

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
MEETING OF THE LORDSTOWN VILLAGE BOARD OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS
1455 Salt Springs Road, Lordstown, Ohio
November 17, 2020

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
Mr. Christopher Kogelnik, Engineer
ALSO PRESENT: Mr. Tom Cowie, Imperial Communities

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS taken before me, DEBORAH LAVELLE, RPR, a court reporter and Notary Public within and for the State of Ohio on this 17th of November, 2020.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'll go ahead and call this meeting to order. Would you stand with me for the Lord's Prayer and Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL:

MR. CAMPBELL: Roll call please.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Kevin Campbell.
MR. CAMPBELL: Here.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Thomas Dietz.
MR. DIETZ: Here.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Michael Sullivan.
MR. SULLIVAN: Here.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Darren Biggs.
MR. BIGGS: Here.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Cinthia Slusarczyk, present. Chris Kogelnik.
MR. KOGELNIK: Present.

APPROVAL AND CORRECTION OF MINUTES:

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. We have Approval and Correction of Minutes from three sets; October 7, October 20, and October 28.

MR. SULLIVAN: I'll make a motion for October 7.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'll second that motion. All in favor?
(All respond aye.)

MR. CAMPBELL: All opposed?
(No response.)

MR. CAMPBELL: I'll make a motion to accept October 20 minutes.

MR. SULLIVAN: Second.

MR. CAMPBELL: All in favor?
(All respond aye.)

MR. CAMPBELL: All opposed?
(No response.)

MR. CAMPBELL: All right. October 28. I'll make the recommendation to pass those minutes.

MR. SULLIVAN: Second.

MR. CAMPBELL: All in favor?
(All respond aye.)

MR. CAMPBELL: All opposed?
(No response.)

MR. CAMPBELL: We've been having a lot of meetings. As you can tell, there's three in one month. Thanks for all the efforts keeping those up-to-date.

CORRESPONDENCE:

MR. CAMPBELL: Cindy, any correspondence?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: We do have a draft agreement for Ultium. I think I have it actually to address it under the battery plant. But it's -- it wasn't a correspondence, it just between the department.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

MR. CAMPBELL: Any Public Comments at this point?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: There's no Zoom.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay.

MR. COWIE: Tom Cowie, Imperial Communities. The two things that I know you're gonna discuss, the master metering and the waste water.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yep.

MR. COWIE: And I have some input with that if you want to wait until then. But I also have some about our water bill that we received. I'd just like to speak on that either now or at the end of the meeting. I mean, it doesn't matter to me or --

MR. CAMPBELL: What do you guys feel? I hate to have him wait.

MR. COWIE: I'll probably stay for the whole meeting unless you have to go to executive session.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Imperial is number five under New Business, master meter.

MR. CAMPBELL: You're not too far down the chain.

MR. COWIE: Water and waste water.

MR. CAMPBELL: We'll cover it under five if that's okay.

MR. COWIE: Yep.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thanks for bringing it up.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Frank Donadee Outside User Tap Request

MR. CAMPBELL: Onto our New Business. First item, Frank Donadee Outside User Tap Request.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: He made application. He's along Pritchard-Ohltown Road. And I have the resolution prepared for Council to accept. I gave the information to the superintendent and he had no concerns. So if you're okay with that --

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah, we talked about that last meeting, didn't we. This is another one except --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: This is another outside user. Previous one was Terrance Helminiak. And this gentleman is actually building where Terrance hasn't.

MR. SULLIVAN: Do we have to refer it to Council?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It has to be approved by Council because they are outside the Village of Lordstown. But the Board would recommend to Council.

MR. DIETZ: He's east of Bailey past the pump house?

MR. BIGGS: Yes.

MR. DIETZ: All right.

MR. CAMPBELL: And I assume CT's -- I think this is probably like the last one, they've kind of checked the tapping in

there and it's okay with our water system?

MR. BIGGS: I didn't check with the engineers. They should be fine. It's just an outside user, nothing different.

MR. KOGELNIK: We did have a conversation, and I said that that was okay.

MR. BIGGS: The first one, because it was so close to the pump station I wanted to make sure that it wasn't gonna cause an issue being right there.

MR. CAMPBELL: I gotcha. That's what it was. Okay. So

--

MR. SULLIVAN: So do you want a motion to --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: We do.

MR. SULLIVAN: -- to accept that?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yeah, to recommend to Council.

MR. CAMPBELL: I make a motion to recommend to Council that Frank Donadee outside user tap request.

MR. DIETZ: I'll second.

MR. CAMPBELL: All in favor?

(All respond aye.)

MR. CAMPBELL: All opposed?

(No response.)

MR. SULLIVAN: Do we need to sign this?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: No, it's just a cover letter to Village Council, to Howard Sheely, to bring it before Council.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'll sign it.

2. Rate Study

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you. All right. New business, our rate study. I assume that's our water rate study topic. Do we have --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yeah. CT submitted a proposal November 11 for the water rate study, broke down into multiple tasks. The total of the tasks comprised is \$25,000.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes. I did read through that online. I thought it was very nice to have the tasks broke down so we could see how it plays out. I know we've talked about it and knew it was coming. I don't foresee -- I didn't have any questions with what they proposed. Did you gentlemen have a chance to look at any of it yet or --

MR. DIETZ: I haven't.

MR. SULLIVAN: No, I --

MR. CAMPBELL: Chris, do you have anything you want to address on that?

MR. KOGELNIK: I don't. That is hourly. That doesn't mean that you're gonna be charged \$25,000.

MR. SULLIVAN: What?

MR. KOGELNIK: That is hourly, not lump sum. So if we end up only needing so many hours to do the study, then it's gonna be less than \$25,000. These kinds of --

MR. SULLIVAN: It could be more if --

MR. KOGELNIK: These kind of studies are heavily predicated on what information we get from the Village. So Bob wanted me to assure you that his thinking is it's gonna be less than \$25,000. That's just a budgetary figure.

MR. CAMPBELL: It says here the fee is a fee -- please offer the -- blah-blah-blah -- determined to have a fee of \$25,000 to complete. This shall be hourly, not to exceed \$25,000. So thank

you for pointing that out, that makes sense. And hopefully, I know between Darren and Cindy we have quite a bit of information, and I know their work loads are plenty, but I know this is one of the aspects that we need to start chomping down because we have businesses coming in and they are needing to know some figures from us.

MR. SULLIVAN: So when are we looking at that?

MR. KOGELNIK: When to do the rate study?

MR. SULLIVAN: Uh-huh. Is it a long drawn-out --

MR. KOGELNIK: I think Bob said that he can get it done in a couple months. I think he said that at the last meeting.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's what I remember him saying also.

MR. KOGELNIK: But I want to point out that in prior BPA discussions we talked about the Asset Management Plan being officially complete before we do the rate study. And in that particular case, we can complete the rate study; but what you're gonna want to do is understand your total projected capital costs from your Asset Management Plan and then see how that works with your rates, you know, your official rates, so that you can understand how things are going to be paid for. And the Asset Management Plan is to be updated each year going forward. So once you get your Asset Management Plan done, it shouldn't be much for you to update that in subsequent years. I want to point that out. I think that's very important, especially in your case.

MR. SULLIVAN: And this takes in the Niles agreement?

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, it works off the whole picture of what it costs for water, what we're selling water for. And now we have the Niles agreement in place, it's a figure they can base things off of once we get to that point sometime out. So Darren or Cindy, do you have any questions on --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: No. To me it's important to get it under way simply because of Trumbull Energy Center, you know, and their rate request. We can't go blind into that. If CT is at least working on it --

MR. CAMPBELL: We can at least say we are working towards a number. I know they'll need some figures out of Darren, I appreciate that aspect of it. And I know some of the stuff you already have in the software was what? What's that software that we have -- that you have, kind of keeps track of our equipment and system and --

MR. BIGGS: GIS.

MR. CAMPBELL: I knew it started with a G.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That's already all incorporated into the Asset Management Plan.

MR. CAMPBELL: But that kind of feeds in that direction of it. I assume it's pretty good, what that -- we have on that, or does it need a little touching up?

MR. BIGGS: We work on it every day, but they had it. They had it when they did the asset management for us. That's where they got a lot of information in.

MR. KOGELNIK: Your Asset Management Plan is a very comprehensive plan. It includes the GIS mapping and all the attribute data that goes along with every valve, hydrant, water line. That's good, that's in check. From what I recall from the discussions with Brian Beeson, that was just some small facts and figures dealing with the administrative portion that were yet to be completed on the Asset Management Plan. I can work with Cindy and with Bob McNutt and wrap that up. It's important for the Village to do that.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay.

MR. KOGELNIK: Because you need to just update that stuff on an annual basis.

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh, yeah. Yeah. As you stated, it's a never-ending task, that's what you need to move forward and know what you need for the future. So --

MR. KOGELNIK: Yeah.

MR. CAMPBELL: So at this point do you gentlemen have any questions about the rate study? I assume we need a resolution to pass that amount. It's \$25,000. So if there's no more questions, I say we need a resolution to actually pass it so at our next meeting we can have that.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I'm sure -- or if you want, I can ask Paul to draft a resolution and make it retroactive to tonight.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm fine with that.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It's just for the dollar amount. We have the information, that's not going to change.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah, I'm fine with that.

MR. SULLIVAN: What did she say?

MR. CAMPBELL: She's saying if we pass it tonight we can get with Paul, the solicitor, and make it retroactive. Because of the amount, by motion it isn't sufficient --

MR. SULLIVAN: So make a motion not to exceed \$25,000 for the rate study?

MR. CAMPBELL: Correct, yep. Is that --

MR. SULLIVAN: That's --

MR. CAMPBELL: I'll second that motion. All in favor? (All respond aye.)

MR. CAMPBELL: All opposed? (No response.)

MR. CAMPBELL: Then you can work with Paul and do that part and we can sign it once it comes in. And Chris, thank you for providing the detail. And make sure you tell Bob that we appreciate all his hard work and look forward to seeing how this works out.)

MR. KOGELNIK: Thank you.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: When it comes in, it will be passed as Resolution 2020-14.

MR. CAMPBELL: Perfect, okay.

3. Permanent Part-time Employee

MR. CAMPBELL: Number 3, Permanent Part-time Employee.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That is for the office staff. Clerk Blank wants to hire a permanent part-time employee and charge the expenses to the Water Department fund.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yep. Basically working in is someone that Cindy can have a back-up and train with.

MR. SULLIVAN: I don't have a problem with that.

MR. CAMPBELL: We can pass that just by motion at this point?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: He just wants you to, yes, acknowledge by motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: All right. Any questions from you gentlemen at this point? All right. Well, I'll make a motion to pass the permanent part-time employee for the Clerk's office.

MR. SULLIVAN: I'll second it.

MR. CAMPBELL: All right. All in favor?

(All respond aye.)

MR. CAMPBELL: All opposed?

(No response.)

MR. CAMPBELL: All right. If he has any questions, he can contact us.

MR. SULLIVAN: So this permanent part-time would assist you?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I hope so since he wants to charge it to your fund.

MR. SULLIVAN: I mean, if it's coming out of our nickel, right?

MR. CAMPBELL: Correct, yep.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: The position is not in your resolution, it's in the Clerk's office staffing resolution. And he has the ability to hire a permanent part-time employee within his office. He just wants to charge that expense to the Water Department fund.

MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I just want to make sure that we get the hours or you'll get the hours.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I agree, because it's --

MR. CAMPBELL: She'll notify us if it gets out of check and we can talk to Bill about it. For the next 4 and 5, I would like to flip those, since we have Imperial here; and the Lordstown Plaza bill, we can do it just after we do -- is that all right with everybody?

