

**VILLAGE OF EPHRAIM
VILLAGE BOARD MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, MAY 12, 2026 – 7:00 P.M.
9996 WATER STREET- EPHRAIM VILLAGE HALL**



Action Items:

Mulliken moved, Meacham seconded to approve the minutes of April 14, 2026, all ayes. Motion carried.

Mulliken moved, Hoyerman seconded to approve the consent agenda as presented, all ayes with T. Nelson abstaining. Motion carried.

The consensus of the Village Board was option D as recommended by the Airport Commission for runway 14-32 rebuild to include a 300-foot extension to increase the runway length to 3,000 feet.

The consensus of the Village Board was that they were in agreement with the Airport Commission on the approach to the turf runway (Runway 1-19) to turn the runway ten degrees, which would almost match property lines, giving the airport complete control over runway protection zones.

The consensus of the Village Board was Alternate A1, as recommended by the Airport Commission, for future hangar expansion due to the taxiway facing southwest for maintenance ease.

The consensus of the Village Board was Building Area Alternate D, which was the preference of the Airport Commission based on need, demand, funding, and the initial 8 hangars being sold.

Hoyerman moved, Meacham seconded that in the event the Village Board approves ordinance 01-2026, an ordinance amending the Village of Ephraim Zoning Code §17.20 (Protected Waterfront), specifically repealing §17.20(3)(b)(1) and §17.20(5) in their entirety, those changes shall only be in effect until midnight January 1, 2027. Further, at midnight January 1, 2027, if the Village Board has not enacted changes to §17.20 or anywhere else pertaining to the Protected Waterfront District, the language in §17.20(3)(b)(1) and §17.20(5) presently shall automatically revert to full force and effect, all ayes. Motion carried.

Hoyerman moved, T. Nelson seconded to approve ordinance 01-2026, amending the Village of Ephraim Zoning Code §17.20 (Protected Waterfront) specifically §17.20(3)(b)(1) and §17.20(5) as presented, all ayes. Motion carried.

Mulliken moved, Hoyerman seconded to approve the Class “B” Alcohol Beverage Retailers License for A&M Enterprises of Door County Inc., - dba Somerset Inn & Suites – 10401 Water Street, pending fire and health inspection, all ayes with Meacham abstaining. Motion carried.

T. Nelson moved, Meacham seconded to approve the Class “B” and “Class C” Alcohol Beverage Retailers License for La Sirena LLC – dba La Sirena – 9996 Pioneer Lane, pending fire and health inspections, all ayes with Mulliken abstaining. Motion carried.

T. Nelson moved, Meacham seconded to approve the Class “B” and “Class C” Alcohol Beverage Retailers License for Anatolia Cuisine DC LLC – dba Anatolia Cuisine DC -9922 Water Street, Unit 7, Chef’s Hat Café LLC – dba Chef’s Hat – 3063 Water Street, Klaud’s Kitchen Inc – dba Klaud’s Kitchen – 10420 Water Street, Prince of Pierogi LLC – dba Prince of Pierogi Restaurant – 9922 Water Street, Unit 6, Summer Kitchen Inc – dba Summer Kitchen Restaurant – 10425 Water Street, and Sunset Harbor Grill LLC – dba Sunset Harbor Grill – 10018 Water Street pending fire and health inspections, all ayes. Motion carried.

Mulliken moved, T. Nelson seconded to approve the Temporary Class “B” Alcohol Beverage Retailers License for Ephraim Business Council on June 20, 2026, for Fyr Bal Festival and Ephraim Fire and Rescue Association on June 20, 2026, for Fyr Bal Festival, all ayes. Motion carried.

Mulliken moved, T. Nelson seconded to approve the 2026 Committee Appointments as presented, all ayes. Motion carried.

The consensus of the Village Board was to send the item regarding non-profit use of the Village Hall to the Physical Facilities Committee for recommendation.

The consensus of the Village Board was to form a task force with Mulliken, Meacham, Cody Schreck (EHF), and Bristol, aiming for a status report and funding request at the June meeting for a minimum of an eight-foot (8') tree.

T. Nelson moved, Mulliken seconded to approve the interview group for the open maintenance position as presented (MacDonald, Meacham, and Collak), all ayes. Motion carried.

Hoyerman moved, Meacham seconded to approve the bid from AM Mechanical & Refrigeration to replace the Village Hall HVAC system in an amount not to exceed fifty-three thousand dollars (\$53,000), payable out of the Village Hall Equipment Capital Reserve Fund, all ayes. Motion carried.

T. Nelson moved, Mulliken seconded to proceed with the Canada Goose Damage Management Plan, all ayes. Motion carried.

T. Nelson moved, Meacham seconded to approve the 2026 Road Paving Project with the Door County Highway Department for paving of North Orchard Street, Holand Road, Spruce Lane, and a 28' x 42' addition to the Public Works parking lot by cold storage for a cost not to exceed \$142,000.00, funded by Road Aids, all ayes. Motion carried.

