RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
MEETING OF THE LORDSTOWN VILLAGE BOARD OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS
1455 Salt Springs Road, Lordstown, Ohio
October 12, 2023

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

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. Howard Sheely, Utilities Committee
Mr. Jamie Moseley, Utilities Committee

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS taken before me, DEBORAH LAVELLE, RPR, a court reporter and Notary Public within and for the State of Ohio on this 12th of October, 2023.

MR. PETERSON: I'd like to call the meeting to order. Please stand for the Lord's Prayer and Pledge of Allegiance.

LORD'S PRAYER
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG
ROLL CALL:

MR. PETERSON: Roll call please.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Chris Peterson.
MR. PETERSON: Here.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Kevin Campbell.
MR. CAMPBELL: Here.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Michael Sullivan.
MR. SULLIVAN: Here.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Darren Biggs.
MR. BIGGS: Here.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Cinthia Slusarczyk, present. And Chris Kogelnik and Matt Ries were not requested to attend tonight's meeting.

CORRESPONDENCES:

MR. PETERSON: Any correspondence?
MS. SLUSARCZYK: No.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

MR. PETERSON: Public Comments? Seeing none.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. A Resolution recommending that the Council of the Village of Lordstown approve Change Order No. 1 in the credit amount of $229,300.00 of CB&I Storage Tank Solutions, LLC in connection with the State Route 45 corridor improvements elevated water tank project.

MR. PETERSON: New Business. The first item, a Resolution recommending that the Council of the Village of Lordstown approve Change Order No. 1 in the credit amount of $229,300.00 or CB&I Storage Tank Solutions, LLC in connection with the State Route 45 corridor improvements elevated water tank project. Any comments or --
MR. CAMPBELL: I don't have any questions on it.
MR. PETERSON: Motion to approve?
MR. SULLIVAN: Motion to approve.
MR. CAMPBELL: I'll second.
MR. PETERSON: All in favor?

(All respond aye.)
MR. PETERSON: Motion passed.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: This becomes Resolution 2023-9. If you would like to sign it --
MR. CAMPBELL: Just the one sheet?
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yes. The rest is just the exhibits.

2. A Resolution recommending that the Council of the Village of Lordstown approve Change Order No. 2 in the amount of $15,477.60 for Engineered Fluid, Inc., dba EFI-Solutions of Centralia, Illinois, in connection with the State Route 45 corridor improvements water booster pump station project.

MR. PETERSON: And item number 2, a Resolution recommending that the Council of the Village of Lordstown approve Change Order No. 2 in the amount of $15,477.60 for Engineered Fluid, Inc., dba EFI-Solutions of Centralia, Illinois, in connection with the State Route 45 corridor improvements water booster pump station project. Does anybody have any questions or discussion?
MR. CAMPBELL: No.
MR. PETERSON: I'll motion to approve.
MR. SULLIVAN: Second.
MR. PETERSON: All in favor?
(All respond aye.)
MR. PETERSON: Motion passed.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: This becomes Resolution 2023-10.

3. Water Rate Increase Review

MR. PETERSON: Okay. And the third item is the water rate increase review. Cindy, do you want to start?
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Sure. Can everyone see this screen? I want to make this a little bit larger, and we're gonna see if I can highlight the column here. In this Column K our projections for 2024 with the current -- this is with the figures that's currently plugged into the water rate study, okay, which are not today's rates, okay. These are increases that were submitted. We'll end next year with a net revenue of minus $311,504.
MR. SHEELY: What?
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Next year's net revenue we'll be short $311,504. So our carry-over balance from this year will then be decreased minus $75,000 and end up – we'll be short next year. We primarily focused on 2024 figures to correct 2024, because with that each additional year there's two methods of this rate increase. One is the readiness-to-serve which covers your fixed costs of the department; and the other thing was your demand fee, how much water each person uses. So we did not have a readiness-to-serve, we did have a minimum bill; but that minimum bill is based on the units, the metered units, of the size based on the size of a water meter, okay. So a resident will pay a certain amount, and then a business has a larger fee based on their meter size because of the demand that they are capable of pulling through the system. So right now to fix next year, okay, because if you choose to increase the readiness-to-serve or demand fee they're all -- you have two methods to make your increases. Whatever method you choose you can -- if you want to do the readiness-to-serve fee you can make it smaller or larger. I just -- this is kind of where Bob and I started with it, and I can show you the impacts from one. And then go back over to the next, to the rate to see that dollar amount for rate per thousand gallons and you can adjust it either way.

But when you increase one, it helps the other area. It depends on how you want to increase the rates. So right now 2024 shows us that minus $311,000 where we're gonna full short. So I'm gonna jump over to the rates tab, and I just said we have two methods of calculating rates for next year based on CT's recommendation of implementing a readiness-to-serve fee and kind of put our brakes on that before hoping it wasn't necessary. But the readiness-to-serve fee here, this column here, in 2024 it recommends a 30 percent increase on the residential account. Right now it's a $3 a month fee. That's -- 30 percent is 90 cents, $3.90. Not a huge impact. That's per month, okay. This is for each month right now. We do a quarterly billing, so that's not a huge introductory step to get the residents to use it. But if you look at the 2025, 2026, 2027 you go from 33 percent to 66 percent. So you judge or calibrate where you want to start. If that's not enough for next year, we can increase it and see how it impacts the sequential years, or we can just work on 2024 with readiness-to-serve and adjust it in the rates. Again, depends on how you want to balance your scales as to what you have to do to balance, to get that into the positive.

MR. SULLIVAN: So say we don't want to do the 66 percent and make it a more level across the Board.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Then that means up front next year you're gonna raise the fixed fee to the residential -- to customers, not just residential. We're only using the residents as an example, okay, here. So that means you'll increase next year's more than the 33 percent. That's this.

MR. SULLIVAN: Right, I understand that.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: You can do that.

MR. SULLIVAN: I'm just thinking 66 percent in one year is an awful big whack.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Wait till you see the water rate. I agree with you. However, there's a small thought here is that in that year, in 2027, TEC should be operational. How will that help us, we don't know.

MR. PETERSON: You don't know until you're in this.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Correct. So if we don't worry about the whole game and worry about this year, maybe next year making those palatable transitioning to the rates, the structures, get it in place, then each year you are to evaluate -- you are required by law to evaluate these every other year. So right now if we do this year and next year, I should say 2024 and 2025, then you can re-evaluate it even next year for the following year. And I recommend that every year, but I wouldn't -- there is nothing calculated in here but a small portion for TEC's revenue, and that's because we don't know when they'll be fully operational. So there's so many aspects in these studies.

MR. CAMPBELL: Always is, yeah.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: You just can't cover every space and say this is how it's gonna be in five years from now.

MR. CAMPBELL: You have no idea. So my question with readiness-to-serve was one of the reasons we were pursuing this was to get more revenue out of LEC. Does that fall into place like we were talking? I mean, I know we were talking --

MR. PETERSON: Potentially.

MR. SULLIVAN: I thought Matt said that no, that they're locked into --

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, their rate. But again, the readiness-to-serve is like a sideline, like another avenue of --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: A new fee.

MR. CAMPBELL: If it's a fee we can hit them with, you know, I definitely like that avenue.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: The only thing we can do there is try it.

MR. PETERSON: Try it, yeah.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's probably what it will boil down to.

MR. PETERSON: Yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: I think we should try it. That's another reason to keep it low, get it in the door.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: The readiness-to-serve fee is based on equivalent meter units. In this -- I don't know if anyone can actually see that. Let me blow that up a little bit more since we're talking about this specifically now. LEC has 10 or 12 inch meters, okay. So the EMU, the equivalent metering unit for your 1-inch meter is one. So that EMU on a 10-inch meter is 46 and then on a 12-inch meter it's 86. So hypothetically, if you times that fee times 86 you should get what their monthly fee should be because that's what is available to them. Whether they want water or not, we have to have the lines in the ground, the water tower up there, the pumps, all the bells and whistles have to be ready to go and drink that water.

MR. MOSELEY: That's just a monthly fee that would be --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Fixed fee.

MR. CAMPBELL: If they use water or not.

MR. MOSELEY: A resident would be 50, theirs might be 85.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: In this example right now it has the 12-inch at $950 a month for setting it for 2024. It has it at $1,235 a meter.

MR. MOSELEY: With how many meters they got, they're gonna fight that.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It's a fee. And in the contract it says they must comply with rules and regulations governing the Board of Public Affairs, so.

MR. PETERSON: I think it's a legitimate --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yeah.

MR. PETERSON: -- charge.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: There's also another revenue. If we reflect way back to when they introduced a readiness-to-serve fee to the Board, they all said there's a thing like the difference between an Ultium customer and a power plant customer. Ultium turns on the spigot and let's it run, okay. TEC or power plants can turn it on and shut it off, turn it on and shut it off. So for example, they both might take 3 million gallons a day; but because this one's taking it over 24 hours, little impact.

