have replace street signs in Village to reflectability standards. Is that so the avenue and street signs will reflect as you approach them?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Yeah, the street signs have a life expectancy to them, and then we have a federal standard to make sure that there's a certain amount of reflectability. Mainly the stop signs, speed limit signs and eventually street signs.

Michael Serpe:

And that's great. But, you know, I'm a proponent of visible stop signs at intersections where they're approaching cross streets that are high speed, Springbrook Road. I can't say enough about the flashing stop signs that we have in certain areas. I would like to see more of those all over. And I bet you I can't get an objection from the police department on that.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

We would have to raise the budget quite a bit for that. I'm not saying I'm opposed to it, but they're thousands of dollars a piece?

Michael Serpe:

Fifteen hundred bucks a piece?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Yes, even a little bit more. Where a regular sign is \$50.

Michael Serpe:

I understand. Here's the thing. When we have an accident because somebody doesn't see the stop sign it ties up squad cars, injures people, sometimes kills them. If we can prevent that from happening we're keeping our police department available for other calls instead of -- I've been screaming about this thing for a long time. I believe in these things. I think they're effective. And I wish we would put more money towards it.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

If the Board's recommending an increase in that one decision packet I would support it as a department head.

Michael Serpe:

Well, it's something to think about in the future. If we have some leftover money someplace maybe you can come up with something.

Kathy Goessl:

As I said operating reoccurring is very difficult with the budget levy limits. But stuff like a one time with the surplus that we've gained, we don't want to use all our surpluses. But if you really believe that's important maybe they can pick out some locations and add that to this package and say I want to put ten flashing stop signs and figure out what places they are. And we could add it to this package. We would be able to fit that into the budget as a one-time expenditure.

Dave Klimisch:

Could you talk more about the wage increases for the part-time public works employees and the part-time park employees? Where are we at on the pay scale?

Kathy Goessl:

John, can you say where we're at right now and where you want to go?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Yeah, we're currently at a part-time employee with the public works department with that commercial driver license is who this would affect, it's currently at \$15.00. We would be raising it up to \$17.50 to be a little more competitive with the market. The existing parks part time, spring and fall, is where we have the hardest time. We're at \$10. This would bring it up to \$12.50. It's still a little bit under what Kwik Trip and some other places are paying. But we have a hard time filling those positions spring and fall. So that's why we're asking for an increase to hopefully increase the amount of applicants for that position.

Dave Klimisch:

And the summer stays the same?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

And the summer stays the same, correct, because there's always an abundance of college kids looking for work when they're home from school.

Kathy Goessl:

Any other questions on any of the other packages, either reoccurring or one time? Otherwise we can go forward and show you the summary of this budget looking at revenue and expenses all in one page and a summary version. We're looking at an increase of total revenues of \$836,000 the majority being property tax being transferred, actually the majority of it, from our capital project fund. Our expenses increasing \$244,000. And last year we did transfer \$850,000 to capital to acquire some more capital assets. But this year we're not recommending any transfer back to them out of our surplus. And so here's a total of the reoccurring versus last year in the decision packets one time which we're recommending more one times this year, almost over half a million compared to \$243,000 last year. We are going to use reserves of \$501,000 which is all directed toward that one line of one time.

So the second component of general government is capital funds budget. This is a summary of the capital fund budget. It shows 2019 budget. Capital fluctuates a lot so we also do an estimate for them. And then also a 2020 proposed budget. Property tax would decrease \$488,000 which is all transfer to the general government for operating expenses. The road grant has increased by \$146,000 which is a max increase of 15 percent that we can receive on the road grant. Borrowing, we're looking at borrowing \$925,000 for the balance of an ambulance, a rescue pumper in addition to the communication stability for half a million. We're really unsure of where the communications stability will land, so we're going to wait and borrow until all the numbers are firm and everything's in place before we make the borrowing. There is money left over from the borrowing we did two years ago which will fund the majority of the ambulance or we'll apply to the rescue pumper.

Use of advanced payments, one of our projects is Highway 50, our contribution to that project. We did collect \$1.6 million in 2014 and '15, and that money will be used to our portion of \$1.5 million to the state project. Land sale, this is the land sale of Bristol land to HSA. This is actually the net profit we're making on this land. We bought it for \$3.7 million, and we're selling it for \$8.9. So that should close in the first quarter of next year. Transfer in, as I mentioned we transferred \$850,000 last year, but we're not recommending transfers into this budget for 2020. Others include shared revenues for the ATC lines of \$46,000, interest income of \$10,000, and sales of squads for \$51,000 for 2020. And some impact fee collections of \$200,000.

