

Village of Weston, Wisconsin
OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE BUILDING COMMITTEE
held on Wednesday, December 9, 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 12 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 | Yes |
| Guernndt, 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, Trautman, Tatro, Maguire, Falkowski, and Parker

Others present: President Maloney, Trustee Ziegler, Jon Wallenkamp, Randall Schoen, and 4 audience members.

3. Approve Minutes of Meeting of December 2, 2020

Motion by Nelson, second by Ermeling, to approve the December 2, 2020 minutes. Question: Gau apologized for missing the last meeting, as he had a situation at home and could not attend. He asked the Committee members for a to-show of a hands of who all-toured the Public Works facility here as it exists (~~it showed that~~ Guernndt stated he did not attend a tour, but he stated he has been back there before. Jordan did not indicate having attended). Gau then asked if any of the Committee members had ever been an operator of a Public Works organization (no one raised their hand). Gau stated this is why he is here on this committee. He stated through all the meetings, he feels this group has done a good job with the administration process of the building. He stated he sees himself here to represent the Public Works facility that we have, which he said is atrocious. He stated he has worked in several public works facilities and has been a highway commissioner and has seen these operations. He asked if anyone here has seen the day-to-day public works operations (no one raised their hand). Gau stated this operation is not a business, it does not run like a warehouse, it does not run like a construction company, it does not run like anything you see today going on in the industry. He stated the things the members are looking at and are chopping out are things that create more labor. He stated when you have snow that is frozen hard under a truck, it takes hours to get it unpacked, and you can't run it the next day. If you leave it in the shop (heated or unheated), ^[KD1] it will not melt off for the next day operation. He stated he had a case where he had to fight real hard to get two wash bays. When you take this down to one wash bay, you are spending labor brushing and cleaning the snow off at the end of the day. He stated if you watch the overtime in the winter, there is a lot. If you have an

automatic wash bay, what they do is run through that wash bay initially, but then run through the manual wash to get the rest of the snow and ice off that vehicle. If you don't do this, you will not be able to operate this vehicle the next day. He stated when you look at how they have been operating, and you start cutting the storage out of these facilities, he thinks they are totally wrong. He pointed out many here are just looking at the dollars, and dollar amounts, and how they can't support something this costly because it does not operate like an industry or a warehouse. He stated this is not a warehouse, and not a business, like what Jordan has. Gau pointed out how some here are saying they can't support the project if it is at a certain dollar amount; and Gau then said that he can't support a project that gets this chopped up, which will affect how the public works is supposed to operate. He stated if he would have been able to attend the last meeting, he would have been speaking up very loudly. Motion carried.

Yes Vote: 11 No Votes: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 0 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 | No |
| 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 Project Variations

a) Base Project Bid

b) Alternate Project Bid

McBain summarized that last time we asked Wallenkamp what has to be done to get to a building project that is somewhere between \$12+ million and \$14 million.

Wallenkamp referred to Plan A201.0, and stated this plan is the Master Plan Floor Plan, which incorporates the tweaks and the layouts that were adopted at the last meeting. He stated that all the plans presented tonight eliminate the things the Committee asked to have eliminated at the last meeting (such as second wash bay). He stated this master plan captures everything and would be the total required build-out.

Wallenkamp then referred to Plan A201.1, which is the same base plan, but only the office changed by his deleting a 20-foot bay out of the office, which is 1,765 square feet footprint (or 3,600 square feet).

Wallenkamp then referred to Plan A201.2, which shows the office cut back the 20 feet, and also cuts 114 feet off the (vehicle storage area) building on the right. He explained how this plan takes out the circulation drive aisle, where the crew will have to strategically park the vehicles in the building, kind of like they do now, or leave some vehicles out in the environment.

Wallenkamp then referred to Plan A202.0, which is the upper level of the master plan, which incorporates the changes. He stated they tweaked this a bit to get all the offices where they could be overlooking the vehicle garage and cutting as much circulation space to maximize the actual use. He stated the future build-out section is more of a square.

Wallenkamp then referred to Plan A202.1, which cuts the 20 feet out of the office. In order to get all the day-to-day operations to work, these were flipped over to the right, and the upper left box is now the future expansion.

Wallenkamp then referred to Plan A202.2, which incorporates the A201.1 and A201.2 and it was two-story space, and the footprint they took out is just over 1 floor.

