

Summary Notes

Meeting of the Pewaukee Merger Advisory Committee

Wednesday, December 2, 2009

6:00 p.m., Pewaukee City Hall

Roll Call

In attendance at the eleventh meeting of the Pewaukee Merger Advisory Committee were, representing the Village of Pewaukee, Village President Jeff Knutson, Trustee Paul Evert, citizen member Mark Muehl, citizen member Tom Houck, and Administrator Scott Gosse. Representing the City of Pewaukee were Mayor Scott Klein, Alderperson Roger Hathaway, and citizen member Dave Swan. SEWRPC Advisor Phil Evenson chaired the meeting. Mr. Evenson reported that City of Pewaukee Administrator Tammy LaBorde had asked to be excused, but that he had not heard from Dan Sanford, a citizen member from the City of Pewaukee. Also in attendance at the meeting were William J. Mielke and Christine Cramer from Ruckert & Mielke, Inc., representing the consultant team assisting the Committee.

Summary Notes of Prior Meeting

Mr. Evenson referred to the summary notes of the Advisory Committee's meeting of November 18, 2009. On a motion by Mr. Evert, seconded by Mr. Hathaway, and carried unanimously, the summary notes of the meeting of November 18, 2009, were approved.

Further Consideration of Draft Consolidation Ordinance

Mr. Evenson noted that all members of the Committee had been given a revised draft consolidation ordinance prepared by Ms. Lawrie Kobza of the Boardman Law Firm. He noted that the focus of the meeting tonight with respect to this ordinance would be on Sections 5 and 8, dealing with elected officials and consolidation payments/assessments, respectively. Before turning to those two items, however, Mr. Evenson asked if there were any questions relative to the other sections of the ordinance or to the ordinance development process in general. The following resulted from that discussion:

1. Referring to the time schedule set forth in the ordinance relative to the forthcoming spring election, Mayor Klein commented that some flexibility in date setting may become necessary depending upon the reaction of the Common Council and the Village Board to this entire ordinance. Mr. Evenson concurred, indicating that it would be up to those governing bodies to determine whether or not to move this matter forward next spring. Should a decision be made to delay this matter, then the ordinance would have to be adjusted accordingly with respect to dates.

2. With respect to an inquiry by Mr. Swan, Mr. Evenson indicated that the Advisory Committee would turn its attention to what Mr. Sanford had referred to as the “playbook” in a prior meeting just as soon as work on the key remaining elements of the ordinance was completed. The “playbook” would include material relative to the one-time costs of undertaking the consolidation process and to a number of organizational issues that would have to be addressed by the new City Council should consolidation ultimately be approved. Mr. Evenson indicated that he expected the Advisory Committee to turn its attention to the “playbook” in January and February 2010.

3. In response to an inquiry from a member of the public, Mr. Evenson indicated that the dates set forth in the consolidation ordinance are not premised on obtaining new legislation.

Mr. Evenson then turned the Committee’s attention to Section 5 of the draft ordinance relating to proposed aldermanic districts. He referred to a series of materials that SEWRPC staff had prepared relative to this matter, including a map and attendant population data identified as Exhibit A, which had been previously approved by the Advisory Committee, as well as two alternatives thereto—identified as Exhibit B and Exhibit C, respectively—which had been developed since the last meeting and which seek to divide the consolidated community into four districts that would be, insofar as possible, population proportional as regards the two existing communities.

At the end of a lengthy discussion concerning the three alternatives, it was moved by Mr. Houck, and seconded by Mr. Evert, to substitute the map identified as Exhibit B for the map identified as Exhibit A in the consolidation ordinance. That motion failed on a vote of three to four, with Messrs. Houck, Evert, and Knutson voting aye, and Messrs. Hathaway, Muehl, Klein, and Swan voting nay.

Further Consideration of Consolidation Benefits and Payments

Mr. Evenson then asked Ms. Cramer to brief the Committee on work undertaken relative to the proposed consolidation payment that would comprise Section 8 of the draft consolidation ordinance. With the aid of a Power Point presentation, Ms. Cramer then walked the members of the Committee through the analyses that had been undertaken to date relative to the calculations of the net assets or liabilities of the City and Village with respect to the general fund and to the sewer and water utilities. She stressed that the basic intent was to develop a payment plan that will result in a fair distribution of the benefits of consolidation. She concluded her presentation by noting that, subject to change based in part on completion of a 2010 consolidated community budget, about a \$4.4 million general fund consolidation payment would be needed to put the Village general fund on an equal footing with the

City general fund. Furthermore, she concluded that a withdrawal of up to \$6.1 million from the Village utility reserves would put the City and Village utilities on an equal footing. Such a withdrawal of Village utility reserves, she further noted, would result in slightly higher future rate increases for Village utility customers, but would maintain significantly lower future rate increases for City customers.

During a lengthy discussion of the material presented by Ms. Cramer, the subject of future storm water management costs in both the City and the Village was again revisited. Such costs would include not only projects that are needed to meet State requirements relative to runoff water quality, but also projects related to the management of the volume of storm water flow. Given that discussion, it was moved by Mr. Swan, seconded by Mr. Houck, and carried on a vote of six ayes and one nay, with Mr. Hathaway voting nay, to remove storm water management issues from further consideration in the determination of consolidation benefits and payments.

Report by Subcommittee on Public Education Materials

Mr. Muehl reported that an initial meeting of the members of the Subcommittee appointed to work with the consultant team on the development of educational materials for the public had been held earlier in the week. He noted that the consultant was recommending using a variety of media to communicate the essence of the consolidation proposal, including such techniques as Facebook and Twitter. The Subcommittee made a decision to develop an educational flyer on the merger topic intended to be included in the forthcoming property tax bill mailings. The Subcommittee is scheduled to meet again on December 17, 2009, at 3:00 p.m. in the Village Hall. Mr. Hathaway noted that the City of Pewaukee is currently examining software that might be useful in this process.

Public Comment

Public comments were allowed throughout the entire meeting. Several citizens made comments or asked for clarification of materials.

Next Meeting Date

It was agreed that the Advisory Committee would meet next at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, December 16, 2009, at the Pewaukee City Hall Council Chambers. Among the items on the agenda will be discussion of the 2010 merged community budget. In response to an inquiry by Mr. Hathaway, Mr. Gosse said that he and Ms. LaBorde would try to get that merged budget ready for mailing to the Committee on December 14. Mr. Evenson reminded the Committee members that the Committee will meet again on January 6, 2010, and then again on January 20, 2010. He indicated that a prior travel commitment would prevent him from attending the January 20 meeting.

Adjournment

On a motion by Mr. Knutson, and seconded by Mr. Evert, the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Submitted by Philip C. Evenson

PCE/lgh

12/08/09

#148318 v2 - PewaukeeMergerAC09