The capital outlay, the 2019 estimate is less than the 2019 budget because of a couple project approved in 2018 and 2019 that are being carried over to 2020. This includes an ambulance, a pumper tanker and road planning. Impact fees are collected and spent in the capital project fund. In 2019 we're estimating spending zero of impact fees, but we're spending half a million in 2019 for a law enforcement facility project plan.

So these are the capital expenditures that are over \$100,000. And in the far column is shows the funding source for each of these projects as well. So we look at the paving program for roads of \$1.8 million. Road aids will take care of \$1.1 million of it and the levy the rest of it. Reconstruction of Highway 50 \$1.5 million is the advanced payments we received in 2014 and '15 from businesses along Highway 50. The rescue pumper as a carry over, and we have a borrowing balance of \$778,000 which we used for that rescue pumper. And then a new borrowing of \$925,000 which will include the rest of this.

Communication stability, half a million, we're looking at borrowing for that. Law enforcement facility project designing or figure out a new police station half a million dollars, we can use impact fees. Ambulance carry over \$333,377 we're borrowing for that. And the vehicle replacement for police which is our reoccurring capital expense of almost \$300,000 will be funded by vehicle sales of \$51,000 and the levy. We have \$5.8 million of project over \$100,000.

For projects under \$100,000 we have, again, the funding sources identified for these. We want to finish the mobile radio replacement for fire and rescue. We want to rebuild a boiler at Prange for \$68,000. The transportation plans a carry over for \$65,000, radios for public safety at \$60,000, and install generators at Roger Prange storage building of \$32,000. And then a radar speed trailer for \$22,000 for total under \$100,000 of \$322,724. So this is a summary of the previous slides. We have carry over of \$1.2 million, paving program of \$1.8 million, projects of over \$100,000 of \$2.8 almost, and under \$100,000, \$257,000 for a total recommended purchase of capital of \$6.1 million.

This is a summary of the fund balance in the capital project fund. You can look at the to part, it shows the beginning balance and the ending balance and change in the fund balance for capital. We want to maintain a balance, an unrestricted balance which is right above the bottom line, the yellow line. Impact fees run through here. So at the end of 2020 we'll have \$2.2 million, almost \$2.3 million of impact fee money. We will not have a borrowing balance. Hopefully we spend -- buy the ambulance and fire truck and communications stability and get it spent before the end of the year. Land activity is at profit for the land sale to HSA. And then unrestricted is what's left over. And we're going to be up in the 2019 budget -- well, from the estimate we're going to be

down a little bit from a little over a million to \$792,000. Any questions on capital or any of the projects we're recommending?

Otherwise I'll go to the last and final component of the general government is debt. Revenue for debt includes property tax which decreased \$27 million to make this a balanced budget. Other revenues is special assessments and interest earnings. Expenses is principal and interest payment with principal payment being up \$25,000, but interest payments being down \$42,000. 2020 is budgeted to break even ending the year with a fund balance of \$1,113,791.

This is our debt for the last five years plus what we're proposing -- well, four years plus what we're proposing for 2020 and projected for 2021. For 2019 we're paying off \$1.5 million in debt. We didn't borrow anything in 2019. 2020 we're proposing \$925,000 in borrowing and paying off \$1.5 million in principal. And for 2021 we're unsure of the borrowing at this point, but we're paying off \$1.4 million.

What we're really interested in is how this will really affect the property owner. We're under a levy limit, and this is our calculation of the levy limit and how it increased by \$346,000. We do a growth factor, and our growth factor is down from last year. Last year was almost 6, now this year it's 2.182, and increase of \$303,473 in our levy. We can do a debt adjustment minusing that last year's debt and putting this year's debt in. And then some property tax payment actually went down from the State because of recalculation based on real facts, and more went toward the TID. So we got \$60,000 increased here because the aid went down. So our new levy is \$12,652,261 per the State calculations.

Our levy is distributed between the three different major categories with the majority of it going to general operating at \$9.9 million or 78.5 percent. Debt is the smallest at \$1.7 million. And capital decreased because of that transfer over to operating. This is assessed value, and the good news is that our actual mill rate is staying the same this year. It's from 4.28 to 4.28 even though we had an increase in our levy. And our assessed value is going up slightly to 3.601 to 3.696.

