

Village of Weston, Wisconsin
OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE BUILDING COMMITTEE
held on Wednesday, December 2, 2020, at 4:30 p.m., at the Weston Municipal Center

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Meeting called to order by Committee Chair, Mort McBain, at 4:30 p.m.

2. Roll Call by Secretary Parker

Roll Call indicated 11 of 12 Committee Members present.

<u>Member</u>	<u>Present</u>
Bender, Bob – Citizen	Yes
Bushnell, Brian – Citizen	Yes
Ermeling, Barb – Trustee	Yes
Ermeling, Bryan – Citizen	Yes
Gau, Duane – PC Member/Citizen	Absent
Guerndt, Gary – PC Member/Citizen	Yes
Jordan, Joe – PC Member/Citizen	Yes
McBain, Mort – Citizen	Yes
Meinel, Steve – Trustee/PC Member	Yes
Nelson, Aaron – Citizen	Yes
White, Loren – Trustee/PC Member	Yes
Zeyghami, Hooshang – Citizen	Yes

Staff present: Donner, Higgins, Wodalski, Crowe, Osterbrink, Tatro, Maguire, Chartrand, and Parker

Others present: President Maloney, Trustee Ziegler, Jon Wallenkamp, and Randall Schoen

3. Approve Minutes of Meeting of November 24, 2020

Motion by Nelson, second by Guerndt, to approve the November 24, 2020 minutes.

Yes Vote: 11 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

<u>Member</u>	<u>Voting</u>
Bender, Bob – Citizen	Yes
Bushnell, Brian – Citizen	Yes
Ermeling, Barb – Trustee	Yes
Ermeling, Bryan – Citizen	Yes
Gau, Duane – PC Member/Citizen	Not Voting
Guerndt, Gary – PC Member/Citizen	Yes
Jordan, Joe – PC Member/Citizen	Yes
McBain, Mort – Citizen	Yes
Meinel, Steve – Trustee/PC Member	Yes
Nelson, Aaron – Citizen	Yes
White, Loren – Trustee/PC Member	Yes
Zeyghami, Hooshang – Citizen	Yes

4. Review, Discussion, Action on Floor Plan Options

McBain explained that this agenda item is to discuss the floor plan options. He stated the other major options we will wait to discuss until we get to Agenda Item #6. He stated this meeting is critical, where we need to decide for sure which way we are going with the plans, including the alternates we will propose, or not. When we get to Agenda Item #6, this is where we have to decide if we are ready to recommend to the Board of Trustees to move forward this project and under what conditions, or not. With the timeframe we are under, it is important that we make a statement tonight, moving forward, so that we can get everyone's input and keep moving forward on this project. He is hopeful through this process that we can answer some of the concerns that were raised. If we can't answer those concerns, then we will discuss what our plan is moving forward. He stated that he is not looking for a unanimous vote on any of this. He stated tonight we will vote on a resolution to the Board of Trustees so they know where we are at on this, and who is on board and who is not on board. He reiterated that right now we need to look at the floor plans and decide what we are going with.

White stated he went through the plans in detail. He referred the group to Plan A201.1, stating in that plan the corridor between the lunch/training room and the boardroom is taking up valuable space that could be used by either the boardroom or the lunchroom. He feels it is wasted space for the corridor. Similarly, in Plan A201.2, there is a large corridor in the street foreman area. White stated he settled on Plan A201.3, as he feels that has the best use of space. The only thing he found concerning with that plan is that there is no door between the boardroom and the lunch/training room, as an access to that facility, and as an emergency access into the boardroom. White then brought up the second floor, and referenced Plan A202.1, stating there are two areas with large corridors. The large space between IT Services Director and the corridor that runs along side the new planning and behind the restrooms. He stated his preference with this floor is Plan A202.2.

Barb Ermeling referred to Plan A201.3, stating with the addition of a door between the boardroom and lunch/training room, that would be her preference.

White pointed out that at the bottom of each plan, there is a date along with the Plan #. He clarified that he was referring to Plan A201.3, dated November 24, 2020, as his preference.

