

**VILLAGE OF EPHRAIM
VILLAGE BOARD MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, JUNE 9, 2026 – 7:00 PM
9996 WATER STREET- EPHRAIM VILLAGE HALL**



Present: Ken Nelson – Chair/President, Rick Hoyerman, Matt Meacham, Carly Mulliken, Tim Nelson

Staff: Brent Bristol -Village Administrator, Andrea Collak - Clerk-Treasurer

Guests in-person: Holly Buthnow, Michael McCutcheon, Kelsey Stone, Angela Reed, John Cox, Colin Welford, Harald Halvorsen, Keith Krist, Ken Pabich, Cody Schreck

Guests online: Bill Schult, “ah”, BD Thorp, Angie, Bruce Nelson, J. Larson, Lane Methner, Michael Miller, Paul

-
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:** There were no changes to the agenda.
 4. **Visitors’ Comments:** Bill Schult, Spruce Lane, addressed the Village Board regarding the Helgeson Memorial Pole, noting that the pole had been partially power washed the previous fall and that the remaining upper half still needed power washing, potential painting, and base repairs. He urged the Village Board to fulfill its obligation to the Helgeson family and move the project forward. K. Nelson acknowledged the matter and indicated it would be addressed.

John Cox, 9923 Town Line, returned to follow up on his previous month's comments regarding the timely posting of Village Board draft minutes. He noted that all committee draft minutes had been posted throughout the month, but that the Village Board draft minutes did not appear until Friday afternoon (Village Board Agenda Packet) - leaving the public without access for the entire month. He reminded the Village Board that all trustees are co-equal members and urged the full Board, rather than the Village President alone, to address the issue. K. Nelson directed Cox to a paragraph in the Administrator's report addressing the matter, confirming that a proposed solution would be brought back to the full Village Board.
 5. **Approval of previous minutes:**

Mulliken moved, Meacham seconded to approve the minutes of the May 12, 2026 meeting, all ayes. Motion carried.

Mulliken moved, Meacham seconded to approve the minutes of the May 18, 2026, Closed Session meeting, all ayes. Motion carried.
 6. **President’s Comments:** Bristol delivered a public service announcement regarding a phishing scam affecting the village and its applicants. He explained that fraudulent invoices were being sent to email addresses found in digitally posted Plan Committee packets, deceptively appearing to come from the Village of Ephraim and requesting payment for zoning permits. Bristol clarified that the village sends digital invoices only for wastewater fees and does not seek electronic payment for zoning-related matters. He advised residents to carefully examine the sender's domain on any such email. He further noted that the village is exploring ways to redact personal contact information from future digital packets to protect applicants.

7. Consent Agenda Items:

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

8. Administration:

a. Discussion and Consideration regarding YMCA request to use Anderson Dock for summer yoga classes:

Holly Butenhoff, the Branch Executive Director at the Northern Door YMCA, noted that YMCA has been partnering with the Village of Ephraim to offer summer yoga classes, utilizing the green space on Anderson Dock, for the past five to six years and they would like to offer it again this summer. They would like to offer a Yoga Flow class this year.

Yoga Flow is designed for those with a basic understanding of yoga poses. Directions for increasing and decreasing the level of difficulty are provided for students to decide the best level for themselves. A goal of this class is to help build both strength & flexibility to balance the body. The flowing movement through poses builds. The YMCA would handle all registrations, waiver of liability forms that will be signed by any drop in participant, and all marketing materials, created by thier marketing department. For marketing purposes they will include both the YMCA and Village of Ephraim logos on all marketing materials. The following was proposed:

Class: Yoga Flow

Dates: Mondays, June 15th-August 17th

Time: 8:15a.m.-9:15a.m.

