



MINUTES - SHOREWOOD BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Committee of the Whole Meeting
September 8, 2020

1. Call to Order

President Rozek called the Committee of the Whole meeting of the Village Board to order at 6:01 p.m.

2. Statement of Public Notice

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

3. Roll Call

President Rozek called the roll. Present over the phone: Trustees Davida Amenta, Tammy Bockhorst, Jessica Carpenter, Arthur Ircink, and Kathy Stokebrand. Wesley Warren was excused.

Others Present: Village Manager Rebecca Ewald, Assistant Village Manager Tyler Burkart, Public Works Director Leeann Butschlick, Police Chief Peter Nimmer, Planning and Development Director Bart Griepentrog, Finance Director/Treasurer Mark Emanuelson

4. 2021 Budget Overview

Mr. Emanuelson went over the budget included in the packet.

President Rozek stated there was a 4.25% levy increase over last year. Tr. Carpenter informed the Village Board the Shorewood School Board voted for a 3.9% budget increase. Concerns were expressed about both increases.

Mr. Emanuelson explained in 2021 the Police and Public Works divisions are budgeted with a 0.5 FTE vacancy factor already built into the budget and the change from the previous year is 0.3 FTE which incorporates the 30% of the contemplated construction coordinator position discussed at previous meetings (is already in the budget to consider). Tr. Stokebrand questioned the 0.3 FTE for DPW; the proposal was for a full time position at the last meeting. Mr. Emanuelson provided clarification the proposal was to add a full time position but 30% of that was to be charged to DPW, the rest of the position is envisioned to be charge to capital projects. Tr. Stokebrand questioned if the Village expects professional fees to go down. Mr. Emanuelson explained professional fees in this segment relates more to attorneys, insurance brokers, and IT Services. Professional fees in the engineering division related to capital projects those are embedded in the total project cost but the expectation is that with the position we will be able to accomplish more in house for less cost.

Tr. Amenta questioned how the parking revenues were projected; there is a deficit in the parking utility but in the general fund it will balance out. Mr. Emanuelson explained correct, in the Clerk/Customer Service division it shows about a \$20,000 increase of revenues.

President Rozek questioned what number does the Village have to get to, to exceed the Village's tax expenditure limit. Mr. Emanuelson explained anywhere between the drafted budget and where the Village Board settles there are ways that staff can advise the Village Board to manage the tax levy that would allow the Village to qualify for expenditure restraint. Mr. Emanuelson further explained, the challenge with those techniques is they are not sustainable budgeting practices and they extremely limit any future flexibility. A \$240,000 increase would be in compliance with expenditure restraint.

Tr. Amenta questioned how the five-year merit increase is being phased in. Mr. Burkart explained every five years an employee can receive up to a 4% pay increase in wages. Tr. Stokebrand questioned if the 4% increase is on top of the \$1.5%. Mr. Burkart explained the merit increase every five years advances employees through the pay range.

Tr. Carpenter questioned what happens with the training funds that were not spent in 2020. Mr. Emanuelson explained when the budget is adopted, revenue and expenditures are equal so there is a balanced budget. If expenditures go up and revenues go down, there is a deficit budget and which will reduce the Village's fund balance at the end of the year. If revenues go up and expenditures are on target, the Village's fund balance would increase. Tr. Carpenter questioned if it was possible to use the unused fund in 2021. Mr. Emanuelson explained the last several years, the Village Board has tried to control the amount of levy for debit service with using the fund balance to stabilize the amount of levy for debt service.

President Rozek clarified the Village's health insurance premiums stayed neutral for 2021 but the budget is projecting them to go up. Mr. Burkart explained there are a few personal cases in which individuals needed to change plan.

President Rozek questioned if there were any fees budgeted for the potential reprogramming of Duncan for parking. Mr. Emanuelson explained no, but if the Village Board approves broader on street parking options that there would be a reduced level of citations written; if the citations fees go down, Duncan's overall cost will go down.

Tr. Carpenter requested to consider employee cell phones/reimbursement for a future budget. President Rozek suggested to consider hiring an attorney instead of contracting attorney services out for a future budget.