Nelson questioned what the opinion was for Donner and Wodalski. Donner stated staff's preference was A201.2, dated November 25th, with adding the door in training room, and moving street foreman's office to the southwest corner of the shop area. Wodalski clarified Donner is referring to having the street foreman's office placed as it is in Plan A201.2, dated November 24th, but then the rest as laid out in Plan A201.2, Dated November 25th.

Bryan Ermeling stated they are referring to the foreman's office, as laid out in Plan 201.3, Dated November 25th. Wodalski agreed with that, but with the rest of the plan like Plan A201.2, Dated November 25th.

White is fine with the foreman's office in either location, and just wants to see the door between two larger rooms.

McBain clarified we are looking at two options, White's preference along with staff's preference to move the foreman's office. Both of these would include a door between the two large rooms.

Barb Ermeling brought up Plan A201.3, dated November 25th, how it showed only two tables in the breakroom, and how she felt that is pretty small.

Motion by Bryan Ermeling, Second by Nelson, to recommend going with Plan A201.2, Dated November 25, 2020, but with moving the street foreman's office over to the southwest corner of the shop area,

and adding a door between the boardroom and lunch/training room. Question: Bushnell confirmed this is also the staff recommendation. Meinel stated that he is not in favor of the design at the \$16 million expense. He feels he is not alone on this, and does not feel comfortable voting on this, until we take into consideration other changes that could be made, to make this more economical. He stated the contract that was signed by President Wally Sparks, on February 20th, indicated the costs were going to be around \$11 or \$12 million. He feels we are rushing through and confirming what the employees had worked with the architect on. He is not in favor of voting for this as he feels there are still other issues to be shaved out of here before we come up with a final plan. McBain understands Meinel, and agreed there probably are others here that feel the same way as Meinel. McBain stated the best way to get this resolved is for us to deal with these smaller issues, get those out of the way, and then under Agenda Item #6, we'll come to Meinel's concerns. Meinel stated he is abstaining from the vote. Barb Ermeling questioned if the plan that we are voting on is the one with the smaller footage, or the full footage? Wodalski stated this is the one with the smaller footprint (less 645 [sq. ft.](#)). Motion carried.

Yes Vote: 10 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 1 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

<u>Member</u>	<u>Voting</u>
Bender, Bob – Citizen	Yes
Bushnell, Brian – Citizen	Yes
Ermeling, Barb – Trustee	Yes
Ermeling, Bryan – Citizen	Yes
Gau, Duane – PC Member/Citizen	Not Voting
Guernadt, Gary – PC Member/Citizen	Yes
Jordan, Joe – PC Member/Citizen	Yes
McBain, Mort – Citizen	Yes
Meinel, Steve – Trustee/PC Member	Abstain
Nelson, Aaron – Citizen	Yes
White, Loren – Trustee/PC Member	Yes
Zeyghami, Hooshang – Citizen	Yes

White stated on Plan A202.1, dated November 24, 2020, he felt that the corridor along the bathrooms and the hall area by the IT service director, is a waste of space. He has similar concerns with Plan A202.3, dated November 25, 2020, regarding the large open space. He stated his preference was Plan A202.2, dated November 24, 2020.

Bryan Ermeling stated his preference is the original Plan A202.3, dated November 24, 2020. He stated that plan squares everything off, and the departments have their own storage, which is smaller, so staff would have to use those a little more efficiently. He stated with the other plans, there is a huge storage space that will accumulate stuff, with departments potentially arguing over who gets how much storage space.

Wallenkamp feels they can piece together the first floor based on comments received, and with the second floor, this is maximizing circulation and if anything taking circulation and putting that into store rooms.

Barb Ermeling commented on how White prefers Plan A202.2, but she does not like the large file storage area. Wodalski suggested then that we could take the file storage area above the stairs, and make that blue. Ermeling feels that is a junk room. Wodalski feels we can get by without and, so it can be eliminated (blue). Wodalski stated that the file storage area (near the assessor office) can be compartmentalized.

