

1. **CALL TO ORDER.** The special meeting of the Village Board was called to order by President Luebke at 6:00 p.m. on Monday, December 18, 2006.
2. **ROLL CALL.** Present: Jerry Bollig, Phil Harms, Jerry Luebke, Hans Noeldner, Eric Poole and Steve Staton, with Jon Lourigan arriving a few minutes late. Also present: Village Administrator Mike Gracz, Police Chief Doug Pettit, Public Works Director Mark Below, Village Engineer Joe Eberle and Village Clerk Georgia Johnson.
3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES.**
 - a) Regular meeting 11/20/06. **Poole moved, second by Staton, to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of November 20, 2006.** It was noted item #7c) lists President Luebke as having called the public hearing to order and it should read Vice President Bollig (in President Luebke's absence). **Motion carried 7-0.** (Note: The change has been made 12/26/06/gj.)
 - b) Regular meeting 12/4/06. It was noted these minutes will be available for the January 8th meeting. [Lourigan arrived.]
4. **APPROVAL OF VOUCHERS.** Staton moved, second by Noeldner, to approve payment of vouchers for the Water and Sewer Utility Funds in the amount of \$35,849.46 per the list dated December 18, 2006. Roll call vote: Staton – yes; Luebke – yes; Bollig – yes; Noeldner – yes; Poole – yes; Lourigan – yes; Harms – yes. **Motion carried 7-0.**

Staton moved, second by Poole, to approve the payment of vouchers for the General Operating Fund in the amount of \$400,187.34 per the revised list dated December 18, 2006 as adjusted. It was noted the revised listing includes \$231,234.81 was added for the Alpine Business Park—TIF #2. Noeldner had questions about whether items on the attorney's billing could be charged back and what item #2255 was for. Gracz noted which items could be charged back and advised that #2255 was for purchase of the EMS Building. **Roll call vote: Staton – yes; Luebke – yes; Bollig – yes; Noeldner – yes; Poole – yes; Lourigan – yes; Harms – yes. Motion carried 7-0.**

5. **COMMUNITY INPUT.** Steve Zach, 330 E. Richards Road, a resident of Oregon for 36 years, came forward to speak regarding item #9c) on the agenda—"review of cost estimates for downtown concepts". Zach stated the issue of the downtown has come up at different times and it was his recollection that the issue was resolved in 2001/2002 when there was a planning process involved that led to a conceptual plan for Main Street and the downtown. Now new concepts for this area have been introduced and he stated he had attended one of the listening sessions. A large part of the discussion at the session centered around pedestrian safety and vehicular safety—and those are the same concepts that have been talked about over the years. Zach stated he felt the County's plan that was drafted does address those concerns. He stated the plan provides for medians and crosswalks plus light signaling which would regulate the traffic and pedestrian flow there. Zach stated he does not see the need to move the road at considerable taxpayer expense and at the risk of losing some County funding for the purposes of establishing the same things that the County plan will. Moving that road may give a little more room to increase the green space for the park, but Zach stated he did not think there has been any proven study or benefit by adding green space to the business downtown. If the idea of adding more green space as a community gathering area, Zach stated the Village has purchased a large tract of land to the west of Lerner Park—and money should be spent there to develop those areas. With respect to parking, whatever is done with respect to that intersection isn't going to resolve the parking situation. There has been a suggestion to use angle parking, but Zach stated going angle parking on Janesville Street or Main Street will exacerbate the already existing traffic concerns that are now present. In sum, Zach asked the Board to move ahead with the County plan forthwith and not incur additional expense that would be present if the road were to be moved. He thanked the Board for their time.

6. **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS.** Noeldner requested (as a follow up to the Fire/EMS Commission meeting) to add discussion of hiring a consultant to study the organizational structure of the Commission and if the Board supports the idea of doing a study to advise what types of things the study should cover. The Fire/EMS Commission would like to have a better idea of the scope and specifics on the study. Lourigan stated this was a budgeted item and had a question about why it was being requested to hold off on this. Lourigan went on to say that the item was discussed at the Commission meeting tonight and it was tabled because it had not yet been determined what to put in the study. There was some discussion including the regionalization study that is being conducted, the cost of the consultant, what was going to be included in the study and so forth.