Fee: \$45.00/Session Y Members/Ephraim Residents

\$90.00/Session Community Members

\$10.00 Drop In Fee/Per Class

Mulliken moved, Hoyerman seconded, to approve the YMCA's request to use Anderson Dock, the green space, for summer yoga classes, all ayes. Motion carried.

b. Discussion and Consideration regarding Village of Ephraim contribution to Anderson Dock Preservation Campaign:

Mike McCutcheon, chair of the Anderson Dock Capital Campaign Task Force, presented three topics on behalf of the campaign task force, which also includes Trustees Mulliken and T. Nelson. He reported that the campaign is being guided by Bret Bicoy and the Door County Community Foundation, with a third planning meeting scheduled for the following Monday, June 15th.

Village Monetary Contribution: McCutcheon explained that prospective donors and committee members had raised the question of why the village itself was not contributing financially to the preservation of its own property. Bret Bicoy advised that the village should have "skin in the game" and recommended at least a six-figure commitment to set an example for outside donors. The current project cost estimate stands at \$1,500,000, with an updated figure expected from AECOM. With the current estimated construction cost at \$1.5 million, McCutcheon said he was present to request at least \$100,000 in cash from the village.

Mulliken and T. Nelson both expressed support for the contribution.

Mulliken acknowledged the legitimate question donors would raise — that since the dock is village property, why shouldn't the village simply fund it entirely — and explained that the committee's position was that Anderson Dock carries an iconic significance well beyond the village itself, making it

worthy of broader community support. She added that the village's contribution, combined with acknowledgment of ongoing maintenance expenses and the already-awarded \$100,000 Community Investment Fund (CIF) grant, would help frame the full scope of the village's financial commitment when approaching donors.

T. Nelson echoed support for a \$100,000 contribution, characterizing village ownership of the dock as a long-term given and noting that an additional infrastructure component of the project — a utility trench along the shoreline to serve the marina — had always been understood to come from marina fund revenues, and could itself be cited as part of the village's total contribution.

Hoyerman expressed support for the contribution in principle and drew a distinction between village funds derived from marina slip rentals—which are appropriate for infrastructure—and the broader cash donation toward the iconic structure. He raised a concern he had voiced in a prior meeting: whether a formal village financial commitment might inadvertently undermine the fundraising efforts by leading some donors to conclude that the village would or should simply cover the full cost. McCutcheon responded that, based on conversations with Bret Bicoy and task force members, the effect was expected to be the opposite — that far more donors would be encouraged by seeing the village commit funds than would be deterred.

Mulliken added that the campaign's framing centered on preservation, not significant alteration, which she said resonated with potential donors who cared about keeping the dock as it is.

Bristol raised an additional dimension: beyond the proposed \$100,000 cash contribution, the village had already spent substantial funds on engineering through its contract with AECOM, likely totaling another \$100,000 or more. K. Nelson suggested that the combined figure — engineering expenditures already incurred plus the new \$100,000 cash pledge — could be presented to donors as the village's total contribution of approximately \$200,000 toward the project.

The Village Board voted to approve a \$100,000 contribution from room tax funds.

Mulliken moved, T. Nelson seconded, to approve Village of Ephraim contribution of \$100,000 of room tax funds to Anderson Dock Preservation Campaign, all ayes. Motion carried.
--

Endowment Placeholder: McCutcheon reported that the campaign's planning documents include a placeholder endowment goal of \$1,000,000 and that the foundation is seeking direction from the Board on how such an endowment would be used.

Hoyerman asked whether any prospective donors had already indicated interest or intent in contributing to an endowment, noting that donor intent would be a significant factor in shaping how the endowment could or should be used. McCutcheon acknowledged this was still an open question, as the committee had not yet approached any donors.

Bristol noted that depending on the structure, endowment contributions might remain an option for donors long after the initial construction campaign closed, and urged the committee to think through whether construction donors and endowment donors would be acknowledged in the same way.