MR. SULLIVAN: That's fine with me.

5. Imperial Master Metering

MR. CAMPBELL: We're gonna move on down to 5, Imperial Master Metering. So at this point, Tom, you had some stuff you wanted to start with?

MR. COWIE: Well, I guess the biggest question is we received a bill based on the formula that was put together by CT.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah, we've been billing off --

MR. COWIE: We were under the impression that after the 27th, after you had a certain period of time of running the meter and seeing if it was sufficient, that we're gonna start the billing in this last quarter for September -- or August, September, October I think it was; and then in turn we would receive the bill based on the --

MR. CAMPBELL: Old style.

MR. COWIE: Old way instead of new way. Our question is why hasn't it been -- why isn't it that way now?

MR. CAMPBELL: That's a good question. We wanted to make sure things were as solid as they could be with a new metering system and billing system. We already have in effect, as you might recall, that we would go back and retrofit or retro-look at billing once we picked a cut-off and decided to bill forward at that point. So we're still at that point, we're gonna do that. So in our mind we want to make sure that what we're gonna do is good to move forward with rather than introduce another confusion. So at this point we have the facts and figures to make the decision on, things are looking good, we've been maintaining and taking the readings, and that's what I wanted to discuss tonight. We want to go ahead and say let's go ahead and flip the billing over, where are we at, and we can go back and look at what kind of adjustment may be needed between this point, old bill, and what our average numbers have been with the new meter. So we're at that point right now. So sorry for the confusion.

MR. COWIE: We were under the impression that that time period from maybe May as to when it was installed, I don't know the exact date when it came online, to the end of July which is, you know, three months of data.

MR. CAMPBELL: Uh-huh.

MR. COWIE: And now we got three more months of data. I mean why -- this thing should have been -- we have a contract since 2014.

MR. CAMPBELL: Correct, yep.

MR. COWIE: Then now we got the apparatus to track the flow and we are not doing that.

MR. CAMPBELL: I understand that. We're going to be doing it.

MR. COWIE: That's our frustration. And we're getting billed \$2,000 or more based on the formula, which is quite an amount. And looking at the figures that are coming through the flow meter now, it is gonna be nowhere near that -- you know, that amount.

MR. CAMPBELL: I understand. But we didn't know any of that until we went through some of it. I mean, it could have been the other way. So I mean, our point is we weren't doing this trying to get more money out of you. We were doing this to make sure we were solid and moving forward. We feel solid from now what we've got. We're going to make the decision to move forward.

MR. COWIE: What you're telling me, we're going to start this next cycle would be the billing is when you're gonna start billing us off that meter?

MR. CAMPBELL: That's our understanding. We're talking with the Clerk's office, yes. The Board has to tell our Clerk to say at this point you need to flip and start billing from that, because we told her at one point to say you're gonna be billing this way until told differently. So that's where we're at at this point. Is that a correct statement.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That is. And to be clear, when the readings were done -- the billing readings would have been done the end of April or about April 25 -- and that meter didn't come online or the first time I had something from them was May 5. So there was not a full 90 day period. And as you know, the readings -- you insist that the readings are done at the same time for to be fair.

MR. CAMPBELL: A correlation.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: So this is the first full billing period that we have a reading for -- to pair it with.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay.

MR. COWIE: And I'm not arguing the point that you needed the data. But I was told prior to this billing cycle that we weren't billing -- starting that because we didn't have the full 90 days or whatever, 92 days, whatever the cycle is. But we do have that now, and we're still gonna wait another 90-some days to be billed again off of that meter. So I wanted to be clear that we're gonna go back and look at these things.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yep.

MR. COWIE: The monetary amounts that we've been charged since all the way back to --

MR. SULLIVAN: To May.

MR. COWIE: No, no, no. All the way back to 2014 -- 2014 when that station came online up there, and then make some kind of determination as to how to --

MR. CAMPBELL: Adjust.

MR. COWIE: I don't know what word's gonna be here, what you're going to call it, but to adjust the charges for those -- that waste water.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's what the Board agreed to back then, and that's what we'll do at that point. I guess to your point, Darren, you've been the one babysitting, keeping the meter going.

MR. BIGGS: My point, I'm with Tom. I'm the one that told him the 27th we're done. I went over there and explained it to Mr. Radtka and told him here's the readings, here's what we've been getting. We did both readings for a whole cycle. Yes, it wasn't a complete 90 days, but it was -- I don't know -- eight, nine weeks. So that's what we have.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay.

MR. BIGGS: And then I was under the impression that we were gonna start it on the 27th, the last one from the old one and then we move on. With that impression -- and I know we had talked about it, and I thought that's what we came up with. Now whether she needed something or not, I don't know. But we haven't even been reading the other one because I was under the impression we were gonna start with the new one. We gave it three months. Everyone agreed, BPA, Imperial, myself, move on. So --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: To be clear, Darren, we weren't using the other meter to bill. We were not using the other meter. We were using a calculated run time that CT developed.

MR. BIGGS: But you go off the readings I give you.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: For water and residential sewer, not -- the only reading we use for sewer was the calculated run time until that meter was put in place. There was no other metering of the sort until now.

MR. BIGGS: Okay. I'm not sure. Still the 27th is what I understood we were gonna be done with, and I'm the one that told Tom that.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay.

MR. BIGGS: That's where I thought we were at. We ran

--

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, obviously there was some communication issues.

MR. BIGGS: I know that's where he got it from because that's when we quit doing the Lift Station No. 4 and started reading the new one. It was May, June and July is when we ran -- we actually did both of them, readings off of both of them. I have everything right here, some of what we did and when we quit and when it was put in. So that's where this whole thing came from. I thought we were

--

MR. CAMPBELL: We haven't gone back in time and figures what had already been done. We have the figures, now we can base and do a calculation on and do a retrofit on the previous years of what happened. So what do you need, Cindy, from us to say -- just a motion by the Board to stay start billing off the --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: And you can do that. I mean, the bill has been presented to them because I have to do that to close the billing cycle to accept payments. But I could still go in and adjust the costs if that's the Board's wishes. I can't change the way I bill when you told me how to bill. You can tell me to adjust that bill. I mean, that is your call, not mine. I had to bill that way.

MR. CAMPBELL: It was just be for that one bill. So what I'm saying is we should take a point in time and say here's the point in time. We're billing off the master meter that's going forward. Now let's go back, we have figures to say we've compared it to see how it correlates between the two and we can -- whatever that ends up being, then we can apply that looking back towards that point in time when we started the initial billing. And we would sit down with Imperial and say here's where we're at, how do we want to move forward, what do we feel is the best way to --

MR. COWIE: We can live with that, Kevin. I'm not objecting to, you know, what we had discussed and there was a communication thing.

MR. CAMPBELL: There was, yeah.

MR. COWIE: That's obvious. So let's pick a point so we're aware we're not gonna get billed on a formula as opposed to a meter that --

MR. CAMPBELL: What works well for the bill, where we're at right now for the Board to issue a line in the sand to say all right, at this point switch over.

MR. SULLIVAN: But on the look-back is there gonna be a huge difference?

MR. CAMPBELL: Until we look back, we don't know.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Well, you only have a three-month sample to begin with. And I understand that you're gonna look back, but I thought that was agreed to before with the calculation that we weren't gonna look back, that we accepted that until that meter was installed. I could be wrong. I'm just saying, I can change --

MR. CAMPBELL: I don't believe it was that way. I believe we said we would compare and see the difference, you know. That's how I remembered it. So -- I don't know, does Chris or you gentlemen rather, we were all part of that loop.

MR. KOGELNIK: That was well-documented. That should be easy to find in the minutes.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: In the minutes, yes.

MR. KOGELNIK: I do remember the idea to go back and look at flow rates after the meter was installed. I do remember that. So I'm not gonna speak any further about it because it's written down.

MR. CAMPBELL: I remember it the way Tom remembers it. We have it in the minutes, and we'll go by whatever is stated in there. So back for the billing, what do you need from us to make a clean point, say after this billing cycle?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Just whatever you want. Tell me what you want and, I mean, I can -- I can do whatever it is.

MR. CAMPBELL: We've already started into that next billing cycle already, correct? I mean, because they've already been billed up through --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That bill is current. They have it right now. It's not been paid.

MR. COWIE: No, it hasn't. It's not due yet either.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That's correct. It's a current bill.

MR. COWIE: That's why I'm here to discuss to since we found that there's -- there was a communication thing. We're good on -- I mean, if we gotta pay that bill based on the formula this time and then you guys are gonna guarantee us that we're gonna go back and look at that and establish what may or may not -- how we're gonna --

MR. CAMPBELL: I'll tell you what. Since this is in

question, going back part until we look at the minutes, I'm gonna make a motion we go back fix this bill right now, it's done, there's no question. Whatever is with the other stuff, at least you have that part, it's not screwed up with if there's some issue with the past.

MR. COWIE: Are you saying to pay the bill based on the formula what we have now?

MR. CAMPBELL: No. What I'm saying, we'll tell Cindy to correct this billing for the master meter. That will be our line in the sand. And then you'll pay whatever that amount is, and then we'll go back and look from that point.

MR. SULLIVAN: If the minutes tell us to do that.

MR. CAMPBELL: Correct. That way at least that part's clean, and we look under minutes and know where we're at with it and we make a decision.

MR. COWIE: So it will be based on the numbers from the last cycle?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: To be clear, we're taking the new master meter for sanitary sewer and we're deducting the residential charges, the consumption from the residential units, and the difference we bill Imperial?

MR. COWIE: It's master to master the contract says.

MR. CAMPBELL: I believe the contract is master to master. I think there was three master water meters, and then the master sewer meter I believe is how the agreement --

MR. COWIE: Yep, that's how it reads.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's what I thought.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That's a greater difference. Just before we start playing with these, because I don't want to adjust this bill again --

MR. KOGELNIK: Double-check. Double-check.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I have the figures.

MR. CAMPBELL: Whatever is in the agreement is what we need to honor.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It says "The BPA will aggregate bulk water meter readings entering Imperial and subtract the volume from the bulk sewer readings at the master meter and assess the balance to Imperial".

MR. CAMPBELL: So it doesn't state the exact water side of it.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: "The BPA will also aggregate all bulk water meter readings entering Imperial and subtract that volume from the bulk sewer readings" -- bulk sewer readings -- "at the master meter and assess the balance to Imperial".

MR. CAMPBELL: It said the bulk water entering Imperial. It didn't say master meters, it said bulk water entering.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: The BPA will also aggregate all bulk water meter readings entering Imperial and subtract that from the bulk water at the master meter and assess the balance to Imperial.

MR. CAMPBELL: I would read it as we're checking the bulk master water meters. That's how I understand that.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Okay. Okay.

MR. COWIE: That was our understanding, master to master.

MR. CAMPBELL: It doesn't say master. But when it says water entering, in my mind I'm locking it in.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It's bulk meter.

MR. COWIE: Bulk would be -- we're using two different

terms. But the bulk would be the master meters each.

MR. KOGELNIK: Yeah, I agree. You're cleaning up the terminology right now, but it's pretty clear that's the intent after she reread that.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. So yes, it would be the bulk waters versus the sewer master meter. I think it's the most accurate way to do it anyway.

MR. SULLIVAN: Are you good with that, Cindy?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I just want to be consistent, that's all. I don't want to change it three months from now.

MR. CAMPBELL: And that's another reason we didn't want to start adjusting the bill. We did it that way, and I gotta fix that one bill that way and this bill that way and it gets confusing.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: The way I have it set up in the software -- because when I looked at the account earlier today -- Tom called me Friday and gave me heads-up. So I looked at the account, and all I'll have to do is change the meter that's associated with the service on the account.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: So it should auto-bill.