7. **PUBLIC APPEARANCES AND PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- a) Recommendation regarding Street Tree Removal and Cost Reimbursement and Review of Terrace Tree Policy from November 27th Public Works Meeting. Luebke referred to the staff recommendation indicating that in the future the Village becomes responsible for the removal of terrace trees and that property owners be responsible for maintaining the terrace trees. **Staton moved to approve the recommendation as presented by Village staff (see attachment 7(a)). Second by Bollig.** Harms stated this came through the Public Works Committee and the recommendation presented tonight was not presented at that meeting. Gracz advised that is true—it is not consistent with the Committee’s recommendation. Although it was not brought up at the Committee meeting, staff has since discussed it at length and feel that the Village should be responsible for removing diseased and damaged trees and that property owners be responsible for maintaining. This is more consistent with what other communities do. There was some discussion. It was noted the Village would have to update the ordinance. Discussion continued. Noeldner noted that one of the basic problems with the trees on N. Main Street was the way Alliant Energy pruned the trees because it took them way out of balance. Noeldner asked if that could be addressed in the Village’s ordinance? There was further discussion. Below stated the existing street tree ordinance allows for trees that are slow growing so pruning should not be a problem in the future. Following discussion, the Clerk read the staff recommendations: (1) Do not require that John and Jan Bonsett-Veal reimburse the Village for the tree removal; (2) Pay for the terrace trees that were removed by Traska and Tarkenton. Both would have to provide appropriate documentation for the payment; (3) Take the Traska and Tarkenton reimbursement from the contingency fund; (4) The Village becomes responsible for future removal of terrace trees, but property owners would continue to be responsible for maintaining terrace trees; and (5) The Village Board direct staff to prepare the necessary ordinance to accomplish #4 and have the ordinance reviewed by the Public Works Committee. **Roll call vote: Staton – yes; Luebke – yes; Bollig – yes; Noeldner – yes; Poole – yes; Lourigan – yes; Harms – yes. Motion carried 7-0.**

It was agreed to take certain items out of order to accommodate the audience. For ease in reading, items appear the same as they appear on the agenda.

8. **PROCLAMATIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS.**

- a) Discussion of 2006 Tax Bills.
 - 1) December 21st 7:00 p.m. Public Forum at Oregon Town Hall. Gracz stated residents were mailed a letter regarding the tax error from Finance Director Hoeft along with a notice of the public forum at the Oregon Town Hall. A notice will be posted to allow for a quorum of the Board should any of the Board be interested in attending.
 - 2) State Senators and State Representatives’ Efforts to Address Tax Bill Error. Gracz referred to the email from State Representative Brett Davis’ office wherein he is attempting to set up an interest free loan. Gracz publicly thanked the Village’s State Legislators—Brett Davis, Gary Hebl, Jon Erpenbach and Mark Miller—they have been in contact with the DOR, the Governor’s Office and have really worked on this error to the point of holding the public forum. Luebke noted the tax keying error will affect Village residents next year and will be

brought up periodically throughout the year to keep taxpayers informed of the impact on next year's tax bill.

- 3) Re-Issuing of Escrow Checks Due to Errors—First American Tax Service. Gracz noted this is for informational purposes only. The Finance Director wanted taxpayers to be aware that First American Tax Service has mailed out approximately 1000 checks that were made out to Dane County rather than the municipality and the checks will have to be re-issued.
- 4) President Luebke and Village Board's Expression of Appreciation for Senior Center's Assistance on Processing Tax Bills and Flyers. Luebke noted the tax bills were sent out as well as the flyers and the Senior Center came forward with volunteers to stuff the envelopes for the Village. Luebke commended the volunteers for their assistance and publicly thanked each one of the volunteers by name. It was noted that due to the tax keying error the Village's tax bill preparation was delayed which put a lot of pressure on getting the tax bills out once they were received from the County. As well, a notice of the taxing error had to be sent out in conjunction with the tax bills. Without the Senior Center volunteers the mailing would have been delayed even more.

It was noted that Oregon taxpayers can mail in their taxes in the envelope provided with the tax bills. Payment can be dropped off in the Village's drop box located in the Waterman Square parking lot. It must be postmarked by December 31st to be credited in 2006. The Village Hall is open 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., closing at noon on December 22nd, and closed Monday, the 25th of December, and Monday, January 1st.