5. Tr. Carpenter moved, seconded by Tr. Stokebrand to adjourn the meeting at 7:22 p.m. Motion passed 6 - 0.



DRAFT

MINUTES - SHOREWOOD BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Village Board Meeting
September 8, 2020

1. Call to Order
President Rozek called the meeting of the Village Board to order at 7:35 p.m.
2. Roll Call
President Rozek called the roll. Present over the phone: Trustees Davida Amenta, Tammy Bockhorst, Jessica Carpenter, Arthur Ircink, and Kathy Stokebrand. Trustee Wesley Warren was excused.

Others Present: Village Manager Rebecca Ewald, Village Attorney Nathan Bayer, Assistant Village Manager Tyler Burkart, Public Works Director Leeann Butschlick, Planning and Development Director

3. Statement of Public Notice

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

4. Special Order of Business

a. Phase 2B Police Department project wrap-up – Riley Construction (7:35 p.m.)
Eric with Riley Construction explained the project was started in January 2020 and finished in May 2020. The project held to the original schedule and came in under budget by \$31,000. Some Village Board members questioned if there are outstanding items. Potential parking lot repairs.

b. Consider modifications of Night Parking regulations (7:40 p.m.)
Mr. Griepentrog provided a brief overview of the August 31, 2020 Special Village Board meeting. There's three steps with the proposed change; an ordinance, policy 39 and the fee schedule.

The ordinance would change the Village code to switch the current practice of providing hardships and special permits to qualifying individuals. The proposed ordinance change would open that up to residents and employees or anyone else that wants to purchase a permit. As drafted there are no residency requirements or household limitations.

Policy 39 is how the Village would administer the permits and includes administration of the temporary permits.

The fee schedule recommended changes are \$40.00 for an on street permit, \$30.00 for an off street permit, \$50.00 for 24 hour permits, and \$30.00 for daytime permits.

The Village Board went around with questions and comments.

Tr. Amenta questioned if alternate side of the street parking is for 24 hours. Mr. Griepentrog stated it is not, it is only between 3:00 a.m. and 5:00 a.m., the proposal would not change that. Tr. Amenta would like to see alternate side for 24 hours to allow for the snow plows to effectively pass through. Director Butschlick explained there is concern about additional cars on the street and the efficiencies of garbage collection and snow plowing. Tr. Amenta supports a residency requirement or limit per household.

Tr. Bockhorst express equity is the major goal. She expressed \$40.00 is too cost prohibited for some. She expressed she does not want to penalize renters; the Village should be welcoming. Tr. Bockhorst expressed her support for the proposed changes

Tr. Carpenter expressed the alternate side of the street can be very confusing and would like to see it simplified. She supports the residency requirement and limiting the number of cars per residence.

Tr. Ircink questioned the primary concern for the residency requirement. Mr. Griepentrog shared it's possible, but can be a time consuming task based on the volume of the permits we issue. Tr. Ircink explained it would add more work to staff which translates into dollars. Clerk Bruckman explained it's not that we can't but there are complications with people waiting until the last minute who don't have the correct proof of residency. Tr. Ircink questioned if alternate side parking would help with snow removal and garbage collection. Director Butschlick explained yes, it would be more efficient.

Tr. Stokebrand expressed she is in favor a residency requirement. She supports the cost at \$50.00 per permit.

President Rozek explained she supports moving forward with some sort of change. Not doing something would be an injustice to our community. She explained the goal is to make it administratively simple. She explained the small businesses such as bakeries and bars that have employees at 3:00 a.m. need places to park. She does not support the residency requirement. President Rozek questioned why there's an ordinance and policy. Mr. Griepentrog explained the policy is the day to day operations. President Rozek questioned alternate side parking. Mr. Griepentrog explained night parking does have alternate side regulations in the code but is not enforced. In order to offer the on street permit, the Village needed to clarify the existing alternate side regulations within that specific part of the code. The ordinance tonight clarifies alternate side parking with respect to night parking but does not tackle the larger issues of daytime alternate side parking and winter regulations. President Rozek would like to eliminate the lots that we do not own and put everything online. Mr. Emanuelson stated the parking lot spaces are limited. There is a vetting process of getting into a lot; once you are on a lot everything can be done online. If you have your spot in the lot, you get to keep it until you don't renew. President Rozek expressed the parking program should be able to just sell just the amount spots to those who want them. She explained the Village knows how many parking spaces are available on the streets and 50% of them could have permits, this would help with the streets and business district not being parking up. Mr. Griepentrog explained there is not an expectation that every on street parking spot will be taken up by the demand. It will extend more than it currently does, but we are not expecting that demand. The last meeting packet had a block-by-block analysis of the denser residential blocks and they can handle the capacity. We are proposing to revisit this in six months. Some Village Board members clarified if there was a limit in the Duncan parking system. Mr. Griepentrog explained the Village has not proposed to place a limit within in the Duncan system but could see if the system has the capabilities. President Rozek is in favor of only allowing a certain amount of street spots to be sold.

