



MINUTES - SHOREWOOD BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Committee of the Whole
June 13, 2018

DRAFT

Call to Order

President Rozek called the meeting of the Committee of the Whole to order at 6:09 p.m. in the Village Center.

Statement of Public Notice

Clerk Bruckman stated that the meeting had been posted and noticed according to law.

Roll Call

President Rozek called the roll. Present: Trustees Davida Amenta, Tammy Bockhorst, Jessica Carpenter, Michael Maher, Ann McKaig, Wesley Warren.

Others Present: Village Manager Rebecca Ewald, Assistant Village Manager Tyler Burkart, Finance Director /Treasurer Mark Emanuelson, Clerk Sara Bruckman, Deputy Clerk/Customer Service Director Diane DeWindt-Hall, Director of Planning and Development Bart Griepentrog, Director of Public Works Leeann Butschlick, Assistant Director of Public Works Joel Kolste, Police Chief Peter Nimmer, Senior Resource Director Elizabeth Price, Library Director Rachel Collins

1. Introduction and Overview of Prioritization from facilitator, Lindsay Schmit
President Rozek provided opening remarks and reiterated there will not be a determine outcome at this meeting.

Ms. Ewald provided background on the intention of the annual vision planning process. Back in 2015 the Village approved a Vision Plan that was to last 10 years, with a vision statement about a half a page. The statement is too long did not identify strategy, priorities or goals; without this there is no direction and consensus about what do to. Now the Village has a Long Range Financial Plan and a Vision Plan with no priorities on how to move forward. Ms. Ewald reminded the Board, that people change over time and there has to be a constant road map in order to respond to changes and directives at a local, state, federal level we do not control. There has not been a formal process for the Board and committees can hear each other. Ms. Ewald reiterated due to this organization being stressed that is essential that some prioritization comes out of this process.

Lindsay Schmit introduced herself and provided an overview of the prioritization process. Tonight's purpose is to engage in understanding and organizing all the initiatives that have been submitted. She will facilitate to chart and guide which will allow for collaboration and participation for the Board as a whole. The focus is informational and provide an opportunity to gain clarification from the staff and committees. Ms. Schmit explained on the meeting on June 18, the focus will be for the Village Board to have open dialog about their initiatives only. The June 25 meeting will look at how the Board may intend to prioritize the initiatives with a potential meeting for July 2 to finish the process.

There were concerns raised from Board members about all the initiatives being grouped. Ms. Schmit explained this will take place on the June 18 Meeting.

2. Clarification Question and Answer of each Citizen Committees, Department Heads, and Village Board Initiatives. A list of parking items was started for future meeting purposes.

a. **Village Board** – The Village Board will have an opportunity at the June 18 COW meeting to discuss only their initiatives.

b. **Clerk/Customer Service**

1. Question and Answer

- a) The E-Poll books would replace a very manual election process. The Village would purchase a tablet-like device from the Wisconsin Election Commission.
- b) There was discussion that the parking app may be part of looking at parking in the Village as a whole. Board members expressed their concern at the cost and why there was such a variance. The difference was dependent on working with our current vendor or another vendor and the scope of the project.
- c) The express Vote produces a paper ballot that is fed into the tabulating machine. This would also reduce the potential for voter error during in-person voting.
- d) The location of the conversation corner would be on the east side of the Customer Service desk.
- e) The Relocation of the Lake Bluff Polling Place could there be other alternatives?

2. Follow-up question for the Clerk. Discussion with the Village of Shorewood School District about polling place alternatives.

c. **Community Development Authority (CDA)**

1. Question and Answer

- a) Review of the CDA tool kit initiative was not specific to only housing, but may include housing enhancements if gaps are determined.
- b) The TID initiative did not contemplate the Village Board's involvement in the process, but could include the Village Board in the process to ensure the CDA is developing a product that the Village Board supports.
- c) The TID initiative did not specifically outline whether or not a policy would be developed; however, it could include policy development within the outline of the initiative if recommended by the CDA and Village Board.

2. There were no follow-up items requested.

d. **Conservation Committee**

1. Question and Answer

- a) There was discussion about how the waste reduction pilot would be executed. Mr. Liberatore confirmed the pilot would operate similar to the organics collection pilot and participants would be incentivized with a new smaller cart.
- b) Mr. Liberatore was asked to clarify the next steps with making the organics collection program permanent and when data on the first year would be shared. A presentation will be given to the Board in the near future. The Board will need to give clarification on whether this becomes a permanent program. If so, an RFP would be issued prior to entering into a service agreement with a provider.