9. **COMMUNICATION AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS.**

- a) Request from Randy Way to have Village Attorney Provide Legal Opinion regarding Incompatibility of Positions. Luebke referred to Randy Way's letter and email regarding getting the Village Attorney's opinion as to his status as a volunteer firefighter and running for office here in the Village. There was some discussion. It was noted Mr. Way will be paying for the legal opinion himself. Mr. Way stated he is looking to get the Village Attorney's opinion on this issue in case it would become an issue. This would be an independent opinion and a legal opinion for Mr. Way individually. There was further discussion. Following discussion, Luebke stated he felt it was a wise move on Mr. Way's part and that the attorney, the Village Administrator and Mr. Way can work out the details. **Staton then moved that the Village Board accept the legal opinion provided by the Village Attorney regarding this issue. Second by Bollig. Motion carried 7-0.**

Luebke indicated items b) and c) would be considered together and called on Noeldner and/or Lourigan to address the matter. Lourigan asked the Chamber Director to talk about the survey results.

- b) Review of Chamber of Commerce's Downtown Survey Results. Linda Pollock, Chamber of Commerce Director, noted the results contain a lot of information and noted that the calculations were done two different ways. The first way is based on the total received—some people did not rank the survey according to directions (from 1 to 10)—for example, some people may have thought there were three items that were priority and they numbered all three items with "number one" and then did not complete the rest of the survey. Those results were tallied separately. Then the second way it was tallied includes those surveys that marked the items correctly—1 to 10. Pollock went over the survey results as listed on page 12 of the survey. The survey results will be placed on the Chamber's website @ www.oregon.wi.com or one can contact the Chamber office to obtain a copy of the results. Pollock said if there was anything else the Board would like done with the results to let her know. Noeldner and Lourigan both thanked Pollock for the time and effort she put into getting the results together. It was noted there is a lot of information to digest and to review. Pollock noted that she has met with business owners downtown and they are looking at working up some different type of parking—that seems to be the #1 choice of business owners.

Plan F is the concept plan the business owners preferred—which specifically deals with parking issues. Plan A Modified—which has the larger green space—is the one residents seem to like. Pollock stated that putting in a stop light in the downtown will be good testing ground for downtown residents to see if it does address pedestrian safety. Staton asked if the Chamber could provide information on the importance of parking directly in front of businesses, how far will people walk to do their shopping and how that translates to a small downtown—that would help when deciding on the parking. Discussion followed. Staton stated he did not think they could get enough green space to make a difference and felt a different location downtown should be looked into. There was further discussion. When asked what her personal preference was, Pollock stated Plan A Modified. Discussion continued.

- c) Review of Cost Estimates for Downtown Concepts. Lourigan noted the cost estimates came in lower than previously and thanked the Ruckert-Mielke firm for the revised estimates, and for working with the rough concepts they had to work with. It was estimated at \$427,000 without contingency for Plan A and a contingency at \$640,000. Lourigan noted that none of the concepts included the utilities. Gracz noted that the 2001 Main Street plan estimated utility work at \$485,000. The only thing looked at for these cost estimates was surface, curb & gutter and so forth—not putting in different types of pavement or utilities or anything. The Village will have to pay the total cost of the utilities. There was some discussion. It was reiterated that the County will only will only pay for what is in the current right-of-way—the 22 center feet and will help pay for traffic signals if S. Main Street is turned back into a two-way road. There was considerable discussion regarding the concept plans presented, which plan was preferred, the County’s involvement, the need to address pedestrian safety and parking issues and so forth. The question is where to go from here—does the Board want to take this to referendum or what. Discussion continued. Joe Eberle of Ruckert-Mielke referred to his memo on downtown redevelopment costs dated December 14th and noted as stated in the memo the estimates provide little value for a number of reasons—particularly in that there are so many unknowns at this time. Eberle stated there are so many variables including more than just filling out the 22 feet of street, that 22 feet of street has to fit with parking, then you have to deal with drainage, utilities, where is the right-of-way, etc. Without looking at all of these issues and taking them into account, you’re dealing with too many unknowns. It is the engineers’ recommendation that if the Village wants to proceed, it needs to pick one of the options and take it from there. There’s still a lot more work to be done before estimates can be valid. Discussion continued. It was noted that the Village does need to move forward with this no matter which plan is chosen.