MR. MOSELEY: Steady.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: This one that shuts it off and turns it on, that peak fee requires you to make larger pipes, bigger towers, larger pumps because it has to be supply and demand now. There's that peak fee usage. So they mentioned before that perhaps pursuing that avenue, you know. There's a cost for that type of demand on our system, not just for water rate. So if they don't want to comply with the readiness-to-serve based on a meter size, then you need to seek a peak fee.

MR. MOSELEY: Use it in the middle of the night when there's not much water being used.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It's what the electric companies do in big cities. They give you a little thing in your house, and a red light comes on and says you're using too many, taper it off or you pay a greater fee for using electric during that time. So that's an example of the readiness-to-serve fee. And again, if we're just looking at 2024, this is worked on percentages which it's -- it gives you an idea. But again for the residents it shows you a 90 cent increase per month. The businesses that have that 10- and 12-inch meter, you know, they never saw anything because they always use water and that $15 fee a month was not even realistic, it was just a taste of what could happen. So that is going to be a huge impact, a huge personal increase for that particular customer or that, you know, based on the size of the meters. There's not too many 10- and 12-inch meters in our system, and I think besides that 6-inch is the next largest meter that we have in our system. So the 8-inch meter, 14-inch meter, 16-inch, only because we have a 24-inch water line we kept those fees because it's capable of having a 16 inch6-inch tap, okay. So the fees are out there if in the event that it's needed.

MR. CAMPBELL: And then I think CT presented that readiness-to-serve avenue for us not so much -- well I think for our situation, but also it's a fairly common way of billing so.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It's a way to protect the system. Whether your customer drinks the water or not, it's paying its equitable portion of what it costs for this department to run every day 365 days a year. It's fair and equitable.

MR. PETERSON: The place goes idle for three months at least you're still getting some revenue and you still have to maintain the same infrastructure.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Correct. No matter whether half million-gallon tower or 3-million-gallon tower, the infrastructure is there, so we have to make sure we cover that expense. At the top of the screen there to the right you'll see that 30 percent factor. I can increase that and it will change the rate down below and it will tell me what that -- how that changes it. Like Mike said, could we make it more -- or more balanced over the years. That's your call. I can plug in --

MR. CAMPBELL: I personally like the idea of what we're gonna be changing. I mean, I like the idea of it. I think there's a lot of value to it, and I think getting that structure and heading that direction, and I think it smart to keep it moving that direction. And once things are in place we can always adjust. I don't think it's the best move just to level it. That's what I'm thinking but --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: For our workshop here tonight do you want to leave that at 30 percent?

MR. PETERSON: I think you're right.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm comfortable with it.

MR. PETERSON: I'm comfortable with it.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: We'll leave that at 30 percent and then go to the demand fee. We're leaving that at 30 percent. So -- and again, that 30 percent was already there and that already showed us our neglect net revenue for the next years.

MR. PETERSON: Uh-huh.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: So the next part of our thing is the demand fee usage, how much water a customer uses. And in this example with our negative revenue, it shows 35 percent increase for next year, and that changes the bulk. Because we've already determined you're going to one rate, you're removing the tiers in the system, we're going to one flat --

MR. CAMPBELL: Uh-huh.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: At a flat rate of $7.76 you're still short next year. So now we got to figure out at what percentage you want to increase to get out of there. I can tell you. $7.76 still leaves you with a negative net revenue to close your fiscal year 2024.

MR. CAMPBELL: How much negative?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: 2024 net revenue minus $311,504. Ending balance in the fund minus $75,736. So we'll go back to the rates.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I'll tell you that in playing with this water rate study, to bring it I'm gonna show you not all of them, but I want to show you what 40 percent does. The 40 percent increase changes your rates to $8.05 a thousand gallons.

MR. SULLIVAN: How much was that?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: $8.05.

MR. MOSELEY: Was that 35 percent?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That's 40 percent. And your net revenue is still minus $219,206, but your ending balance is $16,000. So you ate up almost all the carry-over from the last years but $16,000 because your net revenue is what you bring in next year but you have your carry-over balances from before. So we'll have a carry- over balance, but it's only $16,000.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's still tight.

MR. PETERSON: Is that with adding the new staff member in also? Is that figured in there?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: For next year?

MR. PETERSON: Yes.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I have to look.

MR. PETERSON: I looked. I didn't see that anywhere.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I think we left one staff member in for next year.

MR. PETERSON: I remember we talked. But I didn't know, I couldn't find it.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: We pulled it out for this year because we did not hire, plugged it in for next year. I believe it was with one, and then the following year one I think was our intentions. Did it get here? We had a lot of bumps in the road the last couple of weeks so I need to confirm that. Let me do that. One staff in 2024. And that's how you still want me to proceed, with just one staff increase in 2024 and one for 2025?

MR. PETERSON: That's what we talked about, correct.

MR. BIGGS: That's what I gave in at.

MR. SULLIVAN: What was that?

MR. BIGGS: Hire in one and hire in another.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: So I'm gonna go back to our rates and tab. And if we change the rate, the demand fee per thousand gallons, I'm jumping from 40 percent to 50 percent, okay. The price per thousand gallons is now $8.63 and our revenue -- net revenue for 2024 ends at minus $34,608 with an ending carry-over balance of $201,159. So we didn't eat up all of our carry-over, and we actually are only about $35,000 short of balancing the year, okay. So we're still not in the black. Agreed?

MR. MOSELEY: That's with no issues, correct?

MR. PETERSON: That's with no major issues, correct. The carry-over --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I appreciate you acknowledging that that's just --

MR. PETERSON: The carry-over is there for a reason.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: A snap in the chalk line. So I went in the bare minimum calculation to bring our net revenue and carry-over balance into the positive if we increased our demand fee to 57 cents, a rate of $9.03 a thousand gallons.

MR. PETERSON: Nine dollars and what?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Three cents. You will end up with a positive net revenue for next year of $94,610, which is not two months of total expenses or six months of fixed costs. That is the bare minimum to get you in the black.

MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I would think we would have to go at least to the bare minimum.

MR. MOSELEY: At what percentage?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That's a 57 percent increase.

MR. CAMPBELL: I assume we have some projects in with this, right? I didn't remember seeing --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: No. We --

MR. CAMPBELL: Or did we pull them out?

MR. PETERSON: We pulled them out.

MR. CAMPBELL: I know because it was way worse.

MR. PETERSON: The booster was in there, I'm almost sure, right?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yeah. Capital Improvement Plan has the 1.8 for the 12-inch line on Hallock Young. But see, we have it split up by revenue and expenses, so I don't know that service. And then also next year the relocation of the booster pump station there was $500,000. Now I will say that the Hallock Young Road water line extension, what we submitted to the County was $2,090,000, and this is short.

MR. PETERSON: This is short, yeah. I think that's the way we did it because we were hoping to find more money.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: The relocation of the Pritchard Ohltown booster pump station is only $500,000.

MR. PETERSON: That's the cost of it, yeah. I thought that was the two we left in.

MR. SULLIVAN: Where is the 24?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That's a dream. It's no -- not in here at all.

MR. SULLIVAN: We're gonna have to do it.

MR. CAMPBELL: We kept it to the immediate projects.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yeah.

MR. SULLIVAN: But this will fall within the two years, won't it?

MR. PETERSON: Probably not.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Probably not. If you have got funding, any funding, next year.

MR. PETERSON: Even if you got funding next year it wouldn't happen that fast.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It would start in 2025. And if we had that service against that, we would start paying that in 2026. So this is why I'm trying to keep you to thinking '24-'25.

MR. CAMPBELL: Keep it focused there.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yeah. We got to stop the bleed and figure out how can we operate. And then hopefully that olive branch is there to where we can start, but even then --

MR. SULLIVAN: The olive branch is only 4 million.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: You mean in regards to funding, yeah.

MR. PETERSON: That's the only funding we can apply for.

MR. SULLIVAN: So it left us with what, 13?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: At least 10.

