

**Village of Egg Harbor
Utility Committee Meeting Minutes
February 22, 2022 11:00 AM**

Join Zoom Meeting with your Computer or Smart Phone

<https://villageofeggharbor.zoom.us/j/92718840733>

Meeting ID: 927 1884 0733

Join Zoom Meeting on your Phone (audio only)

Phone Number: 312 626 6799 Meeting ID: 927 1884 0733

John Heller, Chair
Mack Bonk, Member
Tom Prohl, Member

TC Johnson, Member
Paul Zeller, Member
Bert Sawyer, Operator

1. Call to order and approval of the agenda
 - a. John Heller called the meeting to order at 11:00 AM.
 - b. Committee members present: John Heller, Mack Bonk, Tom Prohl, TC Johnson, Paul Zeller
 - c. Absent: None
 - d. Staff members present: Bert Sawyer, Megan Sawyer, Tom Strong
 - e. Others present: Tom Kispert, McMahan
 - f. **John Heller moved to approve the agenda.**
 - g. **Tom Prohl second.**
 - h. **Motion unanimously carried.**

2. Approve January 18, 2022 Meeting Minutes
 - a. Corrections: Committee members recommended one correction.
 - b. **John Heller moved to approve the January 18, 2022 minutes as amended.**
 - c. **Mack Bonk second.**
 - d. **Motion unanimously carried.**

3. Open Session (Limited to Ten Minutes)
 - a. John Heller opened the floor for public comment.
 - b. *Paul Zeller: Regarding the McMahan drawings for the Alpine lift station that includes the existing beach property, that is the plan that was discussed in the meeting last month?*
 - c. *John Heller: Last month we talked only about the plan of the new property. We wanted to get the topography for the entire parcel and also take a look at the surrounding road and existing mail lift station. The second wider beach property drawing was provided after that last meeting.*
 - d. *Tom Kispert: That is correct. We had two options presented for consideration that allows for different size trucks to turn around. These are both very preliminary locations for discussion. Nothing is designed or laid out at this point. This was submitted after the last meeting.*

- e. *Paul Zeller: Could you please forward me those plans in an email as a separate attachment today?*
 - f. *John Heller: We will be looking through this item during the meeting today as well.*
4. Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvement Phase I Project Update
- a. *Tom Kispert: Provided an overview of the project progress as presented in the meeting packet, including packet items DRAFT Change Order #9, Status update on Change Order #9, Miron Request for Payment #13, WWTP Phase I Photos. Extending the project completion date agreed to is required to close out the CWF Loan. We are still waiting for Miron to approve and sign Change order #9. Items on the punch list are still open. We are waiting on confirmation that they agree with the punch list item list, the extended deadline, and the deduction of \$29,185.08 for the additional costs incurred by the Village. I have been frequently following up with Miron on the status. They indicated we should have this letter of confirmation by February 25th.*
 - b. *No Committee questions.*
5. WWTP Reed Bed Cleanout Project Update
- a. *Tom Kispert: Provided an overview of the Reed Bed Cleanout Project as presented in the meeting packet. At this point, we are just waiting to bid the project out late summer or early spring. No changes from last month.*
 - b. *John Heller: When is this going out to bid?*
 - c. *Tom Kispert: We want to do the work in June so we would want to put this out to bid in May to allow enough time for the bidders to review it. This committee will review the bids and then take it through the Village approval process.*
6. Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvement Phase II Project Update
- a. *Tom Kispert: Provided an overview of the Phase II Lift Station planning as presented in the meeting packet, including packet items Lift Station Contour Map and Lift Station Map with Beach Site.*
 - b. *John Heller: Is the location that you had on the original drawing at the same elevation level as the existing lift station?*
 - c. *Tom Kispert: The existing station is around 590'. The middle of the new station is around 594' and the back of it is at 597'. It is a little higher than the existing station.*
 - d. *John Heller: If we take the elevation of the existing lift station and the manhole that feeds that lift station, how far below grade is that?*
 - e. *Tom Kispert: It is about 14 feet deep now.*
 - f. *John Heller: The new station will be anywhere from three to seven feet higher. We would be looking at anywhere from 17 feet to 21 feet deep? If we want a gravity main from the existing manhole to the new one, how much additional depth would we need?*