Wallenkamp then referred back to Plan A202.1, stating his personal opinion is if we have to, he would sacrifice the 20 feet out of the office before he would sacrifice the vehicle parking on the right. He stated then later, if we have to expand on the office space, we could expand into the mezzanine, but then the archived storage would have to be moved and stored off-site somewhere. He stated it would be too difficult to put an expansion on the office later, so we either include the original 20 feet, or we later plan to build into the mezzanine. He feels it is more important to keep that full parking bay, than the 20 feet into the office. He stated with Plan A202.1, the mechanical room was pushed to the west, and there is a direct access from the office. He stated the future expansion area would only be the upper level office space, as it would not be cost effective to start moving all the shops.

Wallenkamp stated the additional plans (A203.0, A203.1, A204.0, and A204.1) are just blow-ups of the spaces.

Wallenkamp then referred to the cost sheets. The sheet with the blue heading is the cost estimate for A201.0 (base design), stating this one has the building estimate between \$10,541,450 and \$12,268,000, and the total overall project costs being between \$13,972,005 and \$16,038,748.

Wallenkamp then referred to the page with the orange heading (covering Alternate 1), with the smaller office, gets our total project costs to the \$13,436,016 to \$15,446,102 range.

Wallenkamp then referred to the page with the green heading (covering both Alternate 1 and 2), stating this gets us to the \$12 to \$14 million range. [\(Alternate 2 is the smaller garage\)](#)

Wallenkamp pointed out the Office cost per Unit Price ~~line~~, and how when taking the 20 feet out, it does not stay at the same per unit price as the original estimate. He stated that all we are doing is taking interior volume out, and the exterior wall is being added to the garage wall, so we are not saving on exterior wall costs. He stated the Unit Price is going from \$125 to \$130, [because you don't equally drop all plumbing and mechanical, as you are buying volume space, which is similar to the vehicle garage](#). Wallenkamp stated he recommends we design and draw the full master ~~full~~ plan, and then include an Alternate 1 & 2. He also recommends we go with Alternate 12 before we go to Alternate 21.

Wallenkamp stated to Zeyghami that with the (blue) master plan cost estimate, the special items: fuel island, automatic wash bay equipment, and 2nd wash bay, have already been taken out.

Wallenkamp stated to White, with taking out the 20 feet of office space, we will still have the drive-up window.

Bryan Ermeling asked what this does to the estimated time we would have to add on? He stated that originally with this project, it was projected the soonest needed addition would be 30 years. Would taking 20 feet out require an addition in 5 – 7 years? Wallenkamp explained that his plans with this alternate is that we would not be adding on to the building, but rather expanding into the mezzanine, and we would be building a separate outbuilding for the things being stored in the mezzanine. Bryan Ermeling questioned with the projected growth rate, what time period Wallenkamp thinks this would need to occur? He asked if this would be in 5 years, where the costs could be twice as much, versus if it were done on the front end, where you would not have a

substandard design. Wallenkamp stated his guess is 5 – 7 years, but it is dependent on growth. Bryan Ermeling stated his concern is that the plan was that this building would be set for 30 years, but now we are looking at modifying it in 5 years. He agrees with Gau that we can't just look at dollar numbers. He stated we are making it less efficient in the garage and that in 5 years will need to spend \$4 million of taxpayer money to do what we could have done for \$2 million today. We have to be very careful that we are focusing on the dollar and we are focusing on the concept of the garage and we are going to heat metal (trucks). If you look at this current facility, they are heating all the metal already. He stated it is extremely inefficient, if there is a snow event, for our drivers to have to spend the time to unstack everything to get out, or a battery is dead and now they have to move three vehicles. He feels that cutting all the area out of the garage does not make sense. He stated when looking at a snow event, if we can get the plows out 10 minutes earlier, look at all the vehicle accidents we can reduce on our residents. If we can reduce 2 or 3 accidents saved because we get out there sooner, that could save \$400,000 in 5 years easily. He believes there are 40 snow events, and if you save 5 accidents at \$2,000, that is \$400,000 in a year that the residents don't have to pay to repair vehicles or to repair property. Wallenkamp stated that his recommendation is to go with the masterplan, and the alternatives were put together based on what the Committee wanted to get the costs down.

Zeyghami stated he agrees we are wasting our time, and feels we should bid the project as is, and then we can make changes. He stated these are just estimated numbers. We do not have real numbers in front of us to cut 20 feet here or to cut the bay for the car wash or to decrease the parking area.

