

# VILLAGE OF EPHRAIM

FOUNDED 1853



## VILLAGE OF EPHRAIM BOARD MINUTES TUESDAY, MAY 16, 2017 – 7:00 P.M

**Present:** Mike McCutcheon- President, Paul Roppuld, Cindy Nelson, Jim Stollenwerk, Tim Nelson

**Staff:** Brent Bristol – Administrator

**Guests:** James Cushing, Jim Peterman, John Held, John Cox, Dick Van de Ven, Chuck Pearson

1. **Call to Order:** Meeting called to order by President McCutcheon at 7:00 P.M.
2. **Quorum:** A quorum is present for this meeting
3. **Changes in Agenda:** McCutcheon requests that we move Physical Facilities #7 up to follow Visitors Comments
4. **Visitors' Comments:** None

**President's Comments:** McCutcheon stated that tonight's goal was to start a series of meetings to discuss the 30% Engineering plans as provided from AECOM. McCutcheon explained how we got to this point in the proposed project. McCutcheon suggested setting the ground rules, noting that our deadline is August 1, 2017. McCutcheon would like to limit these minutes to between 60 and 90 minutes in length. Tonight we will allow the Board members to discuss the plans that have been received. The public will be invited to comment on the plans at the next scheduled meeting on May 24, 2017.

### 5. Administration

- a. **Discussion and consideration regarding streetscape plan and 30% drawings submitted by AECOM:**  
Bristol began by providing a brief summary of conclusions from last meeting and read the document for the audience (a copy will be attached to these minutes at the office). A full financial picture of the project must be clear before a decision to proceed is made. A clear picture of any future financial burdens for the Village must also be assessed.  
Bristol is convinced that working with a financial advisor is essential for this project. Bristol would like the Board to assign a Trustee to sit with Bristol to engage each department head and associated committee chair to identify future projects and formalize a tentative replacement/project schedule with associated costs. A report will then be made to the Board for review. Board is ok with that mechanism. Bristol then reviewed what the basic re-surface DOT project would entail, how the costs would be met.

**Street lighting** - if they are to exist in the right of way as they are now we must abide by the DOT standards. The base answer is if we are going to do new lighting we must do a fully compliant DOT lighting plan like Sister Bay that means 12-16 ft. poles every 50 feet with alternating sides throughout. One alternative is if it's considered decorative path lighting they may consider a bollard type lighting. Perhaps we can utilize our existing locations and put in dark sky compliant heads.

**Homework for the Board** - go thru the associated elements of the Highway 42 streetscape project and mark those items on the list that they feel are integral to the project with the letter I. Those items that you deem accessory to the Project with a letter A and then prioritize them in descending order with number 1 being the highest.

### The list

1. Moravia street Highway 42 re-configuration- that is ours to do
2. Preserving parking around the FH Marina and to continue the walkway up to the FH marina before making its first cross to the bayside. Cut into the bank at Moravia Point. A 2 stack stone as in front of the Hillside. Not that high but high enough.

3. Village Hall Library green space
4. Village street lighting.
5. WPS Utility lines burial
6. Cherry Street Steps

McCutcheon is asking the Board to say what in their view is top priority and to rate these items as such.

Bristol and Jim Peterman both talked to WPS about burying the utilities from Brookside to German Road. Bristol explained that the big picture on what this would cost analysis will be forthcoming. They can send someone up once the Board has made a decision in what they want to do then they can turn it around pretty quickly. Depending who will pick up the cost for this, the Village will pay for the burying of the line on 42 from Brookside to German Road, the cost of getting that line to the property owner's meter and residence; the base cost for that may be \$1,100 up to the plus another \$11.15 per foot after that. An electrician would be needed to put a meter in added Peterman. We will check on pricing and report back.

Storm water drainage is already integral to the plan noted T. Nelson. Thinks this must be on the list, the rest may go away but drainage will be addressed during the re-surfacing regardless if we add any other enhancements. It is primary.

