

Larsen Winchester Sanitary District Meeting Minutes

Location: Winchester Town Hall, 8522 Parkway Lane, Larsen
Date/Time: Tuesday, February 6, 2024—4:00 p.m.

I. Call to order.

1. Verification of Notice
2. Roll Call

Chair Scott Reif	PRESENT
Vice Chair Rob Nelson	EXCUSED
Commissioner Connie Kreutzberg	PRESENT
Commissioner Adam Blackburn	EXCUSED
Commissioner Jeff Guth	PRESENT
Plant Operator Mike Pfankuch	PRESENT
M & E Engineer Mary Jo Miller	PRESENT
Treasurer Cori Thomas	PRESENT
Secretary/Billing Clerk Holly Stevens	PRESENT

Also in attendance was 1 member of the public.

II. Minutes

1. January 2, 2024 Meeting Minutes

Secretary Stevens presented the minutes of the January 2, 2024 meeting.

Engineer Miller noted that her statement on page 11 should be clarified by changing the word “ideally” and replacing it with “required to”.

MOTION:

Motion by Commissioner Guth

Second by Commissioner Kreutzberg

Motion to approve the minutes of the January 2, 2024 meeting with the clarification as noted.

Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

III. Business

1. WWTP Improvement Project

- System Design Update

Engineer Miller explained she has continued the design of the WWTP and met with Operator Pfankuch and Kevin Schumann, Architect.

She noted that Operator Pfankuch had concerns about the plant location will require the addition of a lot of fill, which will likely result in settling over time potentially causing structural issues. It was suggested that getting someone like ECS Geotechnical involved early on in coordination with the building design to make sure we are properly designing the foundation.

She noted they talked about the building having split block walls with a concrete sloped roof sloping to drain and would include some windows for natural light. It will also require multiple fans and louvers for ventilation which will run based on the temperature in the building. Door openings will be large enough to get equipment in and out. It was also agreed that use of unit heaters would be the best option for heating, but this will be reviewed further.

They also discussed having water on site with a new well. She noted that Operator Pfankuch strongly supports this as it is essential to keeping the equipment and the facility clean. Adding water in the building does add additional requirements according to state codes.

They also talked about controlled manholes and the outside valving system. As well as lighting outside the building and along the north side of the lagoon. Operator Pfankuch had indicated he prefers a Kohler generator over other manufacturers. They also discussed an exterior transfer switch relating to the generator.

They also discussed the office space, which is to include a desk area, a separate worktable space, filing cabinets, plenty of outlets, and hooks for safety gear. She noted that the office space will also house the electrical components. She noted the architect is recommending sealed concrete for the floor throughout the building.

They also reviewed the general layout of the site including gravel driving areas for access to and from the site, as well as parking. They also discussed propane versus natural gas, and it was determined that running natural gas is the better long-term solution. She said they also discussed the operation of the UV disinfection and the Mag meter which will likely be on a basement level. They decided to keep moving forward with the current design and take any questions about the UV system to the DNR.

Operator Pfankuch noted they also discussed the floor drains. He said the drains will be handling wastewater from washing things off and would need to go through the treatment system so the drain outflow would have to be determined. Engineer Miller said it will likely have to go to the first manhole, but they have to see how the hydraulics work out.

Commissioner Guth questioned the use of Span Crete for the roof versus metal. Engineer Miller noted that the chemicals in the building are corrosive, which was the main consideration. Operator Pfankuch confirmed that the ferric would eat the metal. He said it is extremely corrosive.

Commissioner Guth suggested the section of the building housing the ferric could have a Span Crete roof, but the rest could have a metal roof to save on costs. Chair Reif noted that the other plant they toured stored their ferric outside. Commissioner Guth added that if it is that caustic, the employees should not be in with it either—he said there should be a lot more ventilation to minimize the effects.

Operator Pfankuch noted that he did not recall discussing the ferric storage location. Engineer Miller said that it is normally stored inside the facility and that is what was recommended. Operator Pfankuch noted that Weyauwega stores it inside, and at Dale it is stored in a separate, unheated woodshed with venting.

Commissioner Guth reiterated that Span Crete could go on a small building and the rest of the building could have a metal roof. He said Span Crete is really costly and a lot of cost could be saved by minimizing its use.

Operator Pfankuch noted that ferric does not freeze—it maintains its viscosity regardless of temperature so it can be stored outside or in a separate but attached building area—like a “closet.” He explained the chemical is delivered by tanker which fills a plastic poly tank.