MR. PETERSON: It's 4 all together, so we would be at 10.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: But if we get --
MR. BIGGS: Now we would be at 10. If you extend that out to '26-'27 for something we need it's gonna be a lot more.
MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah, exactly.
MR. CAMPBELL: Let's not kid ourselves.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: So that is --
MR. CAMPBELL: That's where we're at.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: That's what I have for you.
MR. PETERSON: Numbers don't lie.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: We have -- as you see, we pulled out a lot of the stuff, we -- the employee, there was no employee this year. Hopefully our trucks stay running and our Water Department building doesn't flood anymore and --
MR. PETERSON: Do you have any major capital improvements next year that you are eyeballing?
MR. SULLIVAN: I was wondering that myself. Where are we with the trucks?
MR. BIGGS: The trucks, maintenance and hopefully nothing goes wrong. We shouldn't need to replace anything the next year.
MR. PETERSON: Next two years.
MR. CAMPBELL: I would say for the next couple years we would be okay.
MR. BIGGS: This one we got is a '19, so in the next two years --
MR. PETERSON: So in '26 you should be looking.
MR. BIGGS: Well '25-'26, before it gets too far, because then instead of having to get two though, whatever, one then with one then would have --
MR. PETERSON: Trying to space them out.
MR. BIGGS: Right, right.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: But if you add an employee too. You don't want two employees in one vehicle.
MR. SULLIVAN: Not if there's two different jobs to do.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: I know. We don't want to go there.
MR. CAMPBELL: I know what you're saying.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: So --
MR. PETERSON: What's everybody's thoughts?
MS. SLUSARCZYK: I want a raise.
MR. BIGGS: Is that in there? How about the foreman pay, is there that in there?
MR. PETERSON: Yes, because it was calculated at foreman's pay; correct, Cindy? I would assume he did it as superintendent, one foreman.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: We did like a flat -- we did like a $15,000 increase for benefits and an employee's wage, but we did figure like as the wages increased the known increases it was in there. And when we started this, here's the thing, we did have a foreman. So I want to say yeah, that was in there.
MR. PETERSON: I want to say it was in there, yeah, I would assume.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Because nobody in CT knows --
MR. PETERSON: That we don't have a foreman.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: I don't think it's -- and I'm gonna say that I don't think these -- I will tell you that the pay, the benefits, are not to the penny. I mean, the benefits are not $15,000, they're $30,000. But when it comes to the employees' pay there's always

overtime and things that you automatically just add more to that line whether it's used or not. Just like if you seen the transfer ordinance, our budget last week in the Council meeting, it all come out of the payroll line and moved it to other expenses within the fund. So if he was short for truck repairs it come out of his payroll excess and went in to pay for the truck repairs.

MR. PETERSON: I saw they didn't -- one of the transfers, what was it for, I can't remember. This was two transfers, right?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: There was I think four or five.

MR. PETERSON: Part of it was for like printing or something. Is that for the bills?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: No, because that was actually out of Darren's. I don't know what that actual charge was, but that was in Darren's account. Darren's is the 354, BPA's is a 350, so I'm 351, water supply is 352. So it was either they --

MR. PETERSON: Did you get printing done?

MR. BIGGS: I didn't know why that was. But it was out of your payroll I believe, and employees over there payroll as well, what ended up being. And one went in the -- I don't remember, and the other one went into printing out of yours and out of theirs over there.

MR. PETERSON: What did we spend printing on his end for?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I don't know it was his. I typed that for Bill, but I just typed numbers.

MR. BIGGS: It wasn't out of your payroll and out of the employees over their payroll.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: When you budget for the payroll you don't budget to the penny so.

MR. CAMPBELL: It depends how it works.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: You can't take money from another fund, so you gotta make sure that fund has enough money to -- if needed to move it within the different accounts within the fund. So if payroll is $10,000 high because you allowed for overtime, there's no overtime but he spent, you know, $5,000 on repairs to a truck or something, you know, it was within the fund so it's still all water money. Water money didn't go anywhere, nothing come into the water account, it was just balancing the account within the fund.

MR. PETERSON: It just seemed odd that it was coming out of payroll and going into printing.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: You can't have negatives. So you'll see more --

MR. PETERSON: Somewhere we spent more on printing.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: You'll see more. That was just the first one for this year. It will probably be another one.

MR. CAMPBELL: All of these figures were for 2024 that we --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Absolutely.

MR. CAMPBELL: All right. Say we did 60 percent and then would we be, I guess, ahead of the game where maybe we would not have to do anything in 2025? I don't know. I mean because this is gonna -- this is a lot and, you know, I guess --

MR. PETERSON: You hate to get it wrong because you're gonna turn around it.

MR. SHEELY: It can bite you in the rear end.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: 2025 -- 2025 the projected net revenue is $454,000 is what we'll end up at the end of the year. That is taking into consideration back here another 10 percent increase next year, okay, for 2025 and the readiness-to-serve fee going up 30 percent more.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, I think we're almost at the point where I think we -- you talked about many times you get on that road like everyone's been; and we've seen it for everything else we pay, it's just continual increases every year to keep moving forward.

MR. PETERSON: Does that get us to where we need to to apply for grants?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I don't -- I did not run those numbers backwards. When I was reviewing this stuff before it went to Council I was talking to the gentleman at CT and I go hey, I can't make this negative. And he goes I'm sorry to hear that, I wrote this program, I used to work for them before I worked for CT. And I said sorry. So him and Chris ran those figures, and Chris said it was like it had to be at least $9.00 a thousand. So was it $9.00 or was it $9.13, $9.15?

MR. PETERSON: I think with the readiness-to-serve fee and the $9.00 we would be safe. Because I did -- I think it was Chris I asked, and he said the readiness-to-serve fee would be included.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: But then in another response I took it as no.

MR. PETERSON: Maybe I misunderstood then.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I'm on the same page as you. I think it was read maybe in the discussion, I got the impression that comprehensively; and then in a e-mail it was like no and it's like -- but it's maybe subject to interpretation. We would have to go back to Chris on that.

MR. PETERSON: I'm just looking -- he's correct, we know we're gonna need that 24 and we need to get as many grants as we can. I think it's really stupid of us to not get to the point where we're eligible for grants at least. That could save the residents $10 million.

MR. CAMPBELL: I know. But it's just a hard thing to say gotta raise your rates to get money.

MR. PETERSON: I know. I've been there, I know.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: If you tell me you're gonna raise the rates so you can get some money for a water line, I'm gonna look at you and go yeah, because I'm paying for it. I'm still paying for it today or tomorrow, our water rates and our sewer rates have been impacted by big business.

MR. MOSELEY: Correct.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah.

MR. PETERSON: Absolutely. I guess on the Utility Committee side, what are you guys bringing in businesses?

MR. SHEELY: Probably have to pay the rate one way or the other.

MR. MOSELEY: Still cheaper than anywhere else.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I think we'll have the highest next to Girard at that point.

MR. MOSELEY: The resident shouldn't have to pick up the slack for these questions.

MR. SHEELY: I agree with Jamie on that.

MR. MOSELEY: That wasn't made between you guys.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I was very explicitly clear in my meetings with Council before they entered into those agreements last year, the sustainability of this Water Department was contingent on Niles' supply for the new power plant. So they heard it from this department that it needed to come from Niles. I don't want anyone to think that we were sitting back not paying attention to what was happening around us. The department knew what was going on.

MR. SULLIVAN: Well, and I think Council knew and everybody else. I mean, we laid it out enough times.

MR. CAMPBELL: Where does 60 percent put us just out of curiosity? We're at 57.

MR. PETERSON: And this is before MVSD does any increases, and we know it's coming eventually.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: But they have to go back to court to do that.

MR. SULLIVAN: But you're right, at some time the court's gonna approve it.

MR. CAMPBELL: It's coming.

MR. PETERSON: I mean, it's coming.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Sixty percent makes your rate $9.20 a thousand gallons, and it shows your net revenue minimum.

MR. SULLIVAN: What would it do in '25?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Keeping the same -- when you ask that, am I changing the percentage in 2025, or am I leaving it at the 10 percent minimum?

MR. CAMPBELL: Just leave it the way you have it, give us the figures.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: At 60 percent for 2024, the net revenue is $149,989 and ending balance $385,756. It didn't hardly change it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, it's only 3 percent. It's not like it's --

MR. PETERSON: $389,000 is not a lot of money in a cushion. It sounds like a lot of money.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Six months of fixed costs or two months of total expenses. Did you ever look at the list of bills in the Council packet? One is usually between $400,000 and $500,000 for one of the two that comes.

MR. PETERSON: That sounds like a lot. It's not.

MR. CAMPBELL: It's not.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: No, no.

MR. CAMPBELL: But I guess --

MR. MOSELEY: So what would the residents be paying for the 1-inch water line for that ready to use or --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: A resident's fee --

MR. MOSELEY: Why couldn't you just charge that to the businesses and not the residents?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Fair and equitable.

MR. PETERSON: That question was asked.

MR. CAMPBELL: You gotta treat everybody the same.

MR. MOSELEY: Well, their water rates aren't the same, that's not fair and equitable.

MR. PETERSON: They are the same now.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: They are not. TEC and LEC are not.

MR. MOSELEY: That's fair and equitable? We're paying more than they are.

MR. PETERSON: I was talking about the tiers are gone.

MR. CAMPBELL: The tiers are gone and we're based everything off of --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: But you have two companies that are exempt from that.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's why we were looking for the readiness-to-serve aspect.

MR. MOSELEY: Why should the residents pay that?

MR. CAMPBELL: It doesn't increase much on the residents' side, but it makes a lot of difference on the business size. If I understood Matt correctly, you have to charge everybody the fee -- what the fee is is based on the size.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: And that's why it's based on a percentage of an increase. So your increase went up 30 percent, their increase went up 30 percent or, you know, all the way.