- c) There was discussion about the availability of space on public buildings for solar panels and other renewable energy enhancements, including the Police building.
- d) It was clarified that the overall review of the Neighborhood Loan Program would incorporate the Conservation Committee's request for renewable energy projects.

2. There were no follow-up items.

e. Department of Public Works

1. Question and Answer

- a) There was clarification on which of the DPW initiatives were not addressed in the long range financial plan. Answer: TMDL Stormwater Management Plan, Lead Service program review, CSA Downspout Disconnection program and DPW architectural review.
- b) Clarification on regarding availability of financial assistance for downspout disconnection. That would be considered in the development of the program.
- c) Lead service replacement program the current program was developed with Health Department this is a policy decision the Board should come to some consensus.

2. Follow-up items for the Public Works Director

- a) What is the penalty for not complying with PSC regulations related to water meter replacement cycles?

f. Design Review Board

1. Question and Answer

- a) Staff was asked whether or not the proposed Residential Design Guidelines were in fact guidelines or something that could be written into the code as requirements. It was staff's intent for these to be adopted as guidelines. Staff was asked and provided that the current draft is approximately 75% along the way.
- b) In terms of expanded scope of residential review, staff noted that the intention would be to expand review practices into visible changes to residential properties that are not currently within their jurisdiction, such as window replacement.

2. There were no follow-up items requested.

g. Elder Services Advisory Board and Senior Resources

1. Question and Answer

- a) Could Complete Streets provide an age friendly plan for the Village.

2. Follow-up items for the Senior Resource Director

- a) If the Village rolls the complete streets in with a bigger plan for transportation would that jeopardize the Benjamin Fund?

h. Finance Department

1. Question and Answer

- a) GIS enhancements would be used for asset management purposes. It would also enhance system wide GIS information. Water and Sewer System elements would be updated to reflect replacement year and cost information, if done in past 10-15 years, year of re-lining for sewer segments, and some common geo-reference data that could be used to correlate to locations or with road segments where applicable. This would enhance the information available to the Village's for long term planning and management purposes that are not dependent of file cabinet records or institutional knowledge.
- b) Special Assessment software would allow the Village to track and share multi-year special assessment data between departments in a secured database. Applicable to finance, customer service, and other areas who may need access to this information for public records or disclosure during real estate transactions. Prospective projects currently identified that could result in the need to track this information are: Sidewalk replacement, Alley reconstruction, Lead lateral replacement assistant programs.

2. There were no follow-up items requested.

i. **Marketing and Communications** – Will be placed on the agenda for June 18

j. **Municipal Court**

1. Question and Answer – none.
2. Following questions for Court Clerk & Judge (it was noted that the Police Chief should respond with the same information for the DUNCAN initiative proposed)
 - a) What are the total amount of fines levied in 2017?
 - b) What is the total amount of fines collected in 2017?
 - c) How much more revenue is forecasted if the software solution for the initiative would be implemented by the court?

k. **Parks Commission**

1. Question and Answer
 - a) There was an inquiry on how the permit process for Atwater Beach relates to the permit request for the surf shop to use Atwater Beach last summer. Mr. Burkart clarified that the request to review the permit process is in response to that previous request. Ms. Eckman indicated the Parks Commission will be reviewing and recommending what type of vendor services would be allowed at the beach. Mr. Burkart confirmed their recommendation and a RFP would be brought to the Board for consideration.
 - b) The Board clarified with staff and Ms. Eckman that the formal canoe launch was not built this year and the land was only regraded for boats and canoes to get to the river.

- c) It was asked if the exploration of natural playscape and layout at Triangle Park will incorporate the resident feedback received when discussed at an earlier Parks Commission. Ms. Eckman confirmed the feedback will be incorporated and community members would be able to weigh in on the priority if the Commission proceeds.

2. There were no follow-up items requested.

I. Plan Commission

1. Question and Answer

- a) The difference between the “Zoning Map Review” initiative and the “Research/revise Zoning code relative to site design standards” was discussed. The Zoning Map Review specifically related to how parcels are zoned on the official map and whether or not that zoning should be changed, for example E. Capitol Dr. The “Research/revise Zoning code relative to site design standards” initiative would look at changing specific requirements within particular zones.
- b) It was discussed that the Research/revise Off-street Parking Requirements” was specific to commercial business occupancy requirements, with a likely goal of reducing the amount required by current code.
- c) In relation to the Historic Properties and Districts initiative, it was noted that the goal would be to provide access to incentives to maintain historic properties, such as State or Federal tax credits, as opposed to placing strict limitations on historic properties.

