

**TOWN OF GIBRALTAR
SPECIAL MEETING
THURSDAY, JUNE 20, 2019
GIBRALTAR TOWN CENTER
4097 HIGHWAY 42, FISH CREEK WI 54212
6:00 PM**

Approved: July 3, 2019

Call to order: Dick Skare called the special meeting of the town board to order at 6:00 p.m.

Roll call/quorum:

Board members present: Dick Skare, Steve Sohns, Barb McKesson, Bill Johnson and Tim Luetzgen

Board members absent: None

Agenda/proper notice/adopt agenda: *Motion: (McKesson, Johnson) to approve the agenda as presented. Carried*

Approval of Minutes: *Motion: (Sohns, Johnson) to approve the minutes of May 16, 2019 as written. Carried Motion: (Sohns, Johnson) to approve the minutes of May 29, 2019 as written. Carried*

Review of submitted Project Management Services Request for Proposals:

Dick Skare stated that the primary reason for the meeting this evening was to select a project management firm. A project management firm will help glean the information needed to bring to the voters for them to make an informed decision on the option to purchase.

Two proposals were received: Kuftrin Consulting - approximately \$7,000 and Cedar Corporation - Phase 1 \$4,900. Phase 2 and Phase 3 cost to be determined. The town has had experience with both.

Discussion points:

- Neither proposal include monies to update proposals for the sanitary district.
- Skare stated the purpose of the \$4,900 is to gather the information to get out to the public to make the decision.
- Doug Lindeman asked if the project will be successful if the land and infrastructure are not donated. Dick believed the information gotten from the chosen firm would answer that question.
- Wayne Kudick stated this is a small amount of money to make an informed decision.
- Why is a project management firm necessary? Is this all the money this will cost? Can't the Sanitary District tell us what their cost will be based on the old cost with an escalator?
- Tom Thurman felt it would be irresponsible not to investigate to get experts in to get answers to these questions.
- Bill Johnson feels that the board is incapable of coming to a conclusion to make the right decision without additional expert detail to bring forward to the electors.
- Will the project manager bring in the costs to bring in the infrastructure of streets, electricity, etc.? Bill Johnson did not feel so looking at the proposals.
- Will there be caps for what the town will be paying. Dick Skare stated the town has restrictions on how much it can be in debt.
- The information gathering will be done by the end of October. The vote will take place then as well.
- Barb McKesson stated this is an opportunity that should be celebrated to look forward to making the best choice for our time. There are a lot of people interested in knowing the facts.
- Sohns stated 2014 the electors were interested in the watershed; the town was already working on the property in closed session. The town had always tried to get a longer option, but it was denied. The lower piece is not tied to the upper piece for the building permits which is different than what the town had been told.
- Wayne Kudick encouraged the board to move forward with the project manager.
- Sohns read Cedar's Phase 1 proposal for \$4,900.
- Sohns stated what is in the proposal primarily has been done by the board with the bubble plan. At the end of the day, what it is going to cost the town to do this. Should the town go back to Farnsworth and have

them fill in the numbers and have Cedar do the same thing. It would need to be made clear on the change in the 5 acres taken off, how the 60 acres of the buildings can be laid out and conditional use permits. (Having Farnsworth and Cedar both with the same information to begin - "Bubble Plan")

- Bill Johnson stated the scope needs to be further defined.
- Dick Skare stated the Lake Michigan Research Center is no longer on the table for the project.
- Bill Johnson stated his vision is more of the development and the benefits that bring in youth to the community, year-round activity, student help in the summer, internships, a lot more in the shoulder season. Long term there is a very good possibility for this to work.
- Barb McKesson and Dick Skare feel there should be more current public input.
- Steve Sohns stated it is all conjecture until it is all signed on the bottom line on the same day. We need numbers to see if it works or not. Short/long term costs and revenues. Financials – grants. We would still be going into the meeting of the electors with these are the options at this time and what the costs could be.
- There were numerous questions on the sewer installation and costs.
- Bill Weddig is interested to know if there is demand in single family homes and at what price point.
- Bill Wolff stated the debt increase payment on his personal tax bill would increase by \$760 for an estimated total of \$1,135 (based on a \$500,000 home) for \$15,000,000 in projected debt service.

Motion: (Johnson,) do what Steve has suggested giving Cedar the bubble plan and we also return that plan to the Farnsworth Group to have them follow up with the contractual obligations they may have as far as the future financing or funding with the project. Motion withdrawn.

Motion: (Johnson, Luetgen) to engage Cedar to meet with us and that we discuss the issues that were brought out by the public and to look further at the bubble plan, the 60 acres, commercial conditional use, long term funding and real estate property values to be included in that assessment. Carried with Sohns opposed. Skare will contact Cedar tomorrow.

Determination of Project Management Services Firm: Combined with review of proposals.

Elements for timeline: Skare and McKesson spoke with Marsie Redmann and Ken Smith and they felt that if sufficient action has been taken there is the potential to extend the option date. The timeline will be discussed on June 26th.

Consideration of Open House on Bluff Property: Skare approached Marise Redmann on the idea and she was not opposed. Amber Beard offered her services to coordinate that effort. It was recommended to have the numbers prior to having the open house.

Pre vote business plan: No discussion.

Consideration of topic specific charettes at Old Town Hall: It was questioned if charettes were a repeat of information gathering that had already been done. It could be done on a smaller scale at the open house. There were mixed opinions on the need.

Set next meeting dates: The next meeting is set for June 26th at 8:00 a.m.

Adjourn: *Motion: (McKesson, Johnson) to adjourn at 7:47 p.m. Carried*

Respectfully Submitted,

Beth Hagen, Clerk