Luebke recognized Steve Newton, 146 S. Main Street, and invited him to speak to the issue. Newton stated his property is greatly affected by the Village’s decision. If the Village does not chose the County’s plan, the question is does the Village have to take care of the entire street—which would be an additional expense that wasn’t discussed. There was further discussion. Lourigan stated that although he indicated he preferred Plan A previously, he realizes none of the plans are perfect and he does not care which plan is picked. Lourigan noted that Staton had suggested another public forum in January and that he favored going in that direction. Harms stated the downtown business owners are concerned about their bottom lines such as if they lose a customer because the exposure is not there—the Village needs to listen to their needs. Luebke stated they need to move forward, if it is going to go to referendum it needs to be decided by February 15th, and he believes going with the County will address the traffic and pedestrian problems and it is going to be the cheapest—that makes it the plan to go with in his opinion. Luebke asked if the Board wanted to spend the \$15,000, get the estimates for a particular plan—say Plan A—and see what it costs? Noeldner favored that. Poole said or should we take the \$15,000 and have the engineer do Plan F—the plan the business owners want? There was further discussion. Luebke asked what Lourigan and Noeldner preferred? Noeldner stated he preferred Plan A. Poole expressed concerns with doing another study when a study was done back in 2001. Discussion continued. When asked what he would do, Harms stated if you go with Plan A

Modified—which does have merit—you will lose the public parking lot and the 13 stalls on S. Main Street—so where is the customer going to park—that’s a big concern. Discussion continued. It was agreed that a decision needs to be made whether to make Main Street a two-way street again.

Jeff Groenier, 830 S. Main Street, spoke to the issue stating the Village needs to decide on a plan and that plan has to be something that will work. He stated he believes the Village needs to send it to Slavney, to the Planning Board, etc., to get it designed appropriately, so we can move forward—spend the \$15,000 to do the study. Groenier stated he believes the Village would be better off taking the \$1M and use it for land acquisition for more parking downtown, get more buildings downtown and redevelop that way. The Village could buy Tri-County’s property for that \$1M and then create parking lots in the downtown that are needed. Groenier said he feels it is foolish money spent after foolish money.

Harms stated the ½ acre lot he has downtown could be purchased by the Village for a parking lot. In order for the downtown to survive, more parking is needed and he stated he was tired of hearing the complaints about it. He stated they have a stall—they bought that space 7 years ago—because we wanted our own off-street parking but the Village can buy it—he stated he’s tired of fighting about it. Discussion continued. When asked what his preferred plan was, Harms stated Plan A Modified if there was enough parking.

Luebke requested a motion on the table to spend \$15,000.00 to go forward with Plan A. **Noeldner moved to spend \$15,000.00 to do an engineering valuation on Plan A as proposed by Ruckert-Mielke. [1/8/2007 amendment.] Motion failed for lack of second.** There was further discussion. Gracz stated we need to find out whether Ruckert-Mielke can do it for that amount. Noeldner stated we need to square up whether the County is actually going to come in and do it or not. There was discussion regarding what the \$15,000.00 would get the Village. Discussion continued. Gracz stated the Village needs to have it clarified exactly what Ruckert-Mielke study is going to do. Eberle stated there are a number of issues that still need to be resolved before they can do this and to look at doing some realistically in February a proposal needs to be put together. Eberle stated the sooner the better to get started on doing something. This is not something that will occur in a few days—this is going to take a lot of work. Discussion continued. It was determined that Eberle would meet with Gracz and Below tomorrow (19th) at 11:00 a.m. A cost estimate would be available for the first or second Board meeting in January.