So this is a median residential home which we did not do a reval this year so the value has stayed the same at \$237,200. And our Village property taxes are staying the same, actually decreasing 41 cents for a total \$1,014.23. We don't have any of the other taxing districts levies in so I don't know any of the other parts of that. But I know our own and most of the information is final except for our assessed value which is still waiting for our final manufacturing number. So what I'm looking for is authorization to set a public hearing date of November 18th for this budget.

Dave Klimisch:

This was a thorough summary so thank you for going through that. And I propose -- I move for a public hearing on November 21st to cover the budget.

Michael Serpe:

I second.

Mike Pollocoff:

I say we round the 41 down to 40.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second and a proposal. Further discussion?

Michael Serpe:

We're hearing it from all over the state the levy limits are killing us. We can't keep on adding millions of square feet of commercial and industrial space, residents and housing and not address that with services. It's hard to do. I hope something shakes loose in Madison pretty soon.

Mike Pollocoff:

Not like that's going to happen.

John Steinbrink:

Further discussion? Those in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? Motion carries.

KLIMISCH MOVED TO APPROVE AND SET A PUBLIC HEARING ON NOVEMBER 21, 2019 FOR THE 2020 GENERAL FUND BUDGET; SECONDED BY SERPE; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

H. Consider proposed 2020 Clean Water Utility, Fleet Internal Service Fund and Solid Waste Utility budgets:

- 1) Resolution #19-38 relating to the adoption of the 2020 Clean Water Utility Budget**
- 2) Resolution #19-39 relating to the adoption of the 2020 Fleet Internal Service Fund Budget**
- 3) Resolution #19-40 relating to the adoption of the 2020 Solid Waste Utility Budget**

Kathy Goessl:

I'll present these three budgets, and I'm looking for approval for the budgets. This is our one and only time to see these budgets. The first one is clean water fund. This is a summary of the 2019 budget, what we're proposing is a dollar change and percent change. The operating revenues are up slightly due to building in the area, therefore causing us to have more ER use to charge out. No increase in fees for this budget.

Expenses, personnel is up. The majority is due to actually other post employment benefits which fluctuates greatly from year to year. It's a non-cash item. And also in that category is an increase in public works transfer of a little over \$9,000 compared to 2019. Other expenses, the 2020 budget is basically similar to the 2019 approved budget. You can see there's not much change there. The biggest change is a contingency of \$5,000. The 2019 budget had a budget amendment which originally that was fifty, and it went to fund something else. So basically this budget is the same.

Decision packets is actually from the general government decision packets. So any administrative support departments like IT, finance, HR, whenever they have a new decision packet a percentage of that goes out to the enterprise funds, and this is that amount, \$2,000 that is going out to the Clean Water Utility for the ones that were in the general fund budget. So we're looking at a loss here of \$56,775. We're more interested in maintaining cash and getting projects done than a net operating loss. These are the expense categories. You can see depreciation which is fixed assets being depreciated over the life of their benefits as the biggest expense this utility has. And that's a non-cash expense followed by personnel and equipment, fleet internal service, that's needed to do projects in this enterprise fund.

This is the nonoperating section of it. It brings forth the nonoperating loss from the two previous slides and adds an interest income to get us a smaller loss overall for this utility. This is the allocation of the decision packets in the general government reoccurring of a little over \$1,000, one time of \$1,605 totaling \$2,623. This is affecting this fund and solid waste tonight. And it's basically the allocations of part-time Village Clerk, the promotion of the network administrator, the promotion of the Village missions and vision and culture, the recodification. It's also the employee engagement committee first year and then minor equipment are the things that are affecting here and also would be in solid waste.

These are the capital programs being recommended. I put a column in there of the amount of special assessments we're looking at obtaining for doing these projects. Basically if it's a new project it's 100 percent funded by special assessment. Whereas if it's a replacement the utility pays for 100 percent. So the first project is a special assessment, it's new, for Beverly Woods which is the second project. The \$600,000 special assessment is based on 100 percent of the new infrastructure being paid by the property owners through the special assessment. But there's also replacements of old infrastructure here, and that's being funded 100 percent by the utility. So it's a split between new and old being done in this project. Then we have the yearly paving program adjustment, also the annual Lake Michigan shoreline protection. And then we have the project

Greenway Court culvert replacement for a total of \$2.4 million in projects being covered by special assessments of \$1.3 million.