McCutcheon asked the audience Held would like the Board to consider going as far as the Preserve, the Village does not end at Brookside. We will get those prices. Cox would like to know how the Board feels on each issue individually. Van de Ven referred to a survey by the last Board regarding burying the lines and it was thousands of dollars that was a survey done by Diane Kirkland years ago. We will try to get hard and true and fast numbers responded Cox. Pearson does not feel like we have received any options this is a nice metropolitan walkway. Where are the tradeoffs? Peterman thinks we should ask if this is the best plan for the least amount of money at this time.

We get 2 conference calls and 2 on site visits in the contract from AECOM, added McCutcheon we want to be ready for them before we utilize those options.

An audience member inquired how we intend to pay for this project, a bond answered McCutcheon. The commenter replied that she felt the water problem is the main thing we need to do. We want the water problem solved and maybe burying the lines.

T. Nelson – Question concerning the existing center line, we should go back and ask them to go back to their plan and start with the existing edge of the pavement and work back to the walkway a 6 ft. walkway with 18 inches of curb and 2- 11 ft. lanes and see how that fits on the existing black top foot print. T. Nelson would like them to take this plan and basically re-align it on the existing asphalt footprint focusing on the side where there is going to be some sort of walkway and try to lay that highway plan out from that side of the road across and see what's left on the other side. McCutcheon feels that that is what they did with this plan.

T. Nelson - The other point is up by Mr. Pearson's property, it really strongly depends on being to shift things over or it is not going to work or it is not anything anyone of us is going to want to stand behind. Bristol added that the Board needs to decide if this is the best product and orientation layout is what the Board wants. On the bright side is being that they kept that center we can pull 18 ½ feet from centerline and be able to tell exactly where the backside of the walk will be.

T. Nelson – feels that when they highway shifts from side to side we are going to see that it may not fit. Bristol, McCutcheon and T. Nelson will place a call to AECOM tomorrow to get answers on his queries.

**Audience questions-** Pearson inquired if all these standards we are talking about are law or only suggestions? Bristol replied that we have not received a clear answer on that. However, when funds from the State are in question and you do any project they tell us we are required to abide by their standards. The plan shows concrete sidewalks, we should get an alternate cost for asphalt. Also, a clarification is needed on the sanitary being in a conflicting location. This is something we should probably ask our Treatment Plant staff about what our elevations are on the sanitary sewer in that area and provide that to AECOM.

They clearly put the pathway on people's property, we will discuss this at a future meeting in depth.

Roppuld inquired of Bristol about the final paragraph in his Financial Forecasting Options summary. Bristol responded that he feels working with a Trustee, Department heads and Committee chairs to identify any potential future expensive needs and projects is a key piece for the success of this project. Roppuld is gravely concerned that no where have we identified to any significant degree any competing projects that would compete for this money other than the streetscape project. What if in the future, the groundwater problem starts contaminating our wells, the Board at this table tonight will not be the people on the Board then and if we have encumbered the Village to the tune of millions of dollars and have reached the top limit of our borrowing ability and are bankrupt, we will no longer be able to service the needs of this community. That is bothersome to him.

C. Nelson commented that the Village is in sound financial shape. We can borrow up to about 15 Million and this project is 2 or 3 Million, does not think the doom expressed is realistic.

## 6. Physical Facilities

- a. **Discussion and consideration regarding tree cutting on Larson Ln:** This item was discussed at the last Physical Facilities meeting on May 8, 2017 and they recommend the Board contract with Timberline Tree Services to do tree pruning in preparation of the rebuild of the road on Larson Lane.

**Motion per Stollenwerk to accept the bid from Townline Timber Service to do tree pruning on Larson Lane, not to exceed \$7,200, seconded by T. Nelson, motion carried.**

7. Visitors' Comments: None

8. Adjournment.

**Motion per T. Nelson to adjourn this meeting of the Ephraim Board of Trustees, seconded by C. Nelson, motion carried.**

Transcribed by,  
Susan Shallow- Deputy Clerk