

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
MEETING OF THE LORDSTOWN VILLAGE BOARD OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS
1455 Salt Springs Road, Lordstown, Ohio
May 19, 2021
1:00 p.m. to 2:20 p.m.

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr. Kevin Campbell, President
Mr. Michael Sullivan, Vice-President
Mr. Thomas Dietz, Board Member
Mr. Darren Biggs, Supt. of Utilities
Ms. Cinthia Slusarczyk, Clerk

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. Bob McNutt (CT Consultants)
Mr. Chris Brubaker (CT Consultants)

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS taken before me, DEBORAH LAVELLE, RPR, a court reporter and Notary Public within and for the State of Ohio on this 19th of May, 2021.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm gonna call the meeting to order. We're gonna have the Lord's Prayer and Pledge of Allegiance.

LORD'S PRAYER

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

ROLL CALL:

MR. CAMPBELL: Again, thanks everybody for coming. Roll call. Kevin Campbell, present. Tom Dietz.

MR. DIETZ: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mike Sullivan.

MR. SULLIVAN: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Darren Biggs.

MR. BIGGS: Here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Cindy Slusarczyk. All right. She's here. Well I guess Chris Kogelnik, we'll substitute Bob for that. We knew he wasn't gonna be here, he's on vacation. Paul, he's not here. All right.

AGENDA:

1. Water Rate Study Review

MR. CAMPBELL: This is more of a work session structure with an agenda of four items, the first one which we need some kind of direction today to move forward on the Water Rate Study Review. I give it a high level, and I'm gonna turn it over to Bob. As I alluded to in our meeting, what we're thinking at this point, the best plan of attack is to create a rate structure with TEC involved, present that to TEC with a time line, we pick a time maybe first of October, whatever it may be, for them to get on board and commit to the Village that they're gonna move forward with the project and be okay with that rate structure. And then after that if they don't, we're gonna have a rate and a structure based on TEC not being in our water usage. That seemed to make sense since they are such a big water user and affect the rates, that we go one direction with them and one direction without. And if we end up going a direction, say they pass on committing to the Village and we go to the rate that does not have them included which is gonna be a little higher rate, that's -- and they want in that the point, it's tough cookies, we're just gonna end up moving forward and

rolling with the rate that we had established. So I think that's a good plan of attack, at least for that point. This thing seems to keep changing on us. At this point I'll turn it over to Bob. He can kind of guide us on what he needs from the Board and Cindy. I know Cindy's been integral in these figures and can give him some direction so he can finish up some cranking of figures and we can present it. I believe it can go right from us to TEC. I don't believe there's anything that needs to go through Council. So that's one step that should speed up things a bit. Anyway, go ahead Bob.

MR. McNUTT: Okay. So as a starter, we had a discussion -- I think it was last week -- with Meander water discussing how to do the 24-inch diameter transmission main that we need as part of our system. And that's gonna play in here in a second. So with that discussion it sounded like Jim Jones was trying to champion bringing Meander water into the picture somehow to help fund the 24-inch diameter transmission main. With that idea in mind, TEC reached out to us and I had a conversation with them today. Now I told them something slightly different, so just so you know, Kevin.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, I haven't told them anything. So until we come up with a firm plan, we're good.

MR. McNUTT: Here's what I told them. My job is to recommend, it's the Village's job to decide. I told them we've got two different rates built right now, one is without TEC and one is with; and they're still in the process and we are going to tweak it. But what I told them is I'm probably gonna go to the Board with a recommendation of accepting the rates without you guys unless you decide to sign on before the end of September, early October. I says if you don't sign on, then the higher rate will go into effect; and that would then stay into effect until you do decide to come in if you do, at which case you won't have the more attractive rates unless the Board goes back and does some other change. And again, I kept telling them I'm simply making recommendations, it's the Board's decision. But that's my plan. So I've now told you my plan. If I talk too fast, tell me to slow down. I try not to do that. But the direction that you just said is totally fine. We'll -- and I've got both files that I sent to you guys, you've seen that. So I will complete both files so that we have for the Village the main difference, TEC-yes or TEC-no. With TEC-yes I will have to alter our rates. Gotta make a note here. TEC-yes, I need to take out Lordstown Motors, correct, unless you guys tell me different because TEC-yes now I also had Lordstown Motors and LEC coming over to our rate structure, and I don't see either of those happening yet or that's a discussion for you, the Board.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah, the water agreement for Lordstown Motors -- and what's the other one that's hanging out there?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Old Dominion.

MR. CAMPBELL: It's not a big water user. But yeah, that would be our next plan of attack, to work on that agreement with Warren so maybe we know what those figures are. Right now we're at an -- I guess a steady state, but we need to move forward with some kind of agreement because there's nothing for them individually like we had, there's no bulk one in place. So yeah, I guess at this point I know that they have a decent water usage from Lordstown Motors right now, so that's why I'm a little reluctant to pull it out because it's gonna affect our rate structure not having that calculated in.

MR. McNUTT: And when we say calculated in, we're talking about calculating it into like the Warren side of things, not on our

new tier structure on the Village's side, correct?

MR. CAMPBELL: Well see, those will be -- those will be on our tier structure. It's just that the water supply is gonna be from Warren, and we pay them at a different rate than we pay. See what I'm saying?

MR. McNUTT: I gotcha.

MR. CAMPBELL: It's a little confusing. The only ones in the Village that aren't on our rate structure are LEC. Everybody else falls within the rate structure. So if that helps you, then I guess the question would be that they should be in there.

MR. McNUTT: Okay. So yes, that's in there, the consumption is in there. I was not sure if it was going on our tiered structure.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MR. McNUTT: Or if it was like the LEC 10 cents per thousand.

MR. CAMPBELL: No, no.

MR. McNUTT: So I have our expense in for the Warren. Cindy, do you -- can you get me something that tells me what the actual cost of Warren water is? I mean, I know what it's been the last few years, but I don't know if it's per thousand gallons, so that I can appropriately adjust the expense side for them for Lordstown.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Sure.

MR. CAMPBELL: They're in cubic feet, right?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yeah.

MR. CAMPBELL: So there's a little bit of a -- make sure you convert so it's apples to apples.

MR. McNUTT: That's 100 cubic foot thousand gallons.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MR. McNUTT: All right. The main things that we were looking at, right now we're showing no debt. So one of the things that I know we'll talk about once we get into one of the topics on the tanks is whether or not we want to include any type of debt in this rate and how that might impact things. The other main thing is salaries, when -- I think we're gonna be talking about that. Those are the types of things that's gonna impact the expense side or the needed revenues from our water utility. I think everything else is fairly set up other than figuring out how we're charging or if we're including the TEC group into the structure. So if we add more or less salaries, I will adjust the salaries. If we add any type of debt, I'll put the debt in and that will impact the numbers. Do you guys have any questions, and I'll pull up my rates here just to give you an example of where we were if I can find it quickly. So with/without TEC, what we're looking for in 2022, we have -- our first tier is basically \$5.92 a thousand, \$5.82 a thousand, \$5.72 a thousand, and our last tier would drop to \$4.50 a thousand. And then I have the LEC in here. Obviously with TEC those drop even significantly more.