- g. *Tom Kispert: It depends on where it is setup. We would have to determine the slope that is needed. At the lift station, we have to go down deeper than the height of existing manhole. This will be fairly deep.*
- h. *John Heller: I'm thinking that the bottom of the wet well would be about 30 feet by 40 feet, the size of the building?*
- i. *Tom Kispert: There will be a deeper and shallower portion of the wet well under the building. It will depend in part on the design of the building.*
- j. *John Heller: Do the pumps have to be at the bottom of the wet well? The building would be above the wet well? I'm thinking the depth will be around 30 feet below grade.*
- k. *Tom Kispert: The pumps will be slightly above the bottom. The wet well walls are generally the foundation of the building, but it doesn't have to be designed that way. 30 feet below grade is probably close. This will be a big wet well. The farther west you move it the more secluded the building will be from the beach, but it will also be at a higher elevation.*
- l. *Tom Prohl: Why couldn't the building be located inside the loop for easy access for tankers and semi-trucks?*
- m. *Tom Kispert: That would be a tight fit. We would need to confirm that we can have the loop on the outside of the building like that. I don't have a problem with wherever that goes.*
- n. *Tom Prohl: I think it is important for Tom Kispert to make the recommendation. 10 feet one way or another won't make a huge difference for grade. We don't need the building to look pretty but we don't want it to be ugly either.*
- o. *John Heller: TC Johnson brought up the possibility of speaking with Jim Vander Heiden to improve the aesthetics. I will reconnect with him on that. The WWTP paid for a part of this property, but PPW is also involved regarding the over all plan for the beach and parking. Tom Kispert – we see the location as presented, can you design the building for that location, then move it one way or another if we need to?*
- p. *Tom Kispert: Trucks are heavy. We have to take that into account to prevent damage to the foundation due to that weight. If you drive a heavy truck to close to the foundation, it can cave in.*
- q. *John Heller: Looking at the elevation lines, we are at around 592' and 597 feet in that entire area.*
- r. *Tom Kispert: We can start in that area but would need to know if we are going to be driving a fully loaded hauler truck.*
- s. *Bert Sawyer: I believe there has been only one time during Paul Petersons time here that a loaded hauler was near the lift station. That hasn't happened in my time here.*
- t. *John Heller: As I said at last meeting, I don't know why we need to design this road for large sewage trucks. It should be designed for VOEH vehicles only. This station should eliminate the need for any sewer trucks to be down there.*
- u. *Bert Sawyer: We have a 30-foot setback from the alpine property. If we move the entire property to the east, we could park next to the building. The loop could be more of a horseshoe shape with traffic in one direction.*

- v. *Paul Zeller: That was along the same line of thought that I had. Wouldn't it make sense for the building to move down to the 590' level location and move the building over to that 30-foot setback area?*
- w. *John Heller: We want to develop the beach in that area. The closer we are to the beach, the less attractive that would be. If we move down 7 feet, do we save that much for the wet well cost?*
- x. *Tom Kispert: Yes. It requires less blasting and sewer main piping. We could get down to the 591-592 elevation. The DNR setback is 75 feet from the Ordinary High-Water Mark.*
- y. *John Heller: In that case, you are already touching the 592 elevations. Why don't we move the building over to that setback line and rotate it 45 degrees?*
- z. *Tom Kispert: I can do that. I put it in the existing plans as a reference for the relative size.*
- aa. *TC Johnson: The existing lift station building is in the way for people to turn around. I have been there when people had to back up the entire way so get rid of that building and put in a turn around. I have seen people having to back up through traffic while beach patrons are walking to the rest rooms from the beach. I have heard some comment that the building could be relocated or used for Kayak rentals.*
- bb. *Megan Sawyer: The Kayak rental operation has its own building already. I believe everyone would be on board with removing that building.*
- cc. *Tom Prohl: I had assumed that the existing building will be taking down. I agree with the idea of a turnaround area.*
- dd. *John Heller: What do you have to do to take that building down?*
- ee. *Tom Kispert: Once the sewers have been diverted, we can demolish the building above grade then bust up the foundation so ground water can move back and forth. We would have to cover additional environmental clean ups.*
- ff. *TC Johnson: Can we use the fill created by carving out the lift station to fill that area?*
- gg. *Tom Kispert: You could do that but the material isn't what you want and it would actually cost you a significant amount of more money.*
- hh. *Bert Sawyer: Is there a setback from Alpine Road we need to be aware of?*
- ii. *Megan Sawyer: I don't believe that is technically right of way. I will have to confirm that.*
- jj. *Mack Bonk: The setback shown on the drawing, that distance is 30 feet?*
- kk. *Tom Kispert: That dashed line on the left side doesn't scale correctly.*
- ll. *Mack Bonk: I come up with the same concern that the 30-foot setback isn't represented correctly.*
- mm. *Committee by consensus agreed to move the location adjacent to the 30-foot setback line, as close to Alpine Road as we can get, and at around the 592-foot elevation mark, and rotated 45 degrees to be squared up with the property.*
- nn. *Tom Prohl: I would like to see what this looks like with the corrected setback and as close to Alpine Road as we can get.*
- oo. *Mack Bonk: John, are you suggesting that we don't need to provide access to larger trucks?*