Bollig asked to step back for a second noting that the Village is going to go through a lot of cost and a lot of work but does not understand where this is going—what is wrong with the Highway Department’s plan as presented? Are we not sure of the cost? Is it not a sure thing? Below said he was of the belief that everything has been quantified by the County. Bollig noted that everything on the survey has been addressed in the County’s plan—it slows traffic, it’s safe for pedestrian traffic, S. Main Street going 2-ways will be liked by some and not by others—what is wrong with the plan? Staton stated he could live with the plan right now. Bollig stated Lourigan said he liked them all—is that still true? Lourigan stated they are all fine. Bollig asked Harms if there was anything wrong with the County’s plan? Harms stated status quo stays the same—if you want to stay with the status quo, it’s fine. Bollig said picture it with 4 traffic lights, the median, pedestrian lights, etc., and it is a known commodity. Bollig stated it seems to him they would be wasting a lot of time and money. Discussion continued. Lourigan stated whatever direction we go, we need to incorporate the streetscape as part of the project and we have kind of missed the point on that. Bollig asked if there was any reason the Village would be sorry if it went with the County plan? Harms asked if we went with the County plan and give up the Village parking lot (turning it into green space), then we need to find parking someplace else. That would make the County plan work with everybody meeting in the middle. Discussion continued around the County plan, what was wrong with the County plan, making the County plan work, whether it included the acquisition

of the bank property, the need to find additional parking downtown to make up for the 30 some stalls lost and so forth.

With apologies to both Noeldner and Lourigan for all their hard work on the downtown concepts, **Bollig moved to accept the County Plan in that it addresses all the issues, pedestrian safety, calming of traffic, and to pursue the idea of making that parking lot into green space if need be and actually purchasing more parking downtown—which needs to be a priority with the County Plan. Second by Poole.** Staton stated he supports that especially with the adding on to look at the plaza area—someplace else where we can get parking—noting that all the issues indicated on the survey will be met over a period of time. There was some discussion. **Roll call vote: Staton – yes; Luebke – yes; Bollig – yes; Noeldner – no; Poole – yes; Lourigan—sure, why not; Harms – yes. Motion carried as follows: 5 ayes, 1 nay, and 2 sure, why not. [1/8/07 amendment – change Lourigan’s vote to an abstention and change motion results to 5 ayes, 1 nay and 1 abstention.]**

- d) Discussion Regarding Changing Meeting Dates in January. Gracz noted that the meeting dates in January are being moved forward by one week. The Board needs to decide whether or not it wants another public forum on the downtown. Staton said the survey addressed the concerns and thus he felt no need to have the additional public forum. Lourigan said maybe Slavney should be contacted for an opinion and help with a design. Board members tended to agree. Gracz will check to see if Slavney is available for the Public Works meeting in January. Questions should be forwarded to Gracz for forwarding to Slavney.
- e) Resolution #06-24, Stop Signs and Street Opening Cusick Parkway. **Staton moved, second by Poole, to adopt Resolution #06-14, for the stop signs and street opening of Cusick Parkway. Motion carried 7-0.**
- f) Discussion of Black Box Voting Open Records Request. This is for informational purposes. Gracz noted that although the State Elections Board opinion was not to respond to the “Black Box Voting” open records request, the Village’s Attorney feels the Clerk should respond and she will be working on that.
- g) Recommend that CGC Receive Netherwood Road Soil Boring Testing. It was noted two bids came in for the soil borings on West Netherwood Street. **Poole moved to accept the low bid of CGC, Inc. in an amount not to exceed of \$2,625.00. Second by Staton.** There was discussion regarding whether the monies could be taken out of TIF monies. **Motion carried 7-0.**
- h) Consideration of Appointing Daniel Olson to Park Board. Luebke noted his recommendation to appoint Daniel Olson to the Park Board. **Staton moved, second by Noeldner, to approve the appointment of Daniel Olson to fill the vacancy on the Park Board. Motion carried 7-0.**
- i) Adoption of 2007 Fee Schedule. **Bollig moved to adopt Resolution #06-25, the Village’s fee schedule for 2007. Second by Noeldner.** Bollig went over the changes as listed on the Summary Sheet attached. There was some discussion regarding the use of the Community Room and looking at the cost of using the Community Room. It was noted the Community Room is utilized as a break/lunch room for Village staff. It is available for use otherwise. It was determined to take this to the Finance Committee. **Motion carried 7-0.**
- j) Adoption of 2007 Wage Schedule. **Bollig moved to adopt the 2007 Wage Schedule as presented. Second by Poole.** It was noted the wage schedule increases by 4% all the non-represented positions and the Clerk’s salary has been referred to Personnel. Motion carried 7-0.