Engineer Miller noted they are looking at using two five-hundred-gallon tanks. She said the people she has been working with have indicated they generally see it inside, but it is not impossible to have it outside.

Commissioner Guth said it doesn’t have to be outside—it could be in a separate, self-contained room. He asked what would be less expensive—an attached but separate building with a concrete roof on that section or a separate, detached building versus a building requiring Span Crete on the whole thing. He said you have to add doors for access, etc. but unless we compare the costs of the options, we do not know what the best solution is.

Commissioner Guth noted that they knew when they started all this, it was going to cost about \$6 million and now two years later it is going to be more than that—whatever that is \$7.6 million or more. He said they have to figure out what the best options are to keep the costs down. He said they have to set a limit to spending, and figure how we are going to build this the best way possible without exceeding the financial limits of the district. He said there are different ways to do things and we have to figure out the best way to do it.

Engineer Miller explained that the overall estimate in the Facility Plan was about \$6 million but that included the Angoli Way lift station, the gas line extension to the Angoli lift station, the force main from it, and improvements to lift station #1 to handle the additional flow. She said we are not doing those improvements as part of this project, so those costs need to be pulled out of the \$6 million. She also noted it included the tertiary treatment for phosphorous which was about \$1.1 million. She said they are not doing that at this time so that should be taken out too.

Commissioner Guth asked if she could pull those costs out to determine the estimated cost for the WWTP which the district is facing. He said they need to know what they are looking at financially and then they have to look at various design options to make informed choices.

Chair Reif said he has the same concern—that the costs just keep increasing. He said it is good to know that some of that original \$6 million estimate will not be realized at this time.

Engineer Miller noted that there have only been a couple additions to the project so far—the box screen and the well. She noted that if they go forward with the well, the state code is going to require items which will increase costs. For example, a site with potable water is required to have a bathroom facility. She said they are suggesting the bathroom be designed in conjunction with the emergency shower fixture, making the entire room a “wet room.” But there will be added costs because the district wants water on site. She said without a well on site, there would still have to be an emergency shower and an eyewash station, but a bathroom would not be needed.

Commissioner Guth agreed that water on site and the resulting required bathroom facility is a good idea. He said with chemicals on site it is smart to have the facilities. He said this is why they need to know what they are looking at for costs—so they can add and remove features accordingly.

Engineer Miller said she cannot provide numbers until some of these decisions are made. She said she does not want to give bad numbers.

Commissioner Guth said she has to understand where he is coming from—some of these decisions cannot be made until they know the financial implications. He said they need a better understanding of the baseline costs.

Engineer Miller noted that the bar screen has also been considered for the project because it will extend the life of the plant. She said the cost can be reduced by having a manual bar screen versus a mechanical bar screen. She noted the manual screen is more labor-intensive for the operator, but it is less expensive. The Board discussed the value of mechanical operation and indicated that the added costs are justified by the benefits. Engineer Miller noted that the mechanical bar screens she recommends require water, which is another reason to have water on site.

The operation of the bar screen prompted a discussion to add a dumpster on site and to include the service costs in the operational costs.

Engineer Miller said she also talked with the DNR about the requirement for UV disinfection and the bottom line is that it will be required. She said it is due to the months during which the plant will be discharging and because it will be discharging to the surface. Operator Pfankuch clarified further that it is because the new plant will be a continuous discharge system.

Engineer Miller then explained that there have been discussions with the DNR about the outfall location. She explained that when she provided the preliminary plans at the last meeting, it included a common building, and the system would discharge straight out. She said the DNR said changing the discharge location might affect the MDV for phosphorous. Ultimately, they sent it to legal and a few other people and they came back stating it could be done, but it included certain information which made her uncomfortable with the change and the potential issues which could result possibly including a new facility plan. Engineer Miller said she talked to some people who have moved a discharge point, and their recommendation is to avoid changing the discharge point—don't do it.