- pp. John Heller: You can get trucks down in that area now. I think we need to provide access to the Village trucks.*
- qq. Bert Sawyer: I still think we need to set it up to allow hauler trucks. County Snowplows also need access.*
- rr. John Heller: We will have one turn around where the current lift station is for cars, and a second turn around by the new lift station?*
- ss. Bert Sawyer: It gets so congested down there that I think you need the loops for the traffic flow.*
- tt. Tom Kispert: I will start on the location and turn around design based on this input.*
- uu. Committee member discussed various design options for the layout of the turn around loop concept.*
- vv. Bert Sawyer: Keep in mind that if there is ever an issue with the force main anywhere between the lift station to the main plant, we would need haulers to pump the lift station.*
- ww. Tom Kispert: The logistics of doing a loop like this is a challenge due to the space limitations. In the event of a major issue like that, it would take about 10 minutes to completely fill up a hauler tank. It is tough to even keep up at peak time. I would toss out the idea of staging the trucks on Horseshoe Bay Road, pumping up to the trucks there. You would use the new main pumps to do the pumping through attached valves to direct. You would have to block off Hwy G.*
- xx. Paul Zeller: Would it make sense to get the revised drawing to the PPW committee at this point?*
- yy. John Heller: I am at the PPW meeting regularly. We will be having that discussion. We talked to a contractor regarding the cement repair for the dock as well as a preliminary beach design. We will cover that as well and keep this committee informed.*

7. Wastewater Treatment Plant Manager Report

- a. Bert Sawyer: Presented an overview of the report as presented in the meeting packet, including packet items Monthly Operations Report January 2022 and Mandatory Connection Letter. Volume is down a bit from recent levels. Haulers were about the same. Influent is down about 30,000 gallons. The plan is running clean. Suspended solids have been a little high. We have been adjusting how that sampling is done. There is still a lot of building going on. We are working on repainting older areas of the building. Energenics had to come up to make an adjustment to the new screening equipment. It has been working pretty well since they did that work. We*
- b. No Committee member questions.*

8. Sewer Assessment Policy Adopted May 28, 2008

- a. Tom Strong: Provided an overview of the Sewer Assessment Policy recommendations as presented in the meeting packet. We reviewed the Existing Sewer Main Assessment Policy that is currently in effect along with the first pass at recommended changes. Key points for committee deliberation: Existing*

Policy, Assessment of second side of a corner lot, Sewer Main Extension Form, Assessing Requestor for main that runs along second side of another parcel to service the requestors property, assessing oversized lots that are large enough to be split into multiple buildable parcels. The DRAFT proposal currently recommends assessing for the number of buildable parcels that could be sub divided. As an alternative to that method, Bert Sawyer feels strongly that this policy should be updated to move away from assessing property owners on a per parcel basis, changing it over to a linear feet basis. This is the method that is currently in use in Baileys Harbor. That policy is included in the packet for your review. Staff recommends reviewing the current policy and recommended updates, then direct staff to make updates if needed and table the agenda item to next meeting or make a motion to recommend to the Trustees to approve the updated policy as presented or amended.