Meacham moved, T. Nelson seconded to table the discussion regarding the Emergency Operations Plan as presented, all ayes. Motion carried.

T. Nelson moved, Meacham seconded to convene into closed session per §19.85(1)(c), considering employment, promotion, compensation, or performance evaluation data of any public employee over which the governmental body has jurisdiction or exercises responsibility. For the purpose of discussing the building and grounds maintenance worker position, all ayes. Motion carried.

Mulliken moved, Meacham seconded to reconvene in open session, all ayes. Motion carried.

T. Nelson moved, Mulliken seconded to proceed as discussed in Closed Session, all ayes. Motion carried.

Milliken moved, Hoyerman seconded to adjourn at 10:42 PM, all ayes. Motion carried.

Present: Rick Hoyerman, Matt Meaham (online), Carly Mulliken, Tim Nelson, and Ken Nelson – President.

Absent: None.

Staff: Brent Bristol -Village Administrator, Justin MacDonald – Fire Chief/Maintenance Manager, and Kim Roberts - Deputy Clerk.

Guests in person: Mike McCutcheon, Keith Krist, Missy LeBelle, John Cox, BD Thorp, Andy Bartelt, Monique McClean, Duska and Scott Pearson, Tim Christofferson, Marcia Ellis, Jeff Drajesk, Amber Drewieske (CLA), and Megan Hovell (CLA).

Guests Online: Jane Larson, Lane Methner (EBC), Gary Glojek, “AH”, “Angie”, “Chris J”, Kerry Nelson, Laird Hart, “Michael”, “Paul”, and Rich Bierman.

1. **Call to Order:** K. Nelson called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.
2. **Quorum:** A quorum was present for the meeting.
3. **Changes to the agenda:** Hoyerman requested that Administration 9(d) be considered before 9(c) so that the sunset provision is considered before the ordinance change itself.
4. **Visitors' Comments:**
John Cox of 9923 Town Line Drive spoke about two concerns. First, he questioned why the Village was not putting the video recordings of meetings on the Internet or YouTube. He explained that "Sister Bay

puts all their meetings up on YouTube, and I believe it's worth the time and effort to do that. It's not required, but I think it's desired, from the public's point of view."

His second concern was about the posting of draft minutes, saying, "We used to put draft minutes up after some of the meetings. I think we've stopped doing that generally. I know it's not required, but when you can't see the minutes until the packets come out weeks later, it's hard to ascertain what happened at those meetings."

K. Nelson confirmed that all but the Village Board draft meeting minutes are posted usually within a week of the Committee meeting. He noted that he would consider both of Cox's requests.

5. Approval of Previous Minutes:

Mulliken moved, Meacham seconded to approve the minutes of April 14, 2026, all ayes. Motion carried.

6. President's Comments: There were no comments.

7. Consent Agenda:

Mulliken moved, Hoyerman seconded to approve the consent agenda as presented, all ayes with T. Nelson abstaining. Motion carried.

8. Public Hearing:

a. Public Hearing regarding ordinance 01-2026, an ordinance amending the Village of Ephraim Zoning Code §17.20 (Protected Waterfront):

K. Nelson opened the Public Hearing.

Bristol confirmed that no written correspondence had been received.

John Cox provided comment on the Protected Waterfront (PW) Ordinance as a property owner within the PW District (9939 Water Street). He read a prepared statement. He expressed his total opposition to the thought of a moratorium or ordinance change to write or amend an already very oppressive Protected Waterfront Ordinance. Cox insisted that the Protected Waterfront District is already probably the most regulated stretch of residential real estate in all of Door County. He pointed out that the Village President and some of the Plan Committee members wish to regulate the zone even further. The Village Board tonight is weighing the Plan Committee's desire to do this. Some of us have yet to figure out why. In the last year or more, the Plan Committee has held several noon working sessions to address PW concerns. According to the agendas and minutes for those meetings, not once was there any discussion regarding the issues related to building size, height, and footprint that were presented by the Village President a few weeks ago regarding the PW District. The only reason he could surmise the reasoning for the proposal is that it appears to be another Ephraim overreaction to a perceived problem.

Cox argued that the Protected Waterfront Ordinance and the Design Review process provide the necessary tools for oversight to ensure the district will not be abused. They just need to use them. He referenced a recent Plan Committee meeting where he observed a productive back-and-forth process for two (2) new builds, which he concluded worked well under the current regulations, right down to too many exterior lights. A number of comments from the Village President and Committee members suggest that the twenty-one or so homes in the PW district are what everyone pays attention to as they drive through the Village. These properties are somehow in more need of focus than any other district. This couldn't be farther from reality. All districts from one end of the Village to the other are just as important, but according to some, the PW district somehow demands more attention. When it comes to building size and design, the PW district is essentially more or less self-regulating because of its small lot sizes and the oversight provided by the Plan Committee. Nothing more is happening here than creating a solution in search of a problem.