Some Village Board members expressed with the COVID pandemic, the Village may not know what the true effects of the parking changes will be until a year from now. Some Village Board members expressed concerns for the southwest and southeast portions of the village potentially being parked up. Some Village Board members expressed concern about reducing the workload of customer service but potentially increasing the workload for DPW. Some Village Board members expressed the consultant's report states residency should be required and permits should be limited to two per household.

There was Village Board discussion about requiring residency. Some Village Board members favor the residency requirement and some do not want a residency requirement.

President Rozek moved to defer modifications of Night Parking regulations until no later than December 31, 2020. Motion failed for lack of a second.

Janet Kreilein, 2016 E. Menlo Blvd., Shorewood, 53211; stated she concurs with the goals but has concerns about the southeast quadrant and what effects it may have on the streets. Ms. Kreilein agrees there needs to be a plan for snow removal, so people who need to park on the streets can actually access the streets during the winter months. Ms. Kreilein brought up what the impact will be for streets that only have parking on one side and how that fits into the alternate side street parking. She raised concern about more parking on the streets and how it will affect bicyclist. Ms. Kreilein does not support the residency requirement.

Michael Maher, 2100 E. Menlo Blvd., Shorewood 53211; raised concern that implementing

new parking requirements and then changing them in the future is not easy. People buy houses and rent properties based on parking arrangements. If you say in a couple months the permits will be limited, that will be a real problem. Mr. Maher expressed there should be an analysis done on how many spaces will actually be available in certain areas. Mr. Maher expressed he supports limiting two permits per unit.

Tr. Amenta moved, seconded by Tr. Stokebrand to have staff bring back revisions to Ordinance 3013 that limits the number of on street overnight parking permits to two per unit. Tr. Amenta withdrew her motion by unanimous consent.

Tr. Amenta moved, seconded by Tr. Stokebrand to request staff to return to a future Village Board meeting with revisions to Ordinance 3013 that require Shorewood residency to purchase an on street overnight parking permit and to limit two per unit. Motion fail 3 – 3 with Tr. Bockhorst, Ircink and President Rozek voting nay.

Tr. Bockhorst explained did not support the motion as stated.

President Rozek moved, seconded by Tr. Amenta to defer modifications of Night Parking regulations to allow staff more time to work on the issues they heard from the Village Board members and public and come back with an updated draft before December 2020.

Ms. Ewald explained if the motion to defer passes, that it be deferred until the September 21 meeting. The Village Board unanimously agreed to change December 2020 to September 21.

Some Village Board members questioned what modifications would staff be making to the ordinance. President Rozek explained it's important the southeast area be addressed because it's going to be the most impacted. Some Village Board members suggested to discuss the southeast quadrant this evening. There was Village Board discussion on the Residential Congested Area (RCA) boundary. The RCA is a fixed boundary near the campus area. If you are a residential home owner, you can purchase a permit to park on the street. President Rozek clarified she would like the clause to say you can buy an overnight on street parking permit as long as you are not in the RCA district. Some Village Board members did not feel this is equitable and were not in support. There was Village Board discussion on how residency is proven for the RCA district.

Some Village Board members questioned if it is possible at the time someone signs up for a permit to provide them with the districts that are restricted? One Village Board member clarified one area the Village Board can try and find consensus is clarity on the alternate side of the street parking. It was suggested maybe this would be a good starting point. Mr. Griepentrog explained it modifies the language, it's the same time frame that exist today. He explained the larger conversation with alternate side parking is winter regulations not overnight regulations. Current night regulations already have this built in and there was direction provided at the last meeting to update the wording of those regulations so they could be enforced better for the purposes of night parking not for the purposes of snow removal. Mr. Griepentrog clarified the direction was to allow only parking on one side of the street for night parking from 3:00 a.m. to 5:00 a.m. Some Village Board members expressed concern the Village needs to limit the number of permits being sold then. One Village Board member suggested the Village allow anyone that proves residency a parking spot on the street for \$40.00 and if you don't want to or can't prove residency you pay and park in the municipal lot.