- k) Increase Advance to TIF #3. **Bollig moved, second by Noeldner, to increase the advance from \$45,000 to \$50,000 to cover 2005 and 2006 expenses.** The advance will be paid back when the downtown intersection is done. **Motion carried 7-0.**
 - l) Disposal of Meters and Transponders. **Bollig moved, second by Lourigan, to dispose of the junk meters and transponders as listed. Motion carried 7-0.**
 - m) Disposal of Equipment and Computers. **Bollig moved to dispose of the used equipment for disposal per the attached listing. Second by Noeldner.** It was noted most of the stuff is just junk. **Motion carried 7-0.**
 - n) Set Interest Rate on Advances for 2006. **Bollig moved to set the interest rate for advances at 5.0% for 2007. Second by Noeldner.** This is the interest rate that would be used between funds. **Motion carried 7-0.**
 - o) Stafford 2007 Rates. Referred to Finance Committee meeting in January.
 - p) Reminder Regarding Submitting Election Forms. Johnson reminded incumbents to file the Notification of Non-Candidacy before 5:00 on Friday, December 22nd. She noted that Village Hall closes at noon on Friday, but the Administrator has offered to make himself available should any one of the incumbents want to meet with him to file the Notification before 5:00 p.m. The deadline for filing nomination papers is 5:00 p.m., January 2nd, for anyone interested in running for office.
 - q) Status of Village's Refuse/Recycling Program (per Trustees Noeldner & Lourigan). Referred to the January Finance Committee meeting—possibly with a public forum in February.
 - r) Ordinance #06-15, Changing the Effective Date of the New Zoning Code. Gracz stated the Board adopted the new Zoning Code (Chapter 17) with an effective date of January 1st, however the official map has to be adopted in conjunction with the zoning code and that is not ready for adoption yet. Adoption of Ordinance #06-14 allows for an effective date following adoption of the new zoning map. **Staton moved to accept the first reading, waive the second, and adopt Ordinance #06-15, changing the effective date of the new Zoning Code to be upon adoption of a new zoning map. Second by Poole. Motion carried 7-0.**
10. **REPORT OF COMMITTEES.**
- a) Fire/EMS Commission Update.
 - 1) Letter from Quad Town Chairs Regarding Negotiations with City of Stoughton. For informational purposes.
 - 2) Letter from Town of Oregon Regarding Village's Rescinding Withdrawal Letter. For informational purposes.
 - 3) December 12th Joint Board Meeting. Gracz stated this is in conjunction with the study regarding organizational structure of Fire/EMS Commission.
 - 4) December 13th Commission Meeting. Gracz stated he needs to get more information regarding this and advised he would be talking to Chief Bloom regarding it.
 - 5) November 8th Minutes. For informational purposes.
 - b) Planning Commission 12/7/06.
 - 1) Recommendation Regarding Conceptual Layout of the Proposed Peterson Property—Church Development Partners. Jesse Ishikawa, the representative for Church Development Partners,

stated they have been working with staff to come up with a concept plan that would be acceptable before going into the annexation process. If the concept plan is approved they will then proceed with annexation right away. Ishikawa indicated the configuration before the Board calls for 280 dwelling units—196 of which are single family detached dwellings and 84 are multi-family with a 7 acre parcel to be used for commercial/institutional uses which would be the site for the Community of Life Church. The overall density on the residential component is 7 dwelling units per acre, 70% of the units would be detached single family residential, 30% multi-family—no duplexes or townhouses. Ishikawa indicated they would be willing to answer any questions the Board might have. **Staton moved, based on the Planning Commission’s recommendation, that the Village Board approve the concept plan for the Church Development Partners with the street layout as proposed by staff. Second by Poole.** It was noted this property is located west of the Oregon Parks Neighborhood between Hwy. CC and Netherwood. There was some discussion including minimum square footage on a typical unit—1,000 up to 3,200 sq. ft., whether there would be deed restrictions, the fact that new urbanism has been addressed and the development would offer a new choice for residents who want to live in Oregon. Staton read from Planner Slavney’s email comments: “the proposal for the Peterson parcel provide a strong “skeleton” for new urbanism. The covenants will be the most important factor—controlling setbacks, requiring porches, preventing snout houses and requiring good streetscaping and front yard landscaping—those are the critical items”. Harms asked if the lots would be available to the general public first or would contractors have first call on these. Ishikawa stated the plan in this type of development is to set aside land for the church and pay for the purchase of the land out of developing the surrounding area. The Church Development Partners do not act as developers themselves—they would probably look for a developer that would market the plan—so it would be up to the developer whether lots were made available to the general public. Keith West of Coldwell Banker spoke to the question on behalf of the Partners. A decision has not been made on a developer at this time. There was discussion. It was noted there is still a lot left to be done including sizing the detention ponds, getting the right-of-ways established, the traffic analysis, no roundabout is planned, and so forth. Discussion continued. Noeldner stated he does not feel it is wise to annex property to the west. He stated the Comprehensive Plan (which was unanimously approved by the Planning Commission and the Village Board) listed as a goal—to encourage neighborhood designs and support a range of transportation choices and minimize absolute reliance on the automobile”. Lourigan stated the bike trail is a long term goal and suggested setting aside some frontage for future bike lanes. Luebke stated he likes the way they worked at moving Bergamont around. Bollig stated he likes what he has seen and heard tonight and asked if there were any like developments that the Board could drive by and take a look at. Discussion continued. **Roll call vote: Staton – yes; Luebke – yes; Bollig – yes; Noeldner – no; Poole – yes; Lourigan – yes; Harms – yes. Motion carried 6-1, with Noeldner opposed.** It was noted it will be a minimum of a couple of years before any construction begins—probably Spring of 2008.