She said she started looking at having a separate building with the bar screen separated from the main building. She said the bar screen building would be a much less expensive, fiberglass construction on a slab. She said the main building would be located further down and then discharge to the current discharge location. She said they did some basic cost comparisons and keeping the buildings together would have a common wall so there would be some cost savings there and it would be a wash in price, or it could be about \$15,000 less to have the separate buildings. However, separating the buildings adds the costs for extension of electricity, plumbing, and controls. She noted some of the things to think about when comparing one building versus two include:

- A common building would result in approximately an additional 400 feet of sanitary sewer.
- Separate buildings would require the operator to visit two separate buildings instead of all in one location.
- There needs to be separation from the two areas—the bar screen room cannot be in a common area—it has to be explosion-proof with its own entrance and its own heat and ventilation.
- The bar screen room will require a higher ceiling and blowers.
- There are less corrosion concerns if the buildings are separate keeping the metal bar screen away from the chemicals.

- Both buildings will need electrical controls and water, which is more complicated with two separate buildings.
- The overall cost to maintain one building would be a wash or possibly up to \$15,000 more in construction costs than two buildings. She said the \$15,000 in savings is assuming we can get approval to discharge straight down (changing the discharge location).

Engineer Miller said her recommendation is for two separate buildings and to keep the existing outfall where it is now. She said the bar screen building would be on a slab with a prefab insulated building on it and the main building would be a block building.

Commissioner Guth noted that the fiberglass buildings are good. He said if they have two separate buildings, they should be constructed the same. He said trying to save cost by using a cheaper product often does not work out in the end.

The Board discussed the operation inconvenience of two buildings and the additional cost for a single building is minimal when looking at the long-term operations.

Engineer Miller explained that keeping the same discharge location and a single building would require approximately 600 feet of additional piping at roughly \$75 per foot.

Engineer Miller asked how the Board would like to proceed—with a single building or two separate buildings. Commissioner Guth said in his experience, he would recommend a single building. Especially with a single operator. He said running back and forth is inefficient and constructing a separate, cheaper building will probably result in additional costs later. He said he would prefer a single, efficient building. He said if it comes down to it getting dirty—that is on the operator. He said it has to be taken care of.

Operator Pfankuch said he would agree with Commissioner Guth regarding the fiberglass structure. He said they are not good. He said everything in one building makes more sense. The Board agreed. Operator Pfankuch asked how long it will take to recoup some of the extra cost.

Engineer Miller said it is a lot of piping—about 600 feet of piping to get to the current discharge point. She said it is about \$75 to \$100 per foot. Operator Pfankuch said that is a one-time cost of \$60,000. Secretary Stevens noted that, assuming a total project cost of \$5 million, the additional piping would only add about 1.2 percent to the cost.

Operator Pfankuch noted that two buildings will result in more maintenance. He said in the long run, it will pay for itself. The Board agreed—a single building is the better choice.

Treasurer Thomas noted that what Engineer Miller is presenting is what the Board asked her to do—to compare options and cost implications. The Board agreed.

Engineer Miller then asked to clarify whether the Board wanted to push the DNR for a new outfall point or if they wanted to stick with the current location. The Board said she should stick with the existing outfall and pay for the additional piping. Chair Reif said the plan needs to be as simple as possible so there are no unnecessary complications with the DNR. He said the added costs are minimal in comparison to potential complications. Engineer Miller said she would plan to run the pipe diagonally to the current discharge point.

Engineer Miller said she had a virtual meeting with a subconsultant during which they went over all kinds of things like controls and different ideas. She said it was all preliminary just to let them know this was coming up. She said PJ Kortens works hand-in-hand with Crane, so Crane will supply things like the flow meters and PJ Kortens will supply the control panel. Operator Pfankuch noted that Kortens is the premier control company in this area. He said that they are the best in the area.

Engineer Miller reported she also spoke with WPS about the process. She said they require 3-4 months for their design and then about 5 to 7 weeks for construction. She said there are extra fees for winter construction apply between November 1 and March 31 which would add an additional \$16,000 so they should avoid that work in that time frame.

Engineer Miller said the schedule includes plans and specifications completed by early summer, permitting and WPS design between July 2024 and March of 2025, and also application for clean water funding by September 2024. Bidding and contracts would be February, March, and April 2025 and then WPS can start construction in April and May of 2025, and then the plant construction will begin in about May 2025.

Engineer Miller said the last thing she had was an email from Mark Stanek of the DNR and he was asking about chlorides. She said she reminded him that they had included a chloride variance with the permit application.

2. Operator's Report

- January Operations

January Flow Report

Winchester – 547,619 gallons

Larsen – 308,210 gallons

Total for December – 855,829 gallons.

January Daily Average – 27,607 gallons

Operator Pfankuch noted that the numbers are average for January, and all is going well.