T. Nelson suggested the endowment should not be viewed as a replacement for the village's ongoing annual maintenance commitment — which he expected to continue from the operating budget — but rather as a fund for enhanced programming and graffiti abatement. He described graffiti remediation as near and dear to his heart, noting that a sustained, multi-year financial commitment would likely be necessary to meaningfully change public behavior.

Meacham said he preferred to hear from prospective donors about their own intentions before committing to a specific use for the endowment.

Mulliken noted the committee had also discussed using endowment income to fund programming — such as musical performances — at an improved and more accessible dock facility.

K. Nelson suggested viewing the endowment primarily as a long-term replacement fund, allowing the principal to grow over decades to cover a future major restoration.

Donor Recognition: McCutcheon sought input on how to acknowledge donors in exchange for significant gifts. He confirmed that renaming Anderson Dock was not under consideration — it would remain Anderson Dock — but that a tiered recognition system based on gift level was being explored.

K. Nelson opened by stating his personal preference that no donor names appear on the exterior of the Anderson Warehouse building, expressing concern that such signage could diminish the building's unique character. He acknowledged the interior, particularly the gabled areas of the Hardy Gallery high above the floor, as a potentially appropriate location for permanent, protected recognition.

Mulliken noted the committee had discussed placing names in the upper gable sections of the building — areas that are never touched by visitors — and potentially covering them with plexiglass for protection, a technique that had been used by Hardy Gallery Director Adam for other purposes. She acknowledged, however, that mixing recognition elements inside the Hardy Gallery space could blur the distinction between the gallery's programs and the broader dock preservation project, which she found potentially confusing.

T. Nelson acknowledged that the gabled sections had seemed to him a promising location, both because they were out of reach of vandalism and because their prominent open space might otherwise attract graffiti from those who managed to reach them with ladders or lifts. He cautioned, however, that recognition should not rise to a level that looks gaudy, and suggested that small, tasteful name plaques embedded in the new dimension stone knee wall along the dock's perimeter might also be a dignified option. He referenced brass plaques set in concrete at Menominee Marina as a possible model.

Meacham expressed a preference for keeping all recognition inside the building — specifically, a plaque mounted on one of the large interior structural beams near the north entrance, which he described as a location that would look "classy" and "privileged" while being protected from weather and vandalism.

Hoyerman agreed strongly that the exterior of the building should not bear individual donor names, and added that if the committee seriously considered any exterior recognition, it would first need a credible graffiti abatement plan in place so donors could be assured their names would remain legible and undamaged. He also floated the idea of naming component parts of the dock property — such as a specific lawn area — after major donors, stopping well short of any implication that the broader dock facility had been renamed.

Bristol raised a practical distinction: recognition tied to the construction campaign would have a finite window, while endowment recognition might need to remain open-ended to accommodate future contributions.

Discussion covered several options, including naming rights (ruled out—the structure will remain "Anderson Dock"), signage on the exterior building gables, plaques on the new dimension stone knee wall, names embedded in the new concrete at the elevated Memorial area, and interior recognition at Hardy Gallery.

The Board reached general consensus against exterior naming on the warehouse building itself, while remaining open to knee wall plaques, inscriptions in the new concrete at the elevated Memorial area, and interior recognition.

The task force was directed to refine the recognition framework in consultation with the Door County Community Foundation.

c. Discussion and Consideration regarding – Combination Class “B” and “Class C” Alcohol Beverage Retailers License:

1. Dandelion LLC - dba The Secret Garden of Door County – 10347 Hwy 42

Colin Welford, owner, clarified that alcohol service would occur from a fixed location within the structure as well as from mobile service points throughout the property, given the distance and uneven terrain of the site. The Board noted that health and fire inspections were still pending.