2. Follow-up questions requested for Planning & Development Director

- a) Staff was asked to follow-up with information as to any “penalty” for not updating its Comprehensive Plan in a timely manner.
 - 1. The Department of Administration provided that there is no penalty (such as a fine) written into the Comprehensive Planning Statute (66.1001) for not updating a comprehensive plan no less than every 10 years; however, there is a consistency requirement which states that if a local government enacts new or amends existing zoning, subdivision, official mapping ordinances or several other areas that they must be consistent with a comprehensive plan. It should be assumed that for a Comprehensive Plan to be valid, it must be updated within 10 years.

m. Planning and Development

1. Question and Answer

- a) The Board asked for a potential scope in relation to modifying the Neighborhood Home Loan Program and whether or not existing funds remained. Within the meeting, staff noted that funds were currently available and are being repaid, and subsequently is providing that approximately \$200,000 is on-hand for additional loans. Scope changes could include modifications or elimination of the duplex conversion and down-payment assistance programs, administrative modifications and working with other committees on additional housing improvements, such as energy efficiency and senior-friendly upgrades.

- b) Staff was asked to provide some greater clarity on what a Complete Streets Policy could include, and staff noted that Complete Streets are streets designed for all users, including motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians of all ages. This initiative would devise a policy that would provide multiple stakeholders an opportunity to weigh-in on design, prior to implementation.
- c) Staff was asked to confirm if the proposed annual code review initiative was the same/similar as the Clerk's initiative to re-codify the entire code. Staff indicated that this request would be for an annual review timeframe to implement suggested changes, such as fencing updates, while the Clerks' represented a more extensive once every 10 year look.

2. Follow-up questions requested for Planning & Development Director.

- a) While not specifically requested, there were multiple questions on Complete Streets throughout the evening, so this [link](#) from Smart Growth America is being provided for more detailed information.

n. Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Committee

1. Question and Answer

- a) There was a discussion centered around conducting a comprehensive transportation study. This study would incorporate several of the committee's initiatives. Mr. Peaslee was in attendance to confirm this approach works for the committee and they would like the opportunity to provide their recommendations and perspective in the study.
- b) Members of the Board inquired about terms such as quiet streets and bike boulevards. Mr. Griepentrog mentioned bike boulevards are on streets that provide a safe avenue for bicycles while using paint, speed humps or bumps, curbs and other techniques to make motorists more aware of bicycles. Quiet streets are a similar concept and uses marketing to encourage bicycles and pedestrian to use the street while encouraging vehicles to either travel slowly or use other streets. The City of Milwaukee Riverwest neighborhood will be having a bike boulevard put in soon and Shorewood can learn more from that implementation.
- c) It was confirmed the bike education program is currently occurring in the schools and the committee along with the Police Department and Senior Resource Center is assisting in that effort.

o. Police Department

1. Question and Answer

- a) Cost of Duncan contract to perform Collections and Tax intercept and whether or not the cost would be offset by the collections of the fines?
 - 1. What are the total amount of fines levied in 2017?
 - 2. What is the total amount of fines collected in 2017?
 - 3. How much more revenue is forecasted if the software solution for the initiative would be implemented by the department?
- b) Clarification questions were asked about what the role of the Human Relations Coordinator position and whether or not the board felt the position was necessary.

- c) Question asked about whether or not the \$1-million-dollar estimate for the initiative is the exact number; it was indicated that the number will need to be vetted again by Riley.
2. Follow-up questions requested of the Police Chief
- a) Provide clarification on the Duncan numbers.

p. Public Art

1. Question and Answer

- a) Is the village taking on full maintenance cost.? Addressed in the maintenance policy. When things need to be done, necessary for us to apply to the Shorewood Foundation; we do have a little bit of money with the Foundation. Does sometimes take staff time, from DPW, formalize that in this process.
- b) Would Public Art plan and implement programs for future public art? Nothing s
- c) Replacing of lights next year? Yes
- d) What is wrong with the light? Really hard to access. Goes out rapidly. Allows water and insects in too easily.
- e) Maintenance policy--addresses the three major pieces (fortunate to have had generous donors), looks to the future and lays out various situations and scenarios. Village taking over maintenance? Maintenance has to be done, it's in the policy.
- f) Lays out how art needs to be maintained, three major pieces what happens when. These pieces are owned by the village and need to be taken care of.

