# Schweitzer, Debbie

06-2398

From:

Jones, Richard

Sent:

Thursday, August 17, 2006 1:29 PM

To:

Schweitzer, Debbie

Cc:

Rooney, John

Subject:

FW: Point Blue property

Attachments: pin 276 0000 02468 000.pdf

I need to submit a communication to Council recommending that the northern parcel of the Walker property be transferred to the Racine Water Utility and that the land transfer be recorded with the Register of Deeds.

From: Mandli, Doug

Sent: Thursday, August 17, 2006 9:01 AM

To: Jones, Richard

Subject: Point Blue property

Stacey Salvo said to me that the Water Department can now own property. The north end of the Walker Property can now be transferred to the Water Department. The attached file describes the parcel that is presently occupied by the Water Department. This transfer will clear up the confusion stated below.

From: OConnell, Brian

Sent: Monday, August 14, 2006 5:44 PM

To: Mandli, Doug; Salvo, Stacey; Kienbaum, Thomas Cc: Haas, Keith; Jones, Richard; Bunker, Thomas

Subject: RE: Point Blue property

I think I've figured out what is going on here; see if you agree. The remnant Walker property was split from the Water Utility portion via a deed in what is known as the "splits and joiners" process. This process does not require that a deed be recorded for the now- reduced "parent" parcel.

I have assumed that the existing property description and deed for the remnant are sufficient for a transfer to KeyBridge, the developer. It was assumed to be sufficient for transfer to the museum, when that was pending (before my time). As a result, no one is currently working on a CSM for the site. But we have at least two firms, Singh and National Survey, with the data needed for a CSM. If one is needed for other reasons, a CSM can readily be prepared. The only questions are: what's needed to satisfy the DNR and who will pay for it. (I don't have a budget for it.)

- Brian

From: Mandli, Doug

Sent: Friday, August 11, 2006 2:29 PM

To: Salvo, Stacey

Cc: Haas, Keith; Jones, Richard; Bunker, Thomas; OConnell, Brian

Subject: Point Blue property

Attached is a copy of the description for the north portion of the property. The south portion of the property is described in the e-mail from Stacey.

## 9481 Doug Mandli

From: Salvo, Stacey

Sent: Friday, August 11, 2006 12:54 PM

To: Haas, Keith; Jones, Richard

Cc: Bunker, Thomas; OConnell, Brian; Mandli, Doug

Subject: RE: Point Blue property

These are what are recorded . . .

A split is simple if someone draws up a legal description for me

From: Haas, Keith

**Sent:** Friday, August 11, 2006 11:53 AM **To:** Salvo, Stacey; Jones, Richard

Cc: Bunker, Thomas; OConnell, Brian; Mandli, Doug

**Subject:** RE: Point Blue property

### Stacy:

The issue as explained to me is that there are not 2 unique deeds recorded at the courthouse for these 2 parcels. The water Utility remnant was recorded possibly as an exception to the original 14 acre site. Since Racine has not yet transerred the parcel to Point Blue maybe Brian O Connell is working on a separate CSM to record 2 distinct deeds at the courthouse. Maybe the descepancy is 1201 Michigan vs 1129 Michigan. Is there a deed recorded for 1129 Michigan at the courthouse?

#### Keith

From: Salvo, Stacey

**Sent:** Fri 8/11/2006 11:50 AM **To:** Haas, Keith; Jones, Richard

Cc: Bunker, Thomas; OConnell, Brian; Mandli, Doug

Subject: RE: Point Blue property

Right now, there are separate tax numbers for 1231 Michigan Blvd and 1129 Michigan Blvd. Are we splitting further?

From: Haas, Keith

Sent: Friday, August 11, 2006 11:45 AM

To: Jones, Richard

Cc: Bunker, Thomas; OConnell, Brian; Mandli, Doug; Salvo, Stacey

**Subject:** Point Blue property

#### Dear Rick and others:

It is my understanding that in attempting to get site closure and keep environmental history clean on the 250 feet of the walker property and remaining 10 acres segregated for point Blue, the DNR needs to have a recorded deed at the courthouse documented for the parcel at 1201 Michigan Blvd(Point Blue) and 1231 Michigan Blvd (water Utility) this will be the cleanest way for the land transfer to move forward and keep environmental records at the State DNR clean and consistent.

Can anyone confirm that this effort to record separate deeds is being done by someone at City hall and if so who that party is?

Thanks