If the Board feels the need to appease some of the Plan Committee tonight, he requested that the Board at least scale the ordinance change back by giving it clearer direction on the goals and time limits the Board expects from the Plan Committee. He encouraged the Board to toss this whole

proposal and direct the Plan Committee to deal with its concerns using the well-thought-out processes that are already in place. The property owners in the PW District all expect that the Village works for them as it does for all others in other zoning districts. These are people's lives you are messing with. Please reconsider the whole thing.

No other comments were received from either the audience or online participants.

K. Nelson closed the Public Hearing.

9. Administration:

a. Presentation of the 2025 Audit Report:

Drewieske from CLA LLP presented the 2025 audit report, beginning with the Independent Auditor's Report on page 1. She explained that they had audited the financial statements of governmental activities, business-type activities, each major fund, and aggregate remaining fund information as of December 31, 2025. The audit resulted in an unmodified clean opinion, which she noted was the highest opinion we can provide from an audit standpoint.

Drewieske highlighted key financial numbers, starting on page 9, showing the fund financials. The general fund had just under \$3.2 million in cash available for operations, with about \$129,000 restricted from unspent bond proceeds. The fund balance breaks down into several categories, including \$2.2 million in committed funds set aside through Room Tax and Premier Resort Tax for future capital projects, and \$813,000 in unassigned fund balance.

She explained that based on the Village's policy, of maintaining 15% of general fund expenditures (excluding debt service and capital) in reserve, which would be about \$200,000. The Village's healthy fund balance of \$813,000 exceeded this requirement significantly, though Drewieske suggested they might consider bumping up the policy percentage given inflation and rising costs.

Regarding the Wastewater Utility (page 14), Drewieske noted it had about \$7,118 in cash for operations and \$721,916 in restricted cash for equipment replacement and debt service. The total net position was just under \$4 million, with most being net investment in capital assets.

On pages 57-58, Drewieske reported no compliance issues or findings. The similar findings from last year included segregation of duties due to the small environment, preparation of annual financial reports, and adjustments to financial records - all typical for an organization of the Village's size, and nothing to be concerned about.

K. Nelson asked about the material weaknesses that are discussed every year, wondering if quarterly visits from the auditor would help, and whether additional staff training might address some issues.

Drewieske confirmed that quarterly reviews could help with adjustments, and additional training on the complex financial disclosures could potentially reduce some findings from material weaknesses to significant deficiencies. She also noted there were some creative ways to address the segregation of duties to create a mitigating control.

Hoyerman inquired about a specific point on page 2 in the audit report regarding an uncorrected misstatement about compensated absences.

Drewieske provided clarity by explaining that it was connected to a recent change in the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) protocol. Specifically, GASB 101, making GASB 16 outdated for compensated absences, which had required recording a compensated absence only if there was a payout. The new standard mandates that liabilities must be calculated and recorded for any vacation, sick, and compensatory time carryovers that may be used or paid out in the future. The updated guidance thus broadens the criteria for what should be recognized as a liability, reflecting a more comprehensive assessment of the organization's obligations concerning employee benefits.

K. Nelson inquired about custodial credit risk and the Village's investments.

Drewieske explained that the Village's primary investments are in the Local Government Investment

Pool (LGIP) with about \$102,000, and the Wisconsin Investment Series Cooperative. Both are very safe investments that follow state statutes. LGIP is an unrated investment, and the Wisconsin Investment Series has a triple-A rating.

b. **Discussion regarding Phase 2 – Airport Master Plan Study:**

Jeff Drajesk, Chairman of the Gibraltar-Ephraim Airport Commission, presented Phase 2 of the Airport Master Plan Study.

Drajesk explained that the Airport Master Plan is required to maintain eligibility for future funding, similar to the Village's Comprehensive Plan under the Smart Growth Law. The plan looks at all foreseeable maintenance and improvement needs with multiple options to fill those needs, though it doesn't commit them to actually implementing these projects. He emphasized that this is a three-step process: Master Plan, then a six-year Petition Plan, and finally Project Development with actual funding requests.

The improvements fall into two categories: safety and revenue, with safety decreasing liability and revenue helping achieve financial independence. Drajesk noted they've been operating since 2009 without asking for additional funding.

Runway 14-32 Rebuild

Drajesk presented four options (A, B, C, and D) for the main runway rebuild. Options A, B, and C had runways greater than 3,000 feet (3,300, 3,300, and 3,400 feet, respectively), while option D was 3,000 feet. The commission unanimously selected the shortest runway option (D) at 3,000 feet, representing only a 300-foot extension beyond the current runway length.

Drajesk explained that extending beyond 3,000 feet would significantly extend runway protection zones, requiring more control over those areas, which they wanted to avoid. The 300-foot extension would address safety issues for current aircraft without increasing the size or capacity of planes that can land. He emphasized this is "a pure safety issue" and noted that the engineering firm recommended adding a full-length taxiway to reduce runway incursions, a top safety concern highlighted at recent state airport conferences.