q. Village Manager's Office

1. Question and Answer

- a) Public monitors in key community locations was originally requested in the Vision 2025 approved in 2015. No future funding outside of purchase of the monitors has been budgeted. The value of the monitors compared to bulletin boards is that the Village staff could efficiency change the message content from the office and not physically visit the monitor locations. This would be extremely valuable to disseminate emergency information, such as a Boil Alert, that is time sensitive.
- b) The Welcome New Neighbors program was eliminated in the past; however, this item and the neighborhood captains were suggested as tangible programming that may be deemed important for implementation by the Human Relations Commission as they decide ways to foster inclusiveness within the Shorewood community. This has yet to be determined by the Commission.
- c) Door security is proposed for the Village Center exterior and some interior doors in 2019. The system proposed was successfully implemented at Village Hall in 2018.
- d) The merit pay system implemented in 2017 was not successful as it required a considerable amount of time and effort with few positive gains. In lieu of merit pay program, a performance evaluation and recognition pay program is proposed.
- e) In the past a brief salary study was completed in 2017; however the salary study and organizational analysis proposed would review all departments, current staffing and areas of improvement that could be made to address future operational priorities. This type of analysis has not been completed here in the Village of Shorewood.

2. There were no follow-up items requested.

Parking Lot Items

1. Ped & Bike Safety
 - a. Desire for a larger, broader plan to encompass individual initiatives
 - b. Comprehensive plan together with transportation plan
2. Continued requests for Stop signs
 - a. Comprehensive transportation plan (could/should be a part of)
3. Cost of a comprehensive study to develop a Transportation Plan
 - a. Identify ways to collaborate and assess time & money
4. Benjamin Fund
 - a. Clarification on "eligible expenditures" to expand or address multiple needs. How does coordination impact eligibility? (willingness to look at ways to collaborate, eligibility is assessed based on case presented)
5. Utility Management (tracking of other departments and accessibility)
6. Public Art
 - a. Awareness on maintenance & agreements
7. Planning Department & CDA
8. Adoption of residential and commercial guidelines (Village Board to discuss before adoption for code)

The Board took a break at 7:31 p.m.

The Board reconvened back into session at 7:43 p.m.

6. Review Next Steps of Prioritization
The next meeting will be Monday June 18 and the purpose and the focus of that meeting for the Village Board to deliberate and dialogue in open discussion. Ms. Ewald was requested to provide the top initiatives from her perspective.
7. Adjournment

Tr. Bockhorst moved and Tr. Maher seconded to adjourn at 9:40 p.m. Motion carried 7-0.

Respectfully submitted,
Sara Bruckman
Village Clerk



Village of Shorewood

Summary of Request Execution of New Village Initiatives

Name Department / Committee: Plan Commission

Do not complete columns E-G

*	Title of Initiative	Staff Time (Total Estimated- hrs)	Cost (Total Estimated- \$)	2019	2020	2021+
	Research/revise Conditional, permitted and prohibited uses	60	None			
*	Revise Sign Code	60	None			
	Comprehensive Plan Update	20	\$50,000 - 75,000			
	Finalize decision on porches in front yard setback	20	None			
	Plan Commission increased communication	30	publication costs			
	Research/revise Off-street Parking Requirements	50	None			
	Research/revise Zoning Code relative to site design standards	120	\$ 25,000			
	Historic Properties and Districts	30	None			
	Zoning Map Review	20	None			
	Total	270	\$75,000- 100,000			



Village of Shorewood

Summary of Request Execution of New Village Initiatives

Name Department / Committee: Planning & Development

Do not complete columns E-G

*	Title of Initiative	Staff Time (Total Estimated- hrs)	Cost (Total Estimated- \$)	2019	2020	2021+
	Review/Recommend Revisions to Neighborhood Home Loan Program	120	\$ -			
	Comprehensive Plan Update (RFP phase)	20	\$50,000 - \$75,000			
	Complete Streets Policy	200	\$ 1,000			
	Initiate annual code review and recommendation process and procedure	80	\$ -			
	Create/consolidate documents and applications communicating frequently asked questions	40	\$ -			
	Total	460	\$51,000 - \$76,000			