MR. MOSELEY: But their rate's lower. Fair and equitable.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Even, like I said, with the peak charge --

MR. SULLIVAN: I believe it's gonna be a court case just to get the readiness-to-serve to LEC. They're gonna say hey, we have an agreement on water rates.

MR. MOSELEY: Right.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: And they have done that to us already.

MR. MOSELEY: They want to sue everybody. They want to be a good neighbor too.

MR. CAMPBELL: I guess we know where we're at.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: If it was to end up in a court case, your engineer that did the rate study has always stated there's three things that you have to have to defend your water rate study. Let me find my notes.

MR. PETERSON: Yeah, I can't remember them off the top of my head, but I know you're talking about.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Fair and equitable is for the most part.

MR. MOSELEY: Then I don't know how you can be fair and equitable on one side and not the other.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Fair, equitable, and defensible. They're fair through our thing, but they're not equitable when it comes to that customer. So in my mind, if you took this -- if LEC wanted to take this to court and a judge said are these fair and equitable. No, let the judge rule. What do you have to lose. He's not gonna give them a better --

MR. PETERSON: At the end of the day that could be a benefit. I mean, they could give us the fire power we need.

MR. MOSELEY: Because that wasn't done right anyway, how could it have been.

MR. PETERSON: At the end of the day that could be a good thing.

MR. CAMPBELL: We know there's gonna be a red one way or the other.

MR. MOSELEY: Can't lose much more.

MR. CAMPBELL: But we do have to make a decision on the direction and recommend. I mean, that's why you guys are part of this. No, you guys are part of that.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: If you establish a rate and the readiness-to-serve fee for parameters tonight, that would go to Matt and Peggy tomorrow for Tuesday's BPA meeting.

(A discussion is had off the record.)

MR. PETERSON: You guys bring those in and you brought businesses in.

MR. BIGGS: Or you'll have people up there in Council fighting. That's happened many times. Oh, it was the BPA that did it.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It's nothing any one us wants to do.

MR. PETERSON: No, absolutely not.

MR. CAMPBELL: We're all saying it.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Looking at that. But again, I said it two years ago to the sustainability of this department was contingent on one thing and it did not happen. We've pushed the cart down the road to the point where Darren can't even hire the employee that he needs. We have more people cutting grass than he has working in his department.

MR. SHEELY: If you take the next year 2025, what's that increase?

MR. CAMPBELL: So what would it be in 2025?

MR. SHEELY: Instead of doing like a yearly increment doing like every other year like we did with the sewer, you know what I mean.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I do. Did you do that all up front or do you split it in half? The readiness-to-serve fee is 30 percent and 30 percent. Do you want to hit them all with 60 percent up front?

MR. MOSELEY: I would say it's gonna be bad. Should have been raising up 5, 10 percent every year.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's why we gotta get started.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Part of that you're correct. But in 2020 we went to the City of Niles and we secured a 95 cent rate increase based on the fact that TEC was desired upon their system. We would have been paying 95 cents a thousand gallons. Do you know what that does to our purchase?

MR. SULLIVAN: Plus, they said they were gonna pay for the 24-inch line.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Every gallon you bought was money back in the department. That alone was the band-aid that we needed at the time.

MR. MOSELEY: I understand that.

MR. PETERSON: Listen, I'm still one for --

MR. SULLIVAN: I think the 30 and 30 is the best way to go.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Well, wait. When you say 30 and 30, let's talk -- are we talking the readiness-to-serve 30 percent in 2024, 30 percent in 2025?

MR. CAMPBELL: Because what you had in there was just 10 for 2025, right?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Not for the readiness-to-serve. It's 30 and 30.

MR. CAMPBELL: If that's what you had in there, then yes.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: So I got to write this down so we get the legislation correct. Readiness-to-serve. So now on the rates, the demand fee. The positive revenue just at 57 percent, that got both figures, that ended up with 2024 we ended up with a net revenue of $94,610 and the ending balance, our carry-over balance, is $330,377. So that figure was based at 57 percent on your demand. But Kevin --

MR. CAMPBELL: I just threw that out there.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Okay.

MR. CAMPBELL: What are you guys feeling? I mean, are we looking at least getting to, you know --

MR. PETERSON: I was thinking the 57. And then hopefully in year 2026, yeah, we see where we're with TEC running.

MR. CAMPBELL: Every little bit to help keep it from --

MR. PETERSON: We know there's going to be revenue, but just not what it will be.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm fine with the 57.

MR. PETERSON: I'm not. But I don't think we can afford to go lower.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah.

MR. PETERSON: I just don't. We have to show a positive balance in the budget and we have to show a healthy carry-over.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Well truthfully, it's not health. It's not.

MR. PETERSON: We're at least getting by. It's in the direction of.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It's not two weeks of expenses and you're supposed to have at least two months of total expenses.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, we'll work towards that.

MR. PETERSON: At the same time I don't want to chase away business because the rates are so high either, you know what I mean.

MR. MOSELEY: I don't think there's anything else coming in that I've heard.

MR. PETERSON: Is there any commitments out there that -- under our rate, was that -- I just didn't want to get --

MR. SHEELY: Not that we're aware of. We don't know if somebody has got something in the --

MR. PETERSON: I didn't want to get a curve ball on Tuesday and hey, we promised this.

MR. MOSELEY: Maybe until you get the new post office and zip code --

(At this time, there are multiple conversations going on.)

MS. SLUSARCZYK: And not -- the only other project we hear about is number three. Mike.

MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah.

MR. SHEELY: The shipyard place comes in this here.

MR. SULLIVAN: There was a lot of chatter about the third plant going in that plot. I don't know if that’s --

MR. CAMPBELL: What did you have for 2025 for the rate? We had 57 percent we were looking at for 2024.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: 2025 is 10. So, at this point 10 percent on $9.03 takes your rate to $9.93. So, it's a smaller percentage, but it's still a 90-cent increase.

MR. SULLIVAN: Did anybody run like a resident's bill now and what it would be in '25?

MR. PETERSON: I was gonna ask that actually. Do you know what a typical resident's bill is, how much it would increase dollar amount?

MR. MOSELEY: Mine is usually about $125 every three months.

MR. BIGGS: That's sewer also though.

MR. MOSELEY: Yeah, you're right.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: So, you only want water because we increased the sewer.

MR. BIGGS: They're just asking the water rate.

MR. PETERSON: Better look at a number.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Do you want both or just water rate?

MR. PETERSON: I want one and both. I'm needy.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: $5.75, 10,000 gallons is $57.50. Okay. Now 10,000 times $9.03 is gonna be $90.30, which is 57 percent increase. I don't care how you slice it, it's how you word it.

MR. PETERSON: $33 increase on a typical resident.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: For water alone. That's on 10,000 gallons usage, so.

MR. MOSELEY: Add for the sewer, now you're 60.

MR. CAMPBELL: Now are we -- what was I gonna ask. Are we still looking to bill -- are we still staying on our billing cycle or are we looking at monthly with this?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: No.

MR. CAMPBELL: Quarterly still then?

MR. PETERSON: I think eventually we need to try to find a way to get monthly.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Let's look at those staffing numbers right now because Darren will not be the only one needing a staff member.

MR. PETERSON: It usually helped us.

MR. MOSELEY: Is -- why, is that more?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Because instead of you doing a third, you'll do 1,600 bills every month, not --

MR. MOSELEY: You got them spaced out.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: We have them balanced. Constant income, there's constant balance. If you try to bill everybody you're tripling the work for the same outcome.

MR. MOSELEY: That computer program doesn't do that and spit it out?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It will do whatever you want to spit it out. Who's gonna do the work? Who's gonna collect the payments, print the bills, post bills? Postage goes up every six months now. We're not paying 50 cents --

MR. MOSELEY: E-mail.

MR. PETERSON: That's what we do.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: We have that capability, but that's another increase in the software. And did you ever hear the line I didn't get my bill? Because we've tested it even, we have it even for the payroll system. We're trying to get it to launched in the payroll instead of --

MR. MOSELEY: I'm just curious because I know them are costs and they add up. Everybody thinks they don't add up.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Oh, they definitely add up. Instead of me mailing one bill every three months to you I will be mailing twelve bills, twelve postage marks on there, however you want to do it. Whether you e-mail them or not, you still have to print a paper bill and mail it.

MR. PETERSON: We went to monthly billing, we run a two-month cycle. We went to monthly billing and a program where it excepts credit cards and automatic payments like, and I think there's like 250 people already signed up for automatic payment. So that did alleviate some of the work. They still have to go in and check and make sure everything is fine.

MR. MOSELEY: It's balancing into your account every month was automatic.

MR. PETERSON: And for the first six months it was hectic. But once it gets -- like now it's smooth.