Gau stated from what he saw in the last meeting minutes, we moved the foreman shop and asked why that was. Wodalski stated the area was a better gathering/meeting spot.

White stated with Plan A201.2, here we are stacking all the vehicles again, where all the vehicles in the center would have to move before the rest of the vehicles can come out. He stated it does not makes sense.

Bushnell stated a good part of the discussion last time was heated garage space versus cold garage space. Asked Wallenkamp how much research he did on the warm versus cold, and does that track into the cost estimate. Wallenkamp stated when looking at the color scheme of the plans, the green area (vehicle parking) is heated to 45 degrees. The orange (repair bay) is heated to 55 – 60 degrees, and then the red (office) is heated to 68 – 70 degrees, and the shops are the same 55 – 60 degrees. He stated anything seasonal is planned to be stored down at Ryan Street. He stated all the equipment shown in white are called to be stored in about 45 degrees heated temperature.

Gau agreed with Wallenkamp on the temperature of the equipment storage. He stated the important thing to remember is before storing equipment in there, you try to get them de-iced before you park them. He stated if you park them without de-icing, even with the heated temperature, it will not come off before the next morning. You are wasting energy then. He stated the way Wallenkamp designed this, at the original size, is what we should be doing. He described the temperatures set for each area of the building, saying how they are zoned for what are appropriate temperatures.

McBain confirmed from Gau that to have two washbays is critical. Gau explained when working for Kronenwetter, how the vehicles were washed by hand, all outside, and how much time was spent. Gau stated you are not washing the vehicle to make it pretty, getting it done to get it ready for the next day. Gau confirmed with Wallenkamp that the theory behind the automatic wash bay was to allow them to go through and knock the mud and sludge off the vehicles, and then they would run those through the manual wash bay. Wallenkamp stated those are set up to be "maintenance washes", this does not take care of fine detailing. Wallenkamp stated the automatic wash will have a full chassis wash, but they will still have to go back into the

manual to finish up – but at a lot less time. Gau stated people do not realize how much labor it takes to do those wash downs.

Ermeling stated she recalls there being discussion on having the trucks in a cold storage, but that it may require a sprinkler system, which means it would need to be heated. White stated there are dry systems. Bender stated you would be talking another facility then to house these. Gau stated if the vehicles are stored in the actual cold, when the crew comes in to start their vehicles in the early morning it's hard to get it going, and then they will just pull the trucks into the heated building to get them moving.

Nelson confirmed that Gau would recommend the plan include the originally proposed two wash bays (one manual and one automatic). Gau stated this is the way to make the process efficient and to cut down on additional labor costs. He stated if you only do one wash bay, you will end up with trucks backed up and employees waiting around to get in.

Guerndt stated the wash bay is \$383,000. Gau stated to look at what we are paying in overtime in 2 – 3 years.

Nelson stated Plan A201.2 would create so many long-term inefficiencies. He stated the payback on this facility is ___ years, but the life of this facility is going to be 60-80 years.

Gau stated when working on a shop including the utilities organization, repair process, the welding procedures, etc., there is where he sees we need to go for the future. He agrees the office can be expanded into the mezzanine or have an addition on. If you want a very efficient operation, you need a good shop, a good repair area, and a good cleaning of vehicles.

McBain stated, per parliamentary procedure, it is allowable for a person who voted for this alternate, on a previous vote, to prevail with the vote, to make a motion to reconsider, which puts the motion back on the floor, for us to reconsider, and revisit that vote. He stated it would be appropriate for someone who previously voted to remove the wash bay and equipment to motion to reconsider it. White clarified this would be to “rescind” and make the motion again (not “reconsider”).

Motion by Nelson, second by Bender: to rescind the alternative proposals, in regards to the wash bay and wash bay equipment. Question: White requested the Chair to get a division of an assembly (by roll call vote.)

Yes Vote: 8 No Votes: 4 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 0 Result: PASS

| <u>Member</u> | <u>Voting</u> |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| Bender, Bob – Citizen | Yes |
| Bushnell, Brian – Citizen | Yes |
| Ermeling, Barb – Trustee | Yes |
| Ermeling, Bryan – Citizen | No |
| Gau, Duane – PC Member/Citizen | Yes |
| Guerndt, Gary – PC Member/Citizen | No |
| Jordan, Joe – PC Member/Citizen | No |
| McBain, Mort – Citizen | Yes |
| Meinel, Steve – Trustee/PC Member | No |
| Nelson, Aaron – Citizen | Yes |
| White, Loren – Trustee/PC Member | Yes |
| Zeyghami, Hooshang – Citizen | Yes |

McBain explained now the previous action has been rescinded and is now back up for reconsideration.