Guerndt questioned if the new planning and the new conference rooms are going to be built right away or later, as they are shown in blue. Wodalski explained those rooms shown in blue are ones we do not currently have.

Wodalski then went through each of the offices and described what employees would be using them. Maloney commented how those offices along the shop wall could have windows looking out into the shop.

Wallenkamp explained the difference between the blue and red. He stated the two conference rooms on the left side will be built out, and the large blue area on the right side will not be built out.

Motion by White, second by Zeyghami to recommend going with Plan A202.2, dated November 24, 2020, with the removal of the 214 square foot file storage area (changing that to blue).

Yes Vote: 9 No Votes: 1 Abstain: 1 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

<u>Member</u>	<u>Voting</u>
Bender, Bob – Citizen	Yes
Bushnell, Brian – Citizen	Yes
Ermeling, Barb – Trustee	Yes
Ermeling, Bryan – Citizen	No Vote
Gau, Duane – PC Member/Citizen	Not Voting
Guerndt, Gary – PC Member/Citizen	Yes
Jordan, Joe – PC Member/Citizen	Yes
McBain, Mort – Citizen	Yes
Meinel, Steve – Trustee/PC Member	Abstain
Nelson, Aaron – Citizen	Yes
White, Loren – Trustee/PC Member	Yes
Zeyghami, Hooshang – Citizen	Yes

5. Discussion of Building Mechanical Systems

Guerndt stated that he, Donner, and Wodalski met with Wallenkamp and Rich Root, of Root Engineering, earlier this week and went through some different options with them. He stated he was just suggesting something a little bit more efficient. Guerndt stated it is pretty late in the game right now to be making changes.

McBain asked if both different options are going to be looked at. Donner stated that both options will be proposed for evaluation by WI Focus on Energy (FOE). Wallenkamp stated we will take some of their documents and inputs and also take that into a cost payback analysis. He stated FOE will only give us the energy usage piece, and we will take it one step farther and make sure the payback analysis is also looked at.

Nelson stated the payback analysis for those systems is very important because of what it ends up costing just to keep them running, if you don't figure that in.

Guerndt stated he e-mailed Wallenkamp some comparisons of what he did for ENT & Allergy Associates. Wallenkamp stated that was helpful information and will look at that when doing the payback analysis.

McBain stated we will recommend that FOE evaluates both systems and recommendation based on efficiency and payback costs, and this will come along as part of the recommendations to the Board.

Zeyghami asked Wallenkamp to send him the specs for the blackboxes (or cassettes). He has these in his office in the past. He would like to review the specs so he can comment on them.

Wallenkamp stated this Friday, they have their intro meeting with FOE, and within 10 days they will have a complete side-by-side design options and bundles. Zeyghami would like the specs before then.

Guerndt asked Wallenkamp if they are far enough along that they have picked a cassette that they will utilize? Wallenkamp stated Root has given his input based on ~~a firm in their~~ Texas office that does a lot of these. Wallenkamp stated Root will pick a cassette for his design. If this will be a VAV, then there will be multiple manufactures that are approved to be used. He stated one cassette will be the basis of design, and the spec will give 2 – 3 other options. Guerndt stated to Zeyghami that there is a lot of new technology out there for these and the older technology that is out there has been mastered quite significantly, and there are a lot of different ways to approach these when building them. Zeyghami stated he wants to see the specs to see how much change is there and what are the changes. Guerndt stated those are very easily adaptable for expansion as well.

6. Resolution to the Board of Trustees Recommending the Building Project Proceed and the Committee Continues Its Involvement in the Project

McBain explained he is aware there has been some discussion outside of this committee between members. He stated he knows there are still some serious concerns by members, in terms of the overall project, and some of the components of the project, which are considered to some to be non-essential or non-economical. Those opinions are making it difficult for some of this committee to endorse this project to get it going forward. He feels tonight is the time to get these issues back out on the table with some finality. He stated the goal ~~action~~ tonight would be to adopt the resolution to move recommendations forward to the Board, or not. He stated tonight we can vote on the specific concerns so that we can move to a final recommendation to the Board, which fulfills our charge.