MR. MOSELEY: Well, I'm sure they build programs like that. This isn't something we just invented.

MR. PETERSON: No. The programs we use, you guys --

MR. MOSELEY: I know it's changing. Once you get used to it --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It's not a bad thing. It's -- the Village itself comprehensively has no IT department. There's no security. Who's monitoring and watching that stuff? Our account has fraud activity on it for the last couple of months multiple times a month. This month alone there's three attempts to fraud on our account. Who's monitoring that? Right here, that's who is monitoring it. I am not gonna be accountable for 1,600 different businesses and homes and account numbers and stuff. So do that. The insurance -- we looked into the insurance. The starter package to start accepting credit card payments, base package two or three years ago was five grand just for the insurance. It didn't cover your limits and liabilities, which also is based on the size of your payment. Well, the size of our payment for you and I is insignificant. The size of our payment because of this customer now you just took your little fee to this fee because they have to protect that range.

MR. SULLIVAN: And we did, we argued that.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: We've dug into it multiple times.

MR. SULLIVAN: And Bill -- Bill said no way no how, don't even think about it.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: When we went -- we went to Newton Falls and we said all right, how are you doing these fees. And that time we had zero minimum bill, you just paid based on your water fee. The City of Newton Falls with thousands of people had to charge $18.50 or $18.75 per bill to cover those charges. So that's fine. You can pay that, I can pay that. But I can tell you there's a group of customers that can barely pay the bill to begin with.

MR. MOSELEY: No, I understand that.

MR. PETERSON: We passed the credit card fees on to the customer.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It's gonna be a lot worse.

MR. PETERSON: If they want the convenience of a credit card, we pass the fee on to them. It's usually like three or four dollars.

MR. CAMPBELL: They're all that way.

MR. MOSELEY: I charge four percent. Everybody is doing it now.

MR. PETERSON: Whatever the fee is, we pass it on to the customer.

MR. MOSELEY: If you use a debit card I don't know if they do or not.

MR. PETERSON: Debit or credit, it doesn't matter.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: And then you have to buy the software, the machines, and the capabilities. And then is it just can they do it online, can they come in, there's multiple levels of how you accept credit cards. Some people want to call over the phone and give you a credit card number and it's like well, then you have to have a whole red flag -- we had a red flag policy that basically said this is what we'll watch for fraud and theft on accounts. It's not just an it's an easier form of payment, here's my credit card, swipe it. It not the hairdresser set-up.

MR. MOSELEY: He knows, if you get automatic bill it's even nicer because it just does it.

MR. PETERSON: Correct, it's really nice. And it was a learning curve for people, I mean.

MR. MOSELEY: I'm sure it tells you this person didn't pay this month or they didn't have the money in their account.

MR. PETERSON: Uh-huh.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Well, the payment interface in our software -- regardless our software now, you would have to buy additional software. The expense would be on the Village for the software, the technology and the insurance to implement that.

MR. MOSELEY: That's what makes this go up. I get it.

MR. PETERSON: Well, what are we thinking? Are we in agreement?

MR. SULLIVAN: Looks like we don't have a choice.

MR. PETERSON: Is there a consensus on the 57?

MR. CAMPBELL: I think that's where we're at. I mean, when's the last time we even had a rate increase? It's been a long time.

MR. PETERSON: I was gonna ask actually.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I think it was '19.

MR. MOSELEY: They're gonna ask that.

MR. PETERSON: I think it was 2019.

MR. CAMPBELL: I think it was before that.

MR. SULLIVAN: We had them set a couple times and they got set back because this company was coming in and it would change the whole --

MR. CAMPBELL: It's always a moving target. We gotta get on track.

MR. PETERSON: We can always lower it. Nothing stops us from lowering it, you know what I mean. If Ultium for some reason -- yeah, I mean, and we look at it and say this isn't -- the carry-over gets very healthy -- I never heard of a system doing it but --

MR. SULLIVAN: When Darren and I met with Foxconn they said they were gonna be using more water than G.M. did.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Revised 2/19 of '19. Effective April of '19. And that's where you implemented the minimum monthly fees.

MR. SULLIVAN: We went up 66 cents, didn't we?

MR. PETERSON: Is that because MVSD was passing an increase to you.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: No, we have had not had an increase from MVSD. Again, the MVSD increase was also because the potential customer -- they weren't getting TEC either. So that would have secured the rates from them having to impose those rates as well. I'm not saying it would have, it might have. I don't know.

MR. SULLIVAN: I think the last time we increased G.M. was still here, and we made them part of the increase even though they --

MR. MOSELEY: It had to be before '18.

MR. PETERSON: G.M. wasn't here in '19. You guys might have had to do an increase because G.M. left.

MR. SULLIVAN: We did one before they left too.

MR. CAMPBELL: We did both. There's been a lot of changes in our system even since '19, so.

MR. PETERSON: Oh, yeah.

MR. CAMPBELL: It is what it is. I mean, boil out where we're at and what we need. That's why I asked the questions on the other projects. They're not in there and, I mean, it just is what it is.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Previously the water rate was $5.56, and it went to $5.75 when you changed and added the fixed fee. And that was 10 of '18. So Kevin --

MR. PETERSON: Okay. I guess have Matt draw up the resolution for the 57 percent increase.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: 57 percent in 2024 and 10 percent in 2025, or do you want to look at 2025?

MR. PETERSON: What do you guys think?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Right now if we look at 2025's --

MR. CAMPBELL: I would say we review it.

MR. PETERSON: And make the adjustment. I hate to just do --

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: What was your recommendation?

MR. PETERSON: 57 percent increase now, we'll revisit it for 2025. Is that what you guys think?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: So just now --

MR. SULLIVAN: Just the one year. Rather than going the 10 percent.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, it would be 30 for the readiness-to-serve and 10 percent on the --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Just with the 10 percent net revenue for 2025 that gives you $454,496, which is one month's almost -- maybe one month of carry-over, and you need two.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, we also need to see how next year's gonna go too.

MR. SULLIVAN: That's why I think we just need to do the one year so we can take a realistic look at what --

MR. PETERSON: August of next year it needs to be on the agenda and move forward.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Rates are March. Your rules and regulations say that you'll review the rates and set them in March.

MR. CAMPBELL: We'll just be getting started with this.

MR. PETERSON: Yeah, pretty much.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: So, you are moving with the readiness-to-serve fee increase for 2025 but not the demand fee, or are you only doing one year?

MR. CAMPBELL: I was thinking just do one year and see how it goes, then we look at it for 2025.

MR. SHEELY: Do both of them for one year.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah, yeah. Readiness-to-serve for 2024 and look at both of them.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: And to clarify, the readiness-to-serve will not include consumption.

MR. CAMPBELL: No, I think keep it clean and simple. To me that just muddies it and you're gonna have --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That's what it is now. To be clear, we have to --

MR. CAMPBELL: If you do that you get so much free water rate, it’s just crazy to try to explain to them.

MR. PETERSON: I think that just makes your life way more difficult than it benefits.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: So currently we have an account maintenance fee that is $3. So, we'll eliminate the account maintenance fee or rename it to the readiness-to-serve fee?

MR. CAMPBELL: That makes sense.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: And the readiness-to-serve fee will be what we have under the meter fees now, and that will be the readiness-to-serve fee, the dollar amounts. So, are we ready? For the 1-inch meter the readiness-to-serve fee will be $3.90.

MR. MOSELEY: Per month.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Per month. The readiness-to-serve fee on a 1 1/2-inch meter will be $65 a month. And these are not the same as the current, that's why I'm saying it for record purposes, okay. The 2-inch meter will be $97.50 a month. The 3-inch meter will be $156 a month. The 4-inch meter will be $312 a month. 6-inch meter, $539.50 a month. 8-inch meter, $767 a month. And 10-inch meter $1,001 even. 12-inch, $1,235 even.

MR. PETERSON: I'm sorry?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: 1235. 14-inch will be $1,495. 16-inch will be $1,755. Outside the Village of Lordstown a 1-inch meter will be $5.85. 2-inch outside is $146.25. 3-inch outside is $234. There are no other larger meters. Oh, there is, the Antonine Sisters.