Mulliken confirmed that this wouldn't open the airport to additional types of aircraft but would create a safer environment for existing usage. Hoyerman asked about the runway protection zones, and Drajesk explained that these are areas where they maintain height restrictions on trees and structures through the airport height ordinance, without requiring property acquisition.

K. Nelson suggested tweaking the runway location to move the clear zone away from Highway 42 homes toward Maple Grove Road, where possible.

The consensus of the Village Board was option D as recommended by the Airport Commission for runway 14-32 rebuild to include a 300-foot extension to increase the runway length to 3,000 feet.

Runway 1-19 Options

Drajesk presented options for the turf runway, explaining that it would remain turf but could be repositioned. One option shifted it south but still extended runway protection zones beyond airport property. A second option turned the runway ten degrees, which almost precisely matched their property lines, giving them complete control over the protection zones. This would require clearing more trees and flattening terrain, but it was the Commission's preferred choice as it provided better safety with a wider grass area.

The consensus of the Village Board was that they were in agreement with the Airport Commission on the approach to the turf runway (Runway 1-19) to turn the runway ten degrees, which would almost match property lines, giving the airport complete control over runway protection zones.

Mulliken asked about public feedback, and Drajesk explained they'd held two public meetings with less than ideal attendance, likely due to the timing in March when few people are present. A June public meeting is planned to present final recommendations.

Meacham asked about plans for paving the turf runway, and Drajesk confirmed they have no such plans. When asked about self-funding, Drajesk explained their priorities: first, repave runway 14-32; second, achieve financial stability through hangar growth; and lastly, address the turf runway (*Runway 1-19*) modifications.

Hangar Development Options

Drajesk presented options for hangar placement. Five hangars are being built now, with eight more planned. The choice was between having taxiways and aprons facing northeast versus southwest. The Commission preferred the southwest-facing option because a northeastern-facing home, you're never going to get rid of the snow and ice on your front step. The southwest orientation provides better sun exposure for melting snow and ice, making it safer and cheaper to maintain.

K. Nelson confirmed they're building pads for five hangars currently and that all five have letters of intent, plus someone is interested in a sixth hangar location.

Hoyerman asked about projections for how each additional hangar benefits the airport financially.

Drajesk explained that current lease rates are 65 cents per square foot annually, so a 50 x 60 hangar generates just under \$2,000 per year with 3% annual increases. Their current net income is just under \$11,000 annually, with 75% from lease payments, 20% from fuel, and 5% from donations and other sources.

The consensus of the Village Board was Alternate A1, as recommended by the Airport Commission, for future building area expansion placement due to the taxiway facing southwest for maintenance ease.

Future Hangar Expansion

Drajesk presented long-term expansion options, emphasizing that these are speculative and depend on demand and available property. One option involves property to the north (31 potential hangars) that's currently private - they have "absolutely zero intent to take any property by eminent domain" but would consider it if the owner wanted to sell. This location offers easier access from Maple Grove Road and relatively flat terrain.

The other option involves building across the runway on property they already own (28-30 hangars in different configurations). This would be more expensive, requiring a new road from Highway 42, power installation, and taxiways - estimated at approximately \$4 million.

The Commission's preference is the cross-runway option unless the northern property becomes available, as it allows hangar owners to taxi to both runways. The timing would depend on filling the current eight hangars under development first.

Hoyerman expressed strong concerns about the scale of potential expansion, noting this could make their airport larger than Sturgeon Bay's. While supportive of safety enhancements, he hoped "this does not come to pass" due to concerns about how it might change the community character.

Drajesk responded that about 70% of flights are from visitors, not hangar owners, so more hangars wouldn't necessarily mean dramatically more flights. He emphasized they're "land-bound" with no possibility of expanding beyond current constraints due to Peninsula State Park and other limitations. The hangars would house the same types of aircraft currently using the airport.

Drajesk explained that hangar income is essential for long-term financial independence and funding future runway rebuilds. They raised lease rates 27% in 2024 and are currently the second-highest priced airport in Wisconsin.

Meacham asked about the number of hangars needed for self-sufficiency.

Drajesk projected that after the runway rebuild (costing about \$105,000 from each municipality), continued growth with new hangars coming online should allow them to fund future projects independently, including the development of additional hangar areas by around 2031-2032.

K. Nelson expressed concerns about the expansion, stating, "I, for one, and I would like to talk about this with the Board, I don't want to see the airport grow anymore. You've heard us say that we're happy with the airport. We're not fighting the airport, but we like what we have." He worried about increased volumes and traffic, and was concerned about removing taxable property from the rolls.

Drajesk clarified that hangar areas remain taxable - hangar owners pay property taxes while open airport areas are exempt. He estimated hangars cost around \$200,000 each, so the tax base could actually increase significantly.

The consensus of the Village Board was Building Area Alternate D that was the preference of the Airport Commission based on need, demand, funding, and the initial 8 hangars being sold.

c. **Discussion and consideration regarding intent to reinstate the current PW ordinance:**

Bristol explained this item came up at the last Board meeting relative to setting the Protected Waterfront Ordinance for public hearing. The Board wanted some direction on taking it further than the Plan Committee's intent to turn around a new ordinance within six months, if the proposed amendment passes.