MR. CAMPBELL: What was that last tier? What did it cap out at.

MR. McNUTT: I think it's down to \$4.50.

MR. CAMPBELL: I meant the volume.

MR. McNUTT: That is your fourth tier right now. It's anything, I think, above 60,000 a day.

MR. CAMPBELL: More than 60 -- 600 --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Six million.

MR. CAMPBELL: I think six million is our old one.

MR. McNUTT: But that's not a day, that's a month, right?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It's a billing.

MR. McNUTT: Oh yeah, per billing. That's a much higher group.

MR. CAMPBELL: So that was our top -- so you left the same number of tiers, and that would be our new top one.

MR. McNUTT: The same number of tiers and actually the exact same rate blocks.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's what I needed to know.

MR. McNUTT: And the reason we do that, we looked at how many people are actually in that highest usage block to make sure that we're lumping the right people together.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MR. McNUTT: And the only people that have enough consumption to hit that are gonna be your Ultiums, your TEC, LEC and there may have been one other customer that even hits that fourth block.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay.

MR. McNUTT: I think the way you might be doing it now -- and just let me know, Cindy, if I'm wrong -- do you actually charge every single block how much consumption in each or do you --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yes.

MR. McNUTT: That's the same way then.

MR. CAMPBELL: You gotta work through the tier to get to the upper one.

MR. McNUTT: That's normal. The biggest question to address is we're recommending putting a readiness-to-serve charge. Right now you have, I think, a minimum monthly bill of 15 bucks maybe.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: For industrial.

MR. McNUTT: For industrial. And what for residential?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Three.

MR. McNUTT: Three bucks. And that's just simply a straight-up numb. And if they use more water than that, they don't get that bill?

MR. CAMPBELL: No.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: The \$3 a month and \$15 is fixed.

MR. McNUTT: Plus consumption.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: And there is a minimum on consumption as well. But the consumption is -- even though it's \$5.75, it's \$9 a quarter, \$3 a month. And the same with industrial, they'll pay a minimum bill based on meter size if they're not using water. If they're using water that goes away and that's --

MR. McNUTT: So what we're recommending is very similar to that.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay.

MR. McNUTT: There's a minimum. We call that -- well, not we, I mean the industry word for it is like a readiness-to-serve. So if Darren comes in and he's gotta have the capability of taking so much water out of our system, we have to have our system designed for that, we have to be prepared for whatever he might take. So based on meter size, every meter has a different ratio. And we usually have the fixed cost, whatever that is, I'm just gonna say a million here for an example, and we divide it by the sum of all equivalent meters. And that's the way both of these are set up. By having the fixed cost in -- and I think I mentioned this before -- it protects the Village from the loss of a big user. So if Darren pulls out and we're used to

Darren using a million gallons a month, that could be a big hit unless we're equally dividing the fixed costs across all of our equivalent meters. So in both cases that's what I have. It's not just 15 bucks just because you're commercial/industrial and it's not just 3 bucks if you're residential, it's based on the AWWA ratios based on your actual meter size. The big issue is how do we get people from 3 bucks a month to the reality, if I can find it here real quick, we really should have a lot more money collected under that readiness-to-serve and it jacks it up a lot, like to 22 to 27 bucks a month for a resident. We don't want to do that in one step. So without TEC, because our total usage is less, I was taking our total fixed cost and I went like 10 percent the first year, 20 percent, 30, 40 and 50 so over the next five years I was collecting from 10 percent to 50 percent on that readiness-to-serve, and the next five years we'll try to get up to 100 percent of the fixed costs.

MR. CAMPBELL: I understand that. I know that we discussed it at one of our meetings with you, that the Board was comfortable with maybe not going to 100 percent from the residential side and maybe leaping a little harder on the commercial side. So if your figures show \$27 is, you know, where we really should be for residential, maybe we go to 15 and kind of cap it at that and then bump up the other side to kind of balance that. You know, I mean, that's one of the things in this area we've always tried to do is have the residents kind of benefit from having the large industries in their neighborhood.

MR. McNUTT: And I can do that. I can change that a little bit. When we look at this, do we want to go from \$3 to \$15 in one step?

MR. CAMPBELL: No.

MR. McNUTT: Or do we want to go to \$15 over the five-year step.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah, five-year step. Because I mean, that's -- I think that's the best way to do it. What do you gentlemen think?

MR. SULLIVAN: (Nodding head.)

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay.

MR. McNUTT: All right. I'll step that up in both of the structures. The main difference under the TEC rate, we actually went 20-40-60-80-100 percent because we could go up faster. But I'll tweak that as well so that, again, the residential only goes up to that \$15 as your half because I think it's right around \$27.

MR. CAMPBELL: It's about half, yes.

MR. McNUTT: About half of the service. And we'll have the larger meters pick up the additional of the fixed cost.

MR. CAMPBELL: All right.

MR. McNUTT: That was a big issue to figure out.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay.

MR. McNUTT: I don't know if there's any of the other notes that you saw that you liked or didn't.

MR. CAMPBELL: I know -- Cindy, did you get a chance, a minute, to look at it? And I think she had a couple things.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I just read through it yesterday, I didn't get a whole lot of chance. But this is not in order for that, so I don't know. I had Becky print that out for me to read, but a lot of them -- I can't even think. When you were talking about TEC and the rates, let me look and see if I can find your comment in the note on here.

MR. McNUTT: The other thing too, Cindy, if you need to, even after today, call me up and we can work through it on the screen too, go note-by-note and work through the details.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I know the step was significant in how that increased. I was worried about that. The senior citizen rate, is that still going to be --

MR. CAMPBELL: I know we still had some.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: There's still a lot, believe it or not.

MR. CAMPBELL: I was surprised how many we still have.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: This print is too fine for me to read.

MR. McNUTT: I know, I'm sorry.

MR. CAMPBELL: I guess the question with the senior rate is do we phase it out and/or incorporate it and have it at a lower rate as part of the mix we're doing? I know there's quite a bit on there. It's more than just a handful, it's --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I guess if we even left the water rate at the same price, the fee, the fixed fee that he's talking about, if we put that in there all the same fees my question is, is the senior citizen account still gonna have the same fixed rate as you or I moving forward? Because they've always been discounted. We're getting away from that. But we have seniors that get that \$9 bill, and when we went from \$9 to \$18 it was like oh my god, I don't even use any water. I swear, they try not to use any water whatsoever. But it was a huge jump, and they just went through that last year or the year before.