- 2) Recommendation Regarding Revised Site Plan for 1140 Park Street. Staton noted this has been tabled.
- 3) Review and Recommendation of the Preliminary CSM at 4408 Rutland Dunn Townline Road in the Town of Dunn. **Staton moved to recommend the Village Board not oppose the Preliminary Certified Survey Map at 4408 Rutland Dunn Townline Road. Second by Poole.** Below stated this will divide the house from the rest of the property and the Department of Natural Resources will be purchasing it for conservancy purposes. **Motion carried 7-0.**
- 4) Proposal to Create an Ordinance to Ban Outdoor Solid Fuel and Heating Units (refer to Personnel, Public Safety and Protection). Staton noted this has been referred to Personnel,

Public Safety & Protection Committee. Noeldner felt the ordinance should address the pollution level—not just banning them outright. There was some discussion.

- c) Special Finance Committee 12/18/06.
- 1) Consideration of Ordering Computer Exchange Server. **Bollig moved to accept the Small Business Server proposal from Computer Magic, Inc. inclusive of the spam filtering system in an amount not to exceed \$16,500.00. Second by Poole.** Bollig noted this is a 2007 budgeted expense and Computer Magic will be installing it in the computer room at the Police Department and it will tie into the rest of the system. **Motion carried 7-0.**
 - 2) Consideration of YMCA/Youth Center's Request to Carryover 2006 Funding to 2007. **Bollig moved to carry over the Youth Center Community Contributions in the amount of \$6,000 from the 2006 budget to the 2007 budget as requested. Second by Poole.** This allows the funds to be carried over into 2007 to be used in 2007. It was noted this has nothing to do with rental payments. **Motion carried 7-0.**
 - 3) Consideration of Chamber Lease for 2007. **Bollig moved, second by Staton, to accept the 2007 Lease Agreement with the Chamber of Commerce as presented.** There was some discussion. **Motion carried 7-0.**
 - 4) Wolfe Street Special Assessments. **Bollig moved to authorize staff to notify Wolfe Street property owners that deferred special assessments are due and payable in 2007 and that they need to connect to the Village system. Second by Poole.** There was no gravity sewer in when those buildings were put in and now that it is in place, the property owners have to hook up to Village sewer and pay the deferred specials. **Motion carried 7-0.**
 - 5) 2006 Budget Transfer #6. **Bollig moved to approve budget transfer #6. Second by Poole.** This is the year end adjustments necessary and for housekeeping purposes. **Motion carried 7-0.**

11. UNFINISHED BUSINESS.

- a) Ordinance #06-14, Rezoning Property at 200 N. Main Street (known as the Red Brick Property) from R-1 to PUD. **Bollig moved, second by Lourigan, to accept the first reading, waive the second, and adopt Ordinance #06-14, rezoning the property at 200 N. Main Street. Motion carried 7-0.**

8. ADJOURNMENT. The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m. on motion by Lourigan, second by Bollig
Motion carried 7-0.

Submitted by,
Georgia Johnson,
Village Clerk