Hoyerman explained this was a tough issue and that he's been torn on it from the beginning. While he had concerns about eliminating conditional use permits, he'd also seen confusion among builders and property owners about requirements during his time on the Plan Committee. He noted examples like the undefined concept of "story and a half house" that's not part of the code, but influences what gets proposed. Hoyerman felt that if they were going to eliminate conditional use permits, the only real palatable way to do it would be to put an end date on it through a sunset provision.

Hoyerman moved, Meacham seconded that in the event the Village Board approves ordinance 01-2026, an ordinance amending the Village of Ephraim Zoning Code §17.20 (Protected Waterfront), specifically repealing §17.20(3)(b)(1) and §17.20(5) in their entirety, those changes shall only be in effect until midnight January 1, 2027. Further, at midnight January 1, 2027, if the Village Board has not enacted changes to §17.20 or anywhere else pertaining the Protected Waterfront District, the language in §17.20(3)(b)(1) and §17.20(5) presently shall automatically revert back to full force and effect.

K. Nelson, as chair of the Plan Committee, welcomed the pressure to get busy and have something back to the Board promptly. He thought six months would be adequate with the Plan Committee meeting twice monthly for three months, leaving three months for Board review and potential revisions.

K. Nelson called the question.

All ayes. Motion carried.

d. **Discussion and consideration regarding ordinance 01-2026, an ordinance amending the Village of Ephraim Zoning Code §17.20 (Protected Waterfront):**

Bristol explained that this ordinance would remove two sections: §17.20(3)(b)(1) (*conditional use for additions, modifications to, or replacement of existing residences*) and §17.20(5) (*qualifying criteria for making judgments for approval or denial of conditional use applications*). With approval, these sections would be removed for the set period of time established in the previous agenda item motion.

A discussion was held regarding Ordinance 01-2026. K. Nelson confirmed that normal maintenance activities would continue as permitted, and that all applications that were in concept stage or actual application form had been submitted to be heard at the next Plan Committee meeting in two weeks. Mulliken asked about Historic Preservation Commission participation. K. Nelson confirmed they would invite HPC input since they have authority over compatible infill and bulk/size issues.

Hoyerman moved, T. Nelson seconded to approve ordinance 01-2026, amending the Village of Ephraim Zoning Code §17.20 (Protected Waterfront) specifically §17.20(3)(b)(1) and §17.20(5) as presented, all ayes. Motion carried.

- e. **Discussion and consideration regarding renewal – Class “B” Alcohol Beverage Retailers License:**
 - 1. **A&M Enterprises of Door County Inc., - dba Somerset Inn & Suites – 10401 Water Street:**

Mulliken moved, Hoyerman seconded to approve the Class “B” Alcohol Beverage Retailers License for A&M Enterprises of Door County Inc., - dba Somerset Inn & Suites – 10401 Water Street, pending fire and health inspection, all ayes with Meacham abstaining. Motion carried.
- f. **Discussion and consideration regarding renewal – Class “B” and “Class C” Alcohol Beverage Retailers License:**
 - 1. **Anatolia Cuisine DC LLC – dba Anatolia Cuisine DC -9922 Water Street, Unit 7**
 - 2. **Chef’s Hat Café LLC – dba Chef’s Hat – 3063 Water Street**
 - 3. **Klaud’s Kitchen Inc – dba Klaud’s Kitchen – 10420 Water Street**
 - 4. **La Sirena LLC – dba La Sirena – 9996 Pioneer Lane**
 - 5. **Prince of Pierogi LLC – dba Prince of Pierogi Restaurant – 9922 Water Street, Unit 6**
 - 6. **Summer Kitchen Inc – dba Summer Kitchen Restaurant – 10425 Water Street**
 - 7. **Sunset Harbor Grill LLC – dba Sunset Harbor Grill – 10018 Water Street**

T. Nelson moved, Meacham seconded to approve the Class “B” and “Class C” Alcohol Beverage Retailers License for La Sirena LLC – dba La Sirena – 9996 Pioneer Lane, pending fire and health inspections, all ayes with Mulliken abstaining. Motion carried.

T. Nelson moved, Meacham seconded to approve the Class “B” and “Class C” Alcohol Beverage Retailers License for Anatolia Cuisine DC LLC – dba Anatolia Cuisine DC - 9922 Water Street, Unit 7, Chef’s Hat Café LLC – dba Chef’s Hat – 3063 Water Street, Klaud’s Kitchen Inc – dba Klaud’s Kitchen – 10420 Water Street, Prince of Pierogi LLC – dba Prince of Pierogi Restaurant – 9922 Water Street, Unit 6, Summer Kitchen Inc – dba Summer Kitchen Restaurant – 10425 Water Street, and Sunset Harbor Grill LLC – dba Sunset Harbor Grill – 10018 Water Street pending fire and health inspections, all ayes. Motion carried.
- g. **Discussion and consideration regarding Temporary Class “B” Alcohol Beverage Retailers License:**
 - 1. **Ephraim Business Council – June 20, 2026 – Fyr Bal Festival**
 - 2. **Ephraim Fire and Rescue Association – June 20, 2026 -Fyr Bal Festival**