Michael Serpe:

I just have a question, Kathy. John, Beverly Woods, are you still meeting with the city as far as the water lines in that area? Are they going to do anything?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Yeah, we do have an agreement with the city. So we're going to work it the same way as we did the Beverly Woods area. Once we commit to a hard date that same year in the spring we'll relay any water lines that need to be relaid. And then we'll come right behind it with our project as far as paving goes.

Kathy Goessl:

Okay, cash balances, as I said we were concerned about maintaining cash balances. We are gaining cash balances in 2019 of \$358,000. And we're using a little cash balance as you see there with a list of those projects a little over \$214,000. But we're still ending the year with \$2.7 million in cash reserves for the Clean Water Utility for future projects and operational expenses. Any questions on the clean water budget?

Mike Pollocoff:

I'd move approval of the clean water budget as presented.

Kris Keckler:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

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

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? So carries.

POLLOCOFF MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #19-38 RELATING TO THE ADOPTION OF THE 2020 CLEAN WATER UTILITY BUDGET; SECONDED BY KECKLER; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

Kathy Goessl:

Okay, the next budget I have is the fleet internal service fund. Again, a comparison of 2019 to 2020. This budget revenue is basically the same keeping the charge out rate the same. There will be no inflationary increases this year. We require the general fund to not have any increases overall in their nonpersonnel expenses. Therefore, we can't put an increase in fleet internal service and pass that on to them when they can't increase their expenses on that side.

Personnel is up \$63,000. Again, it's other post employment benefits, an increase of \$47,932, offset by a decrease in WRS trust expenses of \$16,000. There's also an increase of \$9,000 in full-time wages and also public works transfer of \$15,000. Contractual services is up \$10,000. It's mostly due to contracted equipment maintenance up \$10,000. Supplies and maintenance is up \$60,000. It's minor equipment up \$28,000. Fuel was up \$8,000 plus \$24,000 increase in vehicle and equipment maintenance and supplies. The other expenses are pretty level, up and down a little bit. Then we look at decision packets which we don't have any. The actual support department is allocated to fleet internal service.

Operating expenses, supplies and maintenance have exceeded depreciation as the highest expense. Supplies and maintenance is \$587,000 for 2020 which includes minor equipment, fuel, equipment maintenance supplies and vehicle maintenance supplies. The second expense is depreciation followed by personnel in this department.

Nonoperating, the net operating loss is brought forward, and the nonoperating expenses include interest income on the fund's cash balances of \$15,000 for 2020, and a gain and loss on sale of equipment as they replace thing of \$2,500 estimate. So we're looking at a slight decrease here of \$20,383 as the net loss in this utility. They did ask for an increase in fleet internal service charges of two percent or \$33,000. We are not recommending that based on our general government not being able to increase their nonpersonnel expenses.

Purchases being recommended, though, in the capital section total a little over \$600,000. A lot of these are similar to what we've done in the past. Vehicles purchased at auction, pickup trucks, sanitary trucks to build a plow truck with a used cab and chassis, and leaf collector is new for this year, and then a RecPlex van replacement. Cash balance in this fund we have a decrease this year of \$120,000 ending the year at \$903,000. Next year we have a slight decrease on keeping the fund around \$900,000. Is there any questions on fleet internal service? Otherwise I'm looking for approval for this budget.

Kris Keckler:

Move approval of Resolution 19-39 for the fleet internal service budget.

Dave Klimisch:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

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

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? Motion carries.

KECKLER MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #19-39 RELATING TO THE ADOPTION OF THE 2020 FLEET INTERNAL SERVICE FUND BUDGET; SECONDED BY KLIMISCH; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

Kathy Goessl:

The final budget I'm presenting tonight is the solid waste fund budget. We talked a little bit about this last Board meeting when we increased the fees. But you can see now we have the budget in full here. The operating revenues will go up. October 1st you approved a rate increase of \$2 per month residential increase. That's reflective of \$123,300 for 2020. And contracted yard waste services is up \$84,000 collecting more from the outside Illinois company. It's offset by elimination of recycling rebate. We only had \$4,000 budgeted in 2019 and also reduction in bulk pickup of \$19,000. We overestimated the amount we would have collected in the 2019 budget. So it's more than 2018 but not as much as we thought for 2019.

Depreciation is down \$24,000. That's based on what we actually did in 2018. We did write off some assets due to our capitalization policy changing. Office expense down \$7,000. The majority is due to information printed in the calendar. General government is no longer charging solid waste for the calendar inserts because the calendar is not being mailed to residents unless they request it. So the impact for solid waste is very small in terms of the information getting out through the calendar.