- Lift Stations – Master Power Switch Replacements

Operator Pfankuch reported that the master power switches at four of the five lift stations have been replaced. The White Pines Lift Station will be updated at a later time due to the issue with the leaning power pole which he reported about at the last meeting.

- **Wisconsin Rural Water Association**

Operator Pfankuch reported that WRWA reached out to him requesting a meeting to tour the plant and to discuss the LWSD. Operator Pfankuch provided the basic information about the organization to the Board.

WRWA MISSION: Assisting, educating, and representing our members in the water and wastewater industries.

WRWA FACTS: WRWA represents over 85% of systems in Wisconsin serving populations under 10,000. WRWA provides training sessions to thousands of municipal & non-municipal employees each year, while making over 250 on-site technical assistance visits to systems each month. WRWA publishes a quarterly magazine. WRWA holds an annual Technical Conference & Outdoor Expo.

WRWA BENEFITS: Unbiased information to your system personnel, councils & boards. On-site technical assistance regarding problems with your system. Equipment Loaner Program— An extensive inventory for use by members. Training sessions for system operators, board members, & clerks. Continuing Education Credits (CEC) with DNR approved. WRWA JOURNAL— a quarterly publication keeping your system informed. WRWA E-NEWS—a newsletter e-mailed weekly covering late breaking news. Annual Technical Conference—held each spring geared towards systems like yours, with water industry experts present from across the state. Outdoor Expo— Held each fall with product displays and demonstrations. WRWA WEB PAGE—Current events, templates, member listings, Face Book, contact information.

Operator Pfankuch explained that this group represents districts like LWSD at the State legislative level, lobbying for and providing relative information relating to the needs of the smaller systems. He said they have a very large voice in Madison. He also noted that they host the largest vendor expo in the fall and as members he would recommend the Board participate. He said they are an excellent resource for the Board and the district. He asked if the Board would allow him to sign up for membership with the organization at a cost of \$330.

The Board directed Operator Pfankuch to complete the registration for membership to the organization.

3. Engineer's Report

Engineer Miller had nothing additional to report at this time.

4. Chairman's Report

Chair Reif reported that he was advised to write to our federal senator, and he found that Mike Gallagher is the correct senator, so he sent an email off to his office. He said he got a reply stating it was received and when he gets the opportunity, he will get back to us. Chair Reif said it has been a couple weeks and he has not yet heard anything from him. He indicated he would give him a little more time and then he would follow up again if needed.

Chair Reif said that Rachel Cabral-Guavera also suggested the district check with Winnebago County for ARPA funds which might be available. He said he read an article which indicated the County had another \$16 million available to it which it did not yet accept because they do not have a place for it to go. He asked Treasurer Thomas to look into the program.

Treasurer Thomas said she had some basic information from the US Treasury, and it seems they could qualify for funding. She will continue to research it further. Secretary Stevens suggested she get ahold of the County committee directly. She explained the treasury document explains the allowable uses, but the County Committee will need an application and will determine whether they allocate funding to the district.

Engineer Miller said she worked with another community which was struggling with using the ARPA monies and they reached out to Ehlers who is now assisting them.

Chair Reif said he was surprised that no one was at the meeting because he had been contacted again about the Town of Winchester Fire Building tank and he expected to see them at the meeting. He said regardless, he wanted to report that he did a lot of research into the tank to make sure that he had “crossed all the Ts and dotted all the Is” and had all the facts. He said he spoke with the DNR and if it were a residential building, the floor drain would have daylighted to grade, but because it is a municipal building it is treated like a commercial structure. He said that was confirmed both by the building inspector and the DNR. Chair Reif said as a result, there is one of two things that needs to happen—it either needs to go to a holding tank or it needs to go to a sanitary sewer. He noted that the DNR does not care which one it goes to as long as it meets their approvals. He said that is what Engineer Miller had provided at the last meeting.