Motion by Gau, second by White: to reinstate the automatic wash bay and the equipment. Question: McBain clarified the motion was to reinstate the original plan for two wash bays and an automatic wash equipment. Bushnell stated it appears the wash bay was in the original plan, and it looks to him the wash bay equipment was an alternate on the bid, where the Village Board would have the ability to look at, at the time of bids. Wallenkamp confirmed the equipment was an alternate bid. White stated the motion was to re-establish the wash bay and the equipment. McBain clarified the motion on the floor is to restore the second wash bay and the automatic wash equipment. Barb Ermeling asked what the difference would be to have just two manual stalls with two wash bays in each stall, rather than the automatic wash equipment. Gau suggested we look at the difference in cost. Guerndt stated take Line 27 (\$210,000) and then reduce Line Item 4 by \$76,000 (as we would be taking the walls out for the automated), and it comes out to \$382,875. Guerndt stated it would be \$210,000 without the automatic equipment. Wallenkamp stated if we removed the automatic wash equipment, we would still have to add another manual wash, which is \$12,000. Guerndt confirmed if still having two wash bays, we would have to add that \$76,000 back in. Guerndt stated so with the two bays, it would be about \$198,000 savings by taking the automatic washer out and adding the two manual pressure washers. Guerndt clarified the way these bays are set up, they are two-vehicle lengths deep (4 vehicles can be washed at once).

Motion by Guerndt, second by Bender, to take out the automatic wash bay equipment, and bid as make an alternate for the Board to consider.

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

| <u>Member</u> | <u>Voting</u> |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| Bender, Bob – Citizen | Yes |
| Bushnell, Brian – Citizen | Yes |
| Ermeling, Barb – Trustee | Yes |
| Ermeling, Bryan – Citizen | No |
| Gau, Duane – PC Member/Citizen | Yes |
| 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 |

McBain brought up the original motion as amended, which is to reinstate the original plan for two wash bays, with the option for the automatic wash bay equipment as an alternate, to the Board. Gau clarified that Guerndt was correct in stating there will actually be 4 ~~actual~~ areas to wash vehicles.

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

| <u>Member</u> | <u>Voting</u> |
|---------------------------|---------------|
| Bender, Bob – Citizen | Yes |
| Bushnell, Brian – Citizen | Yes |
| Ermeling, Barb – Trustee | Yes |
| Ermeling, Bryan – Citizen | No |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-----|
| Gau, Duane – PC Member/Citizen | Yes |
| 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 |

McBain discussed the overall alternate for discussion, to make sure everyone is clear that we are proposing this alternate be forwarded to the Village Board, as an alternate to the original plan. McBain clarified he is referring to the rest of the plan, and asked if there is any other discussion on the amended floor plan that moves all of the equipment to a smaller footprint (referring to Plan A201.2). White confirmed this plan is being looked at as an alternate plan.