MR. CAMPBELL: And you can correct that one and get it to them?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Absolutely. Again, for me to post the bills to the account to accept one payment on there I have to bill everybody and close that billing. And once I do, the only way for me to do that is a manual adjustment, which I can do. But I had to put a bill in there and post it, and I did not have permission to bill otherwise.

MR. CAMPBELL: No, no. And it was just a confusing aspect from all sides, so -- any more questions before I make a motion, or do you got something else?

MR. COWIE: Well, probably just with Darren on some numbers there, and I guess before you make the motion on that. We've been following those readings, and within the last three weeks the thing has jumped from say a positive 4 to 10 to a 54 which -- without any explanation as to why it's jumped that much. Now in the past when we had heavy rains in July and over Labor Day it reflected those numbers, you know; and we're not in disagreement with when it rained like that we showed the positive numbers.

MR. CAMPBELL: Increase.

MR. COWIE: But there hasn't been that, you know, in the last three weeks. And we're just wondering if anybody is looking down there to see if, you know --

MR. BIGGS: We did see that, Tom, and I haven't had time. I did ask Vinny about it.

MR. COWIE: Yeah, I spoke with him a little bit too.

MR. BIGGS: And yes, it has been checked. Like I wanted to make sure hopefully every week someone is looking down in there because we gotta read that every single week. And I know it was checked yesterday because we did notice these numbers too. So we went over to find out if there was an issue, didn't see anything. So we just started, we don't have anything concrete yet to say why that happened.

MR. COWIE: Okay. Because I know there could be other glitches, not just necessarily the head or the reading down there or a blockage of something. But I mean, that's just -- that's a pretty

huge jump.

MR. BIGGS: That's why we went to the office, to make sure that was fine, because we did notice that.

MR. CAMPBELL: Chris, do you have something to add?

MR. KOGELNIK: Yes. What were the numbers you were referring to?

MR. COWIE: Right here.

MR. KOGELNIK: What is that, inches.

MR. COWIE: No, those are -- I would say they were gallons. I mean, that number between --

MR. SULLIVAN: So we need a motion billing the master meter as of what date?

MR. CAMPBELL: To correct the current billing.

MR. COWIE: And waste water bounced against each other.

MR. KOGELNIK: But the numbers you're showing me you were referring to were reflective of increases in the water consumption.

MR. COWIE: No increase in the waste water output.

MR. KOGELNIK: Measured at the meter pit.

MR. COWIE: I don't believe that's inches, I believe it's probably --

MR. KOGELNIK: I would clarify what those numbers are because if we have to go back to understanding what those numbers are, we'll have no bearing. You need to state what those numbers are for.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well Darren has that, right?

MR. BIGGS: Chris, this is something that we have to do for them and that they look into. This is -- these are our numbers. These are all in gallons. These are the three master meters that go in there, and then we started the meter manhole number three. And we just put in the differences, we keep track of that just for such a case like this. So these are all ours --

MR. KOGELNIK: All right. So the right-hand column of numbers that he was referring to were indeed gallons.

MR. BIGGS: Right. Should be basically a difference in there. There would be a remainder of what is left over that didn't get billed to put it simple.

MR. KOGELNIK: Because there was no -- there was no units given when he mentioned that, and I was thinking it was a surcharge of inches inside the waste water meter.

MR. BIGGS: No. Imperial has nothing on that. Everything is gallons that we read, and so that's -- everything in here is gonna equate to gallons.

MR. KOGELNIK: Okay. Sorry.

MR. COWIE: And I'm just bringing it to Darren's attention here that that's a pretty huge jump for without a good explanation, like I said. In the past when we see increases like that it was justified by two or three inches of rain, you know. And we just haven't had that in these last three weeks, so we're just asking him, you know, to check into it or see what -- you know, if there's an explanation.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. Well then, I'm gonna go ahead and make a motion that we correct the current billing and start billing according to the contract for Imperial waste water.

MR. DIETZ: I'll second it.

MR. CAMPBELL: All in favor?

(All respond aye.)

MR. CAMPBELL: All opposed?

(No response.)

MR. CAMPBELL: All right. So that will fix this one. She'll issue a new bill, and then we'll have to have a meeting and we'll sit and look at figures and see what we want to do, compare and move forward with. Does that sound appropriate by everybody?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I'll try to have that to you tomorrow. No promises.

MR. CAMPBELL: The bill she means. The billing.

MR. COWIE: Right. I mean, if that's doable. I mean --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It is.

MR. COWIE: I just want to make sure what we have to pay.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It takes a little bit of time, and as long as I get a few minutes. I think the accounts are already set up. I just to have change the meter. Now it's not gonna present on a bill because the bill's already printed and I can't change what was printed. I can adjust the dollar amount based on the readings, and that's what your account will show is due. But our next bill it will present properly from there out.

MR. COWIE: But you'll give us something that shows --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I'll show you the calculation. Just like I did with the formula from CT, I'll show you what I had for the readings, the difference, and break it down step-by-step.

MR. COWIE: Good.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. Now you mentioned there was another topic.

MR. COWIE: Yeah, we -- just with our water bill. This time we're showing an overage of 309,000 gallons above every other account that we have.

MR. CAMPBELL: So between the total of the individuals to the three masters?

MR. COWIE: And I've been tracking that for almost five years now, and that number's gone from anywhere from 100,000 up to 300, 250 -- 300,000 down to 168,000, now it's back up to 300,000. I mean -- and I mean, we've been a number of times here --

MR. CAMPBELL: Trying to figure out a way to correlate that.

MR. COWIE: With these new meters that you're putting in, can they be matched up gallon to gallon? Because I mean --

MR. CAMPBELL: That's a question for Darren.

MR. BIGGS: What do you mean gallon to gallon?

MR. COWIE: The master meters are all based on a gallon. And the individual meters on the homes, the new ones, can they be --

MR. BIGGS: They're in gallons.

MR. COWIE: They're in gallons, but we're charging in thousands. And one of our thoughts are sync in now. We can't read that two different ways.

MR. BIGGS: I don't know what to do with Imperial anyway. I mean, we do so much now with master meters and every individual one and all that stuff. I don't know where we should begin or end with that stuff, you know what I mean. I'm at a total loss. We keep adding meters, we keep adding waste meters. And I don't know whether this is -- I don't know what the answer is.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: If they program them to read each individual meter and you have a combination of different styles of meters within the parks -- like an old pulse meter would only pulse at 100 gallons or some meters pulse at one gallon. If they change

that in the software, my software is programmed to bill at 1,000 gallons and it's looking for that unit. So if you start changing those units I can't bill, and I cannot adjust 280 accounts manually every month.

MR. COWIE: If it's not doable, that's acceptable. But the reason I'm bringing this up again, there's a huge amount of water that's not accounted for every billing cycle.

MR. KOGELNIK: We talked about that too when Bruce was here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh yeah, several times.

MR. COWIE: We talked about a roll-over because of that number difference.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, we can never get -- it would be nice if it was relatively consistent, if you can pick a number.

MR. COWIE: After five years -- see, it started out at 100-some thousand, it goes up to 200, 300, then it starts going down again and gets down into the hundreds of thousands again, now it's starting to creep back up. That's over a four-and-a-half, five year period I tracked that. We paid \$25,000 in extra water above what all our other accounts are in the last four to five years. That's \$5,000 a year in extra water that we can't show where it's going or -- it's just -- it frustrating on our end to have to pay that and we can't say where it's going.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah, and we don't know how to quantify a fair way to handle that. CT has worked -- it's a double meter issue.

MR. KOGELNIK: It's a function of the multiple master meters that you have and then the aggregate individual meters. You're not gonna get around that until you eliminate or simplify the master metering. If that -- like we said many times in prior meetings, there should be one master meter. But it's just not arranged that way on the site. It could be. It's just gonna take a lot of work to do that. And until then, you will always have that conundrum.

MR. COWIE: For it's -- it's not really a fair thing to have to -- if we can't justify where that water is going to have to continue to pay for it.

MR. KOGELNIK: If that's the agreement, that's how it's set up, then there's nothing that can be discussed there until it's simplified.

MR. CAMPBELL: I guess the other option we always kicked up is we just bill you off the master meters and you bill all your individual residents. That's how other places handle that stuff.

MR. KOGELNIK: That's exactly how most --

MR. BIGGS: That would be great.

MR. CAMPBELL: Then you're happy.

MR. BIGGS: Think how much it's costing us to have all these meters and running over there, that's costing us crazy. I'll gladly switch the \$5,000.

MR. KOGELNIK: But seriously, that is how these trailer courts and parks normally are metered. I've never been in a situation like this before where you look at the master meters but you bill off the individuals. It's --

MR. BIGGS: On a private line.

MR. KOGELNIK: It adds some question.

MR. CAMPBELL: I guess that's where we're at with that conundrum. If that's something you guys want to discuss, you might want to consider considering that's a solution.

MR. SULLIVAN: And that's where the park wanted it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Back on -- at the time, to their defense, when the Village was looking and starting a water system, that was another avenue we could gain revenue was to bill individually off of that and they didn't have to worry about --

MR. KOGELNIK: One point, there's no action from this but you might want to look into it. The more meters you have with anything, the more probability of error you're gonna have. So if you have one master meter, and typically the larger size meters are more accurate, you may -- that might be your best bet. Despite your reluctance right now, you might want to look into it.

MR. COWIE: Well, the master meters aren't ours.

MR. KOGELNIK: Okay, that's fine. They would be the Village's. But I hear what you're --

MR. CAMPBELL: I thought we did look at making one master meter out of the three, but the way it was plumbed it wasn't real feasible.

MR. KOGELNIK: It wasn't practical.

MR. CAMPBELL: There was an issue with doing it.

MR. KOGELNIK: I really do think that someday we should revisit that because if this is gonna present a labor issue for, you know, managing all those meters, looking at all the differences between the aggregate meters and the bulk meters, I really do think you should look at it. My opinion. It just sounds like a headache.

MR. CAMPBELL: It is from both sides.

MR. BIGGS: I mentioned before I would love to try to discuss with, you know, Imperial and --

MR. KOGELNIK: You have it simplified on the waste water right now.

MR. BIGGS: What we can do.

MR. CAMPBELL: I guess the hardest question on you guys is do you want to take on the billing, how you want to handle the water situation within your park then. So I guess it's food for thought. Any other topics on that? I know we got a lot of stuff to get through on our agenda yet.

MR. COWIE: That's pretty much all I have.

MR. CAMPBELL: If you want to stick around, you're welcome. But if you want to head out, we're gonna be a little while.

4. Lordstown Village Plaza Bill

MR. CAMPBELL: Next item we're gonna dive into, the Lordstown Village Plaza bill with Rocky. I think --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: You have a copy attached to your packet, an account statement. You asked me to provide this to you a couple weeks ago and I sent that to you via e-mail.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes. Now this issue began when the water for the laundromat was -- when the laundromat left that plaza. And that is where -- correct me if I'm speaking wrong -- at one point here that unit is where the tap was tied in which was 2-inch I believe at the time.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: The meter in the laundromat was a larger meter as well.

MR. CAMPBELL: It was a larger meter because of the water they use, so it had a higher minimum bill. Rather than \$9, I think it was like \$45. Is that correct?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Uh-huh.

MR. CAMPBELL: And Rocky at the plaza had all the units in his mind.

(A discussion is had off the record.)

MR. CAMPBELL: So in his mind he's been paying the \$9 because he viewed every unit as being a minimum bill of \$9 for every account that was in the plaza. So he continued to pay \$9 versus the \$45 on those accounts -- on that account. And that just kept building up over time. There was no water usage that I saw on that bill. Is this a correct statement also?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I don't believe so. I didn't -- I did not look at that, but I'm gonna say no.