Compost site 2019 budgeted for lights to be installed along the recycling center driveway of \$30,000. For 2020 there's nothing budgeted. Those lights did not occur because they were actually offset by a contribution from a business that was supposed to relocate there which didn't. But we didn't rebudget for that in 2020. Administrative expense, personnel transfer is up \$49,000 for administrative. That's the majority of that. Leaf collection, both the labor and the fleet's up for 2020, and that's the only two expenses that are in that category.

And the biggest hit we have as we talked at our last October 1st meeting is recycling expense. Tipping fee as we estimate for 2020 is up \$182,000 from our 2019 budget. This includes tipping, processing fee and trucking. The processing piece is up the most. This cost is controlled by the market and passed on to us. We don't have a contract citing that amount. And that's what has

affected us in that category. Garbage expense is up \$19,000 mainly in personnel and tipping accounting for the total increase. Decision packets will be discussed in the next slide or so and has a positive revenue effect of almost \$6,000. This is our expense categories. You can see garbage is still our largest category followed by recycling, but recycling really jumped a lot from '19 to '20. Nonoperating we have the recycling grant and the hazardous waste grant, and we have interest income on our cash balance.

These are the decision packets being recommended. We're looking at an increase in our contracted yard waste acceptance of a dollar per cubic feet for a total income of \$11,250. We're looking at offering residential curbside collection of branches and bush which is going to have a slight revenue of \$408,000. We're looking at I think about \$50 per pickup. And then we use equipment and people to pick up the branches. But that's been requested by our residents.

Wage increase for a part-time recycling attendant similar to our parks and for our public works. We have trouble retaining and obtaining part-time recycling attendants. So we're looking at an increase there in their wages similar to the \$2.50 that we were looking at for the parks and public works. And then we are looking at increasing electronic and television pickup and drop off fees. We just compared what we get charged for them and upped our fees because some of them we were paying more to our contractor to get rid of them than our residents were paying us to drop them off. So we've matched those in terms of the weights and costs.

Reoccurring and one-time general fund allocation of decision packets, those are the ones that I talked about earlier in the Clean Water Utility that was allocated also to the solid waste fund. So we have a net income of \$5,928 overall on our decision packets. We have no capital being recommended for the solid waste fund. And we have the cash balance here because of the recycling increase in costs that hit us the last couple months and us reacting to it a little bit later than we were actually reducing cash by \$58,000. In 2020 with the increase of \$2 per residential per month we're recovering that up. Hopefully they maintain their costs so that we don't -- so this stays here with us not having a negative again. We're looking at ending the year about \$200,000 in the solid waste fund based on the \$2 per rate increase that you guys already approved October 1st and the fees that we're recommending here in the decision packets. I'm looking for approval of this budget.

Dave Klimisch:

A question on the curbside collection for the brush and the branches. Is that \$480 that's the revenue that we would get?

Kathy Goessl:

That's the net revenue. We're looking at about \$6,000 in revenue, and then the \$5,600 in costs.

Dave Klimisch:

For the collection of the brush and branches from a resident's perspective how would that work? They would call for the pick and there would be a fee?

Kathy Goessl:

Yeah, they would call similar to a bulk pick and schedule. There would be one day a week that they would go out and collect it. And so they would call and schedule a pickup, and then they would be charged on their utility bill for the pickup.

Dave Klimisch:

Okay.

Mike Pollocoff:

We're just driving out there with a chipper?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Yeah, we'd be driving out there with a chipper truck and an enclosed truck. So it's \$50 just to go out there and then \$5 a cubic yard based on an estimate of a supervisor's review.

Michael Serpe:

Move approval of solid waste.

Kris Keckler:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second of adoption of Resolution 19-40. Further discussion? Is the trade war with China affecting our recycling in any way here?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Is the what in China, excuse me.

John Steinbrink:

Trade war we're having with China. They were one of our biggest markets for cardboards, other things, electronics.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Yeah, I know that the biggest impact that China had to our recycling was the amount of contamination accepted in the containers that were going overseas to Asia. And so it was like a 5 percent, now it's like at a .5 percent which is basically completely clean recyclable material heading over on the barge. So when they do an inspection they have a guy that opens up the barge. If he sees anything he rejects it. Then they send it back or charge an additional fee. So I'm not sure how that ties with the tariff, but it possibly could be.