Some Village Board members questioned if streets were just having parking on one side, will there never be alternate side parking? Mr. Griepentrog explained the proposed ordinance stipulates an exception, within section C number 2 exceptions to alternate side parking; "alternate side parking shall not apply to street sections where parking is only designated on one side of the street." Mr. Griepentrog clarified alternate side parking is enforced between

3:00 a.m. and 5:00 a.m. when night parking is enforced which is a separate issue from snow removal. It's related to the enforcement of this particular permit. The discussion was to clarify the current language which the police department indicated was confusing for residents to understand. What's proposed tonight was modified and clarified by staff in between the last two meetings and this is what staff was comfortable with enforcing. One Village Board member clarified if there is a potential problem of having unlimited permits and only alternate side of the street parking and sought out consensus on alternate side of the street parking, removal of the overnight parking ban, proof of residency requirement, and control of the amount of permits per block. There was a suggestion to eliminate per block and only allow two per unit. There was Village Board discussion about allowing two on street overnight parking permits per business. There was Village Board consensus about limiting the supply of on street overnight parking permits, alternate side parking and not requiring residency. There was Village Board discussion on not limiting permits for businesses. There was consensus to not limit permits for businesses if the households are limited to two.

Motion withdrawn by unanimous consent: to defer modifications of Night Parking regulations to allow staff more time to work on the issues they heard from the Village Board members and public and come back with an updated draft by September 21, 2020.

The Village Board requested a break for staff to update the proposed ordinance with the suggested changes.

The Village Board recessed at 9:42 p.m.

The Village Board reconvened at 9:57 p.m.

Tr. Amenta explained the ordinance could not be edited as planned and after discussions with Mr. Griepentrog limiting per household is connected to the address verification because someone could say they live at the address but they do not. Alternate side parking is dealing with nighttime first and then dealing with daytime because daytime is a more significant change. Mr. Griepentrog explained daytime changes would require a lot more discussion with signage and the intention is to tackle daytime parking after night parking with the anticipation of next year's winter.

There was Village Board discussion about requiring residency or limiting it to two per household and how could staff handle it if someone uses an address they do not live at. Clerk Bruckman explained staff may not be able to verify at the time of the permit purchase but it could be verified after. One Village Board member questioned if it's easier to handle on a complaint basis. Clerk Bruckman explained we would need to trial it and work from there. Some Village Board members inquired if requiring residency would be easier than monitoring two per household. There was Village Board discussion on what the enforcement and penalties could be. Ms. Ewald suggested using a similar format to the face covering complaints.

Tr. Stokebrand moved, second by Tr. Amenta to approve Ordinance 3013, an Ordinance Amending Section 500-16 Night Parking to allow overnight parking permits, limited two per household, in the Village of Shorewood. Mr. Griepentrog suggested an amendment be made to section 516e(2) r to add a section that would indicate that permits shall be limited to two per household. There was Village Board discussion about reviewing the changes in six months. Some Village Board members questioned if commercial establishments could buy as many as they want. There was nothing specified in the motion about commercial establishments and to allow nonresidential purchase it would need to be clarified in the motion. Motion was withdrawn by unanimous consent.

Tr. Stokebrand moved, seconded by Tr. Amenta to approve Ordinance 3013, an Ordinance Amending Section 500-16 Night Parking to allow overnight parking in the Village of Shorewood with a limit of two

overnight parking permits per residential household and an unlimited number of overnight parking permits available to commercial enterprises. Motion carried 6 – 0 by a roll call vote.

Tr. Amenta moved to defer Policy 39 Overnight Parking Permission until the next Village Board meeting. Motion fails for lack of a second.

President Rozek moved, seconded by Tr. Ircink to adopt Policy 39 Overnight Parking Permissions including the updated verbiage “with a limit of two overnight parking permits per residential household and an unlimited number of overnight parking permits available to commercial enterprises”. Motion carried 5 – 1 by a roll call vote with Tr. Amenta voting nay.

Tr. Amenta moved, seconded by Tr. Carpenter to approve Resolution 2020-30 – A Resolution for Amending Fees within the Village Fee Schedule Relative to On-Street and Off-Street Overnight Parking, and Daytime and 24-hour Parking within Off-Street Lots, as drafted. Motion carried 5 – 1 by a roll call vote.