MR. CAMPBELL: Year before, yeah.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: So that is why I think you need to think if that fixed rate cost is also gonna be identical for them. Changing these rates every year is going to be a lot of work for us. So when we -- when you incorporate these or pass this rate in October, we're going to ask that it all be passed at one time so we can -- I can build it in there.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah, we'll have it mapped out and build it in. Yep, I agree.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: But like I said, this print --

MR. SULLIVAN: How do you do the senior rate? Do they come in and apply?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: We don't do it anymore. It -- the ones who had it were grandfathered and entitled to that discount, which was 10 percent. The higher the rates go, the value changes. But we still have, I hate to guess, but I'd say probably a little less than 200 customers on that discounted rate. And a lot of them have changed in this last year with General Motors going, a lot of families, you know. I was shocked because every time I pull the initial permits out. But I would have to ok at numbers to see what we still have on that billing code.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, as senior citizens how do you gentlemen feel?

MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I think the ones at least that are grandfathered in we should leave.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I would say the same with the rate, the water rate. But I'm talking about the fixed charge that is now currently \$3, he's gonna bump that up to \$15. You're gonna keep that the same, right? You're not gonna discount that?

MR. CAMPBELL: That was my thought, but I want to see. I was thinking we keep the fixed rate across the Board from those. They'll still get their discounted water. And again to Cindy's point,

this is only talking about the ones that are currently in existence. We're not accepting new senior accounts, that's been shut off for years. So our question is how do we want to proceed with the ones we do have.

MR. SULLIVAN: What do you think, Tom?

MR. DIETZ: Doesn't the matter to me.

MR. SULLIVAN: Huh?

MR. DIETZ: I said it doesn't matter to me.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, it does if you're on the Board. So --

MR. DIETZ: Just keep to what we've got.

MR. CAMPBELL: I guess to boil the question down then, do we want the senior citizens to have the same fixed cost, the base expense the same as all the other residents and then discount their water?

MR. SULLIVAN: I would say yes and then discount the water.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay, very good. Does that help you, Bob?

MR. McNUTT: Yeah. So we'll do that. I'm just looking to see if I had any other specific questions. A lot of this is just making sure how you guys want to handle some of these things.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Bob, when you said the rate earlier, you said the lowest rate with TEC. What was that lowest rate again?

MR. McNUTT: Okay, hold on. I'm looking at the one without TEC.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I don't think she printed that one.

MR. McNUTT: I've got both of them right here. And I'm looking at 2022. So with TEC, now your first tier went from like five -- do you have the number right there, Cindy?

MR. CAMPBELL: I believe you said \$5.95.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: We were at \$5.75, \$5.65, down to \$5.45 was the fourth tier.

MR. McNUTT: Let me pull that up. I wanted to give you guys apples to apple here just so you see what we're looking at. This is projected for 2022 in my spreadsheet. Right now I've got projected \$5.92 for the first block without TEC, I have projected \$3.75 with TEC. The next block with TEC I have at \$3.60 and without is \$5.82. The third block, without \$5.72 and with \$3.50. And the fourth block with TEC \$3.40 and without is \$4.50.

MR. CAMPBELL: You said \$3.40?

MR. McNUTT: \$3.40 would be the lowest block. So that's what the majority of the water that Ultium would be buying and TEC would be buying would be at that bulk -- that last tier rate.

MR. CAMPBELL: I gotcha. So basically it goes up a buck ten without TEC in the mix.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: A dollar -- no, only 35 cents. On the TEC tier it goes from \$3.75 as low as \$3.40. But on the residential tier it goes from \$5.92 to \$4.50.

MR. McNUTT: Yeah, the residential -- the top tiers change. And we can adjust those a little bit either way. The goal is --

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm sorry, I'm confused. What was the top tier without TEC, the cheapest it could be without TEC?

MR. McNUTT: Without TEC the top tier is \$5.92.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: The cheapest is \$4.50.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's what I'm looking for. \$4.50 is the cheapest without TEC. And then with TEC the cheapest is \$3.40.

MR. McNUTT: \$3.40.

MR. CAMPBELL: They do definitely affect the rates.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Exactly. Because that's a 95 cent rate from what it is currently. Now there's that fixed cost charge, but that's --

MR. McNUTT: We're gonna raise more of our revenue through the readiness-to-serve side of it. But the magnitude and scale, yeah, I mean, that's a lot of water that TEC says they are going to be using, so that will definitely impact the economy of scale.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. Okay.

MR. SULLIVAN: So we're leaving behind the 60 cents per thousand or whatever that we had talked about.

MR. CAMPBELL: Are you talking from the old time we were looking at stuff?

MR. SULLIVAN: Well, TEC 10 cents over the Warren rate. We talked about --

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, LEC is 10 cents over.

MR. SULLIVAN: That's what I mean. I'm sorry. So at one point we talked about Ultium being 60 cents over.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That was for sanitary sewer, not for water.

MR. SULLIVAN: So -- okay, I'm sorry.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That's okay. I know what you're thinking of, but that was sewer.

MR. CAMPBELL: All right. Well, I'm comfortable where we're at. Do you have something?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: My thing is when I look at this, and I have not tried to calculate out the bills, but if the -- as we stand with this presentation, the current water rate for the residents is \$5.75 a thousand. So there's gonna be an increase on the water cost, and then there's gonna be an increase on the fixed readiness-to-serve charge, okay. So the bills are going up. But the businesses, you know when you start down there, even at \$4.50 we drop from \$5.92 to \$4.50 and that's still cheaper than what we have it even today. I do want to see if we could play with those figures and --

MR. CAMPBELL: I see Bob's finger going already.

MR. McNUTT: I actually have those in here, a whole bunch of scenarios. We can do just that.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I just want to make sure the Board has the same feelings I do. I don't want to -- this is --

MR. CAMPBELL: You want to massage more up towards the --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I understand increases. But again, as you said you wanted it to be heavier on the business side. But still business presently --

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, correct. We need to find that balance.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Right.

MR. CAMPBELL: And I think a good approach is exactly what you're doing together. Say here's a typical resident, how much are they gonna see on an increase. And for the industrial/commercial side, all right, here's the rate, is that industrial still attractive enough to be bringing business in and not scaring everybody for the hills. I think that's a logical approach. And in some of these figures, like you said, they're easy to look at if you factor them into a bill. I guess the other question is Bob brought up look at a monthly bill versus quarterly billing. I know that's a whole separate discussion.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: He's really gonna have to sell me on that one.

MR. McNUTT: I strongly recommend it.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: But Darren can attest that's the biggest nightmare we have is getting those readings and getting those bills. Right now it's a three-week process. There's only four weeks in month so --

MR. McNUTT: I thought we had AMI that reads automatically.

MR. BIGGS: No.

MR. McNUTT: You drive by?

MR. BIGGS: Yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: And we're looking at AMI.