Mulliken moved, Meacham seconded, to approve the Combination Class “B” and “Class C” Alcohol Beverage Retailers License for Dandelion LLC dba The Secret Garden of Door County at 10347 Hwy 42, dependent on passed fire and health inspection, all ayes. Motion carried.

d. Discussion and Consideration regarding – “Class C” Alcohol Beverage Retailers License:

1. Parisienne Farmgirl LLC – dba Everyday Château – 10421 Hwy 42

K. Nelson noted that a 2024 change in state law eliminated the prior requirement to serve food in order to obtain a wine license. The law no longer requires the licensee to be a restaurant. It was clarified that under the “Class C” license, wine may be sold by the glass for on-premises consumption only; bottles cannot be sold for off-premises take-away. Angela Reed confirmed the business had already held a soft opening. A fire inspection was noted as a remaining condition.

Mulliken moved, Meacham seconded, to approve the “Class C” Alcohol Beverage Retailers License for Parisienne Farmgirl LLC dba Everyday Château at 10421 Hwy 42, contingent upon passed fire inspection, all ayes. Motion carried.

e. Discussion and Consideration regarding Temporary Class “B” Alcohol Beverage Retailers License:

1. Ephraim Business Council (EBC) – Evenings in Ephraim/Bondemarked – June 22, 2026

Mulliken noted that the event also serves as a celebration of the opening of the North Path. The license covers a single day.

Mulliken moved, T. Nelson seconded, to approve the Temporary Class “B” Alcohol Beverage Retailers License for the Ephraim Business Council, Evenings in Ephraim/Bondemarked on June 22, 2026, all ayes. Motion carried.

f. Update regarding North Path Project:

Bristol reported that the North Path is operational. He and K. Nelson, along with Relyco and AECOM representatives, conducted a punch list walk approximately two weeks prior. Most minor items identified have since been addressed, and the project was characterized as having gone well overall, with the contractor being responsive and timely.

The Board discussed several follow-up items. Meacham and a local business owner had independently observed motorists turning into driveways without yielding to pedestrians on the path. Meacham indicated that Physical Facilities & Utilities (PFU) had already begun discussing pavement markings at driveway crossings reading "Pedestrians Yield to Traffic," with the intent of placing warnings where people are most likely to see them—at their feet rather than on signage.

K. Nelson raised the possibility of petitioning the state to lower the speed limit in northern Ephraim from 40 mph to 35 mph, citing the increased pedestrian activity generated by the new path and the 45 mph approach from the north. Meacham and others were skeptical, recalling prior state resistance to speed limit changes absent documented incidents. Bristol suggested a two-step approach: placing the state on notice of the village's concerns and documenting observed near-misses or unsafe conditions from nearby business owners to support a future request. The Board was generally in favor of at least formally raising the concern with the state.

Welford raised additional observations: that the new and patched asphalt sections currently make it difficult to distinguish the path from the shoulder; that bicycle path lane markings have gaps; that the orange snow fencing on three adjacent properties should be removed now that construction is complete; and that a relocated utility pole had left overhead wire and a marker ball that should be addressed.

Bristol confirmed the snow fencing and wire would be dealt with shortly, and that the asphalt would weather to a uniform gray over time. He also confirmed that a utility wire installed with a relocated telegraph pole would be buried in the near future. Mulliken also raised the question of whether accelerating the installation of path lighting might help delineate the path more clearly for drivers. K. Nelson indicated lighting installation had been deferred to fall to avoid construction conflicts with path users, but said the timeline could be reconsidered.

As discussed last month the village will be supporting the Ephraim Business Council in a ribbon cutting type celebration of path completion that coincides with the first Bondemarked event on the Monday, 22nd of June, 2026.

g. Discussion and Consideration regarding Door County Emergency Communication Tower Project Draft Intergovernmental Agreement and Easement:

Bristol explained that following prior Board discussion, the village's concerns had been submitted to the village attorney, who then conducted negotiations with the county attorney. Ken Pabich, Door County Administrator, was present and confirmed that the two attorneys had worked through the full draft agreement and reached consensus on all outstanding issues. However, the final revised agreement had not yet been prepared for formal Board review.