- c. Consider Ordinance 3013 – An ordinance repealing and replacing Section 319-11.2, “Face Covering Requirements During the COVID-19 Pandemic,” of Article II, “General Regulations,” of Chapter 319, “Health and Sanitation,” of the Shorewood Municipal Code. (10:25 p.m.) Attorney Bayer recapped that the Village Board originally passed an ordinance that required mask indoors, since that time there has been an additional order by the Governor related to masks enclosed spaces that included some outdoor areas. Attorney Bayer explained there was concern expressed by the Village Board if the Governor’s orders were overturned and challenged in court, the Village should have a local ordinance similar to the state order. The other main question, aside from the enclosed spaces that are essentially outdoors, there was discussion that when social distancing isn’t possible, even in outdoor spaces, that the Village pass a requirement that even if you are outside you must wear a mask if you are within six feet. The two policy questions are, if you want to keep that new enclosed space requirement and mask requirement within six feet outside.

Some Village Board Members questioned if this ordinance is requiring people to wear a face covering in an outdoor restaurant unless eating or drinking. Attorney Bayer explained yes, the language came from the Governor’s mandate. Some Village Board members inquired why the penalty is to provide social distancing education instead of mask education.

Tr. Stokebrand moved, seconded by Tr. Amenta to approve Ordinance 3014 – an ordinance repealing and replacing Section 319-11.2, “Face Covering Requirements During the COVID-19 Pandemic,” of Article II, “General Regulations,” of Chapter 319, “Health and Sanitation,” of the Shorewood Municipal Code and to provide appropriate social distancing education and education on mask benefits. Motion carried 6 – 0 by a roll call vote.

5. Consent Agenda Items (10:34 p.m.)
 - a. Accept Presentation of Accounts – September 8, 2020
 - b. Consider Village Board Minutes – June 15, 2020
 - c. Consider Village Board Minutes – July 6, 2020
 - d. Consider Board, Committee, Commission Appointments
 - e. Consider Application for Special Privilege Approval for a retaining wall in the public right of way at 2112 E. Menlo Blvd.
 - f. Consider pavement replaced RFP for North Oakland Avenue

Tr. Bockhorst moved and Tr. Ircink seconded to approve the consent agenda. Tr. Carpenter requested 5d, Tr. Amenta requested 5a, 5b and 5c to be removed from the consent agenda. Motion carried 6 – 0 with items 5a, 5b, 5c, and 5d removed.

6. Items Removed from the Consent Agenda (10:35 p.m.) –

5a; Accept Presentation of Accounts: Tr. Amenta questioned on page 2, General Fund Manager, Fraud to be reversed in the amount of \$2769.00. Ms. Ewald explained Mr. Burkart's credit card had a fraudulent charge that the Village is disputing. Page 6, Lifeguards, COVID crowd assistance management \$3821 is that the total of the additional amount added to that contract. Ms. Ewald will follow-up with the Village Board.

Tr. Amenta moved, seconded by Tr. Bockhorst to accept the presentation of Accounts – September 8, 2020 Motion carried 6 – 0 by a roll call vote.

5b; Consider Village Board Minutes – June 15, 2020

Tr. Amenta explained there were portions of the minutes that needed to be addressed.

Tr. Amenta moved, seconded by Tr. Bockhorst to defer the Village Board minutes of June 15, 2020 to the next Village Board meeting with suggestions for edits send them to the Clerk and bring back with track changes. Motion carried 6 – 0.

5c; Consider Village Board Minutes – July 6, 2020

Tr. Amenta moved, seconded by Tr. Bockhorst to defer the Village Board minutes of July 6, 2020 to the next Village Board meeting with suggestions for edits sent to the Clerk and brought back with track changes. Motion carried 6 – 0.

5d; Consider Board, Committee, Commission Appointments

Tr. Carpenter explained there are several appointments to be considered this evening. Some residents and Committee chairs would like to have further conversations before the Village Board approves appointments and would like this delayed to the next meeting. Staff requests that Design Review Board and Conservation Committee appointments be considered for quorum purposes.

Tr. Amenta moved, seconded by Tr. Stokebrand to approve Kendra Carey's appointment to the Conservation Committee. Motion carried 6 – 0.