Motion by Gau, second by White: to approve Plan A201.2, as an alternate, to the Village Board, on the shop area only, not the office. Question: Gau stated this is the plan the committee previously asked for, so he is putting it on the table. Zeyghami questioned why we would consider this, and that he won't vote on this. Gau stated he is not including the office in this motion, but is trying to make this move forward. Maloney confirmed Gau and White knew what they were doing (Gau and White both stated they plan to vote it down). Bushnell clarified that with this alternate plan, if there will be a second wash bay, then the shown 4 vehicles will have to go somewhere else. Bushnell stated he has a difficult time voting on this, as we just changed the plan. Gau explained if the Committee likes this plan to vote yes, and if they don't like this plan then you vote no. Guerndt stated the Committee did not ask for the equipment to be crammed in here like this. He stated they asked for a copy and try to get this project down in price. Guerndt stated he does not support this alternate plan, but if this is what the Committee wants to do, then we may as well keep cramming more stuff in here. Guerndt stated we were trying to cut some costs to this, and that is what we asked Wallenkamp to do. He stated there is a compromise that needs to happen. He stated they wanted to see some plans to try to reduce and cut some costs. He stated we were not trying to compromise how the Village flows or cost the Village more money. Bender questioned the issue is if they take out the 8 vehicles in the middle, where do they go and what do we do. Guerndt stated last week we discussed the idea of storing some equipment outside or do we not. He questioned how much of this stuff needs to be inside of the building. Guerndt stated everyone's attempt last week was how we can get this down a couple million dollars. Bender stated he understands that they want to reduce the cost, but with the alternate, part of that was if we weren't going to have them in here, then we have to have another building. If we did that, it would be cold storage and questioned what that cost would be. Guerndt stated he thought the building was going to stay the same size and that we were going to look at cutting some other costs. Wallenkamp stated when he talked about the plan last time, he thought it was clear that his goals were to see how many bays he could cut to get to the dollar amount. He stated then he explained each bay being 30 feet. He pointed out the vehicles listed on the plan were all from the 2016 masterplan, as vehicles scheduled to be in some type of climate control. Wallenkamp stated there is no way to keep the existing green (large vehicle storage) box and cut a million dollars out of it. He stated this is bare bones inside already and it would be a matter of cutting square footage to get the number down. Jordan agreed that he is not in favor of this reduced shop size, he feels this was not the intent at the last meeting. He stated we were trying to find some places to take money out of the budget, and this was Wallenkamp's rendition of how to do that. Jordan stated if we all believe the Village should have the size shop as originally shown, he is fine with this, but he then wants it on a referendum, as he will not put his name on this project; not for that much money and without the citizen's approval. Gau stated the only reason he is putting this on the floor is that the minutes said that you want to cut this

down to a certain amount, which was approved and seconded, which now this stuff is coming back before us. Gau stated this is the plan getting us down to that amount. He suggested to the Committee, anyone not liking this motion can vote it down.

Motion by White, second by Gau, to call the question. Question – McBain explained this means the discussion stops and we take a vote. White explained if the motion fails, then discussion can continue.

Yes Vote: 12 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 0 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 | Yes |
| 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 |

The original motion to adopt this Plan A201.2 as an alternate and forward to the Board. Gau clarified that his motion indicated this is as it applies to the shop organization, not the offices.

Yes Vote: 0 No Votes: 12 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 0 Result: FAIL

| <u>Member</u> | <u>Voting</u> |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| Bender, Bob – Citizen | No |
| Bushnell, Brian – Citizen | No |
| Ermeling, Barb – Trustee | No |
| Ermeling, Bryan – Citizen | No |
| Gau, Duane – PC Member/Citizen | No |
| Guerndt, Gary – PC Member/Citizen | No |
| Jordan, Joe – PC Member/Citizen | No |
| McBain, Mort – Citizen | No |
| Meinel, Steve – Trustee/PC Member | No |
| Nelson, Aaron – Citizen | No |
| White, Loren – Trustee/PC Member | No |
| Zeyghami, Hooshang – Citizen | No |

McBain explained Plan A201.2 is no longer to be considered as an alternate to the Village Board. Gau stated now the Committee can put together a combination of the plans they want, just not this small.

Bushnell confirmed Plan 201.0 is the original, less one wash bay. White stated he noticed the plans changed the position of the showers too. Wallenkamp clarified that this is the original with the required modifications requested by the committee. Bushnell confirmed to Wallenkamp that Plans A202.1 and A202.2 refers to the office space and the reduction. Wallenkamp stated there was a reduction of 1,705 square feet per office floor.

McBain stated the questioned is if we forward this reduced office space as an alternate to the Board. Bushnell stated the reason he went to that is because the lengthy discussion will be on shop and garage, so he felt we could get past this first. He pointed out the reduction offers some cost savings.

Bender questioned if a motion can be made, as an alternate to the bid, have the smaller office. Plans A204.0 and A204.1 were brought up, and it was stated that these are close-ups of the 1st and 2nd floors. Bushnell confirmed A204.1 is with the reduction. Wallenkamp stated 1,765 square foot reduction per floor. Bender corrected that the plans referred to are A203.1 (first floor) and A204.1 (second floor) for alternates.