The Board discussed next steps. It was agreed that the matter would proceed to the Plan Commission for review of the specific site location and design, while the attorneys finalize the updated agreement language for a subsequent formal vote. County Administrator indicated that the county is primarily seeking assurance that the village intends to move forward in good faith so that due diligence work—including soil borings to confirm site viability—can proceed in parallel. He confirmed that the proposed southeastern corner location continues to provide adequate coverage for the downtown area.

The Board reached consensus to authorize the village attorney to finalize the agreement with the County and to place the item on the Plan Commission agenda, with the final agreement returning to the Board for signature.

h. Discussion and Consideration regarding Administration building project planning, design and options:

Bristol presented an update on the administration building project. Since the prior month's discussion, the task force had submitted follow-up questions to the architect, Keller, and PFU had reviewed the options and provided a recommendation.

• **OPTION 0 (Deferred Maintenance):** *\$600,000 with \$50,000 contingency*

The project scope is limited to targeted deferred maintenance, including the addition of HVAC to two enclosed office spaces (currently not code compliant), improvements to building insulation / exterior envelope, conditioned HVAC basement, and full roof replacement. The work does not include building expansion, reconfiguration, or full system replacement beyond these defined areas, and is intended to address specific performance deficiencies rather than a long term solution.

Pros:

- Addresses the deferred maintenance issues within the current building.
- HVAC added to the two rear offices and basement
- Conditioned basement allows for additional storage
- New roof on building
- New insulation on exterior walls and roof of building

Cons:

- No alterations within the office building
- No relocation of meetings from Village Hall
- No room for any growth
- No accessibility improvements
- Not intended as a long-term solution

• **OPTION 1 (Remodel Existing 2,172 sq.ft):** *\$1.3 million with \$100,000 contingency*

A comprehensive renovation of the existing 2,172 square foot facility to improve functionality, code compliance, and overall building performance. Work would involve reconfiguration of interior spaces, upgrades to mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems, and improvements to the building envelope as needed. This approach maintains the existing structure while modernizing the facility to better support current and future operational needs. In addition, some interior reconfiguration within existing space.

Pros:

- Can possibly move smaller committee meetings back to Admin Building
- Conditioned basement allows for additional storage
- Options for minor reconfiguring of office layout within the existing building envelope
- Some modernization of facility to better support current and future needs
- Better accessibility with the addition of exterior ramp
- HVAC added to the two existing rear offices and basement

Cons:

- 1 office still has no openable window
- Still requires the use of Village Hall for HPC/Plan and Village Board Mtgs.
- Meetings held in office are still somewhat disruptive to office operations as the flow and access is not ideal
- AV system while new would likely still have to be broken down from time to time and cannot likely be hard wired. This increases the likelihood of failure, disruption and maintenance.

• **OPTION 2 (Remodel & Small Addition, Total 2,990 sq. ft.; Existing 2,172 sq. ft. & New 818 sq.ft.):** *\$1.8 million with \$100,000 contingency*

This option includes renovation of the existing 2,172 square foot facility combined with an 818 square foot addition to allow internal ramps (rather than external). This option improves on

‘option 2’ in allowing a safer solution with lower long-term maintenance costs. Work includes integration of new and existing systems, interior reconfiguration, and upgrades to building systems and envelope as required to support the addition.

Pros:

- All village meetings, minus the largest public hearings, can move back to Admin bldg.
- Board/Committee member table and AV systems can be permanent/hard wired
- Conditioned basement allows for additional storage
- Small addition allows for a more significant reconfiguring of the office/meeting room layout for more separation and better flow. Offices can all be new construction designed based on needs with new HVAC equipment and openable windows.
- Modernizes facility to better support current and future needs
- Accessible ramp is completely enclosed
- Addition only impacts the portion of the building that was previously an addition. Original aesthetics retained
- Room for Fire Department classroom training

Cons:

- Looking at the long term this plan likely limits office staffing to 3 full-time employees. Current staff does not see the need for a 4th full-time staff member on the horizon. Space can be found for part-time employees, limited-term employees or interns if need be.