MR. CAMPBELL: I looked through what I could see, there was no water usage on that. What ended up happening overtime when he's only paying 9 of 45, there was a growing difference with penalties and the billing difference. So that's what kept growing on that aspect. Now at one point what, a year, a year-and-a-half ago or two years ago we switched how we were billing our accounts. Remember when we adjusted our account minimums and switched how things were billed from our whole account system. At that point it switched for them also, and at that point he has been paying this correctly and is current with that current billing structure on accounts. Is that a true statement?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That is. In addition, he changed the meter size on the account also.

MR. CAMPBELL: Also, okay. So at this point in time -- I know it's a little confusing, you guys kind of up to where we're at with that? So at this point in time he's been paying accurately to what our current account system is, and there was an oddity with the way it was because of the way that unit was, the meter that was in it compared to the rest of the units. And with us unable to shut off or do anything with the whole plaza because there was only the one line going to it, we ended up just sitting on this until either we were hoping someone was gonna come and rent that unit and we would address it then; and it's still a vacant unit unfortunately. At this point Rocky contacted me a couple months ago, wanting to try to clean up stuff because he realizes he's been keeping up to where things are currently and wanted to clean up that back bill issue. So he was asking the Board to waive these back fees and charges from the old system and then make it a clean slate to move forward. That's his request to the Board. So I said okay. I apologized for a couple times that we didn't get to it on our agenda because we've been having so many meetings and so many things going on in this Village lately, which is great for the growth; but unfortunately we've had to put him on the list to get this worked out. And I said well, this meeting should work out to at least we can look at it, get an answer back to you and move forward. So --

MR. SULLIVAN: The question I have on that is we're billing him like it's a single unit?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It is. Each unit has a meter.

MR. SULLIVAN: But actually it's two separate --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: No, it is billed --

MR. SULLIVAN: I mean, I understand when it was a laundromat we're only running the one line into it.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: And that account was established as a certain size, and that generated a \$45 bill. Because of that issue, that made you review and restructure your bill structure. And when

he reduced his meter size his current bill, if he would be billed according to the current rate structure that you kind of modified for that purpose, he would have been paying \$39 a month. So if I understood Kevin correct, he's asking for us to write off the full amount of the back bill.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's what he's asking, yes.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Your correction was from \$45 to \$39, so I'm not prepared --

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah, 45 for the old system to the new system.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: The new system charges would be \$39 a month. So what I did was take that rate and go back to where he took ownership of the account and calculated it at \$39 all the way through instead of, but I did not calculate zero.

MR. SULLIVAN: That sounds right.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Because at no point it was nine.

MR. CAMPBELL: At the point he switched the meters.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: At the point he switched the meters the bill was much greater. It was \$189 a month according to the new billing system. So I told him if he changed the metering size, got it down, that reduces his bill. So he did buy the meter and reduce it down or else his monthly bill was \$189.

MR. CAMPBELL: So it is definitely a confusing matter, that's for sure. And going on, it has not gotten better. So at this point that's I guess the good thing --

MR. SULLIVAN: Cindy's saying -- you're saying we should be billing now with the new at \$39?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I am billing at \$39, yes. That is the new rate for that unit.

MR. CAMPBELL: And he's been paying that?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Previous.

MR. SULLIVAN: So what we would want to do is go back to the past bills and redo that to \$39?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That's what I did. That's what I thought.

MR. SULLIVAN: We agreed to.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: There was no agreement. I thought that's what we would do is go back and say okay, the new rate is -- you were -- if he thought that that was unfair or high at \$45 you corrected it, you changed the rules, and now it's currently billed at \$39. So he would be saving \$6 a quarter on his billing is what I did. He had 29 bills; and if we billed him the same as we do today, we would have billed that from the onset instead of \$45 and his total charges would have been \$1,131. He paid \$585.80 out of there. Four times he paid late. So based on the old charge and the now charge, it's a little bit of a different couple dollar difference. But according to what I say, his account balance is \$947.05. To where now if you reduce it down to that \$39, it would be \$545.20 plus either \$15.60 in the late fees for the times that he was late or \$18. It's a \$2.40 difference. But the balance due I have would drop it about \$400. And that's billing him at the \$39 quarterly payment.

MR. CAMPBELL: That makes sense in my mind. And I understand from his side, as he viewed this originally, that it was only a \$9 minimum just like the other units were charged. He could never understand why that unit was supposed to be more. I don't know why.

MR. SULLIVAN: Because it had a larger --

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, that is correct.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It was all the way around.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm just saying from his side of it that's why he only paid the \$9. He viewed every unit should be the exact same, and we're saying that unit has a larger meter. So when he finally adjusted that, you know, then and our now account system, you know. He has been -- and I'm thankful for that, he's been wanting to clean that up, he's been current with his billing structure, that's all great. And I definitely want to get this off our books to have it cleaned up. So that's why he's asking for a complete waiver of it. Cindy expressed a better alignment from where it is now to where it was, and us as a Board have to make a decision what we want to do. Do you have any questions down there, Tom?

MR. DIETZ: I vote no.

MR. CAMPBELL: I know, but we haven't -- no on what do we want to do? We have to decide what we're gonna do first. I'm saying we have a couple options.

MR. SULLIVAN: I'm saying what Cindy already did.

MR. CAMPBELL: She didn't do that yet. She's saying this is how she --

MR. SULLIVAN: How she explained.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: My thought process.

MR. CAMPBELL: Her thought process in aligning it for what we currently do to what it was, which is a significant reduction of his bill and cleans things up.

MR. SULLIVAN: But what -- he doesn't get the two, I have the one-inch.

MR. CAMPBELL: What he doesn't understand -- and that's why he paid the \$9 versus \$45. I'm thankful he paid something, which was good. But you know, there's always a difference that he saw in his mind that's how it was. I can't speak to that, I'm just expressing how he understood it. And us as a Board have to make a decision to align it to what Cindy said, stick to the full bill or waive it. I guess that's the three options we have before it.

MR. SULLIVAN: I think we should stay to what Cindy has done. I think that's the correct --

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, I think that's a way to look at it. I think that's a fair aspect to look at it.

MR. SULLIVAN: I mean, if anybody else has the 2-inch we would be charging them at that time 45, now 39.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: We did. And that's why I did what I did. I just thought okay, when we corrected the scenario for the tap and went to the meter sizing that applied. I got that one bill and I told him hey, if you change the meter -- and he did within the billing period, he changed the meter to reduce that bill to the \$39 bill and --

MR. CAMPBELL: And has been paying it since then.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yes. And that's why I gave you a full account statement so you could see.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well how about, would you gentlemen consider -- I mean, it's not a lot in the late fees. We would waive those and just keep it at the \$545. There was no water used on it, which is a good --

MR. SULLIVAN: Late fees are only 18 bucks.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's what she said it was, either \$15,

\$16. It's under \$20. So to my mind, that's something else we could help toward the cause that helps clean it up. I guess that's my two cents.

MR. DIETZ: Now where are you coming up with that.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: \$545?

MR. DIETZ: Yes.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That calculation is he had 29 bills in that to date. If he was billed \$39 for each one of those bills, the total would be \$1,131. On his account his payments totaled \$585.80. The difference is \$545.20.

MR. CAMPBELL: Which you don't have those figures, that's just something she's expressing.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: If you look at the end of his thing, his account balance is actually \$947.05, so that would reduce his account balance by almost \$402.

MR. SULLIVAN: So say four -- 420?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Well, I don't want to go with what we're reducing, I want to go with what you want charged. The balance due at \$39 would be \$545.20.

MR. CAMPBELL: What do you guys think? Are you guys comfortable with that?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: So I'll make a motion that we bill off of the \$39 across those billing periods and also waive the late fees on those, and it should bring the total to the current balance to \$545.20; is that correct?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That is correct.

MR. CAMPBELL: All right. Gentlemen, any second on that?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah I'll second it.

MR. CAMPBELL: All in favor?

(Mr. Campbell and Mr. Sullivan respond aye.)

MR. DIETZ: Nay.

MR. CAMPBELL: You're aye for good or aye for opposed?

MR. DIETZ: Just because his account --

MR. CAMPBELL: You oppose? You oppose. Let's not get into that. It still passes with a majority, so that's --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I want to work on Imperial's first. That bill is not actually in the current billing cycle.

MR. CAMPBELL: And if you could put a little description with it as to what we --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Absolutely, I'll do a cover letter.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Utility Billing Rate Review

MR. CAMPBELL: Old Business, Utility Billing Rate Review. This is on the waste water, utility billing rate review. Is that something we can take off because we're doing a rate study? I'm trying to remember why we have utility billing rate review. What did that cover?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: The water rates.

MR. SULLIVAN: That's all part of the --

MR. CAMPBELL: Rate study.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: So I can remove that from the agenda? Chris will just cover it under his report.

2. Lordstown Motors Draft Agreement with the City of Warren

MR. CAMPBELL: Number 2, Lordstown Motors Draft agreement with the City of Warren. That's still on here because we still need to get some kind of an agreement with Warren for Lordstown Motors.

MR. SULLIVAN: Have they ever contacted you?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: No.

MR. CAMPBELL: The most we got out of them was an agreement with some figures. We did get that.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yeah. And in June I did e-mail I think it was Valerie and asked -- because the Mayor had indicated that they were considering a bulk water agreement with us, and I don't believe I received any response whatsoever. I didn't go back and refresh anything before tonight's, meeting but I have had no -- no communications with them in regards to that.

MR. CAMPBELL: I know that the Mayor's expressed from communications with them that they were entertaining more than they were before the option of bulk rate with us. So I think while the iron's hot it might be our best time to -- like we did with Niles -- pursue and push something in that direction and see if we can get something.

MR. KOGELNIK: I agree.

MR. CAMPBELL: Get something locked in and run.

MR. KOGELNIK: You're not gonna have a better time.

MR. CAMPBELL: I don't know how to -- I know that they never liked the correlation between if one went up the other -- they couldn't raise without the other. I'm not sure how to make that work even if it's an option. Maybe we just keep them clean and separate.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That died with General Motors.

MR. CAMPBELL: But what I'm saying with us to live with two rate structures, it would be nice to have, from the billing side, something that kept them in line. I mean, does that make sense? It might be very difficult and impossible to do, but --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Well no, because in the software I can separate the customers by districts, Warren district, Niles district. So that's one of the basis of the --

MR. CAMPBELL: So you could have one --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I can split it out and say --

MR. CAMPBELL: So we could deal with it if they were two different rates?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Truthfully, the flat rate is so much easier than to figure how much did I sell. You can't do that at end of the year.

MR. CAMPBELL: If we have a flat rate from them we could fix a lot of problems.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It doesn't matter what day, what month; in the next 365 days this is what we bought and this is what we paid for it, period.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'll ping the Mayor and see if we can poke that little even engine along.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Just to be clear, the Lordstown Motors and Old Dominion, Warren did say that they would -- I should say with Lordstown Motors that they would honor that understanding for one year.

MR. CAMPBELL: Correct, we had the year on that.

MR. SULLIVAN: One year.

MR. CAMPBELL: Which we're burning through faster than you think.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: But we didn't get that letter until May or June or July. So there is some time.

MR. CAMPBELL: Look how long it took us to get the Niles bulk water so --

MR. KOGELNIK: Yeah, you couldn't be in a better time frame right now because Old Dominion won't start up until February of next year and Lordstown Motors really hasn't taken off in terms of production. So use that time.

MR. SULLIVAN: When are they supposed to go into production?

MR. KOGELNIK: I don't know; but no, haven't yet. So now is the opportunistic time, and you can use it to negotiate with Warren.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yep, all right. I like it a lot.