MR. PETERSON: What size are they?
MR. MOSELEY: 6-inch, right, or 8?
MS. SLUSARCZYK: It's 4 or 6.
MR. BIGGS: I was thinking 4, but I'm not sure.
MR. MOSELEY: The pipes they are putting in --
MR. BIGGS: That's a main line and a 6-inch for a fire, and they are putting a 2-inch service on there; but they have one now that's bigger. Or maybe it's only an inch-and-a-half.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: They did downsize their meter because of those.
MR. BIGGS: Now that I think about it, it might be an inch-and-a-half and they might run a two on the other one. How are they gonna treat the fire? Some have meters on there and some don't.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: It's per meter no matter what its purpose. So if a power plant has four meters, they will have to have four fees.
MR. BIGGS: But what about the fire ones? Some have a meter for the fire system and some don't. How are we doing that?
MR. MOSELEY: Per meter.
MR. CAMPBELL: But he's saying some are reading, some are not.
MR. PETERSON: What's the requirement?
MR. BIGGS: We don't charge for it. If there's no requirement, they're just gonna say we'll get rid of it then.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Well the fire service line, if it's not metered they pay a fire service line fee.
MR. PETERSON: Any new ones are required to have it, Darren?
MR. BIGGS: We don't charge. Well, she can better answer that. We've never had that you have to, you don't have to. We didn't, right.
MR. SULLIVAN: The $3.90 -- now we're paying $3 and we're going to the $3.90, correct?
MR. CAMPBELL: For a standard 1 inch-inch.
MR. BIGGS: Yeah. So is our fee for the residential -- what is that?
MR. PETERSON: $3.90.
MR. BIGGS: $3.90 is 1-inch, right? What's 5/8 by 3/4?
MR. PETERSON: Cindy, is 1/8 and 5/8 --
MS. SLUSARCZYK: 3/4 by 5/8-inch meters are coded up to 1-inch.
MR. BIGGS: You have to have 1-inch. You have one at 1-inch, so how about below?
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Up to and including 1-inch.
MR. BIGGS: That's different.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: I clarified --
MR. BIGGS: Is that how it reads though, and including?
MS. SLUSARCZYK: It's up to -- it says domestic service up to 1-inch. And then it goes 1 1/2, 2, 3, 4, et cetera. My other thing is based on Darren's comment about fire service line. If you do not have a metered fire service line your bill is $30 per month. Do you want to review that fee while you're doing this as well? And then this will throw your deposits out of whack. Your deposit will not cover your bill so you'll have to adjust your deposits.
MR. PETERSON: Pandora's box. Yeah, you're gonna have to adjust that fire fee because, you're right, they're just gonna take the meters out and you want meters on there to know if there's a problem I'm assuming.

MR. BIGGS: It's a better thing. It was not actually required.

MR. PETERSON: What's your biggest fire line in the Village, 6, 8?

MR. BIGGS: I can't answer that.

MR. SHEELY: Travis might be able to.

MR. PETERSON: He probably wouldn't know. I don't want to say it this way, but do you adjust the fire line fee to the same fee as the meter fee?

MR. CAMPBELL: I guess that's what we're looking at if you shored it up.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Well the -- this is just my thoughts is your fee is based on equivalent meter units based on what you can pull out of that line. Typically a fire service line is not used; but if it has to be used, we'd have to be able to supply the necessary water, right?

MR. PETERSON: Correct.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well it's back to readiness. It has to be ready to use any time.

MR. PETERSON: It's a readiness-to-serve. So is business that has a 6-inch line, we're gonna tell them essentially your new fee is $549.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: And then we need to discuss the fact that is a compound meter one meter.

MR. PETERSON: Yes. I would say so.

MR. CAMPBELL: What do you mean by a compound meter?

MR. PETERSON: A compound meter has a low and high side. It's two readings but it's one unit. Wouldn't you agree?

MR. BIGGS: That's exactly right. And you would bill from the -- it's normally a bigger meter anyway. It's not a small one, it's a bigger one so that it can read at higher rates. It was just more accurate at the time. We don't deal with them anymore, but we still have them in our system. You got a high and a low. One would be more accurate at low and the other one would read more accurate at a high, but it's one unit.

MR. CAMPBELL: One unit. Okay, I'm fine with that. The fire thing, I don't know what to tell you. Do you know how many are metered?

MR. BIGGS: No.

MR. PETERSON: I think half.

MR. BIGGS: I don't know. I have no clue.

MR. PETERSON: Or do we just want to come up with a set fee, and does that cause any issues with the readiness-to-serve fee is what I'm getting at? If you're doing a readiness-to-serve fee and there's a meter on the fire line and we make it a different fee, is that gonna cause issues down the road? Does that make any sense?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: If you have a metered fire line and you charge the readiness-to-serve fee you're talking hundreds of dollars a month. A fire service line is $30 a month. If I had a meter on a fire service line it will come out tomorrow.

MR. PETERSON: Absolutely. And that's what I'm trying to avoid because that helps you see if there's an issue on that fire line. You want a meter on there, I assume because you don't charge for that.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Just to brainstorm, how is Fear Forest -- was that corrected with the change?

MR. BIGGS: It was. They got -- they'll still have a fire service but they have to because they have that hydrant after. So what

I did, they have tapped off of that and ran down the service line, so now we only charge for the smaller one. And there's just a couple little things that I was hearing, you know, with doing that. Like you said LEC has got four meters. Well, two of them aren't even ours. We -- are we gonna start charging for Warren meters?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: All of them are ours. They're our customers. It's not based on the meter.

MR. BIGGS: Fair enough, okay. I'm just picturing when I went in and put a meter in, Warren came out and changed it and said no, they're our customer and that's --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That's how it went down.

MR. PETERSON: I will have went to Warren and said no, it's not. Does Warren read the meter?

MR. BIGGS: Yes.

MR. PETERSON: Warren reads the meter for people on their line.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: And send us the --

MR. PETERSON: And gives you the reading.

MR. BIGGS: We go out and read Warren's also so we have our own numbers.

MR. PETERSON: Are all the meters up there Warren's?

MR. BIGGS: Up where?

MR. PETERSON: Every system on Warren's line, are they Warren's meters or are they our meters?

MR. BIGGS: The residential ones, are -- how are they? I mean, I think all the business ones are theirs.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: We have nothing -- if there's a resident on Warren water they get billed from Warren. They are not part of our --

MR. BIGGS: That's what I'm saying, nothing to do with us.

MR. PETERSON: But they charge at our rate and they give you back money?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: No.

MR. BIGGS: We have nothing to do with them. We just gave it to them.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: No. That's Warren's customer 100 percent.

MR. PETERSON: So wait a minute. We make no revenue off of anybody off the Warren line?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That's too broad of a statement.

MR. PETERSON: Matalco.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Matalco is contracted with the City of Warren, we buy water from Warren, Warren bills us, we bill Matalco.

MR. PETERSON: Okay.

MR. SULLIVAN: But do we generate any revenue?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: Foxconn's on the same line.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: There's no resident on the Warren water line that we bill. Does not exist.

MR. PETERSON: So residents are essentially Warren's customers.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: No, not essentially, they are Warren's customers. If they're connected to the -- there's customers on Tod Avenue that have Lordstown water, and there's customers on Tod Avenue that have Warren water rate. If they have Warren water they are Warren's customer, they are not our customer.

MR. SULLIVAN: Well a couple of those that were Warren's customers and they put in the pumps, grinder pumps, and Warren said --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That's sewer.

MR. BIGGS: That's the waste water.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: That's for sewer.

MR. BIGGS: That's waste water. We're talking just the water right there. And that goes to Trumbull County. We maintain that, but Trumbull County gets all the revenue from that.

MR. SULLIVAN: I thought the last couple serviced them for water too.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I can't tell the sewer customers, that's a whole other nightmare. The utility committee is here. (Cindy exits the meeting briefly.)

MR. CAMPBELL: Back to your question of like do we want to make a flat rate fire service. It's just if you have a meter or not meter and it's fire service you're just paying that; is that what you were saying, not opening up a can of worms?

MR. PETERSON: But I think there should be a bigger charge if they're not metered.

MR. CAMPBELL: To force them into the meters.

MR. PETERSON: To force them into a meter. But the readiness-to-serve fee I think is a little excessive for something we want them to have. But I guess they're required to have it if they have such a square foot building. So I'm kind of forced into it, but I don't want to get into having different fees because of what might come down the road. Does that make any sense?

MR. CAMPBELL: I know.

MR. PETERSON: I'm trying to think ahead. So I guess that will be a Matt question.

MR. CAMPBELL: This is definitely another hiccup.

MR. SULLIVAN: Can of worms.

MR. PETERSON: Pandora's box, open it every day.

MR. SULLIVAN: So we're at 56 percent or whatever?

MR. PETERSON: I will say if Matt concurs that we can charge different rates, is everybody okay with that?

MR. CAMPBELL: For the fire?

MR. PETERSON: For the fire. Does anybody see a problem with that?

MR. CAMPBELL: When -- you mean like again are you looking to do one rate for fire service, do you want to have one a different rate if there's no meter versus a meter?

MR. PETERSON: Correct, that was my thought. If Matt concurs that's --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Fair and equitable and defensible.

MR. PETERSON: That was the three things I was looking for.

MR. CAMPBELL: How are we looking to structure it then? If you didn't have a meter you would be paying more than the readiness-to-serve fee.

MR. PETERSON: I was thinking like $60 if you don't have, $30 if you do have.

MR. CAMPBELL: I see. Well, I think that aligns more with what type of service line and what it's on for than the other side of what we're doing for readiness-to-serve.