Motion by Bender, second by Bushnell, to recommend Plans A203.1 and A204.1 as alternate plans to be bid. Question – Bushnell questioned if Wallenkamp has a dollar amount that can be attached to this. Bender state, looking at the alternates, this will amount to \$380,000 reduction. Bushnell stated when taking this number along with the preceding approval, we are now approaching a \$600,000 reduction. Zeyghami stated to remember these are just estimates and we will not know what we have until the bids come in. Jordan confirmed the cost estimate, labeled Alternate 1, is basically a change to offices with shop staying the same. Jordan stated he would rather see the committee adopt this alternate as the plan that would be submitted to the Board, rather than adopt it as an alternate to the Board. Bender stated his motion was to recommend A203.1 & A204.1 as the alternate plans. He stated we could turn around and have either as the alternate or vote it down and make it primary. Bushnell stated his second on the motion was based on this being an alternate. He personally prefers to give the Board as much choice as possible when the bids come in and they are seeing real numbers, rather than tying their hands in a way that does not let them look at real numbers to allow them to make a decision. Gau brought up Jordan’s comment regarding the Alternate #1 Cost Estimate. Jordan stated it was the responsibility of this Committee to evaluate and to work through all of these issues before hand. He is interested in giving the Trustees a plan that we can all agree on, and as close to the original \$15 million that the Board was talking about. His thought is that we work on all the issues as a group here, as this is not the Board’s job. He stated why are we here, if we are going to give the Board all the options. Wallenkamp stated it is not abnormal to have a committee like this, and the Board, to have alternates to choose from. Barb Ermeling would like to see the original plan and an alternate to come before the Board. She stated while they are all concerned about the cost, and she is afraid if we don’t give an alternate, she is afraid the project could die. Bushnell stated we are an advisory committee, and the Board could change the plans. White stated the decision this committee makes is not binding. White stated he appreciates the work and expertise done on this project and feels it is good to have non-elected officials involved. McBain feels like it is perfectly acceptable to give the Board a few choices.

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

| <u>Member</u> | <u>Voting</u> |
|------------------------------------|---------------|
| Bender, Bob – Citizen | Yes |
| Bushnell, Brian – Citizen | Yes |
| Ermeling, Barb – Trustee | Yes |
| Ermeling, Bryan – Citizen | No |
| Gau, Duane – PC Member/Citizen | Yes |
| Guernadt, 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 |

Mcbain asked if there are any other motions or actions to be taken on Agenda Item #4. Donner confirmed the action taken is to take the base project to the Board along with reduced office footprint alternative, as depicted on A203.1 and A204.1.

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

Mcbain pointed out a revised draft has been handed out, which has 12/09/2020 at the bottom of the first page (in Item 3).

White questioned if #3 on the first page will need to get revised, where it refers to A201.0 and A202.0. Donner stated those are the base bids for project, and would not need to be changed.

Donner stated that Item #4 will be changed based on the action taken tonight. Donner stated his suggested wording would be *“Include an alternate project bid, with reduced office area, as depicted on Plan A203.1 and A204.1”*.

Donner stated Item #5 would say *“An alternate bid will be requested for interior wash bay equipment”*. Gau stated the equipment would be the alternate.

McBain asked permission to jump to **Agenda Item 6. b) Project Introduction Mailer**.

The Committee then moved to discuss the **Project Introduction Mailer**.

Bender stated #3 should be amended to note the 2nd wash bay being added. After discussion, it was agreed that language is not necessary, as it will be shown on the plans.

Guerndt stated there will be some changes in the pricing, as the equipment in the 2nd wash bay could be smaller. Guerndt stated the larger equipment bay, if it ends up being just 4 manual pressure washer bays, the second stall would be the same size as the first stall (whereas, if proposed as automatic the automatic bay will have to be wider for equipment).

Bushnell stated #7 refers to estimated project budget at \$15.5 million. It was stated to Bushnell this is still based on the original bid. Donner stated back in March, the Board evaluated a 5-year Capital Improvement Plan, included spending on other capital projects plus an estimate on the municipal facilities (this facility and Public Safety Building) and the amount was \$15 million. Then, as we get ~~bids estimates~~ on our projects, we’ll take a look at how this project comes in. If it comes in less, that’s great. We will evaluate the bids and whether they financially fit with what our plans ~~were are~~, back in March of this year. McBain wonders if we should not include the “...other Village capital project costs...” and just refer to the \$15.5 million maximum costs”. It was commented that this includes the land purchase and building demolition. Bryan Ermeling stated \$16.5 million was the original amount. It was stated that they went with the medium \$15.5 million.

