

**VILLAGE OF EPHRAIM  
CAPITAL PROJECTS AD-HOC COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES  
WEDNESDAY, JULY 13TH, 2022 – 8:30 AM  
9996 WATER STREET**



**ACTION ITEMS:**

**Meacham moved, C. Pearson seconded to approve the minutes of June 15th, 2022, all ayes.** Motion carried.

*The consensus was to recommend to the Village Board option number one (1) as provided by AECOM for North End lighting and to provide an alternate option to do nothing and have the state complete intersection safety lighting. The remaining amount of streetscape money that could be applied to the project was to be noted in the report to the Village Board because the work was to be completed within the right of way.*

*The consensus was to provide Keller with direction to proceed to cost out the improvements and additional space that were originally reviewed for the maintenance buildings.*

**Meacham moved to adjourn, Bridenhagen seconded at 10:23 AM, all ayes.** Motion carried.

---

**Present:** Ken Nelson-Chair, Matt Meacham, Maggie Peterman, Fred Bridenhagen, and Chuck Pearson.

**Staff:** Brent Bristol- Village Administrator.

**Guests:** Buck Olsson of ES Olsson Construction and Cindy Nelson.

1. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order by K. Nelson at 8:30 AM.
2. **Quorum:** A quorum of the Capital Projects Ad-Hoc Committee was present.
3. **Approval of previous minutes:**  
**Meacham moved, C. Pearson seconded to approve the minutes of June 15th, 2022, all ayes.**  
Motion carried.
4. **Changes to the agenda:** There were no changes to the agenda.
5. **Visitors' Comments:** There were none.
6. **Discussion regarding the Anderson Dock project:**

K. Nelson stated that he would like to agree by the end of the meeting as to what the committee would like to recommend to the Board. K. Nelson suggested that he and Bristol draft a report for review by the committee which will then be presented to the Village Board. He suggested presenting the two (2) public projects as one (1) report and the building projects as another report.

K. Nelson commenced reviewing the reports that had been submitted for Anderson Dock from ES Olsson Construction and Laib Restoration Inc. He noted that the Laib report provided historical background that reviewed when the different buildings were put in. He noted that the building is out of plumb and has shifted, but in a way, the building has become more durable. Laib concluded that the building is in pretty good shape, it needs repairs but it is not about to fall down.

The ES Olsson report, K. Nelson said, was orientated towards what needed to be fixed. He went through what it would cost to make the necessary repairs to the building and preparation for the building to be lifted at a total of ninety-five thousand dollars (\$95,000), not including the cost of concrete or lifting of the building.

There was a discussion regarding the foundation of the warehouse building. Laib had expressed some concern over the foundation. Buck Olsson noted the current iteration of the building is over one hundred (100) years old, of course, it is a little out of plumb. He was not as concerned as Laib. Laib had suggested that one of the corners may be settling.

Further discussion arose regarding options for the foundation, ceiling supports, detailed design questions that still need to be answered, and establishing a contingency that may need to be increased with the questions pending. K. Nelson suggested a placeholder regarding the concrete foundation.

K. Nelson asked Olsson about the foundation and the concrete slab. He asked if putting twelve (12) inches of concrete on top of the current slab, the condition of the wall that goes around the perimeter that the building sits on, and what work may need to be done with that wall when we have the building up in the air?

Olsson said his concern was adding concrete and having it settle; it is a lot of weight. He discussed potentially adding some material to reinforce it. He added that the foundation has been there for over one hundred (100) years and it is a structure out on a manmade peninsula.

Both Olsson and K. Nelson agreed that engineering would be required to conduct an evaluation.

Additional discussion occurred about the need to raise the building, the current state of drainage, the building sitting in a depression, raising the building to re-do the decking so water drains away from the building, current safety hazards on the dock, a minimum of six (6) inch pour of concrete which results in the building being raised to achieve positive drainage, the amount of concrete required will be a huge part of the financial puzzle for the project, and bracketing and hold downs for the building.

Further discussion included concerns about adding more weight to the dock, the process of getting the building ready to lift to prevent twisting, freezing underneath a concrete pour, borings of the dock, Kahr's lack of concern over adding more weight to the dock, and the current information is the best the committee can do without spending tens of thousands of dollars on an engineering package.

K. Nelson reviewed his suggestions for the summary report. Included in the report will be information on what additional work needs to be completed during the final design. We are going to have to make some assumptions and we will let the Board know these are our assumptions and try to put a cost with those assumptions. We will let the Board know as part of the next step when you do the engineering study there has to be a geotechnical study with borings for a structural design plan.

#### **7. Discussion regarding North End path and lighting:**

K. Nelson reviewed the AECOM report for North End Lighting which offered three (3) options. The first option, he said, is a shorter pole which is what was used downtown for the streetscape project. These poles would be closer together than the other options, starting at North Orchard to the North end of the Village for a cost of seven hundred fifty-six thousand one hundred fifteen dollars and twenty-three cents (\$756,115.23). The second option is a twenty-two-foot (22) high pole with a downward-lit LED. There is money savings with option two (2) because the pole and the luminaires are cheaper in addition to the spacing being further apart. The cost for option two (2) is four hundred ninety-nine thousand three hundred forty-two dollars and eleven cents (\$499,342.11). The third option at five hundred ninety-four thousand eight hundred eight dollars and thirty-five cents (\$594,880.35) is a traditional lighting head with a curved pole.