Mulliken moved, T. Nelson seconded to approve the Temporary Class “B” Alcohol Beverage Retailers License for Ephraim Business Council on June 20, 2026, for Fyr Bal Festival and Ephraim Fire and Rescue Association on June 20, 2026, for Fyr Bal Festival, all ayes. Motion carried.
- h. **Update regarding the North Path Project:**

Bristol reported that the North Path project was moving very quickly after three years of planning. The sub-base was in place, the curb and gutter had been poured in the southern portion, and the contractor was fine-grading with paving scheduled for Thursday and Friday if the weather held. Final landscaping would follow, with completion hoped for by Memorial Day weekend, which had been the contractor's goal from day one. Bristol praised the neighboring property owners for being great to work with and noted excitement about the project.

K. Nelson thanked all property owners who provided easements for the path.
- i. **Discussion regarding North Path ribbon cutting:**

K. Nelson explained that the Ephraim Business Council (EBC) was considering an event for the end

of June to commemorate the completion of the North End Path, possibly coordinating with businesses. He asked if the Village wanted to do something similar, noting they had done a ribbon cutting for the Streetscape Project at Moravia Street and Highway 42 with about eighty people attending, followed by a gathering with refreshments.

Mulliken explained EBC's idea to coordinate with the first farmer's market on June 22nd, having participating businesses hold open houses or tent sales. Lane Methner confirmed EBC's plan to have an event application ready for the month-end Plan Committee meeting, trying to coordinate a celebration for June 22nd.

The Board agreed to let K. Nelson work with Bristol and Mulliken to coordinate with EBC and provide at least signage thanking supporters.

j. **Discussion regarding Administration building project planning, design, and options:**

Bristol provided background on the Administration Building project, explaining that it was one of the remaining items from the Capital Ad Hoc Project Committee's work from years ago. He, K. Nelson, and Mulliken had been meeting monthly with Keller representatives for about six months, starting with site surveys and three-dimensional drawings of existing conditions.

Mulliken presented five options ranging from deferred maintenance to complete teardown:

- Option 0 (Deferred Maintenance): \$600,000 plus \$50,000 contingency to address HVAC issues, roof problems, and exterior wall insulation - basically bringing the building up to functional standards without addressing workflow needs.
- Option 1 (Minimal Changes): \$1.3 million plus \$100,000 contingency for exterior ramp addition, some interior reconfiguration within existing space. Would improve accessibility but only accommodate smaller meetings, with potential workflow disruption.
- Option 2 (Small Addition): \$1.8 million plus \$100,000 contingency for a small addition to the existing structure with an enclosed interior ramp. Could accommodate most meetings except large public gatherings, provides better workflow separation, and includes space for interns. This was the staff's preferred option.
- Option 3 (Large Addition): \$2.3 million plus \$100,000 contingency for a larger addition, but would create workflow problems with too much separation between staff areas.
- Option 4 (New Building): \$2.0 million plus \$100,000 contingency for teardown/rebuild or new location, which would solve all issues but create new problems regarding temporary location and what to do with the existing building.

A discussion was held regarding the Administration Building Project. Meacham questioned whether they needed a proper needs assessment from staff. Mulliken confirmed that after extensive meetings, staff preferred Option 2, feeling it addressed all problems, including accessibility and workflow, while meeting current needs without creating unnecessary distance between staff. K. Nelson noted all options from Option 1 up would provide adequate room for Fire Chief MacDonald's classroom training, and potentially allow training in the lower level for non-accessibility-required activities. T. Nelson requested information about basement usage plans for each option and how each could handle additional office space if needed. He noted that Option 2 provided forty chairs for public seating, which should handle most meetings. Hoyerman found it interesting that the new facility option provided more space than the large addition option due to efficiency considerations. He requested a presentation about actual staff needs before making decisions, expressing concern about spending given other major Village projects like the Wastewater Treatment Plant.

The Board requested additional information before the June meeting, including basement drawings, more discussion about accommodating additional staff, and three-dimensional renderings. K. Nelson indicated they'd like a decision in June to keep the project moving with the architect.

k. **Discussion and consideration regarding committee/commission appointments:**

K. Nelson presented the 2026 committee appointments list. The biggest change was Karen McMurtry stepping down as Chair of the Board of Appeals after sixteen years, with Sarah Glenn agreeing to take over as chair. This moved Duska Pearson from alternate to regular member, with two new alternates: Dennis Jewell (currently on the Wastewater Committee) and Alan Kroll.

Plan Committee: Reappointment of Grace Held and Monique McClean

Historic Preservation Committee: Reappointment of BD Thorp as Chair and Kathy Pentler.

Community Protection Committee: Reappointment of Carly Mulliken.

Wastewater Committee: Reappointment of Jim Peterman.