3. ODFL Draft Agreement with the City of Warren

: Speaking of that, next item is Old Dominion Freightliner Draft Agreement with the City of Warren. So obviously --

MR. SULLIVAN: One in the same really.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, exactly.

4. Gresham Smith - Battery Plant

: Number 4, the battery plant. What do we have updates on that?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: You do. Also in your handouts you'll see a draft of an agreement that was submitted from Trumbull County Sanitary legal department. Did I give it to you or do I have it? Here, I have it. I'm sorry. This just came in yesterday at 3:30, so I already had your --

MR. CAMPBELL: Packets made.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It seems pretty straight forward from the one you had last week on the 11th. However, if you look at I think page four or page five, the only thing that I can see that does not work with our system -- it's on page four, it says at the top Paragraph "I" that the Lordstown --

MR. CAMPBELL: Do you need a copy this that, Chris?

MR. KOGELNIK: I'd like one.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: There's a lot of different colors, but Ultium did this last review and mark-up. However, it says Ultium shall pay the Village's invoices within 30 days of receipt. Our software's set up for 15. So I don't -- that's not something -- either we change everybody's --

MR. CAMPBELL: No.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Or we keep this at 15. I didn't want to answer back without your consent.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm saying keep it with 15. Do you gentlemen agree?

MR. SULLIVAN: Here.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: On page four.

MR. CAMPBELL: I, 4(I).

MS. SLUSARCZYK: In red. The difference also is our sewer penalty is 5 percent, and Trumbull County's sewer penalty is 10 percent. It creates a conflict if they do pay late.

MR. CAMPBELL: Because then we're gonna get charged 10

percent.

MR. SULLIVAN: We should make ours 10 percent then.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Then you have to change it for all.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's what her point is. It wasn't in line considering else that we have.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: And you can change that. But it's one thing throughout the system. And I'm not changing the system until you're good and you have looked -- there's a lot of things you have to happen. You have to go back to your rate sheets and do that. But it can be done, it's just that you're gonna --

MR. CAMPBELL: We would do a 10 percent across the board on our system.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: On your customers, on your east side customers. It could not be for one account.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's what she's trying to say. Was that under us or more Council because it's the sewer?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Well, Council will ultimately, I'm sure, enter into that agreement. I didn't look to see. But they can't enter into something that doesn't work for you, that's why you have to --

MR. CAMPBELL: Correct, we have to agree to it.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: And that's a programming rate.

MR. CAMPBELL: What do you guys feel? Did you want to just leave that and take the risk that if they don't pay then we'll get charged 10 percent and can only recoup 5 percent of that? That's the risk. Or we align our system to align with theirs because they are not gonna change their side of it, we know that one.

MR. DIETZ: Align with them.

MR. SULLIVAN: Huh?

MR. DIETZ: Go up to the 10 percent. We gotta give some, they gotta give some.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, they ain't giving anything. They set the mark.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: We can ask. But in here it actually says the County's standard 10 percent penalty was just struck, so it doesn't have to be dealt with. But if this is between the County, Lordstown and Ultium I think it needs to be clear right now.

MR. CAMPBELL: I agree.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: If you're willing to do that, you know, that's your choice. But just -- and not that I ran any calculations, but when you bill Ultium the County's rate is at \$6.66; so your penalty would be 66 cents, you know or not even. Yeah, 10 percent, so 66 cents. But your bill will be -- it has a 60 cent adder to that, bill at \$7.76. So you will be doing like 73 cents -- no, not even because it's half. So you do have like a 35 cent -- you know, there's a 30-some cent difference there. We'll bill higher, they'll pay five percent on top of the rate of \$7.26, but we'll be responsible for paying the 10 percent penalty.

MR. SULLIVAN: So I thought that there was still some negotiations on that \$6.66. Apparently not.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: This is -- I'm gonna say no because if this gets signed it's done, and it very clearly has it stated on there right on page -- Section 2(A), the Village service charge not more than 60 cents unless, and they added not more than. I would like to see that struck too.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MR. KOGELNIK: Yes. That's not --

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, I agree with that.

MR. KOGELNIK: That can be zero.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It says sewer service 60 cents a thousand gallons. I mean, it is what it is. I say strike it and reply back with it being struck, and we know where to go from there.

MR. KOGELNIK: Right, just to make ourselves clear.

MR. CAMPBELL: I agree.

MR. KOGELNIK: The Village is not intending to ever go below 60 cents per thousand.

MR. DIETZ: Now you're talking on page 4?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Or should I just strike "more" and add "less"?

MR. DIETZ: Yeah, I found it.

MR. KOGELNIK: Is this a Bud Light commercial?

MR. CAMPBELL: Just trying that outline of their --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Just strike the change.

MR. CAMPBELL: So what do you gentlemen want to do with the penalties?

MR. SULLIVAN: So Ultium then has agreed to pay the \$6.66 plus the 60?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Well, if this agreement gets signed -- this is one of many drafts -- but Ultium will be signing it. It's the understanding between the three parties.

MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I definitely think we need to strike the "not more than".

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Okay. I have that marked. And I did the 30 days to 15.

MR. CAMPBELL: Only thing left is 10 percent or 5 percent penalty.

MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah.

MR. CAMPBELL: Like I say, either we adjust all our stuff to do 10 percent, or we leave it at 5 percent and run the risk that when we don't get paid and they charge us 10 percent we can only recoup 5 percent of it back.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I would never do that. I would change ours or get the County to move to 5.

MR. CAMPBELL: The chance of them moving to 5 is pretty remote.

MR. SULLIVAN: Well, but this is an agreement with Ultium.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: And the County.

MR. SULLIVAN: And the County.

MR. CAMPBELL: And us.

MR. SULLIVAN: So why would we have to adjust residential to --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Because your computer -- when I put in sewer penalty, it's one figure. I can't say Mike pays 10 and Kevin pays 5. You can't do that. It has to be the same. It's not by account, it's by a service. And the service -- the sanitary sewer service penalty is you put in the percentage and it's in the program.

MR. CAMPBELL: And the penalty doesn't affect somebody unless they are late. I mean, just pointing out the fact, it's not like we're increasing --

MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I understand that. But you know, I would hope that the industry helps the residential, not hurts them.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Uh-huh.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, what would you like to have done? Would you like to reply back and ask Trumbull to change to 5 percent and see what happens?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah.

MR. CAMPBELL: I guess we could try. Wish in one hand. We can ask. What else did you have?

MR. SULLIVAN: And I would guess that they're not gonna have a problem with Ultium paying their bill.

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh, yeah. I mean, the assumption is we're not gonna have -- usually you have problems with an account when you first get started and you are trying to get stuff worked out and when you're closing it.

MR. SULLIVAN: Once they get up and rolling. So really the only ones it would affect then is the residential. The ones who happen to be late or --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: If, yeah.

MR. CAMPBELL: If they're late, yeah. Okay. What else did you have on that?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That's all I have. But please, again

--

MR. CAMPBELL: Read through it.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Because if there's something you want changed, now is the time. It came in to me yesterday at 3:22, so I attached it to your packet -- or didn't attach to your packets. I just want to make sure that we went over it today.

MR. CAMPBELL: Very good. Thank you, Cindy. Anything else on the battery plant at this point?

MR. SULLIVAN: No.

MR. CAMPBELL: Chris? No?

MR. KOGELNIK: Not on the battery plant itself. But on your agenda there's no mention with the water distribution system unless you're determining that these are one in the same, you know, the improvement to the water distribution system to serve Ultium.

MR. CAMPBELL: The Master Water Model Plan, that's the next thing. That's where I classified it.

MR. KOGELNIK: All right, got it. We're there. Okay.

MR. SULLIVAN: So in this plan we don't have any maintenance?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: We do. We'll maintain the connector from Ultium to the Trumbull County interceptor, 1,700 feet approximately.

MR. KOGELNIK: Yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's about what it is. A little chunk of it.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I did want to say there was discussion in the e-mail. If I did not forward you the e-mail, I will do that in the morning. The term or length of the agreement is a real stickler between the parties. So read that and please comment on that if you have --

MR. CAMPBELL: Because they wanted a five year. I remember reading it.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It went from 25 to 5.

MR. CAMPBELL: I thought that was really short for this

big of an agreement. Five years is short.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That's also discussed. It's on top of page five. So --

MR. CAMPBELL: Where is it at right now? Is it still stuck at 5?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: This was written to 5. "The initial term of this agreement shall be for five years starting from the effective date, provided Ultium shall be entitled to terminate this agreement upon delivering a written notice of termination to other parties hereto at least 90 days prior to such termination."

MR. KOGELNIK: Who selected five years?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That, I believe, was Ultium. That's Ultium's markup.

MR. SULLIVAN: Apparently we had it at 25.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's a typical thing; 25, 30 years for this type of agreement is pretty typical. It even had 10 at one point, now it's 5. I was uncomfortable at 10, now I'm fighting to get it back. I would definitely like to see no less than 10. I really, really -- I will reply in the e-mail with that. If we make the suggestion that's -- what do you gentlemen feel?

MR. SULLIVAN: I think we should shoot back to 25.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's a big shot.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: This agreement also dictates that they are Trumbull County's customer. So if in 5 years or 10 years they have a choice --

MR. KOGELNIK: Yeah.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: -- you just eliminated their choice by going with 25. And that's just putting it out there. If this is a choice.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's a valid point.

MR. KOGELNIK: You know, you may want to keep it at 5 because --

MR. CAMPBELL: Look how much stuff has changed in 5 years already.

MR. KOGELNIK: You have a lot to think about in the realm of rates for water and for sewer. So something might -- you might want to take an opportunistic time to change something, you know, for your rate on sewer in 5 years.

MR. CAMPBELL: I guess on the flip side of that, 5 years from now we don't have anything as an option and now we're stuck to fighting for another agreement so --

MR. KOGELNIK: Yeah.

MR. CAMPBELL: Who knows.

MR. KOGELNIK: You're covered because you're just gonna make 60 cents per thousand on whatever the rate is.

MR. CAMPBELL: Until this agreement's done.

MR. KOGELNIK: Like Kevin was saying -- I'm talking myself into it right now -- if you don't have any skin in the game, make it 25 years. So that's how --

MR. CAMPBELL: I wonder why Ultium wanted it so short. Do they know something we don't know, planning something we don't know?

MR. KOGELNIK: Yeah, that's an interesting question in itself. But I think I just talked myself into why I want it to be longer.

MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I definitely want it to be longer.

MR. CAMPBELL: So what do you want to push back for,

what's our recommendation back?

MR. SULLIVAN: If you're not comfortable with the 25, we'll go with 15.

MR. CAMPBELL: What do you think, Tom?

MR. DIETZ: Yeah, I don't trust any of them.

MR. KOGELNIK: Plus your useful life on the sanitary sewers is construed to be approximately 50 years. So you're gonna have -- you should have minimal maintenance.

MR. DIETZ: Depends on what they stick down it too.

MR. KOGELNIK: You need to make a decision.

MR. CAMPBELL: If we push back at 15 and they come back to 10, at least we gave up -- gained 5. If we push back to 15 and they say we'll go back to 10, at least we're getting 5 years out of it. I don't know. Yeah, I'm saying 15. Push back for 15. All right. Motion or just put it in there?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: No, you tell me -- again, it's a draft. I just don't want to markup something without --

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah, we're good with it.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: So the Board agrees to a 15 year term?

MR. SULLIVAN: Do you agree with that, Tom?

MR. DIETZ: Yes. That's locked in?