White questioned why #5 needs to be there, as it is a negative statement. Bryan Ermeling stated the point was so they don’t look at an alternative in the bid. Donner stated it does need to be modified to state an alternate bid for the automatic wash bay. Maloney agrees it is just stating a fact. McBain suggested the language be *“An alternate bid will be requested for interior wash bay equipment.”* It was confirmed that the fuel island was removed previously.

Motion by White, second by Zeyghami, to adopt Resolution No. BC-2020-001, as modified. Question – Maloney confirmed that new copies will be given to the Committee.

Yes Vote: 12 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 0 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 | Yes |
| Guernndt, 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 |

6. Discussion of Progress on Public Communications

a) Review and discuss list of FAQ's

Donner stated this is still a work in progress. He pointed out the first two are related to our project costs. He did find the median and average assessed home value in the Village, which is median is at \$148,700, and average is at \$158,800. He stated we were previously debating on what values to use for what say the tax impact would be. McBain confirmed we were going to use \$150,000 and \$300,000 for reference.

White confirmed this is not affecting other projects. McBain confirmed this will go up on the website shortly? Donner stated trying to time it with when the flyer goes out. He stated we are getting changes to printer tomorrow, and it will take 3 – 4 business days to get in mail. Trautman stated the tax bills will be mailed on Monday. Donner recalls that we do not want this mailer and the tax bills mailed at the same time, so we need to decide to be mailed right away, or hold back a bit. McBain confirmed this will go out after the tax bills.

McBain jumped down to **Agenda Item 6. c) Press Release.**

b) Project Introduction Mailer

McBain stated rather than automatically putting all names of the committee here, he proposes to retain the leadership of the committee and the Board, and any volunteers here that would like their name added. If you don't volunteer by action, then your name will not appear. He is hopeful this will help those who are not 100% to move forward without feeling like you are on the spot.

McBain stated the leadership will consist of himself, Gau, Donner, and Maloney. He then asked for the members to state yes or no to have their names included in the mailer:

| <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 | Yes |
| Guernndt, Gary – PC Member/Citizen | No |
| Jordan, Joe – PC Member/Citizen | No |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-----|
| McBain, Mort – Citizen | Yes |
| Meinel, Steve – Trustee/PC Member | No |
| Nelson, Aaron – Citizen | Yes |
| White, Loren – Trustee/PC Member | Yes |
| Zeyghami, Hooshang – Citizen | Yes |

Nelson requested that we remove the School District from his contact information, and just note him as a citizen, to prevent people from thinking the School District is affiliated with this project. Bryan Ermeling asked for the same.

McBain then directed the Committee back to **Agenda Item #5, Resolution.**

c) Press Release

McBain stated this will go out the same time as the mailer.

Donner stated it is drafted and he will send it to the Committee.

7. Agenda for Next Meeting

Donner stated he is not sure if we need to meet? Maloney feels we should meet after the press release goes out. Donner asked if Board should react to resolution first? It was stated the recommendation to the Board will be on December 21st. Donner is thinking the press release should go out after ~~to~~ the Board meeting. Maloney feels it would be good to get a reaction.

McBain clarified the press release will be put together and emailed to everyone ahead of time. Then we need to decide when the flyer goes going out (after taxes) and ~~Have flyer out~~ at same time the and Board will look at the resolution.

It was stated we probably will not meet on the 23rd. Barb Ermeling questioned what we would discuss on the 30th? She does not want a meeting for a meeting.

Bushnell stated we have not looked at FAQ's in a while. There is no information out there right now. McBain stated if we meet next week, we can go over the FAQ's. Maloney stated this can be reviewed on Wednesday, and it could go out then that Thursday.

McBain stated the primary item on the agenda for the 16th will be the list of FAQ's.

Bushnell stated to have access to what is there now to see where we are starting from? McBain stated we will bring a current list next Wednesday, and will review before they go on website. Donner stated we will get them out to Committee ahead of the next meeting.

Maloney suggested to the committee when talking to residents it is OK to say: "I will take your name and number down, will get some information, and call you back."

8. Next Meeting Date:

- a) Wednesday, December 16, 2020 @ 4:30 p.m.
- b) To Be Determined?

9. Remarks from Meeting Participants

White confirmed we are meeting December 16th.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

ADJOURN

Motion by Bender, second by Bushnell to adjourn at 6:13 p.m.

Mark Maloney, Village President
Keith Donner, Village Administrator
Valerie Parker, Recording Secretary