• ***OPTION 3 (Remodel & Large Addition, Total 4,178 sq. ft.; Existing 2,172 sq. ft. & New 2,006 sq.ft): \$2.3 million with \$100,000 contingency***

This option includes renovation of the existing 2,172 square foot facility combined with a 2,006 square foot addition to expand overall building capacity. The project would address deficiencies within the existing structure while providing new, purpose-built space to support operational needs. Work includes integration of new and existing systems, improved layout and circulation, and targeted upgrades to the existing building to align with the addition.

Pros:

- All village meetings can move back to Admin bldg.
- Board/Committee member table and AV systems can be permanent/hard wired
- Conditioned basement allows for additional storage
- Large addition would completely separate the admin office from the meeting room so no disruption would occur
- Completely modern office housed in a brand-new office addition.
- Better accessibility
- Enough space to guarantee that the addition would satisfy the needs of the admin department for the foreseeable future.
- Accessible ramp is completely enclosed.

Cons:

- Cost
- Separation is a con on election day as the offices of Andrea and Kim would be removed from the operation and out of earshot.
- Significant change to the look of the building, additional bulk

• ***OPTION 4 (New Building, 3,500 sq. ft.): \$2.0 million with \$100,000 contingency***

This option includes construction of a new 3,500 square foot facility, replacing the existing building entirely. The new facility would be designed to meet current operational requirements, building codes, and energy performance standards. Important to note this does not include land cost. This approach eliminates constraints associated with the existing structure and allow for a fully optimized layout, modern systems, and long-term durability with reduced maintenance.

Pros:

- Ground up purpose built new construction that will be a long-term solution without the need to

utilize a portion of the existing building.

Cons:

- Plan results in either the demolition of the existing Admin building or the relocating of the facility to a new location. The latter option would still require us to incur the costs of deferred maintenance in Option 0
- If built in the same location, we would lose a historic building
- If built on the same site but in a different location, would require new utility connections, parking lot, driveways, etc.
- Cost

Bristol reported that Keller's responses to the task force's questions were as follows:

- A limited-use elevator to the basement would cost approximately \$100,000; a full commercial elevator would cost approximately \$300,000.
- Demolition of the existing building, if pursued, would cost roughly \$40,000 for teardown and hauling, plus approximately \$15,000–\$16,000 for asbestos tile abatement in the basement.
- The timeline for teardown and new construction on the same footprint would be approximately 8–9 months, with the teardown itself requiring only 1–2 weeks.
- Upgrading a new building (Option 4) to reflect the high-end masonry aesthetic of the existing admin building would add approximately \$150,000 to the baseline Option 4 cost of \$2,000,000, bringing that option to approximately \$2,150,000.

PFU's recommendation was to focus the Board's attention on Option 2 (a modest addition to the existing administration building) and Option 4 (a new standalone structure).

Meacham clarified that Option 4, as discussed, would not involve demolishing the existing administration building, but rather constructing a new building on a different portion of the same village-owned parcel, on the opposite side of the fire station from the existing building. He argued that it made little financial sense to invest heavily in an aging building with old electrical, plumbing, HVAC, and roofing when the village already owns land where a purpose-built, fully accessible new facility could be constructed, and staff could continue operating in the existing building during construction.

Mulliken flagged that any option applied to the existing building would need to address accessibility, and noted the Board had also received public comments expressing strong sentiment for the existing admin building, which, while not on the historic register, carries significant historical significance to the community.