MR. KOGELNIK: And if they do come back and contend you or something, I would tell them hey, you're building a brand-new sewer, what part of that infrastructure are you --

MR. SULLIVAN: We're not going down -- that gives us an opportunity to go up that much sooner.

MR. KOGELNIK: The useful life on a sanitary sewer by the state's definition is 50 years. We're not gonna make this a year by year thing.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yeah. Five years it's just like our trash contract. It's like are you kidding me, it's up. You can't keep track of all those agreements every 5 years.

MR. KOGELNIK: Tell them their adder is going to go up if they do.

MR. CAMPBELL: Two minute break.

(A discussion is had off the record.)

5. Master Water Model Plan Update

MR. CAMPBELL: We're back. Good deal. Master Water Model Plan Update. Is there anything to update for the system that you want to bring up?

MR. KOGELNIK: Yeah. So we were -- we've completed several portions of the sets of drawings for the individual contracts; and several of those documents have already gone to the Ohio E.P.A. for their review, especially for the water line that's needed to be started up here in construction soon. So that's all I can tell you. And there will be the preliminary designs that are gonna be shared with you before too long that illustrate all that. So as far as I know, the design for that large water distribution system improvement is going well, and that even includes the tank. So several teams going simultaneously. It's -- I don't have anything negative to report right now.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. Any questions?

MR. KOGELNIK: In fact, I think we're a little bit ahead of schedule with respect to starting late.

MR. CAMPBELL: Ahead of schedule when started late. I like that statement.

MR. KOGELNIK: We started late, and we got caught up to the point where I didn't think we would be here at this point in the game right now. So that's going okay.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. Very good, thank you.

MR. KOGELNIK: You're welcome.

6. Utility Department Building

MR. CAMPBELL: Utility Department Building. We're keeping that on. Hopefully that will be plans for what we were just talking about, right?

MR. KOGELNIK: Yeah. We -- right now, you know, we're reserving a spot on the site for that. And Bob McNutt is still working with our Cincinnati architects to concept that area or that building out. Of course, Darren's gonna have to see that throughout the entire concept phase of that.

MR. CAMPBELL: It's gonna be on top of the pump station that they are gonna build at the water towers. Eventually that's the plan, to make that a utility building. Is that a correct statement?

MR. KOGELNIK: I believe so. Not on top of the pumps.

MR. BIGGS: The pump station has to come in first. That has to be second.

MR. CAMPBELL: I thought you were going to take the roof off and put the building on top of the pump station.

MR. BIGGS: You got the two tanks south of where the two tanks are now. Just north of the existing tank we have now, booster station just north of that is actually gonna be the building.

MR. KOGELNIK: So they are gonna be on separate footprints. Got it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Things change all the time.

MR. BIGGS: 1:00 to 3:00 I had a meeting with Bob today, and that's the latest.

MR. CAMPBELL: Do we want to take that item off our agenda if it's kind of under the umbrella of the master water meter? It's just an idea, just something to have off the agenda.

MR. KOGELNIK: You can if you want.

MR. CAMPBELL: You'd already have it on there.

MR. KOGELNIK: But it's a separate work authorization that you gave us, and we do need to show you the concept as that goes on. I wouldn't want to conceal it in the water system.

MR. CAMPBELL: I gotcha. We'll leave it.

MR. SULLIVAN: I'm losing something. Who's paying for it?

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, it's gonna be part of the project. I guess it depends on if we can get grant money or some funds with it, how it's gonna be coming about. That's all yet to be determined, right?

MR. KOGELNIK: It is. Because the \$5,000 work authorization that you guys gave us was to develop a concept to create a cost estimate so you could know who could potentially pay for that. So we don't know the answer to your question just yet. We hope that you're gonna receive that external funding from grant applications that we helped you to apply for.

MR. SULLIVAN: But CT is looking for the grants too?

MR. KOGELNIK: We will after we prepare the concept plan

and cost estimate.

MR. CAMPBELL: All right. Very good.

7. I&I

MR. CAMPBELL: Number 7, I&I. Any --

MR. SULLIVAN: My fault we haven't been able to meet.

MR. KOGELNIK: That's all right, Mike.

MR. SULLIVAN: One day next week.

MR. KOGELNIK: Yeah, I should be able to do that. We'll make it work.

8. Sanitary Sewer Rate Review

MR. CAMPBELL: Sanitary Sewer Rate Review. Is there any -- I guess any topic or discussion? That was --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: No. I think with the water -- or the rate review -- I guess we should clarify, is that water rate review or is that the rate review comprehensively?

MR. KOGELNIK: I thought the proposal was for water.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Water only.

MR. KOGELNIK: Let me talk to Bob about that and see because I'm almost certain it was water.

MR. CAMPBELL: I am too.

MR. KOGELNIK: Yeah.

MR. CAMPBELL: Throw it in there.

MR. KOGELNIK: I don't think that's ready for sewer yet.

MR. CAMPBELL: He's going nuts now, that's for sure.

MR. KOGELNIK: But let me talk to him about that so that we can understand the efficiencies of doing the water side; and then if the Village wants to do sewer later on soon after we wouldn't have to, so to speak, recreate the wheel.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yes.

9. Warren Water

MR. CAMPBELL: All right. Number 9, Warren Water. I guess this is the bulk water topic kind of thing. Is that -- is that why we have it on here, because of the Warren water agreements that we don't have?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Right.

MR. CAMPBELL: So again, I'll ping the Mayor and see if

--

MR. SULLIVAN: I got a note there, Warren water, go to Niles.

10. Personnel

MR. CAMPBELL: All right. Number 10, personnel. What do we have at this point that we can just -- nothing at this point?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I did put a -- Darren had the ad for his full-time employee. I did send a fax over today to get a quote or a cost, which typically is a couple hundred dollars. All he did was update the date and the rates -- the hourly rate.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: But I -- since it's November 17, by the time we get it and it hits the newspaper and we run it for two weeks, I put at end -- if this is good with you -- no resumes will be accepted after three p.m. on December 15. That's advertising and then giving them time for submission.

MR. BIGGS: That's kind of short.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Is it?

MR. CAMPBELL: With the holidays I do think it's kind of short.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It's your -- whatever you like. It's almost one month from today.

MR. BIGGS: But it's not even -- I think that's too short. I don't want to limit ourselves.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: You tell me. It's just a date.

MR. CAMPBELL: If you're gonna push it back you're getting real close to Christmas, then you might go into January.

MR. BIGGS: I'm picking January.

MR. CAMPBELL: Pick a date.

MR. BIGGS: Second week of January.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: We'll do it the first full week of January on Monday.

MR. SULLIVAN: That's fine.

MR. KOGELNIK: It's the 4th, Monday the 4th.

MR. BIGGS: Yeah, that's fine.

MR. CAMPBELL: Fine with me.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: 1/4/2021. Now that is where I sent for the price quote was to the Tribune and Vindicator. But myvalleyjobs today, you hear that on the radio station. I hear every day with jobs. For them to do that for 28 days it's \$99.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's a lot less.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: And if you do a feature job posting where they are announcing it and doing stuff like that it's \$149. I don't know if you'd want to try that in place of or in addition to, but I just thought I hear it. I mean, I don't hear -- you have to really --

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah, I hear it quite a bit. It's on the -- I think it's definitely worth doing. Do you want to replace it instead of --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It's definitely local.

MR. SULLIVAN: Go the \$149 and use it as a replacement.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm fine with that.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Do you want to try that?

MR. CAMPBELL: It still meets our requirements of advertising. Are you all right with that, or do you want paper also?

MR. BIGGS: I don't know. What do we have to do to involve ours with one or the other?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I looked today, and it's just an online application. That's where I got the prices from. If you look on there, I just scrolled through the --

MR. CAMPBELL: The Board is comfortable with whatever you feel would be best. If you look into it and it looks like it works --

MR. SULLIVAN: I see that on the noon news every day.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

MR. CAMPBELL: Good point. No more public, so no public comments. We had them, there's nobody here.

REPORTS:

1. Solicitor's Report

MR. CAMPBELL: Reports. Anything from our Solicitor?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: No.

MR. CAMPBELL: Beside all the stuff going on with the contracts and everything else.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That was it. Again, prior to the meeting I had let you know that I had talked to Paul a couple months ago in regards to the Warren -- the City of Warren's water treatment. They informed me on September 9 that that agreement expires. I believe they said it expires at the end of this year. I didn't agree with them, but they referenced where it went back to the Lordstown Energy Center agreement. I hand-delivered Paul a copy of that e-mail and the agreement on September 16, and I haven't heard anything. And like I said, I may not be here next month; if not, somebody is gonna have to follow through and make sure that that's covered because I don't want to get a bill in January or February with a much different sanitary sewer rate. You know, we can't let them increase --

MR. CAMPBELL: Do you have that electronic that you sent to Paul? I know you just have a hard copy.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: You electronically -- I don't think I sent it to him electronically. Bill and I went down to his office.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, I would recommend -- might just make a pdf and send it to him so we have a record. I touched base with you back in September, that is reminder, if this is due, if this expires next month, then we need to get on it real quick. If not, then what do we need to do?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Right.

MR. CAMPBELL: But I think you have a little better way to track stuff electronically then.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Um, yeah, I agree.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay, very good.

2. Engineer's Report

MR. CAMPBELL: Engineer's Report. Chris, do you have anything else?

MR. KOGELNIK: In addition to the master water plan update the only thing I wanted to mention, which I think is kind of significant, it's going to become significant as we get into '21, the Village had me write that letter to Ohio E.P.A. --

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you for that.

MR. KOGELNIK: -- regarding LEC and TEC. Not one of my favorite things to do. I got a call back from Steve Remillard, and he was most interested in TEC as you can imagine because that's the project he's in charge of. And he's obviously got some concerns about the fate of the project as it relates to, you know, our desire to not have them discharge their treated waste water and storm water into Mud Run stream. So you know, it was just basically an argument, and he was basically saying that he's already explained all of that to the Village. And I says well, we don't have really anything in writing, you know, and we had to find out almost second-hand that you were getting that permit and et cetera. He says no, I explained what we were doing at the Ohio Power Siting Board meeting at the school, which I wasn't there.

MR. CAMPBELL: I wasn't there.

MR. SULLIVAN: I was there. And there was at least 15 residents that spoke about not going into Mud Creek.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: For TEC, they had something at the school?

MR. KOGELNIK: According to Steve they did.

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.

MR. KOGELNIK: Had a public meeting at the school.

MR. SULLIVAN: A public meeting.

MR. KOGELNIK: And I was not there, I did not attend that. And he also stated he presented all of this to the BPA in a meeting. I don't remember that.

MR. SULLIVAN: That's not true. I called him at least four times, and the last time I said well will you at least come to the BPA and lay out your -- and he said no.

MR. KOGELNIK: Oh.

MR. SULLIVAN: He said no, I'm not coming. He said I already went out and I looked at Mud Creek and it only had three-quarters of an inch of flow to Mud Creek.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: You're talking to -- Ohio E.P.A. you talked to?

MR. KOGELNIK: We're talking about Steve Remillard, the project manager and developer for TEC.

MR. SULLIVAN: I'm sorry, but I was at that school.

MR. KOGELNIK: So there was a public meeting for the Ohio Power Siting Board at the school. I don't remember -- I was not at that meeting, and I was definitely not at the one, to my knowledge, where he presented.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's the first time I ever met Steve Remillard was that last meeting.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Right. He was here once.

MR. KOGELNIK: I don't know which meeting he's talking about. But the end game is here there's several significant things you all need to understand that I'm learning on this after the fact. Number one, they applied for that direct discharge permit years ago. I learned today that they actually -- the permit was issued by the Ohio E.P.A. in December of 2017. That's astonishing. I didn't know that. So they got that direct discharge permit. So any complaint that we make about that really is after the fact. It's meaningless, it's already -- they already have a permit. So I'm advised to advise you that if you want to question and contend that, really the only question you can question and contend is the process from Ohio E.P.A. to give them the permit letter.