MR. BIGGS: We got 20 of them as a trial, Bob. I wanted to see how it would go and see what the Board thought about it after the trial.

MR. McNUTT: The major reason to recommend going monthly is it makes it a lot easier on your residents to budget and get used to that, I'm gonna say, monthly number than they see on a quarterly basis. A lot of the clients have just found that it makes it a lot simpler. But you have a specific reason for not doing that right now, and that sounds like it's your whole billing process and maybe there's something there that could be tweaked.

MR. CAMPBELL: I think another thing from a resident's side, if we do monthly we're going to have to strongly look at doing automated billing.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: And that's an expense and IT department. We're not talking \$10,000.

MR. CAMPBELL: I know. Plus our Clerk has to be on Board.

MR. McNUTT: I looked at it. And what you're spending per year to replace meters is probably what you could do if you took on debt and do the whole system AMI. It would be more automated.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Having walked the walk from that transition in 2008 from them walking the route and getting me readings in three days, the AMI was supposed to do that in the drive-by and have it at the end of the day. But those same radios failed from day one. We've not had one billing cycle where it went and read all the radios. Now the batteries are dying. And I understand progress. I would love to flick the computer on and have the readings. But it's not as smooth as the picture that they paint, it's just not there. It's not gonna resolve everything. And in one breath, if I could pay a person to work three days a month and walk the routes, I had readings in three days not three weeks. And she just billed yesterday from the 27th to the 18th for readings. So to --

MR. CAMPBELL: I understand. I understand. It's another chunk of this equation.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yeah. And then the cost, you have the meter cost. And then the expense. Is that something that you built into that rate because I mean, if it does sail I think Darren's talking like in a year or so.

MR. McNUTT: We put in \$40,000 a year that you're normally spending to replace the meters. I know we talked about that. And when I looked at the debt to do the whole system-wide replacement it's the same basic number. So of course, the \$40,000 is just an O&M cost right now. It would change to a debt cost. So it would be over 20 years versus however many years it takes you to keep replacing those meters at \$40,000 a year.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Uh-huh. But you would want them all changed out at the same time.

MR. McNUTT: Absolutely.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: So that initial purchase --

MR. McNUTT: But if you did it on debt. If it cost you a million bucks, you wrap that over 20 years debt. You don't pay a million dollars in one year.

MR. CAMPBELL: We would have to get a loan.

MR. McNUTT: If you do it under debt service and not have to pay it all at once, that's a different --

MR. CAMPBELL: That's another topic of discussion. I think before we leave that, you started out with it.

MR. McNUTT: Let me say this real quick, Kevin. Table 3.6 has the average customer bills for the various rates, and that is in Tab 3 rates. Just so you know where to look for it if you look at my Excel spreadsheet. Those are the comparisons of different bills with or without. As you look at each table, that's where you find that comparison.

MR. SULLIVAN: What was it?

MR. McNUTT: It's Table 3.6. It says average customer bill comparison, rate payers; and it's on Tab 3 rates in the spreadsheet.

MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. So when we're talking about the \$15 and over the five years, we're talking about that as like a service charge.

MR. CAMPBELL: Correct. Right now it's a \$3 and up. In a five-year period we'll get it up to the \$15 fixed. And I guess keep in mind that as they're crunching numbers, it really should be around \$27 or \$30 if we want to have it spread across evenly enough that if we lose a big chunk of industry we wouldn't be in the boat we're in. We're saying we're okay with that boat, let's keep the residents' costs as low as we can, wind some funds like we have and maybe have a nest-egg to see through the ups and down that we go through in a life span.

MR. SULLIVAN: And where are we with Lordstown Motors?

MR. CAMPBELL: He's gonna include those in the rates. He's gonna include their usage because they're part of our tier. That's what his question was. What we don't have is an agreement with Warren how to supply them water. We gotta get to that, but --

MR. McNUTT: Yeah. In the rates with TEC the Lordstown Motors demand is in there. So I already have that built in. I may not have the expense correct for that part of the flow, but the rates are in there and their consumption is in there.

MR. CAMPBELL: Now when you started out the MVSD water lines, you know, we have the existing 24, we want to get a second 24. Are those in that equation at all? Are we leaving them out because MVSD might have it? I was just curious where they're at.

MR. McNUTT: Right now I did not include the cost for the 24-inch line, I did not include the cost for our next elevated water tank.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay.

MR. McNUTT: And for the upgrade of the booster pumps because, depending on how that goes with the developer, let's say TEC -

MR. CAMPBELL: I understand.

MR. McNUTT: -- they would cover certain portions of that cost. So that cost is not in here.

MR. CAMPBELL: I just want to make sure. At this point, I think that's the proper way to look at it because they're so unknown, it's changing so much, we don't know where all it's gonna fall. I'm comfortable with where we're at with this for now. Is there anybody

else that has questions? There's still some stuff they are gonna crank on, and Cindy and Bob are gonna work through some things and they will bring it and we can -- unfortunately, as you know, TEC is presenting this as the last thing that they need, right. So there's a lot of pressure on getting them a number. So as soon as we can get them something that we're gonna stand behind and if they jump on board we can go all right, we're gonna live with this. It may not have been right on the money, but we can live with it and move forward. But they need that number sooner than later. Anything else?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Now also the rates that you factored in here for LEC is the current -- just the 10 cents adder. Notify me if they dump the contract.

MR. McNUTT: The one with LEC is their contract. With TEC, I will back that back out because there is no guarantee we'll get LEC on our rates. I'll back it out differently to make it the way it is today.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah, that would be correct then. All right. Thanks for all that hard work. Thanks for the hard work coming with it. I know that's always kind of fun.

2. Water Tower

MR. CAMPBELL: Water tower, big topic of discussion. I tried planting the seed to see how Council -- at this point, from what I understand, if we needed a loan -- sorry, if we wanted to go for a loan for the water tower, it would have to go through the Village, that it would not be something the Board can do. So with that being said, and if we want to push forward for a 4 million gallon water tank, Council definitely has to say thumbs up or thumbs down on it. So at the Council meeting on Monday it was not, of course, received well to venture that. Here's my mindset, see if you guys agree or disagree. If we, working with our utility and engineer, believe that the 4 million gallon is the proper volume that we need to support what we know for current residential and business use, then we need to push for that. And then, you know, because if we don't recommend it and move it forward it will go nowhere, it will be a 3 million gallon tank and we won't have a chance of changing that tank, we'll have to live with whatever we do on the second tank whenever that comes. That's where my mindset is with it. I guess at this point we've talked a little bit about it, but I would like Darren and Bob to both kind of reiterate so you gentlemen can kind of understand why they believe --

MR. SULLIVAN: I agree wholeheartedly that we need to push forward.

MR. CAMPBELL: So you're already on board with the 4 million?

MR. DIETZ: Yeah.

MR. CAMPBELL: I guess we can save some time there.