McBain brought up the proposed washbays. He stated they could be left out or changed in favor of contracted wash services by local businesses.

Donner clarified with the two proposed washbays, that one will have a portable pressure washer, which is what we do now for our vehicles. The other washbay is the one that will have equipment provided under an alternate bid. Donner stated his concern with taking washing off site, is that we will be taking on an operational expense, somewhere else, where we do not have the ability to create money for new operations. With our levy limit restrictions, we cannot raise our operating levy (we can only raise our debt) unless we have growth and other things that permit us to increase the levy for operations. Donner is under the impression the real concern is with the automatic washing equipment in the other washbay, not the manual washbay itself. Maloney asked ~~stated~~ with the automatic washbay, who would pay for the chemicals and the heat.

Nelson commented the option within the building still could have a manual, and save on the \$315,000 costs for the equipment (and maintenance and soap). Guerndt confirmed one wash bay is manual and one is automatic.

Jordan asked why we need the manual wash bay area, as in why could we not just wash the vehicles in the large vehicle entrance?

Barb Ermeling stated she is concerned about the automated wash bay, with the potential mechanical problems. She feels this will be an expense we don't need. She feels we need the manual wash bays, just not the automatic one. She does not know what the savings would be to have both bays set up for manual.

Guerndt commented on how some places (like Wausau Supply) hire a contractor to come on site, you have your equipment all in a row, and that hired contractor comes in and washes the equipment.

McBain questioned if we went to two manual wash bays, it would still allow us to contract for outside washing services. He is not sure if changing from automatic to manual would necessitate the use of two bays, though it would leave the option. The other option would be to kick this forward to the Board, as a serious alternate.

Nelson questioned if we got rid of the automatic equipment, and just have two manual bays, would that save us \$315,000?

Guerndt understands and agrees that we need a wash bay to wash our equipment.

White questioned if by making the Large Vehicle Entrance into a wash area, it would prevent other vehicles coming in and out, if someone is in the process of washing there.

Wallenkamp stated you can wash vehicles in stalls, but then you add more mechanicals involved as there will now be more moisture in big building. He stated after 30 years of research, you will see more rusting of vehicles and equipment if you wash in the stall. Wallenkamp stated by removing the automated washing equipment, the main dollar savings will be on the wash equipment costs. Wallenkamp explained to Guerndt the stairwell in the bay is for the manual system, to allow them to clean on top of their trucks. It was explained to Guerndt that in the long bay, you can get two units in there to wash. Wallenkamp suggested if the members want to remove a wash bay, we just create two entry aisles, which also gives you other areas to wash in this area. He suggested to then take the manual wash bay and move it to the right, as it would not make sense to change the size of the overall building.

Guerndt stated we are trying to get this building down to \$10-12 million, as it was originally planned, which he feels is where some of the members are having a hard time with this. He is concerned when we do not have buy-in ourselves, how are we supposed to sell to the taxpayers. Guerndt commented that we could plan to add on to the shop later in the future to save costs now.

Nelson commented the only way to obtain that \$10-12 million goal is to park vehicles outside, but he is not sure if it is feasible to park half the fleet outside. Wodalski stated the goal has always been to make it so we don't have to play Tetris trying to fit all the vehicles inside and/or to not have them all rust from staying outside, or being stored in multiple locations throughout the Village. Guerndt stated parking outside is not going to make them rust, its not washing the salt off of them every night that will make them rust. Jordan stated his biggest issue is having all the equipment stored inside.

