In attendance:
Mayor Steve Bierce, Aldermen B. Bergman, C. Brown, B. Dziwulski, R. Grosch, J. Kara and J. Wamser.

Also in Attendance:
Attorney S. Riffle, Administrator S. Klein, DPW Director Engineer M. Wagner, Utility Manager J. Mueller, City Planner & Community Development Director N. Fuchs and Clerk/Treasurer K. Tarczewski.

1. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

   Mayor Bierce called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm and requested everyone stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. Public Comment - None.

3. Consent Agenda
   3.1. Approve Accounts Payable Listing Dated September 21, 2020

   A motion was made and seconded (J. Wamser, C. Brown) to approve the consent agenda. Motion Passed: 6-For, 0-Against.

4. Presentation by Ehlers Related to the City's Levy Limits and Current Debt Profile

   Todd Taves from Ehlers was present for this item. In summary, Mr. Taves stated the City's practice of using levy limit adjustments for non-levy supported debt service will put pressure on future levies, especially for roads and capital based on the City's current debt profile. He said the options going forward would be one of the following; using special assessments to reduce levy for capital financing or considering short-term financing of some capital items to use debt service adjustment. Future general obligation debt issuance for non-levy supported debt can increase permitted adjustments or have a levy limit referendum.

   Mr. Kara asked if the City isn't borrowing enough.

   Mr. Taves stated the City should only borrow when appropriate. If the City does need to borrow for utility projects, it will afford continued opportunities to cash fund projects. He did not advise borrowing to build more cushion with levy limits since there is a fall back option of a short term borrowing.

   Mr. Bergman asked what the reason was for levy limits and what it protected against. Mr. Taves stated it controls property taxes.

   Mr. Wamser stated he wanted to protect residents economically due to the strain of Covid.

5. Discussion and Possible Action to Extend Municipal Sanitary Sewer to N28 W24376 Watertown Road (PWC 0921-994) and Surrounding Properties

   Ms. Wagner stated this issue is coming back with additional information in regards to extending municipal service to three properties on Watertown Road. During a previous Common Council meeting, the Common Council questioned the other two adjacent property owner's thoughts about extending municipal service. Ms. Wagner stated post cards were sent out to the other two property owners. Only one response was received from the property to the west, and they stated they did not want it. The property to the east did not respond.

Ms. Wagner stated coming from the west would be less expensive as it is shallower and would go past the property that voted against it.

Mr. Grosch asked if it would be less expensive to have the owners install their own individual grinder pump station and pump it to the manhole, which could be a temporary and less expensive solution for 10-15 years until the road was be redone.

Ms. Wagner stated the grinder line would run directly across a property that is not serviced. The City does not want multiple private utilities. It creates issues for all the other utilities that go in the right of way. Ms. Wagner stated although it could be an option, it is not recommended. Ms. Wagner stated the estimated cost coming from the west was $125,000 to $150,000. Ms. Wagner mentioned the project will be complicated due to the high ground water and dewatering that needs to be done to install the main.

Thomas Schultz lot owner on Watertown Rd was present and stated the $125,000 is more than what they originally thought. Unfortunately they would be unable to do a mound system due to disturbed land which came from digging. Without sewer lines, nothing can be done. He understood it was not ideal for neighbors on either side but, he wanted to come up with a solution.

Ms. Brown asked if the letters were sent certified mail to verify they were received and informed. Ms. Wagner stated they were not sent certified. Ms. Brown asked how much it would cost the City or property owners to get an actual number for the project. Ms. Wagner stated the City would have to design and bid it, which would run roughly $12,000 - $17,000. Ms. Brown stated she would be interested in making the investment to see how much this would cost the City and landowners in the area to get a better idea of what it would look like.

Mr. Kara was concerned about the potential costs to the property owners and nailing down the property owner who didn't respond.

Attorney Riffle stated the City typically does not go to bid unless we know we want to go through with the project. There is also a 10-10 ordinance for anyone who wants to front the money and eventually get reimbursed after hookup. Mr. Bergman stated reimbursement is only out ten years. Further discussion took place regarding the 10-10 ordinance and different options.

Mr. Bergman recommended resending the letter with more detail. Mayor Bierce recommended that Mr. Schultz write a letter or email to the other property owners.

A motion was made (B. Dziwulski) to ask Ms. Wagner to get a number from Mr. Schultz as to what the other two properties would be reduced to and send a certified letter to both property owners.