MR. SULLIVAN: We had the executive session and talked about it.

MR. CAMPBELL: We did. Like I said, I can't go into details.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I asked Bob if he built a 4 million gallon tank. I know originally they said about elevation, we wouldn't be able to use it. Would that take the half million gallon tank out of service completely, would it stay, would it come down? What -- what's its future?

MR. McNUTT: As of right now, while we build the new tank

we need the existing tank to act on the distribution side of our pumping station. Once that is done, the way I'm looking at the system now, I still think it's valuable to keep that tank; but not on the distribution side but on the suction side of that pumping station. So when we start drawing those big levels of demand we have water right there that we can pump out quickly into our higher elevated tank. That doesn't mean we're gonna keep it long-term, but that's like what I'm looking at for the initial short-term just until we get comfortable with the operations with that new massive pumping station.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm glad you asked that because that has been a valid question from Council's side. You know what are we doing with that tank. Why can't we use that spot, why are we paying on maintenance? I said as far as I know we need it for a little threats, let's not throw it to the curb yet. You just confirmed that.

MR. McNUTT: Our 24-inch water line and a lot of other moving parts need to come together before I can make a recommendation to get rid of that 500,000 gallon tank.

MR. SULLIVAN: Why was it that we can't do a loan?

MR. CAMPBELL: I guess what it boils down to is the Village actually owns the assets that are the Village's within the Village. We manage and run the aspect of it, but they're the ones that actually own. So anything that's gonna be owned they have to say yeah or nay on for the loan. Now I guess to back up one step, because I do appreciate Chris contacting the tank manufacturer. And the high level is they would be willing to give us 18 months zero percent. Basically it would be the time they are building the tank, they'd give us that time that we wouldn't have to worry about that aspect. But at the end of 18 months if we didn't get a loan on our own, they could convert it to like a 15 year loan with like -- what was it -- Prime plus 2.5 percent or something like that I think it was. So they had some mechanics in there. They really don't want to be in the bank business. They are building water towers, they're not a bank; but I'm sure they had somebody that they could farm it out to if we went that route. But ultimately it was, I think, 2.3 million additional cost to go --

MR. McNUTT: It's about 2.5. I rounded it off.

MR. CAMPBELL: So \$2.5 million to go 3 million to 4 million gallon water tank. And we've already discussed the advantages of what we have and going forward. It sounds like they are willing to work with us from the tank manufacturer. There's even a couple things, we'll give you \$100,000 back if you work with us on towers. It sounds like they want to do a great job for us and they want to use it for getting additional business. That's how I took a lot of that.

MR. BIGGS: If you guys got any questions on that, on what the manufacturer Landmark was willing to do to try to help us get this through, he's the one that's been working with them on that. He has everything.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you, Bob. I thought it was from Chris.

MR. McNUTT: So Landmark, if you guys want them to come in they would be more than happy to come in, talk to Council, your administration, you guys. They are more than anxious to try to get this as a 4 million gallon for a lot of marketing and business related purposes.

MR. CAMPBELL: Is that the biggest tank?

MR. McNUTT: This would be the biggest composite water tower built in the United States. They have built a couple of 3.5

millions, they haven't built a 4 yet. So this would be a big feather in their cap and a good marketing tool from their perspective so they can showcase to the Clevelands, Columbus and all these other mega-utilities.

MR. CAMPBELL: Little Lordstown got this huge tank, how come you guys don't want a big tank.

MR. SULLIVAN: Is that tank similar to what we have here?

MR. McNUTT: The tanks, the composite tanks, are gonna have a concrete -- I call it the column. Your tanks right now have all these multi-legs, it won't look like that at all. It will be a composite concrete cylinder up until you get to the bowl of the tank or where the water sits.

MR. CAMPBELL: It would be a lot of tank at the top. That's a big circle.

MR. McNUTT: That's a lot of water. When we designed it, we designed with both options. Obviously we have to submit to E.P.A. with both options because we want to have the ability -- as I was thinking ahead, we wanted 9 million gallons on the property. We lost one you guys already talked about, so we could only do two tanks. This is a way to try to get our storage in line with what our needs are gonna be at the least cost possible. So that's why we did that, and I'll just put it out there.

MR. CAMPBELL: I guess one of the loaded questions I'm sure Council is gonna ask. I guess there's a huge time frame for getting it completed for Ultium. Last thing we want to do is say we're gonna go for a larger tank for the community and we're gonna jeopardize a huge project that's supporting the community. There's a lot of concern surrounding this topic, getting it done on time, getting it approved on time is ultimately the first hurdle. What's the deadline? We need to know by that date what is going on with this tank is what counsel is gonna need to know.

MR. McNUTT: Bid opening was April 30, I believe. And we have 60 days from bid opening to have a contract signed. And that's why Landmark was offering the 18 months free funding or financing, to give the Village time to look for either grants or wrapping this into an OWDA loan. And I think my last e-mail yesterday had some stuff from Jennifer Brown regarding, you know, much better rates. But you can do a refi on that. But really it's up to, it sounds like, Council.

MR. CAMPBELL: It's up to Council.

MR. McNUTT: And if we decide to go with a loan, then obviously I need to put that into the rates.

MR. CAMPBELL: There has been much talk about MVSD making us part of their distribution system.

MR. McNUTT: The talk we had with MVSD had them stopping to your border, to the new booster station. That was Jim Jones' opinion through whatever legal Council he got an opinion from. They could come that far. They would not do your booster station or the water towers. They could do the transmission main up to that point, but they couldn't do your stuff beyond that.

MR. CAMPBELL: The tank would be on us. Okay. All right. So what was that date? Sorry we talked about it, I didn't write it down.

MR. McNUTT: I think it's two months or 60 days after April 30.

MR. BIGGS: Sounds like June 29. Is that what you had? Chris had, yeah, June 29. Before that date.

MR. CAMPBELL: We need it before that because the bids are already out.

MR. McNUTT: It's already bid. That's when you need to have a contract signed. And just as a reminder, we're seeing this in construction everywhere.

MR. CAMPBELL: Things are going through the roof.

MR. McNUTT: The costs are going up through the roof. So if -- I mean, time is not our side right now --

MR. CAMPBELL: No.

MR. McNUTT: -- for the tank.

MR. CAMPBELL: Never is.

MR. McNUTT: For anything. Booster pumping station, the water main Phase 2, all of that, we need to get those things under contract.

MR. CAMPBELL: All right.

MR. BIGGS: Is there anything that CT or myself could do to help with Council to understand that this is actually a cheaper way to go, that this is kind of needed to get their thoughts. I know we're here today.

MR. CAMPBELL: Their concerns were -- the two big ones was jeopardizing the whole project because of this and, you know, the money, right? We don't have the money.

MR. BIGGS: How would it jeopardize it?