Hoyerman said he had a few distinct thoughts. First, regardless of which option is selected, he believed the existing admin building would not come down — the community would not allow it — meaning maintenance and eventual renovation costs for that building were effectively fixed no matter what. Second, he noted that staff had indicated no fourth full-time employee is anticipated in the foreseeable future, and that the historic Village Hall has significant symbolic value as a meeting place. He expressed a preference for continuing to hold all the meetings in the Village Hall, characterizing it as a special and symbolically appropriate venue for public governance. He suggested that improving the Village Hall's technology infrastructure should be explored as a parallel track, and said that for him, the decision between options was between Option 1 and Option 2, not Option 4.

T. Nelson said he shared Hoyerman's idea for holding meetings at the Village Hall, but acknowledged he had been informed that the technology limitations of the building are not easily solved by available vendors — the fundamental challenge being that the current setup requires assembly and disassembly for each meeting, and that the more permanent and hardwired a system becomes, the less compatible the space is with its other uses. He said he had arrived leaning toward Options 2 and 4 but was

reconsidering whether Option 1 might remain on the table if a workable technology solution for the Village Hall could be identified.

Bristol acknowledged the appeal of keeping meetings at the Village Hall but raised the reliability challenges of the current audio-visual setup - representing an investment of \$25,000–\$30,000 - works adequately, but its reliability is compromised by the need to tear it down and reassemble it for every meeting, since a permanent hardwired installation would reduce the room's versatility for other uses., which requires teardown and setup for each meeting and has experienced failures when remote participants are involved. He noted that permanence of the AV installation is closely linked to reliability, and that a hardwired, permanently installed system in the Village Hall would substantially reduce the risk of failure—but would require some physical modification to the stage area to accommodate it. He estimated that extending the stage depth by more than the two feet previously discussed would significantly improve the options for a permanent, functional layout. He also noted that the increased frequency of the Village Hall's use — driven by the policy of making it available to nonprofits — had itself increased the setup and teardown burden.

K. Nelson reframed the conceptual path forward: if the Board wished to keep all village meetings in the Village Hall permanently, then the appropriate questions were (1) what investment would be needed to make the Village Hall reliably meeting-ready, and (2) how would that change the footprint requirements for whatever option was chosen for the admin building. He noted that if meetings were never going to return to the admin building, the admin building options could be scaled down — Option 1 could be considered for \$1.3 million instead of Option 2 for \$1.8 million - no need for a large conference room, since the Village Hall would serve that purpose. \$500,000 could be used to get the Village Hall meeting-ready.

Hoyerman acknowledged the logic of this framing and asked whether anyone had obtained technology advice specifically on what it would take to make the Village Hall reliably functional for remote-participation meetings on a permanent basis. Bristol said no formal study had been commissioned and suggested it might be worth exploring.

Bristol also reported that the environmental testing of the existing administration building had returned results indicating the presence of mold. While the levels did not trigger major alarms at the time of testing, the report qualified that the testing occurred during cool, dry conditions and that mold levels could be significantly higher during hot, humid summer weather. He indicated he intended to follow up with the laboratory for guidance on next steps, including whether a retest during summer conditions would be warranted.

Mulliken reminded the group that one of the main concerns that task force tried to solve was the workflow of the admin staff, the overall operations and how the space of admin building could be used more effectively with having all the meetings back in the administrative building.

The Board reached consensus to eliminate Option 3 from further consideration. Options 1, 2, and 4 (new building on a separate portion of the existing site) remain under active consideration.

The task force was directed to explore what investment would be required to make the Village Hall a permanent, reliable meeting facility, which would inform how much space in a renovated or new administration building would need to be dedicated to meetings. The matter will return to the Board at the next meeting.

i. Discussion and Consideration regarding planting of Liberty Tree:

Mulliken provided an informational update on the Liberty Tree project, noting that the task force consisting of Cody Shreck from Ephraim Historical Society, Matt Meacham, Brent Bristol and herself had reached a consensus. They are recommending a Princeton Elm Tree – a disease resistant hybrid of the American Elm, the species of the original historic Liberty Trees – sourced from Hortonville,

Wisconsin, to be planted at Harborside Park, near where another tree had come down, leaving ample lawn space for public enjoyment. An aerial image illustrating the proposed placement was shown. The proposed tree would be four inches in diameter and 18 to 20 feet tall at planting. The cost is \$650 for the tree.