A discussion was held about the type of lighting the state would do at intersections as safety lighting (not roadway lighting), the remaining balance of streetscape money, and tying the two (2) ends of the Village together with consistent lighting. Meacham stated that if a walking path was to be considered eventually, each one of the lighting alternatives makes a difference in the safety and usability of a path. If a walking path is to be considered, he favored option one (1), if there was no walking path, he felt the safety intersection lighting at the State's cost was all the north end needed.

K. Nelson stated what he was hearing was a consensus for option number one (1).

Bristol asked if the consensus was option number one (1), regardless of if a path was to be considered.

*The consensus was to recommend to the Village Board option number one (1) as provided by AECOM for North End lighting and to provide an alternate option to do nothing and have the state complete intersection safety lighting. The remaining amount of streetscape money that could be applied to the project was to be noted in the report to the Village Board because the work was to be completed within the right of way.*

K. Nelson went on to review the two (2) options provided by AECOM for paths. He discussed the number of trees that would need to be removed with each of the options and the challenges at the south end of the project where minor construction easements would be required. The lighting design accommodates both path designs, he stressed.

A discussion was held about estimated costs for a North Path. A ten-foot (10') shared use path from Anderson to Orchard was estimated to cost four hundred and seventy thousand dollars (\$470,000) and Orchard to Townline was estimated to cost three hundred thousand dollars (\$300,000). The second option was a Northbound ten-foot (10') shoulder widening from Anderson to Orchard and was estimated to cost six hundred ninety thousand dollars (\$690,000) and Orchard to Townline was estimated to cost four hundred sixty thousand dollars (\$460,000). None of the options include utility relocations or easements or right-of-way acquisitions.

All agreed that an independent path would be better than widening the shoulder.

Cindy Nelson stated at the last meeting of the Community Protection Committee several residents in the residential section asked if the Village would consider changing the thirty-five (35) mph speed limit to twenty-five (25) mph from Brodd to Orchard. Residents love to walk downtown and it is not safe. While the committee looks into the speed, she said, she wanted to hear what was going on with this committee because the paths from Anderson to Orchard would certainly make a difference to those that wish to walk downtown. Our community, the people that live here, are asking for that, she said. She added that she wanted to be apprised because a speed study will take time and money. If we are going to have a path, perhaps we don't need a speed study, she said.

K. Nelson suggested taking the spacing and costs information to document the cost if we were to consider lighting Anderson to Townline.

Pearson agreed that there would be pressure to complete that area.

Bridenhagen suggested that the Village work with a grant writer; there are monies out there for these things, he said. We need to be looking for funding sources.

A discussion was held regarding funding. K. Nelson said a recommendation could be made to the Board to explore available funding sources. Bristol noted that the multimode use lends to a larger pool of funds available. He added that the Anderson Dock project also ticks a lot of boxes relative to grants or other funding sources. Bristol pointed out that they would need plans to get in queue. Pearson suggested reaching out to Congressman Gallagher.

K. Nelson suggested having a conversation with Nick from AECOM to obtain some knowledge about federal funding for multimode paths so that we can put it in the draft report as a recommendation. He added that they should find out how far they would have to go with plans to get in line for funding. The other recommendation to the Board may be to get an engineering plan with cost estimates so that funding can be sought. He noted that he and Bristol would work on a report to review with the committee.

**8. Discussion regarding Administration/Fire Department/ Maintenance Buildings:**

Bristol updated the committee that he had met with Buck Olsson regarding the Administration building and Olsson will return to look at some roofing concerns. Bristol reviewed with the

committee regarding a conversation with Keller regarding the Fire Station. He explained that he advised Keller that the campus idea is a back burner idea. He directed them to move forward with items reviewed during the walkthrough.

C. Pearson stated that nothing should be done until a decision is determined regarding a fire district. Bristol and K.Nelson stated that there won't be.

Bristol added that the plans were started with Keller by the Fire, Wastewater, and Maintenance Departments long before this process commenced. The committee is benefiting from being able to play with the plans a bit.

K. Nelson stated that the first thing the report needs to state is that we need to figure out if there will be a fire district and until then no money would be spent beyond normal maintenance.

Further conversation involved a fire district, determining what repairs were needed for the Administrative building, records retention, if a multi-purpose room will be required, the inadequacy of the Administrative building as a meeting space, improvements needed to continue to hold meetings at the Village Hall to resolve the shortcomings of the current system, the information provided to Keller to come up with the proposed plan, and direction given to Keller regarding the maintenance buildings.

*The consensus was to provide Keller with direction to proceed to cost out the improvements and additional space that were originally reviewed for the maintenance buildings.*

**9. Discussion of future meeting dates:**

K. Nelson suggested Tuesday, July 26, 2022, at 8:30 AM for the next meeting of the Capital Ad Hoc Committee. *(This meeting date was changed to 7/22/2022 at 8:30 AM)*

**10. Adjournment:**

**Meacham moved to adjourn, Bridenhagen seconded at 10:23 AM, all ayes.** Motion carried.

*Recorded by,  
Kim Roberts – Deputy Clerk*