MR. CAMPBELL: Because we're asking them to do something. You're taking -- they've built 3 million gallon water tanks, they know what they are going to do, everything is locked in. And we know it's almost 100 percent to support Ultium. Now we say we're gonna jeopardize part of that project from building that tank to a new ground-breaking tank, and they haven't done one this big. If something goes wrong, it could get set back because of construction of that could affect Ultium.

MR. BIGGS: Is that true, Bob? Could we handle that?

MR. CAMPBELL: It's up to the manufacturer.

MR. BIGGS: What if we could run it off to the booster station or something in our distribution system to get around it. That's what -- I'm curious.

MR. McNUTT: Let's look at 4 million, just focus on that. We bid the contract for four million due to be constructed by October of 2023, or they could offer an increase in cost to have it done by December 2022. So we do the same on both contracts. Because we know the prices we're looking at right now is December '22, we can, with the booster station, buy us that extra several months. So if there's a problem in the manufacturing and construction, we could buy that extra time and still provide Ultium what we need for them.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. Well, that helps answer. It gives me a better feeling. I know Council right now is June 6. See what we they decided, unless there is nothing on their books to do and they would skip the first June meeting. We've got this coming, I can't see them skipping the first June meeting because that, in my mind, will be the top discussion unless something else comes. Do we have their meeting the first week in June so we could have hopefully an answer from Council on either support or not supporting the tank? Would that be sufficient in our time frame?

MR. McNUTT: Yeah. I think it would be fine. And if they approve it on June 6 and say go, we got free financing for 18 months offered through Landmark. So that gives us time to look for any other

funding and financing, but we would have that in place.

MR. CAMPBELL: I understand. I understand. I'm just trying to make sure to lay it all out. Put it in a e-mail to them and say you guys, the Board approves moving forward looking at the 4 million gallon tank. So I guess I'll put that out there and start with that. If they do not, what do we have to decide. So say Council doesn't support the 4 million gallon tank, we'll be down to a 3 million gallon tank. What decisions do we need to have that ready? Do you need any decisions around the 3 million gallon tank.

MR. McNUTT: I think the only decision is whether you go forward with it.

MR. CAMPBELL: So it's either 4 or 3, that's it. If the 4 doesn't go, we fall into 3 and you guys have what you need to go forward. Well, actually everything is ready to go for 3. The question is supporting the 4 or not. Okay. I just want to make sure we agree on that.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Are you asking Paul for a resolution recommending Council proceed with the 4 million gallon tower then? Because you need a resolution and legislation.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah, because they would have to pass it.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I think if you talk to him today because they need to have it for them. If they don't want to do the meeting, get it to conversation or the floor before then, they acknowledge there's a time. So I would ask also for Paul to get that, get the wheels turning before June 6.

MR. SULLIVAN: Could we make a --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: You can make a motion, but --

MR. CAMPBELL: All we can do is make a motion with it.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: But ask Paul for a resolution for Council, to present to Council.

MR. SULLIVAN: Right. We can make the motion to do it so we'll be done with our part and it will go forward.

MR. CAMPBELL: We'll make a motion. I make a motion that we proceed with Council pursuing the 4 million gallon water tank.

MR. SULLIVAN: I second.

MR. CAMPBELL: All in favor?

(All respond aye.)

MR. CAMPBELL: All opposed?

(No response.)

MR. CAMPBELL: Now I think it would be nice if you could put some -- like you discussed -- the detail of alleviating the concerns about jeopardizing the project. I think if we had some engineering terms behind it, we have it in place, we have that backed up, we have that in place, and basically boil it down to their concern of the money, right. And from that side of it I would say, depending on how things play out with this whole mix of who owns what and where things are going, worst case if we end up at that point it's part of our rate structure. And they're gonna be how much is gonna added to the rate. So if you -- they're gonna want to know a rough number, I guarantee you.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Well it depends on the pay-back of the loan.

MR. CAMPBELL: We know it's 2.5 million. We can give them a rough-in number, it's gonna cost this much, here's how it's gonna affect the rate. You can do that?

MR. McNUTT: I can do that, that's easy.

MR. CAMPBELL: We can give them concrete stuff and make a decision yeah or nay.

MR. SULLIVAN: It would be good if we could give them the concrete stuff before the meeting.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's what I'm saying.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: With the engineer's recommendation to proceed with the 4 million gallon tank I think is what we need.

MR. McNUTT: I'll put together a bullet point, Darren and I will work on it, here's all the advantages, here's what we think, here's the cost, here's concerns with the delay, if there's a delay how we would approach that or resolve that, ie. with the booster station to give us that time.

MR. CAMPBELL: All right. Thank you for that. And so when you have that put together send it to me and we'll move on with it.

3. Phase II Booster Pump Station

MR. CAMPBELL: Phase 2 Booster Pump Station. What did we need with that? Is there something we need to pass or approve or look at? Phase 2 booster pump station.

MR. McNUTT: We sent the letter of recommendation over with the bid tab recommending to move forward. I saw an e-mail from Ultium saying that they were putting together the purchase order for this project. So I think you guys need to have some resolution or recommendation for do you need Council approval on this, I don't know. But it's ready to go with your approval.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, I thought the big hold-up was just what you stated, the financial aspect of not having the money to cover the project. So if they got that worked out --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That's why I asked if Bill was attending the meeting because he has the hang-up with --

MR. CAMPBELL: He had a problem with it.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: What you sent in your e-mail stating that Ultium is putting in a purchase order for the dollar amounts; if that is acceptable to Bill then, you know, you can award the contract. If it's not acceptable to Bill, we're still waiting on his acceptance. Do you want to call him down? I told him that, I sent him an e-mail yesterday to check his -- I think it was like 12:40 or something it came in. I told him to look at it.

MR. McNUTT: He had that e-mail earlier. I just had to point out because it was further down in the e-mail where that was it. And I blew it up and highlighted it so it stood out.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yeah.

MR. CAMPBELL: All right. We'll let that sit then.

4. Employee Wage Resolution

MR. CAMPBELL: Let's move onto the Wage Resolution. I know Darren put some time and research in. We talked about it at our meeting.

MR. McNUTT: Right before -- Kevin, let me ask a question. The Phase 2 water main, that has already been recommended for Ultium.

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh, that's right. Bill put us -- we were going to pass it. Didn't we pass it based on -- or did we not at our last meeting based upon Bill had the financing stuff. I think Mike suggested that because if it came through we didn't have to worry about it. But did we do that?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah.

MR. CAMPBELL: I thought we did.

MR. BIGGS: I'm thinking he told me this morning that you guys still needed to pass that. I thought because -- I thought it was done also, but I'm pretty sure I think that's what he told me this morning.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, hopefully he can come down here in a minute. All right. So, all right. Darren, back to the -- maybe we can work this one out while we're waiting for Bill for the wage resolution. So were there any questions? I guess it boils down to the sheer fact that we need people, can't keep people. Our advertising isn't going well with response. And I don't believe you guys see a different solution other than, you know, I guess the number one thing that keeps people working around is their pay, right?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah, exactly.