MR. PETERSON: Because I feel they're paying the readiness-to-serve.

MR. CAMPBELL: That they're gonna have another meter that pays readiness-to-serve.

MR. PETERSON: I don't know if it's fair to double.

MR. CAMPBELL: For the fire suppression?

MR. PETERSON: Yes.
MR. CAMPBELL: Makes sense. I guess it makes sense as much as for anything else we got.
MR. PETERSON: As long as Matt concurs that that fits their three definitions.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: So you're saying a fire service line that is metered will not pay a readiness-to-serve fee but they will pay a fee of --
MR. CAMPBELL: Whatever we come up with.
MR. PETERSON: I just threw numbers out there. I don't know if those are the numbers you guys want or not want. I think there should be a -- charge something for the fire service line, I agree with that. But I don't agree with charging them the entire readiness-to-serve fee for a 6-inch meter when they're a business that has a large meter.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: And hopefully is never gonna use it.
MR. PETERSON: Yeah, absolutely. And again, I don't want to deter people from putting meters on.
MR. BIGGS: Will you be able to determine that in the billing okay?
MS. SLUSARCZYK: It would be okay metered and non-metered service line.
MR. BIGGS: You will be able to determine which meter is which and that?
MS. SLUSARCZYK: In the beginning the whole thing will be a nightmare. I will probably live here for the next two months.
MR. CAMPBELL: If it's fire suppression with a meter or without a meter.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yes. Some of that information we do know because there are -- if currently metered, fire service line is not charged. If a fire service line is not metered they are paying a fee already. So that's -- if you change the dollar figure, then I'll change the dollar figure. If you're going to charge for the metered service something, then I have to notify what that is. But if it’s -- that's up to you if you want to do that, you know what I mean.
MR. PETERSON: What's your guys' thoughts?
MS. SLUSARCZYK: I think the purpose of the fee was okay if they do use -- you know, we have the water there.
MR. PETERSON: If they do use a little bit more --
MS. SLUSARCZYK: If someone -- sometimes the set-ups had a sink after it, so it recorded the use. And if they have used that sink every day and at the end of the year we bill something off of it, we bill something off of it. I think Darren would notify where those are. And like I said, I know the one customer who had that, and I think there's one other building that had that and they may have been required to add the meter because of that. That would be something he would literally have to give me yeah, nay.
MR. PETERSON: What are you thinking?
MR. CAMPBELL: I was thinking what other things we have on our list that we have to make sure are getting --
MR. PETERSON: I was gonna ask her when we decided to go down the list and see what else we affected.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Well, the deposit. What's our deposit now?
MR. CAMPBELL: What's our deposit now?
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Water deposit is $200. For homeowners is $90. So that $90 deposit was set basically to cover a bill for a five-

month period, the three months of the billing cycle and two months before you would shut it off. Rates for one quarter's bill is gonna be $90 or over $90 now, so together five months it would be like $145, or actually a little bit more than that. But a homeowner in the Village you can assess the taxes on if you catch it. The risk is the landlord or the tenants. And we don't do tenants anymore, but we still have the situation in the system until they move out; and then lessees, the residents of like Imperial, so their deposit was $125 because we have no ability to seek that. It's -- if we can't collect it and Imperial doesn't pay it or if you waive it, we lost that money.

MR. PETERSON: Well, what are we thinking for the fire service line?

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm okay with that approach as long as Matt says it's something we can implement with going in the direction.

MR. PETERSON: What are the dollar amounts, because I'm sure he's gonna need that.

MR. CAMPBELL: Whatever you guys feel comfortable with. I think keeping it as low as we can for that side of it --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: If you're not implementing the readiness-to-serve fees, if you're gonna adjust the fee, you can adjust the fee. But do you want it to be different if it's metered or not metered?

MR. PETERSON: Yes, because I think that entices people to meter, which helps you in the long run.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Well, okay. Do our rules and regulations require that because isn't fire flow not supposed to be restricted by a meter?

MR. PETERSON: See, I have some that are metered. I don't require metered.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: As do we. But I hear one thing from one end and --

MR. PETERSON: I don't want to say it to you because I don't know without looking it up.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Why don't we leave that sit until March.

MR. PETERSON: I'm fine with that. And just --

MR. CAMPBELL: We have to do something about the meters because there's a meter that's gonna come up in the system so.

MR. SULLIVAN: And if they're not metered they have a readiness-to-serve, correct?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Well, that's what I asked. Is a fire meter going to be charged, because there's multiple times you have a meter on your home. Like for instance, a sewer deduction meter.

MR. CAMPBELL: I still think it needs asked to Matt as to whether or not --

MR. PETERSON: I will say we just adjust the regular domestic water meters to a readiness-to-serve fee. Does that make sense? We charge the readiness-to-serve fee on a domestic water meter.

MR. SULLIVAN: And that will be $3.90.

MR. PETERSON: Well $3.90 for up to 1-inch and then going up based on the meter size.

MR. SULLIVAN: But the residential would be --

MR. PETERSON: Yeah. Residential would be $3.90, yes, correct. Does that make sense, Cindy?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yeah. Readiness-to-serve fee on just the water meter, not on a fire service meter?

MR. PETERSON: Correct.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Account maintenance fee will be gone. And in essence we'll set that up as the readiness-to-serve fee based on meter size. And then your demand fee will go to $9.03, right?

MR. CAMPBELL: That's 57 percent.

MR. PETERSON: Yeah, 57 percent. That's right.

MR. SULLIVAN: From what? What's the current?

MR. PETERSON: Current rate's $5.75.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah, on a tier.

MR. PETERSON: On a tier, yeah.

MR. CAMPBELL: The tier's going away.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Correct. Tier has been removed per your last meeting.

MR. PETERSON: Any other hidden fees?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: The only other thing is the deposit I think.

MR. PETERSON: I agree, I think you need to move that deposit. What are you comfortable as for the deposit? $145?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: If a deposit was meant to cover five months at $125, that's $25 a month. So --

MR. SULLIVAN: So the current bill for a residence would -- for the three month bill would go up 66 --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: No. The rate is -- the rate you proposed tonight is $9.03. We're currently paying $575. That's an increase of $3.28 per thousand gallons, plus the readiness-to-serve fee.

MR. SULLIVAN: Three -- what did you say, $3.27?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: $3.28. And on the residence you have -- so $3.90 times three is $11.70 per bill.

MR. BIGGS: That only went up what, a dollar eighty?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Well no, because it included consumption. Oh no, that was account maintenance fee that was fixed.

MR. BIGGS: So that disappears, so then it's really that part for residential goes up a dollar and eighty cents, right?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: $2.70, 90 times three.

MR. PETERSON: So on an average customer's bill you're talking about a $33 every three months increase on an average customer. You said the average water bill was 90 -- or I'm sorry, $57.50 now average customer, not -- and then that would jump it up to $90.30, correct, just so I have the right figures?

MR. SULLIVAN: That's right.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yeah, $35.50 just for water rate. The sewer increase will take effect as well but --

MR. PETERSON: So you're talking $35.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: And that's someone based on 10,000 gallons that on the average bill we don't use, you have to take out the big business. You can't, our average bills would all be huge.

MR. PETERSON: Absolutely, I get that. So yeah, yeah. Okay. What have we decided on the deposit?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: What did we decide on what?

MR. PETERSON: On the deposit we have.

MR. CAMPBELL: Like I said, we have the people that own homes. I mean, I know we had it what, at $90, and we had the other ones like at $125?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yes. And then commercial/ industrial users was $200. Our industrial users have significantly changed since the implementation of a deposit. Before it was really only General Motors, and they were here before the deposit was started.

MR. PETERSON: Before the deposit was even started, yeah.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: But still that money just sits there.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's the bad part of it. It has to sit there and it has to be encumbered to give back whenever someone closes an account, so it's not like we can use it.

MR. MOSELEY: Make money on it, 5 percent.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: No, you cannot. Deposit trust is you're not allowed to.

MR. CAMPBELL: It sits there and does nothing. Isn't that crazy?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Thank you Ohio Revised Code.

MR. MOSELEY: How much is there?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It varies day-by-day.

MR. MOSELEY: That's really dumb.

MR. CAMPBELL: It is what it is.

MR. SULLIVAN: So just leave that alone.

MR. PETERSON: I was thinking $150.

MR. BIGGS: Is that just to cover water for the five months, that's it? I mean, but homeowners, you can go after them anyway for the water bill.

MR. MOSELEY: She said you can assess the taxes.

MR. BIGGS: What's the big deal about raising it?

MR. CAMPBELL: At least for homeowners.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: The homeowners we have recourse. On the tenants and lessees we do not.

MR. BIGGS: What I'm getting at is let's say they left Imperial -- that's what you're talking about, right -- and don't pay and you can't go after them, what if they took the meter. That don't cover the meter anyway if that's what we're worried about.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: The deposit is never intended to cover the cost of the meter, and that's theft.