Nelson stated the only way to get this building down ~~by to~~ \$5 million, is to cut the building in half. Jordan stated we definitely need a new building. He feels it was a good idea to have staff put together the plans initially, since they will be the ones using everything. But with it based on a wish list, they put everything in there that they can imagine. He can't get on board with this, when he sees other local businesses having their equipment standing outside. He sees other municipalities who don't have all equipment inside. The idea of bringing all equipment inside during the wintertime, the size of HVAC to deal with the amount of moisture that will come in, will be phenomenal. He stated at Wausau Supply, they load their trucks in the cold to minimize the amount of water (from snowmelt) in the building, as the moisture will affect their products. Jordan stated they have always done metal frame construction, which can be added onto easily. He stated 30 years ago, they did a building with tip-up concrete, and back then the cost was 30% more. He feels we could get the cost down on this building by making a metal frame and allowing some of the stored vehicles and equipment to be outside. Jordan asked what we will do if this goes out to bid, and comes back in at \$16.5 million? Donner stated if that happened, we would not award the contract. He stated we will not know what the costs will be until we bid it.

Donner stated the scope of the project has not changed. Back in 2016, the estimate was \$12 million. There are provisions in the contract language for making adjustments. Donner stated the latest estimates used, including financing, have all been at \$15 million. Maloney commented that the \$15.5 million on the resolution

includes \$140,000 in demolition, and also the \$1 million that we paid for the site. He stated then to take out \$315,000 for the automatic wash bay, and now we are at \$14 million. Nelson stated then to cut the building in half and make it a metal building, and we are then down another \$2.7 million. Maloney stated to take out the fuel island, which will be about \$285,000. He stated the election/training room could be in the Board Room, as he feels the Board Room is not used that often. He stated then the proposed election/training room could be that flexible area, like the future area on the second floor.

Nelson stated as far as the building storage, would it make a difference to use the Village's existing facility to store half of the equipment. Maloney stated the goal is to sell this current facility and hope to get \$0.5 million for it. Jordan suggested to take that \$0.5 million and put up a secondary cold storage building. McBain stated the revenue from the sale of this [site building](#) will help to offset the costs.

Ermeling asked Jordan what would be the advantage of building a secondary, unheated building, versus having the equipment in a heated building.

Wallenkamp stated he could take the right-hand side, where each bay is about 30 feet. He stated we can come up with an alternate plan that cuts off 90 or 120 feet, and we bid that as an alternate. He stated another alternate could be for a storage building. This will give us a mix of numbers, where we can see [where](#) that extra 120 feet will cost us. He commented, however, if you build a storage shed, it will require utilities to be run to it. From what he has seen, it is better to build the biggest box, versus a bunch of little boxes.

Guerndt questioned if part of our building could be unheated? Wallenkamp stated anytime you get to a building of this size for vehicles, we are required to sprinkle the building.

Guerndt questioned, with operating expenses, what is in the budget for heating this building now. Donner stated we are hoping to get an idea of this from FOE's evaluation. Wallenkamp stated the average of a current is about \$77.00 per square foot, and they are usually able to get it down to the mid-\$30's. Guerndt stated will lose a lot of heat when opening doors. Wodalski stated that currently, all the trucks used to plow are brought inside.

Barb Ermeling stated we chose a floor plan that reduced the board room and training room, and asked if that is giving us any savings. Bender stated with that we basically saved on one 14-foot wall.

McBain stated we could look at the alternative that Wallenkamp just proposed.

[There was discussion about electrical or gas needs for the welding booth.](#) Guerndt confirmed with Wallenkamp that they will still need the NO2, CO2, and make-up air. Wallenkamp stated they would not need make-up air. Meinel questioned cold storage for the trailers, lawn mowers, etc., and if they need sprinklers? White stated there are no separating walls between parking area. Nelson stated whenever there are gasoline powered equipment, you have to have sprinkler system. Guerndt stated unless you have firewalls throughout building, will need to be sprinklered.

McBain questioned if the committee is okay with our taking Wallenkamp's alternate suggestion and then run warm storage versus cold storage to Board. White stated we still need heat in the mechanics area. It was stated if we keep the washbays, we will need some heat.

Guerndt asked if Wallenkamp can get this building project down to \$10 - \$12 million. Wallenkamp reminded the members we were talking \$10,500,000 for building costs, and that the higher number is the whole project. Need to know if they are talking the building or project costs. Wallenkamp stated his goal is to get this as low as possible.