MR. CAMPBELL: So unless someone knew of a better solution to keep and get people and retain people, I think we're at that point where we need to. And I know it's not gonna -- I've already been getting lumps about it.

MR. SULLIVAN: Oh, well.

MR. CAMPBELL: Like I said, I told them exactly that, do you know a better way to keep and retain people. No. Well, we need to do something. And that's how I'm looking at it.

MR. SULLIVAN: I make a motion that we move forward with the resolution as printed.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I have questions before you do. There's no change -- I just want to be sure, there's no change for the Superintendent's pay or the part-time persons pay on this mark-up. Are you just doing the foreman and employees, or are you gonna consider the Superintendent?

MR. SULLIVAN: You're right, we should include the Superintendent.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Because it is all together. And if you're gonna --

MR. SULLIVAN: What are you talking about then, the permanent part-time.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Permanent part-time employee was not. One permanent part-time went up, it says up in here one permanent part-time. So it's the Superintendent's pay that has not been addressed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Like I say, it's just the Superintendent's pay. I think everything else went up.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That's my fault, that's my error.

MR. CAMPBELL: I thought the Superintendent was in there.

MR. SULLIVAN: I did too.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: He's in Section 2, an increase. No, that's why -- just pointing it out. I just thought if you're gonna change things, if you're intended on it being changed. They went up \$2. It went up basically \$2 on the lower half, right, the other positions. Is that a correct statement?

MR. BIGGS: That's correct. For 2021.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well --

MR. SULLIVAN: Superintendent should go up.

MR. CAMPBELL: Equivalent. What are you suggesting?

MR. SULLIVAN: \$4.

MR. CAMPBELL: You want him to go up \$4? I was thinking keeping it across --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: A dollar each year also or \$4 at once.

MR. SULLIVAN: Pardon me?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That shows a dollar each year. Are you talking a dollar each year for a total of four years, or were you saying \$4 in the beginning?

MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I think we should do something in the beginning. Even --

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, there is.

MR. SULLIVAN: Well, there's a dollar.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yeah.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Did you want to increase it the \$2,080 each year?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah. What do you think, Darren?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: \$2,080.

MR. CAMPBELL: Don't put Darren on the spot for things, that's a loaded question. Don't put him in that spot. It's up to the Board to decide that. And one, I appreciate Darren not -- you know, I appreciate all the work he did for the guys that support him, and I think he handled it very professionally and properly. And now it's up to the Board to look at it and compensate appropriately. So --

MR. SULLIVAN: Why don't we do that. Let's do the Superintendent \$2 the first year and then a dollar, so in the three-year period he'd go up \$4.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: His is salary.

MR. SULLIVAN: We'll load the first year with \$2.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: His is salary, so you can't talk an hourly rate. So if you're talking \$4,160 --

MR. CAMPBELL: We can correct it. I mean --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It would be \$4,160 based on 2,080 hours. Not what he actually works, but based on a normal 2,080 the increase would be \$4,160.

MR. SULLIVAN: For the \$2?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Uh-huh.

MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I think that's reasonable. Because all the other people, if they work over the 40 hours they get compensated for it. Darren doesn't. He works many hours over the 40. So I think if we do the \$2 the first year and then dollar, dollar.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm texting Bill. He's gone, he's not here. He said he's not here, he can't come down. So I texted him our question. So you're saying well whatever the figure was, roughly works out to -- how much was it?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: \$4,160 based on a typical 40 hour week.

MR. SULLIVAN: The first year. And then \$2,080 the next two years.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: The second, third and fourth.

MR. SULLIVAN: And just from what he gave us, the low end was like \$60,000. Nope?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That was not for a Superintendent. That was for like foreman and even less than that.

MR. CAMPBELL: Correct, yeah.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: For one department, water or sewer.

MR. BIGGS: Example, last year Niles was looking for an assistant superintendent starting at \$70,000. There's an example of one of our neighbors.

MR. CAMPBELL: All right. So that's what your -- is that your motion?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah.

MR. CAMPBELL: All right.

MR. DIETZ: Whatever his motion was, I'll second it.

MR. CAMPBELL: All in favor?

(All respond aye.)

MR. CAMPBELL: All opposed?

(No response.)

MR. CAMPBELL: All right, motion carries. Very good. Can you adjust that for the resolution, Cindy?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yes.

MR. SULLIVAN: Well, the way I understand this --

MR. CAMPBELL: No, I support it. I'm not gonna say any more about it. It's the only way, we need to keep and retain people.

MR. SULLIVAN: The way I understand it, we have the ability to do that on our own.

MR. CAMPBELL: That I have somewhat confirmation on. The best I can get, yes.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: The next question we have is we need an effective date. Is this going into effect July 1, or is it going into -- because he's paid monthly, they're paid bi-weekly. But you are talking about implementing this --

MR. CAMPBELL: When does it work well to flow --

MR. SULLIVAN: July 1 would probably work the best, correct? No?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It's workable no matter what we decide. It can be done. He does the time.

MR. BIGGS: The dates are different. I get paid on the 15th and 30th. They're every two weeks. I think they get paid today, so in two more weeks. But the pay period ends -- we hardly ever hit at the same time, so it doesn't --

MR. CAMPBELL: All right, so --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It ends on a Saturday, so whatever. And July --

MR. CAMPBELL: Whatever works, I guess, it works to make it flow.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: So effective --

MR. BIGGS: Well it ends on a Sunday anyway, the week. Well, does this have to go to Council anyhow with the June 6 --

MR. CAMPBELL: I would assume it has to go through them, and then we'll see if they're gonna have the -- we don't have the right to raise our own thing, it will have to go through Council. And worst case it goes at the end of June.

MR. BIGGS: So there, June 7. So if everything is good, then you could run June 14 then.

MR. CAMPBELL: But they may not have that first meeting. I'm assuming they will because of everything else we need. I don't want to base it to something they don't have. I know for sure they'll have the end of June meeting, so it will be safer end July things will be in place.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It will give payroll time to adjust the rates. And it's like six months at that rate and six months on this rate.

MR. BIGGS: Are we looking at July 5 then, does that sound right? That would be a Monday.

MR. McNUTT: Is that when your pay periods start, Mondays?

MR. BIGGS: Yeah.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: But the pay period would be for the two previous weeks, so that's where. Let me see. You said they get paid this week. I don't remember because I'm --

MR. BIGGS: They'll get an actual check tomorrow. The pay period ended on the 16th. So this is the first week of a new pay period for them.

MR. SULLIVAN: Wasn't it said at the last meeting that we were a bigger water user than Warren?

MR. BIGGS: About everybody around us --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Warren and Niles together, yes. Bob pointed that out.