MR. CAMPBELL: No, back up one step. That's back like a long time ago, '17. That's when Mike was contacting the E.P.A.

MR. SULLIVAN: Right.

MR. CAMPBELL: We were trying to say we don't want that. And obviously it didn't go much of anywhere, and you couldn't get any headway with the E.P.A.

MR. SULLIVAN: Well, we wrote a letter to send.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I think the letter was in '18, and that was done at that point in time. And that's why I said the TEC, LEC and then ultimately CEL or CEF, when they got that approval I have to wonder if it was through Clean Energy Future. But I said months ago that TEC has a permit to dump or to discharge into Mud Creek. And in addition, Lordstown Energy Center has applied for a permit to discharge into Mud Creek.

MR. KOGELNIK: We'll talk about that last.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. KOGELNIK: But you're right. And my -- one of my associates just e-mailed to me the TEC permit, and it says right on

there issue date December 2017. So I told Steve, I said Steve we're -- again we're learning about all of this in a really strange way. You have a \$1 billion investment for a land development project, we don't have really anything formally at Kelly's office that announces hey, this is a project, this is when it's gonna happen. But yet you've somehow coordinated with the Ohio E.P.A. in a convoluted manner to get a permit to discharge into our stream. How do you think that bodes? And he contends that the reason for his permit was because the City of Warren could not accept the waste water constituent and flow coming from his development at their treatment plant. As you will remember, most of the flow from TEC is projected to be similar to LEC and it's gonna be, you know, probably the same flow rates with total dissolved solids, fluorides, that sort of thing that the City of Warren would have a hard time treating because it's an inorganic, I-N-organic. So that's why. And because our east side sanitary sewer was tapped out from LEC, he went and got the permit from Ohio E.P.A. You know, to his defense and Ohio E.P.A.'s defense, anybody and their brother can issue -- or I'm sorry, apply for a permit. What happens at Ohio E.P.A.'s office, once they receive the permit is another matter. You know, there's typically a 30 day comment period for these things. And so that's where we're at with that. And I'm not saying that this is the end of that. But you know, he does have a permit and he's got the right to apply for a permit to install now, which is literally the design that he has to --

MR. SULLIVAN: Who has? TEC has it or --

MR. KOGELNIK: TEC has a permit to discharge to Mud Run. What they don't have is a permit to install for their facility that says I will discharge this waste water using this treatment system or conveyance system, and that's what they still have to do yet. So Steve asked me very much so that I would ask you if you would be willing to have a meeting to discuss his design and how he's going to intend to manage and operate that treatment system so that you can have the confidence of how it's going to be delivered to the Mud Run stream. All I could say is okay. So he wants to have that meeting with you. I would do that, because he's got every right to make an application to Ohio E.P.A. for the permit to install next. So you should hear him out with respect to how he's going to, you know, design, manage and operate that system because I don't know how it's going to be designed, managed or operated.

MR. SULLIVAN: So what is it with LEC then? They're now making an application to go into Mud Creek?

MR. KOGELNIK: It's my understanding that there's a permit in from LEC to Ohio E.P.A. to discharge their waste water, of course in a treated manner, to the Mud Run stream. That is a clear breach of the contract that the Village has with LEC, that should be handled legally. I really don't have anything else to say about that. But you know, there's been thoughts that Cindy has and I have been sharing back and forth being, well what if that happens or that happens with LEC and they're -- we think that that's gonna create a hardship on the Village if LEC were to disconnect from your east side sanitary sewer. And I think it's actually negligent on the part of Ohio E.P.A. to consider that.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: When you say it's like a legal matter, is it a legal matter with the Village and the Ohio E.P.A. and a legal matter with the Village and Lordstown Energy Center?

MR. KOGELNIK: I can't speak to the former, but I can

definitely see how the legal matter is going to exist between the Village and LEC. I don't know how the Ohio E.P.A. is gonna treat that. How can you give, you know, a certain Village a permit to upgrade every one of their pump stations and then a couple years later, just because the -- you know, the owner for LEC says it's cheaper to just dump right into the stream, isn't -- don't they represent the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Right. Well, and if they could walk backwards on the permit that they gave them to discharge into our sanitary sewer system, then they should be able to walk backwards on the TEC to discharge into Mud Creek.

MR. CAMPBELL: Good point.

MR. KOGELNIK: She's got some really good ideas.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I know. But we also know it's not ever gonna happen. But does that permit for the TEC have an expiration -- do they have --

MR. KOGELNIK: Yes. N.P.E.S. permits are only five years.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: So if it's not installed in five -- by December of 2022 --

MR. KOGELNIK: Yeah.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: -- it's --

MR. KOGELNIK: They would have to have -- they would have to renew it somehow. So I would -- I would get Steve Remillard here to give a presentation. But I definitely have some thoughts in place about how, you know, we can help facilitate that to just -- we want their business definitely. But we want -- in the perfect world, we would want to work with them to accept all of their waste water and deposit it at the right facility for treatment. But you know, the stream is not it. But Ohio E.P.A., for whatever reason, is saying you got your permit for that, you just need to design it, send us a permit for the design and then you can build it.

MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I don't know if you remember, but when the thing was still on the drawing board Warren said it would be \$30 million to upgrade their system.

MR. KOGELNIK: Yep.

MR. SULLIVAN: And then it was 15, and it ended up at 3.

MR. KOGELNIK: That's -- Steve Remillard remembers that too. It was 25 million the figure that Steve -- but regardless if it's 25 million or 3 million it's -- it's a game or showstopper for TEC. They just don't want to do that.

MR. SULLIVAN: But you know what really upset me about this whole thing the E.P.A. come out, and he measured it in July when there was no rain. And we do have a problem now even without either one of them.

MR. KOGELNIK: Yeah, I agree with you.

MR. SULLIVAN: Down Brook Hollow, that thing floods all the time. And they said it's only adding three-quarters of an inch. I said you're adding three-quarters of an inch to a problem we already have.

MR. KOGELNIK: Well in addition to the volume, blow down by its nature is typically a warmer temperature water. And when you discharge a warm temperature water to a stream that is normally at this time of the year 35 to 40 degrees, what do you think is gonna happen? It's gonna change the ecosystem. And so that's not my job, that's the Ohio E.P.A. And but I do recommend that you get Steve in

here to have a good meeting and --

MR. CAMPBELL: See where that goes.

MR. KOGELNIK: Get him to submit something on paper for Pete's sake.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. Well, we have a to-do list there. Schedule him. Anything else, Chris?

MR. KOGELNIK: Oh, Steve Remillard had been asking, regarding the TEC facility, about some options to fit into the master water plan so that, you know, he could be connected to our water distribution system instead of a Warren water line. And of course, we want that and we desperately need that to happen. So that's going in a more positive manner than it was about a week ago. And -- but his questions are many, okay. And so we're gonna need some sort of authorization from him to account for that because what he's talking about doing changes several things that we had in our master water plan. And the only way to really address these things is to model them so that we can be confident that what they're asking for is feasible or not and how is it gonna impact what we're doing in the Village. So we would like to submit a work authorization and get his approval on it so that he's paying the Village for that.

MR. CAMPBELL: Agreed.

MR. KOGELNIK: And it would be hourly and we need to do that. So --

MR. CAMPBELL: Now say we made these changes to the model, we move along like it's going to be there because we know that projects like -- it's not like the battery plant where it's half-built, this project's a lot up in the air. So if it falls off and we have the plan to move with it, does it hurt us just to continue on with that plan or not?

MR. KOGELNIK: I don't know the answer to that, but I'll talk to Bob about the dynamics and the statics of all of these variables, Kevin. I can tell you the one idea that Steve had, it was like I was shaking my head back and forth no. But after we looked at it we said, you know, this might be feasible, but it's gonna take a model to figure it out. And so we need to just be realistic about this and --

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. I agree with that, yeah. If you want to get them to approve and model it up and pay for it --

MR. KOGELNIK: We've already start talking to him about that, so he understands this is coming. So probably

MR. SULLIVAN: So do you think we should have a special meeting for that?

MR. KOGELNIK: You may have to have a special meeting for that. Maybe when he comes in here for his waste water presentation we can, at that time, discuss how to connect to our master water plan. He would want to do that.

MR. CAMPBELL: Makes sense.

MR. KOGELNIK: Last things, I have some older charges from what we did on the valves on Pump Station No. 2 on Salt Springs Road that I'd like to send an invoice in for that I just have been holding. And it's my own fault. If I can work with you, Cindy, on that. It's a couple thousand dollars.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It's for what?

MR. KOGELNIK: The valves, air release valves and the valve pits on Salt Springs Road from Pump Station No. 2 when we did the air release valve pit program.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Okay. I don't know if I have them open still. But if you send it over to me and I can take a look at that.

MR. KOGELNIK: I have the charge, the time and the description of what the work was. So if I could please --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yeah, by all means we would want to get that bill.

MR. KOGELNIK: It doesn't have to be this month.

MR. CAMPBELL: She's saying --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It does have to be because Bill is going to close the books financially by December 19. So anything we have, we have to have paid before that time. So the sooner the better in all honesty.

MR. KOGELNIK: All right. I'll get it to you. That's all I have.

MR. CAMPBELL: All right. Any questions for Chris? Thank you for attending tonight. As you can see --

MR. KOGELNIK: A lot.

MR. CAMPBELL: It's just hard with the phone conversation to hear.

3. Utility Committee Report

: So Utility Committee Report. Anything from Utility Committee?

MR. DIETZ: Not that I know of.

MR. CAMPBELL: All right, very good.

4. Clerk's Report

MR. CAMPBELL: Clerk's Report, Cindy. What else do you have?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: One is I have the letter that you had me draft for the \$30 credit. I thought you would all like to sign that.

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh, yes.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That was from last month's meeting for the customer that was deployed and was charged a late fee. I credited the late fee back, and that's a letter to her explaining the change on her account. I did send that to you in the e-mail.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah, yeah. It was nice. I'm glad we made the process change to accommodate --

MR. DIETZ: Did you know what branch she was in?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I don't. I believe it was the army, but I don't know.

MR. CAMPBELL: What else have we got?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: The next thing we have is the trash bid book. Amanda had marked it up and sent some things with the date. I told her the dates don't matter. We gotta get it put out to bid. Bill doesn't want to handle it, and when I go out there's nothing I can do. I mean, I'll be out until I'm released to come back to work.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yep. What do you need from us for that?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That contract expires March 31, so it's not giving them a lot of time.

MR. KOGELNIK: Did you take a moment to review it?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I skimmed through it. I looked through her things with the dates and questions like that. But I looked through it last Friday and I skimmed through it. I did not print it.

MR. KOGELNIK: I'll tell you what. Allow me to take a

more detailed review of that tonight. I'll take another spin through that and I'll get you a response tomorrow, because I had a phone call with her today just making sure that both she and one of my other staff were looking at it and she didn't know if you had a chance to do an in-depth review. Allow me to do an in-depth review, get you a response so that we can all be confident about putting that on the street.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yeah. One of the questions she had and one of the things she asked was if you want the option for us to bill the customer or to pull that from the bid book. Previously you had it in there. It's something that you didn't accept but I don't -- it makes no difference to me whether it's in the bid or not in the bid. Everybody -- all the contractors are willing to bill the customers directly. Previously it wasn't of any savings for us to do the work, so we didn't want to take on the risk.