There was discussion on the wash bay costs. Wallenkamp confirmed the bays are estimated at \$75 per square foot, and at the bottom of the cost estimate sheet is where the cost of equipment is shown (automatic was at \$210,000, versus manual pressure washer at \$12,000). Guerndt commented on if we eliminate one wash bay (and automatic equipment), we will save quite a bit. Wallenkamp stated we need to get to the alternate plan and bid it that way to see where we want to go. Guerndt questioned if he can look at making part of the shop area cold storage. Wallenkamp stated he will put together an alternate plan for that 120 feet.

Guerndt discussed how he feels washing the equipment is important, and there was some discussion on how much of the proposed shop storage space will be for plow trucks.

Wallenkamp questioned the committee what dollar amount they want him to try to get down to for the building costs (Line 6). Wallenkamp asked the group what Line 15 should be for everyone to feel comfortable. It was stated to get the total costs between \$10 to \$12 million would make the members okay with this.

Guerndt stated he does not want to take the calls, as he feels he will not be able to justify the costs without taxpayer approval. Guerndt stated when he and other business people do not have the money to do this, and if they did, now they would be paying more in taxes, more in heat and electric, etc. Guerndt and Meinel would be more in favor of this project if Wallenkamp can get the price between \$10 and \$12 million.

Barb Ermeling confirmed he suggests as an alternate to take our equipment in the heated building and build a cold storage shed? Guerndt stated he is referring to just half of it. Barb Ermeling stated would they be better off in cold storage (after washed). Guerndt stated it is very time consuming to wash the equipment. Ermeling questioned if the small equipment can be parked in a cold storage. Guerndt questioned the tip-up walls and if Wallenkamp could look at steel. Wallenkamp stated with a steel building, you have to have exterior columns and footings/frames. He stated instead, they could look at different facades, and perhaps painting concrete versus already tinted/colored. He stated how a steel building does not last as long as tip-up walls.

Bushnell stated we need to decide what line 22 should ~~to~~ be, and then let the Trustees decide. Barb Ermeling questioned what they are comfortable with, \$10 – \$12million or \$12 – \$14million? Nelson stated \$10 – \$12 million will drastically change the plan. Bender stated to get to \$12 – \$14 million, with alternatives.

McBain stated we discussed the wash bays being manual vs automatic. With regard to the fuel island, do we want to look at alternative of fuel island. Several members agreed to take out the fuel island. Barb Ermeling questioned what Guerndt was talking about with fuel on a trailer? Guerndt stated there are 3 good vendors that offer this service, which the Village could bid. Guerndt stated to have the crew purchasing fuel from local businesses would give them the opportunity to interact with the community. McBain asked for a show of hands on the fuel system: 6 agreed to take the fuel island off the plans, and 3 agreed to keep it on the property.

Jordan stated his concern with a fuel island is who will keep up on the recordkeeping, maintenance, etc. He looked at doing this for Wausau Supply, but felt it was not worth the cost. McBain stated part of objective is to limit number of alternatives. Guerndt explained to Ermeling the option of renting a portable trailer from a vendor, and how the vendor will monitor it and will not charge us for that.

Barb Ermeling confirmed that automatic wash bay equipment is out. McBain asked for a show of hands: 8 agreed to remove the automatic wash equipment. McBain stated with a majority in favor of removal, that alternative is now out. It was clarified that we were looking to remove one full bay (the automatic bay), and the manual one-bay will have two wands.

Jordan suggested we use \$12 million on line 22 as the bottom or low side. Jordan feels with what was discussed tonight, we may be able to get there.

Meinel questioned the salt storage on site, can we use proceeds for this current facility to pay for a salt shed to be constructed later? Bender stated the issue will be our selling this facility, plus there will be a lot of back and forth. Meinel questioned an environmental phase 13 on this area? McBain stated that will need to be done. Jordan asked if we can move our current one salt shed? Wodalski stated our current salt shed is in dis-repair, and how there is money being spent each year just to maintain this current one. Wallenkamp stated the salt shed is being bid as a barn profile (like the current), but will do alternate with round style. The material will be creosote [treated lumber](#), like current. The round style will be concrete buttress wall with wood structure roof.