Bristol noted that equipment and digging will be coordinated between the vendor and maintenance manager MacDonald.

The plaque itself, just under \$600, would feature the following text, refined during discussion:

Semiquincentennial Liberty Tree planted July 4th, 2026, in Commemoration of the 250th Anniversary of the founding of the United States of America, dedicated by the people of Ephraim.

The task force recommended a specific font and a darker leatherette-style background texture for the plaque.

Total project cost was estimated at approximately \$1,900.

T. Nelson raised a practical question about soil preparation, suggesting that the nursery (Wolf Rafter) be consulted on any recommended soil treatment or conditioning to maximize the tree's chances of survival. Bristol noted that Wolf Rafter had previously completed a large planting project in Sister Bay and was familiar with the local soil conditions.

Hoyerman was supportive and asked whether the Ephraim Historical Foundation would be making a monetary contribution to the project and whether the Foundation's name should appear on the plaque alongside the village. After discussion, the Board reached consensus that the plaque should simply read "the people of Ephraim" — reflecting that the village as a community, rather than any specific organization, was the sponsor — without listing organizational names that could raise questions about why some were included and others were not.

K. Nelson raised the practical question of timing: with the target date of July 4th and no additional Board meeting before then, the task force would need to move quickly on finalizing the plaque wording so the order could be placed, given a 4–6 week lead time for fabrication. Mulliken acknowledged the plaque might not be ready by July 4th and suggested the tree could be planted first, with the stone and plaque installed once they arrived. The Board discussed whether a small gathering or ceremony might be organized for July 4th to mark the occasion, with the practical consensus being that a photo opportunity and informal gathering — rather than a formal ceremony — would be realistic given the timeline.

The final agreed wording was:

Semiquincentennial Liberty Tree planted July 4th, 2026, in Commemoration of the 250th Anniversary of the founding of the United States of America, dedicated by the people of Ephraim.

T. Nelson moved, Hoyerman seconded to approve the Liberty Tree Project as discussed, all ayes. Motion carried.

9. Physical Facilities:

a. Update regarding Village brush dump:

Trustee Matt reported that in response to concerns about illegal dumping discussed at the prior meeting, the village will place an existing camera at the brush dump in plain sight, accompanied by

signage advising users they are on camera. Gravel has also been added to address a low spot in the area, and usage has reportedly increased.

b. Update regarding Canada goose damage management plan:

Bristol reported that that U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) scheduled Village of Ephraim for the goose round-up and removal of geese. Per the Board's prior authorization, the action will proceed contingent on adequate numbers. He indicated that responses from participating properties have been strong and that the plan is on track unless conditions change.

c. Discussion and Consideration regarding Non-Profit use of Village Hall and fees:

Meacham presented the PFU committee's recommendation regarding the use of the Village Hall by nonprofit organizations. The committee's consensus was that Ephraim-based nonprofits should be permitted to use the Village Hall without charge, subject to the condition that they leave the space in the same condition in which they found it — including setting up and taking down chairs and tables themselves, and sweeping the space afterward. If it is determined after use that the space was not left as found, an \$85 cleaning or reset fee would be assessed.

The Board confirmed that the preferential no-fee arrangement would apply only to Ephraim-based nonprofits; nonprofits from outside the village would be subject to the standard rental fee schedule. The Board directed that appropriate language be added to the fee schedule to reflect this policy. No formal motion was taken.

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

11. New business for the Next Meeting: There was no new business for the next meeting.

12. Adjournment:

T. Nelson moved, Meacham seconded to adjourn at 9:15 PM, all ayes. Motion carried.

Recorded by,

Andrea Collak – Clerk/Treasurer