Chair Reif said he has talked to Tom Spierowski numerous times—the door has blown off his office for him. He said Chair Olson has also been in to talk to him. Chair Reif said he called and spoke with Brian Bates who is the designer of the system who said they did look at the potential of going to the sanitary but he was told, though he could not remember by whom, that the sanitary district did not want the inflow and had no way to bill for it—but Chair Reif said he does not recall the matter coming to a meeting. Chair Reif said Brian Bates indicated that he was left with no other choice but to design the system with a holding tank because LWSD didn’t want it. Chair Reif said where that information came from neither he nor Mr. Bates was sure. Chair Reif said he does not see it as a big deal. He continued explaining that the DNR approved the plan and gave a permit for it. He said he has a copy of the application and the DNR permit, and he has gone through it. He said the system is very specific—there is no plumbing in the building and basically it is drip water off the trucks. He said it is identified as non-domestic industrial wastewater and in talking with the designer the DNR approved the permit because it is compliant with their rules. Chair Reif said that the designer questioned why the district would prohibit holding tanks when there are cases when the district does not want the waste that is being generated because it could result in additional treatment issues and costs. He said Mr. Bates said there are some instances when the district would want to use holding tanks so the waste can be hauled away and treated differently. Chair Reif said he thought that perspective was interesting.

Chair Reif said he also spoke with Daniel LaFabve at Winnebago County and asked him why he would permit this tank when they know there is a sanitary district. He said Mr. LaFabve clarified that they did not issue a permit because it is non-domestic wastewater, and they only regulate domestic wastewater. Mr. LaFabve said because it is non-domestic wastewater, they couldn’t care less. He said the state takes care of that (the DNR). He said it would be a whole different story if there were someone living in the building or was sewage in it, then it would be different but as non-domestic wastewater, they do not care.

Chair Reif said he also spoke with the plumber who installed the system, who indicated the state will regulate when this needs to be inspected and pumped—that is all very specific. He also said if any plumbing were added to the building, it would have to go through state approvals which would likely result in a change to the system.

Chair Reif said he also talked to Brian Noe, the state commercial building inspector, who said if anything were put in the building, a pump could be added to pump it into the sanitary district. He said a trash pump could solve the problem.

Chair Reif noted that in the ordinance section 4-09, it was stated that it would be a public nuisance and a health hazard, but he cannot imagine anything in that tank being a public nuisance or a health hazard—there is no domestic wastewater in that tank.

Chair Reif said because this is so new to the district board and there are so few commercial customers, the Board should amend the ordinance to make sure the district is equipped to handle future industrial customers. He also said he does not think there is any need to require a permit for the tank—the state has already done that. He said he does think that there should be some way for the sanitary district board to be notified of this and similar systems prior to construction.

Commissioner Guth asked if there is any type of regulation indicating how often the tank has to be checked. Chair Reif said it is all in the DNR permit and it is very specific.

Matt Olson, Town of Winchester Chairman, said that whatever the DNR requires will be complied with. He said the Town will provide complete cooperation and compliance.

Commissioner Guth asked who will set that up. Chair Reif said it is done by the DNR. He said when he read the permit, it is a very specific requirement, but he cannot remember the exact details.

Chair Reif said that ultimately what has come from this is that the sanitary district should be notified of any tanks planned for within the sanitary district. Engineer Miller agreed, noting that they do not want to miss out on any potential customers, but she is unsure how that should be worded.

Chair Reif noted there may be the need for holding tanks, however, the district does not want to see wastewater going somewhere else when it could be treated here.

Operator Pfankuch asked how the district would know when this might be happening. Chair Reif said he is unsure how they can guarantee that. He said the county does not even permit them, so he is not sure how to get noticed.

Matt Olson noted that the board could easily ban domestic wastewater holding tanks in the district, and in fact, that is already in place. Chair Reif confirmed that is the way he reads 4-09. Mr. Olson suggested the district work with the clerks in the towns to be a good frontline source for information.

Secretary Stevens noted that any commercial development with the potential to produce non-domestic wastewater would require a Site Plan Review. She suggested that the district request the towns include information in their Site Plan Review Process regulation which identifies the requirement for sanitary district review as well.

Chair Reif said the district regulation should include language for this, but it is not going to be solved at this meeting. He said there is no reason for any residential property to have a holding tank for domestic wastewater within the sanitary district.

Chair Reif said he is not going to get into the middle of any of this—he was hoping the people who had contacted him would have been at the meeting, but they did not come. They said they had questions, and he was more than willing to answer them to the best of his ability, but the Board had already determined the tank was okay at the last meeting.

Secretary Stevens clarified that Chair Reif wants something in the ordinance which prohibits holding tanks for domestic wastewater, and another clause which allows for industrial, non-domestic wastewater holding tanks subject to Sanitary District review, conditions, and approval.