Nelson stated we are discussing how to lower line #22, we almost have to do that before we can make a motion. Nelson stated when adding up the fuel island, one wash bay, and wash equipment, it comes to about \$650,000, which gets us between \$13,800,000 to \$15,800,000. Nelson stated to look at original and look at secondary option between \$12 million on low side and \$14 million on the high side.

McBain confirmed the motion will be that Line 22 should be \$12 – \$14.5 million. Nelson stated Wallenkamp will bid this a couple ways, the first as is, less those three items; then the second to modify the garage plan to reduce the overall cost.

Guerndt questioned Wallenkamp if he is taking the \$650,000 and if removing the pigment out of the spancrete, and just paint it, is there is enough room to get another \$1.3 million out without cutting the size of the building. He stated there is not \$1.3 million in fluff to remove. Wallenkamp gave the example of the orange maintenance area itself being \$1 million. Wallenkamp stated to let him build an alternate to get us to this number. Zeyghami questioned how good the contingency is. Wallenkamp stated he needs to stay at 6%, and later once we are done bidding, we could go down to about 3%. Zeyghami stated the only way to make that \$1 million is to cut the square footage. Zeyghami suggested that perhaps we cut out the future development. Zeyghami stated that while he does not want to see square footage cut out, if that is what it will take to make the project happen, then that is what we will need to do. Wallenkamp stated to get him the number we want to be at, and he will get alternate to do this.

Motion by Nelson, second by Jordan to eliminate the fuel island, the automated wash bay equipment, and one of the wash bays.

Yes Vote: 10 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 1 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

<u>Member</u>	<u>Voting</u>
Bender, Bob – Citizen	Yes
Bushnell, Brian – Citizen	Yes
Ermeling, Barb – Trustee	Yes
Ermeling, Bryan – Citizen	Yes
Gau, Duane – PC Member/Citizen	Not Voting
Guerndt, Gary – PC Member/Citizen	Yes
Jordan, Joe – PC Member/Citizen	Yes
McBain, Mort – Citizen	Yes
Meinel, Steve – Trustee/PC Member	Abstain
Nelson, Aaron – Citizen	Yes
White, Loren – Trustee/PC Member	Yes
Zeyghami, Hooshang – Citizen	Yes

Motion by Nelson, second by Jordan to reduce the bottom line (line 22) on the alternative bid, to be \$12 million on the low end to \$14 million on the high end.

Yes Vote: 9 No Votes: 1 Abstain: 1 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

<u>Member</u>	<u>Voting</u>
Bender, Bob – Citizen	Yes
Bushnell, Brian – Citizen	Yes
Ermeling, Barb – Trustee	Yes
Ermeling, Bryan – Citizen	No Vote
Gau, Duane – PC Member/Citizen	Not Voting
Guerndt, Gary – PC Member/Citizen	Yes
Jordan, Joe – PC Member/Citizen	Yes
McBain, Mort – Citizen	Yes
Meinel, Steve – Trustee/PC Member	Abstain
Nelson, Aaron – Citizen	Yes
White, Loren – Trustee/PC Member	Yes
Zeyghami, Hooshang – Citizen	Yes

White commented that we have made significant changes that will affect this resolution; therefore, he does not think this committee can vote on this at this time. He referred to the resolution and the items that will need further clarification, to further describe what plans we are referring to. He pointed out that #3 on the first page refers to 01/25/2020. [Donner clarified that was a typo and should be 11/25/2020. Donner also stated the resolution was a draft and he expected there would be changes made before adoption.](#)

McBain stated we need to get to the final question, which is a vote to move forward on the project as described in the resolution, which will be revised. He needs the committee to vote whether they are willing to move forward with this. The next thing we will do then is send out the flyer, which will have everyone's name and number on it.