- b. *Bert Sawyer: My argument for using linear feet for sewer assessments is that the Village shouldn't have to pay for those sections that run past a parcel that is considered to be unbuildable from being too small or wetland. Paying per linear feet is the fairest way to assess owners for these costs in my opinion. If someone has a larger parcel and they divide it up later, they aren't paying for their fair share if they are assessed for only one buildable parcel that they divide later.*
 - c. *Tom Strong: The parcels that we are dividing up right now are in that exact situation. One is getting four buildable parcels out of a larger lot that was assessed as one parcel with 777 feet of frontage. A second one had 600 feet of frontage, that was divided up into another 4 parcels. Looking back at the prior projects, it would have been more equitable for all property owners involved.*
 - d. *The committee members agreed with the direction of changing the sewer assessment policy from the current buildable parcel assessment to assessing property owners by linear feet.*
 - e. *TC Johnson: Is anyone grandfathered in under the existing policy?*
 - f. *Tom Strong: We have no pending sewer main extension requests at this time, so no one is grandfathered in under the existing policy.*
 - g. *John Heller: Would this policy change mainly apply to the Point Beach area?*
 - h. *Tom Strong: It would apply to Point Beach but there are other areas of the Village that might also have a sewer main extension.*
 - i. *The committee members agreed with the direction of the other proposed changes as previously presented.*
 - j. *John Heller: Requested staff to updates as requested by this committee for the March Utility Committee meeting.*
9. Closed Session per State Statute 19.85(1) (e) Deliberating or negotiating the purchasing of public properties, the investing of public funds, or conducting other specified public business, whenever competitive or bargaining reasons require a closed session, and pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 196.374(2), prohibiting a municipal utility from releasing customer information to any person, subject to specific exceptions not applicable to this subject matter; and then to return to open session to take further action or to adjourn the meeting
- a. **John Heller moved to go into Closed Session per State Statute 19.85(1) (e).**

- b. **Seconded by Tom Prohl.**
 - c. **John Heller – aye. Tom Prohl – aye. TC Johnson – aye. Paul Zeller – aye. Mack Bonk – aye.**
 - d. **Motion unanimously carried.**
 - e. **John Heller moved to go back into Open Session.**
 - f. **Seconded by Tom Prohl.**
 - g. **Motion unanimously carried.**
 - h. **John Heller moved to approve the motion made in Closed Session.**
 - i. **Seconded by Mack Bonk.**
 - j. **Motion unanimously carried.**
10. Open Session (Limited to Ten Minutes)
- a. John Heller opened the floor for public comment.
 - b. *Bert Sawyer: 2 parcels on Hwy 42 do not have stubs. South Trail does not have a stub. I don't want to see the highway dug up after the highway is done.*
 - c. *Megan Sawyer: We could put this on the next agenda. We can also reach out to these property owners to make them aware. I don't know if we have a mechanism to require them to put this in. South Trail is probably a larger discussion point.*
 - d. *John Heller: If they have to hook up after the Hwy 42 project, they would have to pay for that? We can't force them to put in a lateral.*
 - e. *Bert Sawyer: Yes, they would and correct, we can't force them to put one in. I would hate to see the new road and sidewalk dug up after it is in place. Installing the stub is their cost. I would say just sent them a letter with the contact information for the engineer in Sturgeon Bay to get an estimate of costs.*
 - f. *Tom Prohl: Do we need to discuss the connection letter in the packet?*
 - g. *Megan Sawyer: That was just for reference. No discussion needs to take place. Tom and I both talked with the property owner.*
 - h. *Tom Strong: At the prior meeting the question was raised if there is anyone in the village who has access to the sewer system, is over the 10-year grace period and hasn't hooked up yet. Bert and I went through that list, and this is the only one we found.*
 - i. *TC Johnson: I would like to step down from this committee if a replacement can be found.*
 - j. *John Heller: I have a few potential candidates. I will follow up with those individuals. If anyone else has someone in mind let me know.*
11. Next Meeting Time and Date
- a. Tuesday, March 15, 2022, 11:00 AM.
12. Adjourn
- a. **John Heller moved to adjourn.**
 - b. **Tom Prohl seconded.**
 - c. **Motion unanimously carried.**

Meeting adjourned at 12:46 PM.

Minutes completed by Tom Strong on March 1, 2022. Submitted for approval on March 15, 2022.

Italics – summarized comments

Bold – Committee Action