Airport Committee: Reappointment of Scott Pearson and Gary Glojek.

Board of Appeals: Sara Glenn appointed as Chair, Duska Pearson reappointed, Denis Jewell appointed as Alternate #1, and Alan Kroll appointed as Alternate #2.

Library Committee: Reappointment of Cindy Nelson and Mary Wilson.

Mulliken moved, T. Nelson seconded to approve the 2026 Committee Appointments as presented, all ayes. Motion carried.

l. **Discussion and consideration regarding non-profit use of the Village Hall and fees:**

K. Nelson presented a handout showing that for 2026, only one rental had generated income, while twenty-nine other rentals were fee-free due to nonprofit status. The cost breakdown showed about \$85 per meeting for cleanup, meaning the twenty-nine nonprofit rentals would cost the village about \$2,500. All but one (MS Walk) were Ephraim nonprofits.

Meacham noted this should have gone to the Physical Facilities Committee first for recommendation, as had been done with previous fee discussions.

Mulliken reported conversations with Ephraim Historic Foundation and Ephraim Business Council, both organizations use the Village Hall heavily. She noted Sister Bay uses an annual fee equal to one rental rate. The nonprofits could plan for an annual fee, but felt that per-event fees would be cost-prohibitive and might eliminate some programming.

The consensus of the Village Board was to send the item regarding non-profit use of the Village Hall to the Physical Facilities Committee for recommendation.

m. **Discussion regarding planting of a Liberty Tree:**

K. Nelson explained that in quarterly meetings with the Ephraim Business Council (EBC) and the Ephraim Historic Foundation (EHF), they'd been discussing how to commemorate the 250th anniversary of the United States. Shreck from EHF suggested planting a Liberty Tree. Specimens can be selected that are descendants of actual Liberty Trees of various species that are now disease-resistant (like the American Elm Tree, which is resistant to Dutch Elm disease).

They initially considered the library location, but realized a large tree would eventually damage the roof like the previous tree. Other lakefront locations were discussed. K. Nelson emphasized this needed to happen quickly for a Fourth of July commemoration, suggesting a task force approach.

The consensus of the Village Board was to form a task force with Mulliken, Meacham, Cody Schreck (EHF), and Bristol, aiming for a status report and funding request at the June meeting for a minimum of an eight-foot (8') tree.

n. **Discussion and consideration regarding interviews for the open maintenance position:**

Bristol reported they had received a number of applications for the open maintenance position, with the deadline being the past Friday. MacDonald, Meacham, and Collak took a first cut, whittling applications down to six candidates. Given the approaching busy season, interviews were scheduled for tomorrow and Friday, with MacDonald hoping to get someone in place by early June.

T. Nelson expressed concern about not following normal Personnel Committee procedures, noting they typically meet to review and potentially update job descriptions when positions become vacant. While appreciating the urgency, he emphasized the importance of maintaining consistent procedures and being involved at the beginning of the process rather than just approving interview teams after the fact.

T. Nelson moved, Mulliken seconded to approve the interview group for the open maintenance position as presented (MacDonald, Meacham, and Collak), all ayes. Motion carried.

10. Physical Facilities:

a. Discussion and consideration regarding HVAC replacement at Village Hall:

A discussion was held regarding Village Hall HVAC replacement. Meacham reported that two of the three air conditioners were not working. Three bids were requested, with two bids received. T. Nelson asked who installed the existing equipment, with consensus that it was likely Wolf Brothers, though the current equipment is quite old. MacDonald explained that everything was integrated with the boilers upstairs, and mini-splits wouldn't work below 20 degrees for heating. He recommended maintaining building integrity and keeping the aesthetic appearance rather than having units hanging on walls. He confirmed that two of three boilers had been replaced about seven years ago, with the library boiler being the next potential replacement, though it was still running well. He saw no other pressing needs.

K. Nelson confirmed the Village had \$100,000 in the Village Hall Equipment Capital Reserve Fund to cover this expense.

Hoyerman moved, Meacham seconded to approve the bid from AM Mechanical & Refrigeration to replace the Village Hall HVAC system in an amount not to exceed fifty-three thousand dollars (\$53,000) payable out of the Village Hall Equipment Capital Reserve Fund, all ayes. Motion carried.

b. Update on the Village brush dump:

Meacham reported the dump was open and at least six times bigger than what was previously there. It was functional with directional signs, though some people still disposed of brush improperly despite signage. The plan calls for annual tub grinding with the area large enough for equipment access, providing year-round mulch availability, though they couldn't load people at this location like at the maintenance building.

Discussion turned to illegal dumping concerns. Meacham suggested installing a solar camera with cellular plan facing the dumping area, noting they already had cameras elsewhere. The visible camera would serve as a deterrent. Mulliken asked about the definition of "illegal dumping." Meacham explained this meant people who aren't Ephraim residents or residents dumping items not prohibited.