Attorney Riffle stated he was uncomfortable representing any private individuals' offers unless they were locked down contractually.

The motion was withdrawn.

6. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding a Certified Survey Map for the Pewaukee 16-94 South Proposed Industrial Development Located at N17 W25045 Bluemound Road (PWC 0948-985-003

& PWC 0945-989-001) in Order to Reconfigure Two Lots Into One Lot and an Outlot

Mr. Fuchs stated the CSM for the proposed industrial development was to create a lot, improvements and an outlot. The Plan Commission approved the plans at the September 17, 2020 meeting with a 3-2 vote and also recommended approval of the Certified Survey Map. The property is zoned and planned for industrial use and staff is recommending approval of the CSM.

Mr. Wamser questioned the site plan and the 40 to 50 garage and truck doors on Bluemound Road. He felt the residents would not like it and felt the constant truck traffic would cause a considerable amount of noise. Mr. Wamser stated a small berm with shrubs was not going to cut down on the noise. Mr. Wamser asked why it could not be rotated 180 degrees. The building is beautiful and looks nice from Highway 94 and 16, but if the building is flipped, the noise could go towards the freeway.

Mayor Bierce stated placement was discussed at the Plan Commission meeting.

Mr. Wamser stated all the trees have been leveled during this and other developments even though they were told not to.

Mr. Klein stated this is a CSM only and turning the building 180 degrees was not an option.

Mr. Bergman stated the agenda item only references the CSM.

Attorney Riffle stated the site plan and plan of operation has been approved. We are now working on the land division ordinance and the combination of two lots to accommodate the building. Attorney Riffle asked that the City focus on the reasons why the application should not be granted under the land division ordinance and not the site plan, because that is done.

Doug Kiser (N16W24980 Bluemound Road) stated the land use is different and has changed. There is no business plan for this project and no plan of operation because it is a spec building. He requested a traffic study and spoke with the Director of Public Works at the County who is looking into it. When it was mentioned that it has 32 docks it was stated that this is a distribution center, which could mean the access road may become a public street. Once it is bought or rented, if it meets the designation, it automatically gets approved.

Mr. Bergman stated the City has approved spec buildings before without knowing the tenants, which is why the City has zoning, permitted uses and conditional uses. He agreed with having a traffic study completed.

Further discussion took place regarding a traffic study and the permitted uses.

Mayor Bierce asked if the Plan Commission had a final say on everything but the CSM. Attorney Riffle stated the zoning was not an issue and per the Zoning Administrator it is zoned for the use, and Plan Commission approved the plan of operation and site plan. The only thing left is the land division request.

A motion was made and seconded (J. Wamser, B. Dziwulski) to table this item. Motion Passed: 5-For, 1-Against (B. Bergman).

7. Public Comment

Dom Ferrante with Briohn Builders stated the traffic study completed in 2016 was turned in and included the three buildings. The use and intensity is the same as it was presented.

8. Closed Session – You are hereby notified that the Common Council and staff of the City of Pewaukee will convene into closed session after all regular scheduled business has been concluded and upon motion duly made and seconded and acted upon by roll-call vote as required under §19.85(1)(a), Stats. The purpose of the closed session is for the following:

   - §19.85(1)(e): Deliberating or negotiating the purchasing of public properties, the investing of public funds, or conducting other specified public business, whenever competitive or bargaining reasons require a closed session specifically related to the contract with the Village of Pewaukee for Building Services.

   You are further notified that at the conclusion of the Closed Session, the Common Council may convene into open session pursuant to 19.85(2), Stats., for possible additional discussion and action concerning any matters discussed in closed session and for adjournment.

   A motion was made and seconded (B. Dziwulski, R. Grosch) to go into closed session. Motion Passed Via Roll Call Vote: 6-For, 0-Against.

   A motion was made and seconded (B. Dziwulski, J. Kara) to go back into open session at 8:27 p.m. Motion Passed: 6-For, 0-Against.

   A motion was made and seconded (B. Dziwulski, R. Grosch) to approve the Building Services agreement with the Village of Pewaukee, subject to the Village paying 35 percent of the annual software maintenance fees. Motion Passed: 6-For, 0-Against.

9. Adjournment

   A motion was made and seconded (B. Bergman, B. Dziwulski) to adjourn the meeting at 8:30 p.m. Motion Passed: 6-For, 0-Against.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kelly Tarczewski
Clerk/Treasurer