MR. CAMPBELL: So we have a date. Do you have something you can work with?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I would say effective with the first pay of July.

MR. CAMPBELL: Effective with the first pay of July.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Is that all right? Now next -- let me write this down so I get it correct. Next is if you're starting this July, is your raise going into effect -- the second tier of your raise going into effect January 1 or July of next year? Is it one year from the passage of this or is it in January? Because you're starting -- this whole resolution will come through with a new date, and you're gonna say this is gonna start in July. So are they working for one year, or is it effective as -- 2022's rate effective January 1 or July 1.

MR. CAMPBELL: To keep it -- I think it's easier from I think the Board's side and Clerk's side if it's effective starting the first of the year. I think keeping it by year makes it --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Totally fine. I just want to be clear.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yep.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Because that's what Paul -- I don't know if you read the e-mail, the effective dates.

MR. CAMPBELL: That was his question for it.

MR. SULLIVAN: So we'll have a '21 rate, '22 rate.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: The rate this year, the new rate, will take effect in July. They'll work for six months and they will get another \$1 an hour raise.

MR. DIETZ: In January of --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: '22, correct.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's how it --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Is that the Board's understanding?

MR. CAMPBELL: We're gonna go the rest of this year at that rate, and start of next year it starts with the next one and goes forward, get back on a year schedule.

MR. SULLIVAN: Okay.

MR. CAMPBELL: All right.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: One more question. Because of Darren's salary, the next question is gonna be we're halfway through the years and he's salary. So the second half of the year is he to make the full increase in the six months, or is he to make half the increase in the next six months?

MR. CAMPBELL: I would say half the increase in the next six months because we're gonna start the next year at the next dollar anyway. She wants to know since he's salary does he get the \$4,160 for all this year, or does he get half that for the appropriate line-up for the six months of this year since he's salary. I'm saying doing the

half for the half of the year and next year starts fresh and we're clean.

MR. SULLIVAN: I'd say do the \$4,000 this year.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. Tom, what do you feel?

MR. DIETZ: You don't want me to say what I feel.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: There's a difference. You have to break, they differ in opinion so --

MR. CAMPBELL: He's saying give him the full raise right for the whole year. Or we're gonna give him half the raise because there's half a year left. I guess that's what it boils down to.

MR. DIETZ: I'd give him half.

MR. CAMPBELL: All right. So that's what we're gonna do, we'll give him the half for this year because it's appropriately -- it's a raise for this year, so it's half for the six months and next year it starts out. Okay. Bill texted back. All he had to say was we don't have the funds yet. When we get the funds, I will order the legislation for you guys. So we've got nothing with that at this point. I don't know, it doesn't help you at all for this project and it sucks.

MR. McNUTT: I've already told our staff to get the contracts to the bidders to get everything prepared so that when the Village is ready, you guys will hopefully have contracts in your hand for your signature upon Bill and Village approval.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. I guess that's all we can do with it at this point. All right. Was there anything else? I don't have anything else. Does that cover these topics for everybody at this time? I'm not hearing anything, so I'm gonna take a motion for adjournment. I see Bob's eyes going.

MR. McNUTT: I'm trying to remember if there was anything else in my list that I left in the car. Chris, did I miss anything?

MR. BRUBAKER: We had talked about the impending price increase and how critical it was gonna be if we stalled, materials.

MR. McNUTT: I think I mentioned that already, that that is a concern.

MR. BRUBAKER: It's a big concern. So --

MR. DIETZ: Well, we can't do nothing about it if the battery plant don't get of their duffs and do it. Is there any way we can pass it onto them then?

MR. McNUTT: If there is an increase required, by the contract yes, they will be paying that increase.

MR. DIETZ: All right.

MR. BRUBAKER: If you can get the material. By contract, you can only extend time -- on a force majeure event like that, you can only extend time. But the question is can you get the material, because everybody is buying it right now because they know the price is gonna go up in about two-and-a-half weeks.

MR. McNUTT: So we might be hit with a delay in construction schedules because of that.

MR. BRUBAKER: Right.

MR. McNUTT: So -- but there's nothing we can do about that either. You know, when things get approved we'll all just work through it together.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah, I don't know what to tell you. There's nothing else we can do from our side. I mean, at least from a financial side of that. So all right. Now that you've seen the resolutions, I guess you can adjust the wage. That answers our other

question, right? Our wages are gonna be increasing, so you can adjust the rates appropriately for that.

MR. McNUTT: I wrote in, yeah, to increase the rates in here. I'll get together with you.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I'll get you a clean copy. When it's clean, I'll send it to you.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'll take a motion for adjournment.

MR. SULLIVAN: Before we adjourn, do you think we should contact Council and ask them for a special meeting?

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, I definitely want to start with having information that they're gonna put together for the water tower. I want to get that in their hands so they have something to read. And I'm thinking the June meeting, because honestly I don't have the time this week, and the next two weeks there's no way. I can't attend a meeting. I can attend their June meeting. So if you guys want to pursue a meeting, you know, before that, then I have no problem with that at all. I'm just saying I can't. I definitely want to get the information and hit them at the June meeting and make a decision.

MR. SULLIVAN: That's fine. I don't want to have a meeting without you.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That alone is 17 days away and -- two-and-a-half weeks.

MR. CAMPBELL: I know.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I mean --

MR. SULLIVAN: Well, that's why I said --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: If you developed a resolution and such and it went to Council and it was ready, even if Kevin couldn't attend, if he was happy with what was created and done, you could have a meeting and pass it and get it -- pushing it to them.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's true.

MR. SULLIVAN: I would be good with that.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It would really be a two minute meeting to pass a piece of legislation.

MR. CAMPBELL: You could even do it before Council meeting.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Just that.

MR. CAMPBELL: Let's get the information to them so they can digest it and hopefully see how that goes. All right. So I think we had the motions.

MR. SLUSARCZYK: Do it again.

MR. CAMPBELL: Motion for adjournment.

MR. DIETZ: I'll second it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mike made it, Tom seconded it. All in favor?

(All respond aye.)

MR. CAMPBELL: All opposed?

(No response.)

(The meeting adjourns at 2:20 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF OHIO)
TRUMBULL COUNTY) SS.

I, Deborah I. Lavelle, a Notary Public in and for the State of Ohio, duly commissioned and qualified, do hereby certify that the foregoing meeting before the Board of Public Affairs was written by me in the presence of the Members and transcribed by me using computer-aided transcription according to the stenotype notes taken at the time

the said meeting took place.

I do further certify that I am not a relative, counsel or attorney of any Member, or otherwise interested in the event of this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal of office at Niles, Ohio on this 1st day of June, 2021.

DEBORAH I. LAVELLE, Notary Public
My Commission expires 4/16/2022

Submitted:

Approved by:

Cinthia Slusarczyk, clerk

Kevin Campbell, President