Hoyerman noted problems with people dumping oversized material. T. Nelson supported the high-resolution camera idea for license plate identification but questioned whether they had adequate ordinance enforcement backing with appropriate fines and penalties. He noted people would abuse an unmonitored location and suggested having a proper legal framework, including signage citing relevant ordinances and penalties. Mulliken asked about monitoring frequency. Meacham explained the camera would be motion-activated with unlimited picture capability and alert notifications.

K. Nelson praised the dump's appearance and size but worried about misuse. He questioned whether it should remain open 24/7, suggesting they could limit access by locking gates during certain hours, though this would inconvenience weekend residents who do cleanup work.

The Board discussed various enforcement and access control options, with consensus to have the Physical Facilities Committee explore alternatives, including camera installation, ordinance review, and potential time restrictions.

c. Discussion and consideration regarding Canada Goose damage management plan:

MacDonald and Bristol reported they needed to notify the contractor by June 2nd or 3rd if they wanted to participate this year. The contractor now required 45-50 birds to make the trip worthwhile (up from the previously discussed 30-40). The quoted cost remained around four thousand dollars.

The idea of donating meat to a food pantry wasn't being pursued by neighboring communities, and there would be no cost savings for the required testing. Bristol noted Cindy Nelson's suggestion at the Green Tier meeting that if supporting food pantries was a goal, the Village could simply donate money directly rather than providing small amounts of goose burger.

The Board confirmed they remained interested in proceeding, understanding this just put their name on the list without final commitment. They could still withdraw at the June meeting if bird numbers weren't adequate.

T. Nelson moved, Mulliken seconded to proceed with the Canada Goose Damage Management Plan, all ayes. Motion carried.

d. Discussion and consideration regarding the 2026 Road Paving Projects utilizing the DC Highway Department:

Meacham presented the 2026 road paving project quote from the Door County Highway Department involving four (4) roads: North Orchard Street, including the 20' intersection of Bella Vista Lane and North Orchard Street, Holand Road, and Spruce Lane. The 2026 paving would include a 28' x 42' addition to the parking lot area in the back of the cold storage building. The total project cost was \$141,763.00.

The Board reviewed the road fund balance of \$195,000, with the 2026 budget bringing it to \$298,000, so this project would spend about half the available funds.

T. Nelson mentioned reports of a depression near Bill Schultz's place on Spruce Lane, possibly from a fire truck during a past emergency.

MacDonald confirmed the plan was to mill all roads off and repave, noting some roads hadn't been paved since the 1970s or early 1980s.

Bristol explained the road fund receives varying amounts annually - this year the Village received \$195,000, previously around \$80,000, historically \$50,000-\$60,000, showing an improving trend.

T. Nelson moved, Meacham seconded to approve the 2026 Road Paving Project with the Door County Highway Department for paving of North Orchard Street, Holand Road, Spruce Lane, and a 28' x 42' addition to the Public Works parking lot by cold storage for a cost not to exceed \$142,000.00, funded by Road Aids, all ayes. Motion carried.

11. CPC:

a. Discussion and consideration regarding Emergency Operations Plan:

Mulliken presented the draft internal Emergency Operations Plan. She noted items for the Village Board to consider, such as: The Village President to serve as the Emergency Operations Director, Chain of Command, if the Emergency Operations Director is unable to serve, Village Trustees, in order of seniority, would assume the role, and a dollar amount allocated to department directors to permit the acquisition of equipment and supplies needed immediately following a disaster. She explained that the Community Protection Committee (CPC) felt that the document was much more usable and provided an actionable plan.

K. Nelson requested that the Board read the document. He encouraged the CPC to read the plan again to ensure that it is a workable plan.

Meacham moved, T. Nelson seconded to table the discussion regarding the Emergency Operations Plan as presented, all ayes. Motion carried.

12. Committee Minutes for review: There were no comments.

13. New Business for the Next Meeting:

- a. Emergency Operations Plan.
- b. Policy for Village Attorney Consultation.

14. The Village Board may entertain a motion and convene into closed session per §19.85(1)(c), considering employment, promotion, compensation, or performance evaluation data of any public employee over which the governmental body has jurisdiction or exercises responsibility. *For the purpose of discussing the building and grounds maintenance worker position.*

T. Nelson moved, Meacham seconded to convene into closed session per §19.85(1)(c), considering employment, promotion, compensation, or performance evaluation data of any public employee over which the governmental body has jurisdiction or exercises responsibility. For the purpose of discussing the building and grounds maintenance worker position, all ayes. Motion carried.

15. Please take notice pursuant to §19.85(2) Wis. Stats, the Village Board may entertain a motion and reconvene in open session and may address the matters considered in closed session and all other matters on the agenda.

Mulliken moved, Meacham seconded to reconvene in open session, all ayes. Motion carried.

T. Nelson moved, Mulliken seconded to proceed as discussed in Closed Session, all ayes. Motion carried.

16. Adjournment:

Mulliken moved, Hoyerman seconded to adjourn at 10:42 PM, all ayes. Motion carried.

*Recorded by,
Kim Roberts – Deputy Clerk*