MR. CAMPBELL: Correct, yeah.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It's up to you if you want that page pulled. But everything else was dates as to how long to standard. And that's standard, whatever the standard is. We just gotta get it out there.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Next question I have is the service department did a curb box replacement on a customer's property. And we have a charge for it, and I'm just not sure how to apply that because it's really the first one. Curb box re-installation, \$475 for one inch or less. Do I charge that? I mean, I don't know how the customer damaged his curb box. But my rate shows -- says if we re-install a curb box it's 475 bucks. So he's here, you're here, let me know what I need to do. I have no clue.

MR. CAMPBELL: This wasn't the one with Warren, right?

MR. BIGGS: I have no idea what she's talking about.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Salt Springs Road. It was -- I have the copy of the work order if you want to look at it. It said turn off the service curb box, shaft broke, had to replace the whole curb box, turn service back on at 1:00.

MR. CAMPBELL: Sounds like it's pretty much a full replace.

MR. BIGGS: This is the one that was just recent.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yeah, 11/10. So a week ago.

MR. BIGGS: Why, that was the one that the rod in there had broke. We replaced the whole thing because it's different rods and whatever now. I don't know why we would charge them for the whole thing. This is the first I found out. I -- unless I put down there to charge.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: No, you didn't.

MR. BIGGS: That's why I didn't know anything about it.

MR. CAMPBELL: We're just trying to get on the same page. But what she's saying, in our rate structure we just have --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Re-install.

MR. CAMPBELL: Fresh install. If you feel from your side that repair isn't equivalent to what that would be we need to either charge that or add something to our rates within --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Well, was it ever meant to charge the customer, or is this where a contractor goes out and digs up and destroys somebody's curb box? I've never had to apply this before. I'm talking on the phone today, and I see that there and I'm closing out the work orders.

MR. KOGELNIK: Where is that \$425 stated?
MS. SLUSARCZYK: On our rate sheet.
MR. KOGELNIK: Can I see that?
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Absolutely.
MR. KOGELNIK: Because I don't believe that was intended for a repair.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: And that's what I said, I need an understanding of how this would apply. It's at the very bottom, Chris.
MR. KOGELNIK: Okay.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Like I said, to me the infrastructure, you know, they have their service line and we know that that's their responsibility. But this is not something that they're even allowed to play with.
MR. CAMPBELL: Correct. Could it just be something that we just fix it?
MR. KOGELNIK: So there was damage to a curb box.
MR. CAMPBELL: The rod was broke off on it.
MR. BIGGS: Have you got the work order?
MS. SLUSARCZYK: I do.
MR. BIGGS: If this is the one I'm thinking of. They had a plumber in there, had to turn the water off, could not get on the road, the rod was broken. You can't do anything with it. They dug it out; and instead of putting that old one in there who's been there in there how long, I tell them to replace the whole thing, bring it back if we can use the parts. That's what happened.
MR. DIETZ: Well, it was no fault of it, not theirs, the box was broke.
MR. BIGGS: As far as I know you're absolutely correct.
MR. DIETZ: Well I think if we had to replace it because it was broke, I mean, I think that should be ours.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: I agree.
MR. BIGGS: Yeah, that was just a shaft.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: It's not like they're out there, they can't get --
MR. KOGELNIK: It does say re-installation.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: And Bruce changed it, like I said. This was just changed not too long ago and it's like -- I don't understand the purpose.
MR. CAMPBELL: The intent of it. So again, I'm not charging this customer.
MR. DIETZ: I would not.
MR. KOGELNIK: Yes, that's --
MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. But how this applies --
MR. DIETZ: I think if a contractor goes through there and destroys it, then they should be charged.
MR. KOGELNIK: That's true. I agree with that.
MR. CAMPBELL: We'll use it for that. I like it.
MR. BIGGS: Any kind of direct neglect I could see. Not just sitting there for 15 years and --
MR. CAMPBELL: And just broke.
MR. BIGGS: Correct. There was no obvious damage to this one here, you know, nothing.
MR. DIETZ: Because they had to come over and dig mine up one time.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Right. This was on Highland. If you

recall, when they put the sanitary sewer in and when they were doing it, Bruce had them replace the curb box as they were digging instead of messing with the old ones. And then he brought it to the Board. But that's all I can remember. I just -- no charge.

MR. CAMPBELL: Nope, we're good.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Last I have grinder pump. When they had to call-out at 449 Salt Springs Road we had a bill from the City of Warren for \$504.98. We sent a letter to the customer about having the electric panel. I still don't know what to do with that invoice. We paid the City of Warren, but you were kind of waiting for her to see what the electrician said or something before the Board billed for that or not. Again, it's one of those things I'm just trying to clean up before --

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah, I do remember that one. We couldn't find anything wrong from our side of it and --

MR. BIGGS: It definitely did trip inside the home, which since it did it in the grinder pump the panel itself tells me if it's between that and the home.

MR. CAMPBELL: And it's been working since.

MR. BIGGS: And the letter was sent to the resident also that said it would be looked at and explained why. I have had no reply.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I have had no response.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, I guess at this point we bill them.

MR. SULLIVAN: Was that last month?

MR. CAMPBELL: It was a while ago.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It was in August or September because I paid Warren in September.

MR. SULLIVAN: I remember, if it's the same one, where you went out and you found it, the problem was actually on their property. Is that the one we're talking about?

MR. CAMPBELL: Uh-huh, yep.

MR. SULLIVAN: But you said go ahead and do it, then we should bill them for the parts, we weren't gonna bill them for labor.

MR. BIGGS: We did talk about that. That's what she's saying how we were going a bill. If it was hard to bill if we weren't sure on our end if it was our fault or the homeowner's fault. We were gonna send a letter out because that's what we were thinking, it was on the homeowner's side. Hopefully they would get back to us and then we could move on from there. They never did anything, to my knowledge anyway, I never received anything back from that.

MR. SULLIVAN: But I thought where we were on that that we were gonna send them a bill for the parts.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It wasn't parts. The bill that we got was because they had to bring Warren out to pump down the pit to even get in there and see what was wrong with it. It was full because it wasn't pumping.

MR. BIGGS: Everything worked fine with that, Mike. It was nothing except for Warren just because it did trip inside the home, which didn't allow the box -- control box outside to work properly, work at all actually, and no alarm so the homeowner didn't know about it anyhow.

MR. DIETZ: I think Mike is talking about the water line, that it was a couple feet in and we went ahead and repaired it. Lyntz Road.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Oh, that was just for -- to bill for just the parts.

MR. SULLIVAN: The parts.

MR. DIETZ: I think that's the one Mike's talking about.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Right, you're correct.

MR. CAMPBELL: So at this point Cindy wants to know what we should do. Because we already paid Warren, but do we go ahead and bill the customer or just eat it? That's kind of where we're at.

MR. SULLIVAN: How much was it?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It was \$504.98.

MR. DIETZ: First send them a letter to ask them did they get the electrician out to look at it. But then we're in --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yeah. What if they didn't and this happens again, Tom?

MR. KOGELNIK: At least you have a bill that's on the record.

MR. CAMPBELL: I think we just need to send the bill to them.

MR. SULLIVAN: I agree.

MR. DIETZ: All right.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: I make a motion to send a bill to the resident for the Warren water repair.

MR. SULLIVAN: Second.

MR. CAMPBELL: All in favor?

(All respond aye.)

MR. CAMPBELL: All opposed?

(No response.)

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Okay. That's all I have. I need signatures from Mike and Tom after the meeting on the resolution. Other than that --

MR. CAMPBELL: Any questions for our clerk?

MR. DIETZ: No.

5. Superintendent's Report

MR. CAMPBELL: All right. Superintendent's Report. Mr. Darren.

MR. BIGGS: With our remote SCADA we've been dealing with. No progress on that. There's been a new IT gentleman that come out, but nothing so far.

MR. SULLIVAN: So it's -- Bob's gone now?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Who?

MR. CAMPBELL: Joel.

MR. BIGGS: Oh, Joel. No. No, he's still here.

MR. SULLIVAN: So you're gonna keep him until we get somebody?

MR. BIGGS: You're talking something totally different, Mike. Hang on, we'll get to that one. Just our SCADA. Remember I was having problem with that port and our router over there and nobody could figure out why. That's what I was talking about. It was a new IT gentleman that came in. He's been trying to figure it out with no success as of yet.

MR. SULLIVAN: Well I thought Cindy, you -- you called the other day and wanted authorization to get --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I did.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's that guy.

MR. SULLIVAN: -- the Geek Squad.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: He came out. And what he has found or

believes to be the problem is when that lightning strike took out our equipment, they brought in a new piece which controls our phone system, and the modem that brings in the Internet service was destroyed that day. So they brought in a new service. He believes that when Joel brought the system back online with phones -- like you get six addresses, and a lot of times they give you the first address and -- but with phones they give you with computers or Internet, I don't know, they usually give you the first one and then you have six more. Well with phones they give you the last one. So he feels that when Joel reconfigured the system he got the last address, and so the actual IP address that's static is on the wrong address.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: He thinks if he could talk to Joel and tell Joel that and Joel can do that, switch it around, then our port issue will be resolved. We gave him Joel's phone number, and Joel won't answer the phone. So if he has no luck -- I just checked with him prior to the meeting tonight. If he has not spoke to Joel come tomorrow morning, then I'm going to have Bill call Joel.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's a good idea.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: And tell Joel to call him and to see what -- to see if it resolves the issue. He said he took it back to -- they had the original records, the gentleman from that company is no longer with them, he retired or whatever. But they did have records and they -- it all started from that 124 days ago, which is when that lightning strike hit, and they replaced the modem. And our whole system is based off a telephone networking which is goofy, and then there are 100 routers in here which makes it a communication nightmare. He says it's bad. He literally went online on my -- can we leave this off the record?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah.

(A discussion is had off the record.)

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay, we can go back on the record. What else do we have?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: We were on Darren.

MR. CAMPBELL: What else you got, Darren?

MR. BIGGS: Those meters we talked about a couple months ago where you can get online and see, they are in now. You gentlemen decided you're okay with putting one in your homes so you can get an idea?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah.

MR. BIGGS: Can you get with Cindy and set up an appointment so we can get those started. And yes, Tom, you want a quieter one. I know, okay.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: This one turns really well.

MR. DIETZ: Yeah. But you'd have to hear mine to understand.

MR. CAMPBELL: All right. Can do. What else you got?

MR. BIGGS: One other thing. Were we gonna go executive to talk personnel or can we --

MR. CAMPBELL: We can. Like I said, we gotta do it pretty quick. I got a 6:30 meeting. It's just at the church, but I still have to leave and get there so we got like 10 minutes.

MR. BIGGS: Let's do it.

MR. SULLIVAN: Make a motion to go into executive session.

MR. CAMPBELL: To discuss personnel. Cindy?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Campbell.
MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Dietz.
MR. DIETZ: Yes.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Sullivan.
MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.

QUARTERLY APPROVAL OF BILLING ADJUSTMENTS

MR. CAMPBELL: I make a motion to pass the quarterly billing adjustment thru October.

MR. Sullivan: I'll second it.

MR. CAMPBELL: All in favor?

(All respond aye.)

MR. CAMPBELL: All opposed?

(No response.)

MR. CAMPBELL: Motion carries.

(The Board enters into executive session at 6:15 p.m.)

ADJOURNMENT:

MR. CAMPBELL: Very good. I'll make a motion to adjourn.

MR. SULLIVAN: I'll second it.

MR. CAMPBELL: All in favor?

(All respond aye.)

MR. CAMPBELL: All opposed?

(No response.)

MR. CAMPBELL: Thanks everybody. Have a good night.

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 8th day of December, 2020.

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

Submitted:

Approved By:

Cinthia Slusarczyk, clerk

Kevin Campbell, President