Barb Ermeling stated looking at the resolution and listening to what people are talking about, she feels they won't support a resolution until they get an idea of what the costs might be. Jordan stated as written tonight he does not support. Nelson questioned Wallenkamp how long it will take him to come up with a secondary plan? Wallenkamp does not feel it will be ready next week. Nelson questioned what difference this will make if we push off a few weeks. Barb Ermeling stated the difference is the bidding.

Wallenkamp ~~asked stated~~ if we don't have to have the documents 2-3 days prior to meeting, ~~he can~~ [he](#) have it ready by next Tuesday, at 4pm. [The committee indicated it will be OK for Wallenkamp's to submit drawings question if okay for](#) next Tuesday by 4pm. White [suggested to](#) defer [further discussion](#) to next meeting, Jordan [said it should be second,](#) pending receipt of Wallenkamp alternative plan.

Motion by White, second by Jordan defer this to a future date, or next meeting, pending receipt of Wallenkamp's alternative plan.

Yes Vote: 10 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 1 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

<u>Member</u>	<u>Voting</u>
Bender, Bob – Citizen	Yes
Bushnell, Brian – Citizen	Yes
Ermeling, Barb – Trustee	Yes
Ermeling, Bryan – Citizen	Yes
Gau, Duane – PC Member/Citizen	Not Voting
Guerndt, Gary – PC Member/Citizen	Yes
Jordan, Joe – PC Member/Citizen	Yes
McBain, Mort – Citizen	Yes
Meinel, Steve – Trustee/PC Member	Abstain

Nelson, Aaron – Citizen	Yes
White, Loren – Trustee/PC Member	Yes
Zeyghami, Hooshang – Citizen	Yes

Wallenkamp clarified this is for the alternate bid plan to take \$1 million out, along with the full regular plan. Guerndt questioned Wodalski, on the service area, if we currently have 6 spots? Donner stated currently we have no secluded area for welding. Guerndt questioned if we have to have all these overhead doors in? Wodalski stated they have talked to Wallenkamp about maybe changing so that only 3 of the 6 bays are drive through. Wodalski stated typically we have 3 vehicles under repair at a time. Wallenkamp will update the spreadsheet. [KD1][MW2][MW3]

7. Discussion of Progress on Public Communications

a) Review and discuss list of FAQ's

b) Project Introduction Mailer

c) Press Release

McBain stated since we delayed voting on the resolution, the mailer will get delayed also. He stated we should hold off on the press release too. Bushnell stated the mailer does not say anything about project costs. He does not see why the mailer can't still get out now. McBain stated the dilemma we have is sending this out when we do not have full support. We would end up with some kickback. Unless we can get a unanimous vote to send this out, or we make a change, or if some insist their names come off, we should hold off.

Bushnell stated the vote was made to approve with project cost between at \$12 million and \$14 million, and that now it's just a matter of how we get there. Jordan stated that is a goal, but have not removed it off the table yet. He may be supportive of a modified project for a certain dollar amount. But if he gets calls now, before the changes happen, he can't be supportive. Bender stated we are not sure which way we are going just yet, until the revisions come in, he does not feel he has what he needs to discuss with public. Meinel stated to put off for one week.

8. Agenda for Next Meeting

None.

9. Next Meeting Date:

a) **Wednesday, December 9, 2020 @ 4:30 p.m.**

b) **To Be Determined?**

9. Remarks from Meeting Participants

Jordan stated he would appreciate if staff would work with Wallenkamp to get the costs down. He stated that the committee wants to see this go forward, and hope that the staff can be proactive and come up with some ideas to help Wallenkamp get to that number.

Zeyghami questioned if we could make the north wall a knock-out wall. [KD4][MW5] Wallenkamp stated it is a non-load bearing wall. Zeyghami stated we could add that addition on later. Wallenkamp stated we are going to shell that area out right now. We would have to move the roof to make Zeyghami's idea work.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

ADJOURN

Motion by Nelson, second by Barb Ermeling to adjourn at 6:46 p.m.

Mark Maloney, Village President

DRAFT