Chair Reif said he doesn't want to open the door for holding tanks, but he wants the board to be able to allow tanks for pretreatment if necessary. Secretary Stevens noted that the suggested language in the preliminary draft of the changes to the ordinance provides for just that. She said what needs to be added is the requirement for the district board to approve a proposed system because they may or may not want the wastewater.

Engineer Miller said she would suggest prohibiting all holding tanks. She said if commercial development comes in, the district can require them to pretreat their waste to a level that you are willing to accept. Secretary Stevens noted that pretreatment systems include holding tanks. Engineer Miller said a holding tank is a tank that holds the waste and is then pumped and taken to another facility.

Commissioner Kreutzberg added that if a development is unable to complete the pretreatment as required, then the district is discouraging development due to the restrictions. Secretary Stevens suggested that the district has to be very careful with the verbiage. She said prohibiting all holding tanks is too restrictive. She said the ordinance should allow for tanks but should establish the controls giving review authority to the board. She said that allows for cooperative development on a case-by-case basis.

Chair Reif asked how other districts do this—he said there must be other districts dealing with this.

Secretary Stevens explained that the new Winchester tank is not the only holding tank in the district. She said when the Town Hall was built, it has floor drains which were not hooked into the district. She said the plumbing is, but the floor drains were not. She also noted the county building at the bottom of the hill has an 8000-gallon tank which collects the drip water from the county trucks. She asked if the district would want that wastewater if the pipe is extended down the hill. She said prohibiting holding tanks altogether would be the best solution.

Treasurer Thomas asked about the Clayton shop and if they are hooked up. Operator Pfankuch explained they are hooked up and every time they wash the trucks his chloride numbers go through the roof—the numbers quadruple in the winter because of the salt. Treasurer Thomas said that is an example of why the district would not want this water.

Chair Reif said he would look into how other districts to see how they deal with this situation. Secretary Stevens said the language in the ordinance can be written to accomplish whatever the board is looking for, but it is the triggering mechanism that is needed to get projects in front of the board for review that is more difficult to achieve. She suggested the towns add something in their zoning regulations for Site Plan Review which includes the requirement for Sanitary District review and approval when applicable. She noted the Town of Winchester is currently revising their code and that sort of addition could be easily accomplished.

Chair Reif said the Board should be able to figure out the ordinance language.

5. LWSD Ordinance Review

Due to the absence of two of the five commissioners, the Board postponed the discussion until the next meeting.

6. Financial Report / Bills

Treasurer Thomas presented the current accounts payable, noting that the required year-end reporting was completed.

Treasurer Thomas noted the M & E billing included a \$5,590 for outside services with Donahue and Associates. Engineer Miller explained she is using them as a reference for second opinions as needed because they do a lot of wastewater work. Chair Reif asked if there will be more bills from them. Engineer Miller said it is like having several engineers in the office—it is just an alternative to that. She said it will not be more money overall—she said that is the only billing they have done since the beginning.

Operator Pfankuch requested to include the bill from Crane for the mixers for \$10,527 be added to the bills being paid. He also requested the payment come from his operating budget for 2024 rather than from the emergency fund as previously planned. The Board agreed the funding should come from the 2024 operating budget.

The total for bills included in the accounts payable report totaled \$32,271.24.

MOTION:

Motion by Chair Reif

Second by Commissioner Guth

Motion to approve the accounts payable as presented.

Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

IV. Public Comment and Requests for Future Agenda Items

Matt Olson, Town of Winchester Chairman, thanked Chair Reif for doing all the extra research on the tank situation. He said he also wants to thank the board for the conclusion which they arrived at. And he also wanted the board to realize there was a political agenda which resulted in the sanitary district getting dragged into the situation—they gave the board no choice—they dragged you into it. He said he wanted to apologize for that. He also said he thinks any issues with future holding tanks should not have the political issues attached to it—it should be more business.

Chair Reif said he can see that too and he has no issue saying that publicly. He said some of the text messages he received were nothing short of a personal attack, and that is when he stopped conversing with them. They wanted to meet with him outside the meeting, but he said absolutely not—what he has to say or what anyone has to say should be heard by the entire board. He said he is not one person who makes the decisions.

V. Next Meeting

The Board scheduled the next meeting for Tuesday, March 12, 2024 at 4:00 p.m.

VI. Adjournment

MOTION:

Motion by Commissioner Guth

Second by Commissioner Kreutzberg

Motion to adjourn at 5:42 p.m.

Motion carried unanimously.