Tr. Amenta moved, seconded by Tr. Carpenter to approve Larry Pachefsky, Nick Carnahan (Alt.), Kathryn Kamm (Alt.) and Ryan O'Conner to the Design Review Board. Motion carried 6 – 0.

Tr. Carpenter moved, seconded by Tr. Bockhorst to defer the remaining Board, Committee and Commission appointments to the next available Village Board meeting. Motion carried 6 – 0.

7. Public Hearing(s) (10:49 p.m.) –

Public Hearing for the proposed discontinuance of a portion of unimproved right-of-way on the west side of N. Cramer St. at the southwest intersection of N. Cramer St. and E. Menlo Blvd.

The Public Hearing opened at 10:50 p.m.

The Public Hearing closed at 10:51 p.m.

8. Citizens to be heard – This item is for matters not on the agenda. Discussion may follow comment on non-agenda items or discussion and action may come at future meetings. (10:54 p.m.) – None

9. New Business

- a. Consider Resolution 2020-22 – a resolution to discontinue a portion of unimproved right-of-way on the west side of N. Cramer St. at the southwest intersection of N. Cramer St. and E. Menlo Blvd. (10:55 p.m.)

Tr. Bockhorst moved, seconded by Tr. Amenta to approve Resolution 2020-22 – a resolution to discontinue a portion of unimproved right-of-way on the west side of N. Cramer St. at the southwest intersection of N. Cramer St. and E. Menlo Blvd. Motion carried 6 – 0 by a roll call vote.

- b. Consider Resolution 2020-33 authorizing staff submission of WDNR urban forestry grant application. (10:56 p.m.)

Tr. Amenta moved, seconded by Tr. Ircink to approve Resolution 2020-33 authorizing staff submission of WDNR urban forestry grant application. Motion carried 6 – 0 by a roll call vote.

- c. JP&L Committee report on citizen complaints/charges (10:57 p.m.)
Tr. Carpenter explained the JP&L Committee reviewed and discussed all the affidavits and the recommendation to the Village Board and all four of the affidavits did not meet the framework and qualifications that Attorney Bayer set forth by state statute.
- d. Consider communication for emergency procedures. (11:02 p.m.)
Ms. Ewald explained the Public Safety Committee voted unanimously to recommend the emergency communication procedures. Some Village Board members expressed a Public Communications officer was another aspect to consider.

Tr. Carpenter moved, seconded by Tr. Bockhorst to approve the emergency communication procedure and insert the procedure within the Communications Policy. Motion carried 6 – 0 by a roll call vote.

- e. Consider board member representation on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Committee (11:09 p.m.)

President Rozek moved, seconded by Tr. Carpenter to approve Village Board Members Tr. Ircink and Tr. Stokebrand to participate on the EDI Committee for the next 12 months. Motion carried 6 - 0 by a roll call vote.

10. Reports of Village Officials (11:14 p.m.)

- a. Village President – Proclamation for the Public Art Committee for Signal Box Project.
President Rozek announced she will not be seeking re-election in April 2021.
- b. Village Trustees – League of Wisconsin Municipalities Statewide Race Equity and Leadership program report – Tr. Bockhorst
- c. Village Manager – None

11. Items for future consideration (11:16 p.m.)

Tr. Amenta moved, seconded by Tr. Bockhorst to consider on a future agenda developing some policies and procedures regarding media and press relations. Motion carried 6 – 0.

a. Consider the topic of how to avoid social media mistakes – Tr. Bockhorst deferred to the next Village Board meeting.

b. Consider permanent closure of Estabrook Parkway – Tr. Ircink.

Tr. Ircink moved, seconded by Tr. Carpenter to consider recommending permanent closure of Estabrook Parkway at a future meeting. Motion carried 6 – 0.

12. Closed Session – The Village Board will adjourn into closed session pursuant to 19.85(1)(g) to confer with legal counsel on strategy regarding pending litigation regarding the Estate of Jonah Marciniak.

Tr. Bockhorst moved, seconded by Tr. Amenta to defer the closed session until the next Village Board meeting. Motion carried 6 - 0 by a roll call vote.

13. Adjournment.

Tr. Bockhorst moved and Tr. Carpenter seconded to adjourn at 11:26 p.m. Motion carried 6 - 0.

Respectfully submitted,

Sara Bruckman, CMC/WCMC
Village Clerk