John Steinbrink:

It just seems like we're paying in the end.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Yes, we are.

John Steinbrink:

And the beginning. All right. Further discussion? Those in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? Motion carries.

SERPE MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #19-40 RELATING TO THE ADOPTION OF THE 2020 SOLID WASTE UTILITY BUDGET; SECONDED BY KECKLER; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

- I. Consider approval of the First Amendment to Amended and Restated Water and Sanitary Sewer Service Agreement between the Village of Pleasant Prairie and the Village of Bristol.**

Matt Fineour:

Mr. President and members of the Board, this is an amendment to the restated water and sewer agreement between the Village and the Village of Bristol. If you recall we entered into this water and sewer agreement with Bristol to service approximately 500 acres along Highway U just west of the Prairie Highland Corporate Park. As part of that agreement there was a section, a condition, subsequent section that provided two conditions to be met for the agreement. And that

was due to the Village owning approximately 68 acres of property or the HSA property that HSA is going to purchase from the Village here for that land.

As part of that agreement the two conditions was that we get PSC approval and that there is an execution of the developer's agreement between Bristol and HSA. Those two conditions were to be met by September 30th of this year. If they weren't met by September 30th, the agreement allowed either party to terminate the water agreement by October 31st. The PSC approval essentially has been obtained. We're planning on getting actually formal approval beginning of November. But we've got every approval from them that's going to happen.

The other agreement, the developer's agreement between Bristol and HSA I think it's still ongoing, but it seems to be coming to a close. This amendment allows that October 31st deadline to be extended to January 20th of next year -- or January 30th of next year, sorry. So Nathan's been working with Bristol and the HSA on this, and he recommends approval of this extension.

Dave Klimisch:

I move approval of the first amendment.

Kris Keckler:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

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

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? Motion carries.

KLIMISCH MOVED TO APPROVE THE FIRST AMENDMENT TO AMENDED AND RESTATED WATER AND SANITARY SEWER SERVICE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE AND THE VILLAGE OF BRISTOL; SECOND KECKLER; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

J. Consider various board/commission appointments.

Jane Snell:

I will be presenting this. We're recommending, or administration is recommending the Plan Commission appointment for Michelle Burnette as an Alternate #2. Her term would be October 22, 2019 to May 1st of 2020. Terry Rice would be the Alternate #3. A term for that would be

October 22, 2019 to May 1st of 2020. Park Commission is Sandy Chhun-Genc, Alternate #1, term October 22, 2019 to April 30, 2020. Board of Appeals Chris Bilik, Alternate #2, term October 22, 2019 to April 30, 2021. And then finally reappointments for the Community Development Authority, Tom Reiherzer October 7, 2019 to October 6, 2024; Jill Sikorski, October 7, 2019 to October 6, 2024; and Dustin Decker, Alternate #1, term 10/7/2019 to 10/6/2020.

Michael Serpe:

I would move approval of all.

Dave Klimisch:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? Just to say we did interview 12 applicants, all very good applicants. It's good to know that there's so many people interested in the Village, so many people with so much expertise in different areas. All of them showed interest [inaudible], some of them we even recommended to other -- after talking to them recommending them to other openings we had in other Village things just because of their expertise out there and their interest in serving. So it's nice to know we have a deep wealth of people to choose from here. And it was a hard decision in a lot of places. But it's good to know we have great reserves out there. Because all our members change on our commissions on brief notice it's nice to know we can dig into the pool of applicants and come up with people that are really qualified for different positions on our commissions.

Michael Serpe:

It's nice to see Terry Rice has come back. He was on our original Town Board.

John Steinbrink:

A little history of Terry. He was on the Town Board. I actually took his place after he left when there was a opening. That's way back. And another point of interest is Terry was on the decision making end of bringing Mike Pollocoff into the Village. But you fooled him and you turned out quite well. With that if there's no further discussion, those in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? Motion carries.

SERPE MOVED TO APPROVE THE APPOINTMENTS OF VARIOUS BOARD/COMMISSION MEMBERS AS PRESENTED; SECONDED BY KLIMISCH; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

6. VILLAGE BOARD COMMENTS

7. ADJOURNMENT

Michael Serpe:

Move to adjourn.

Kris Keckler:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion has been made for adjournment and seconded. Those in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? Motion carries.

SERPE MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING; SECONDED BY KECKLER; MOTION CARRIED 5-0 AND MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:32 P.M.