MR. PETERSON: It's just the water bill.

MR. MOSELEY: How do you know who took it?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: You don't. Most of them now there's not even a value to them compared to a brass meter before.

MR. CAMPBELL: So what do you want to do? Leave the homeowners alone?

MR. PETERSON: I would leave homeowners alone. We have recourse against the homeowners. The renters, do you want to up that to $150? Are we safe there?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah. Cindy, are you comfortable with that?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It's just a security blanket.

MR. PETERSON: Okay. What about commercial?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: They don't usually just leave town unannounced. They declare bankruptcy and we can file in court against bankruptcy.

MR. PETERSON: They usually still own. I know you have renters and like the plaza and stuff, but most of them own and you can still assess taxes. I would say just leave it alone.

MR. CAMPBELL: $150, $200, then it's all even numbers.

MR. PETERSON: If you want to do it that way I'm cool with it.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm fine.

MR. PETERSON: I'm fine with the way it is now.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: What about your frontage fee for outside users. That's just never been adjusted.

MR. PETERSON: What is it now?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It's $800 maximum for outside the Village. We charge a frontage fee on the water line, which is the cost that it would cost to lay that line if we -- $8 a foot doesn't cover it.

MR. PETERSON: $8 a foot isn't even close.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: That I think has never changed, so.
MR. PETERSON: What does it cost you?
MR. BIGGS: To put the line in the ground?
MR. PETERSON: Yeah.
MR. BIGGS: I don't even know what it would be by the foot now.
MR. SHEELY: What is it down your way?
MR. PETERSON: I don't know because I've never had to charge it.
MR. BIGGS: I mean, we don't charge it. We don't make them do it.
MR. PETERSON: If I extend a water line they're paying for it anyways.
MR. BIGGS: You know what I'm talking about, right?
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Obviously it needs adjusted. But do you have want to wait to adjust that until March and get some figures, Darren?
MR. BIGGS: I couldn't even get close. I'd have to -- I don't -- I couldn't even give you a good guesstimate on that.
MR. PETERSON: We'll wait until March. Just so it doesn't get forgotten. I don't want to put you on the spot and say you gotta --
MR. BIGGS: Let me find out, if you're looking to adjust obviously, where we're at.
MR. PETERSON: Let's do that. Everybody is okay with that?
MS. SLUSARCZYK: So that's the whole -- that's our sheet there. I mean, that's comprehensive. I'm just the office end of it.
MR. PETERSON: You'll look at it in March and make sure you're okay with your tap-in fees.
MR. BIGGS: You're asking me to review that before March? I heard you, Chris. I'll add it in to my --
MR. PETERSON: Okay. Anything else on Water Rate Increase Review?
MR. CAMPBELL: Only thing left is to check with Matt on what we're gonna do with that, right?
MR. PETERSON: Cindy, do you want to send him an e-mail?
MS. SLUSARCZYK: For the fire service line? I thought that was a held until March.
MR. PETERSON: It is, but I think we should ask Matt the question.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: I think that question is probably gonna have to be directed to the engineers because they would know if a fire service line could be restricted to a meter or not.
MR. CAMPBELL: As far as being applied or not being applied.
MR. PETERSON: I just want to make sure we're following under them definitions.
MR. SULLIVAN: Tuesday we'll finalize whatever we're doing?
MR. PETERSON: Correct, as long as they can get the Resolution ready in time. I think you checked and they can.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: I will submit this. I have to mark it up and send it to them tomorrow and ask them. The agenda probably won't be posted until Monday sometime, if they could prepare it in that amount of time. So I mean, and there's hoping.
MR. PETERSON: That's not a bad idea.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: What's that?

MR. PETERSON: Do you want to put in there if Meander raises the rate, our rate would follow in suit? That way we wouldn't have to turn around -- if Meander passes something we could just -- it would be -- would that work?
MR. SHEELY: It would be automatic.
MR. PETERSON: It would be automatic, we wouldn't have to --
MS. SLUSARCZYK: It's a rate sheet. I understand building it into the resolution, but I don't know how --
MR. PETERSON: Is that a Matt question?
MS. SLUSARCZYK: I don't think it could work that easily. I would love for it to work that easily. When they implement the rate, MVSD could increase it to Niles, then Niles has to increase it to us. So when it took effect with us, we can't be in the middle of a bill cycle with somebody, so when do we implement that?
MR. PETERSON: You could put that language in there at the next billing cycle. I guess it wouldn't be MVSD, it would be Niles, we would pass on whatever Niles would pass on to us. I'm just trying to save you work on another resolution six months from now because they raised the rates and --
MR. SULLIVAN: I don't think that's a good idea.
MR. PETERSON: If it's doable.
MR. CAMPBELL: Easier than running the thing through again.
MR. PETERSON: Or we can run it through again.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Has MVSD reached out to anybody and said anything about that?
MR. PETERSON: I haven't heard anything.
MR. SULLIVAN: They've gone back to court.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: They went back?
MR. SULLIVAN: That's what I understood.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: See, I was told that they had to have their figures reviewed better and resubmitted, and I've not been able to communicate with them, so.
MR. PETERSON: I'm sure they are still moving on it. It's been a year, so I'm sure they are going through the motions. I just didn't want to pass this and then three or four months from now them pass something and we have to return around and pass one again. We can do that.
MR. MOSELEY: It's been a year since they've been in court.
MR. CAMPBELL: It's hard to say.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: November of last year.
MR. PETERSON: If you guys want to leave it out of there --
MR. MOSELEY: They went to court for 11 cents in 2022, November.
MR. SULLIVAN: I really think that would be good if we can do it, or whatever their increase when it comes, we increase.
MR. PETERSON: Whatever Niles increase would be. Yeah, I can't -- Matt would have to come up with the language. I'm not sure how we would word that.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yeah, because in our current agreement with the City of Niles it says if you meet this much supply and demand because --
MR. PETERSON: Because it could go down 95 cents.
MS. SLUSARCZYK: They should be billing us $3.49. So if we say it goes up and if say we hit that 28 million gallon mark and it goes down, I mean, that would have to be worded cautiously.
MR. PETERSON: So cautiously to make sure we're covered.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: If you have a resident read that and it says it went down, it didn't go up, where's my discount for 95 cents.

MR. PETERSON: I guess that would be a question for Matt even if it's -- even I might say it's not a good idea and that's fine with us. If it's something he thinks he can put in there; if not, leave it alone.

MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I think that would be a better question to Bob, wouldn't it?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Bob?

MR. SULLIVAN: McNutt.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: No, I think it's a legal question.

MR. PETERSON: I think it's a legal question.

MR. CAMPBELL: It on the legal side.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: If the rates were to change, we have that parameter built into that. And here's the thing. If they're not doing it in the immediate future, okay, and we're here next October and they're saying okay --

MR. PETERSON: If they increase it and we're two months away, we can be okay.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: For that sake, I think it needs to come for the Board to say 11 cents is enough when we know right now we need 90 cents next year. So why would you increase it two or three times in a one-year window instead of doing it now, and only if it is increased to us or next year when you review that. If they start before we do, then you do your adjustment at the same time.

MR. PETERSON: I can live with that. Let's leave it out of there for now, because then you're turning around and adjusting it twice.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Well, today. And if MVSD adjustment, it goes up, we need our 90 cents. But I'm not covered on the 90 cents, I'm covered on the 11 cents.

MR. PETERSON: If they do it eight or nine months from now we're close enough to the next time we're going to do something, we can just do it then if you get it in.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: And the last time they were very prompt on giving us the notice. It wasn't after the fact; it was a hey, in January we're going up.

MR. PETERSON: They understand it takes us three months to do it. Okay, I'm fine with that.

MR. CAMPBELL: What was our carry-over? I know we had -- when things were going well we had a huge carry- over when G.M. was here and it was like point --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It was over $1.5 million.

MR. CAMPBELL: The -- I think the question is gonna come by how did you get by this long without a rate increase, and we should have that.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Again, you started with a little increase and the fixed fee. So if TEC came on board we receive a 95 cent discount. That takes -- that's a huge savings and that we got the 95-cent discount, and you could have eliminated that, plus at what rate the profit that you would make off of the new customer. I mean, they're big, millions of gallons of water a day.

MR. CAMPBELL: We had a huge carry-over that we had.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: We were trying not to do this. We were trying to ride out the storm to see if --

MR. PETERSON: So to see where are we at now.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: And when TEC signed papers last June or

July they said they were breaking ground two months later. They're more than a year behind.

MR. PETERSON: Yeah.

MR. SULLIVAN: Well, the Village is trying to stop them or was trying, or what's going on with that?

MR. MOSELEY: Haven't heard anything.

MR. SHEELY: We haven't heard nothing.

MR. SULLIVAN: There's 40 or fifty cars there every day.

MR. MOSELEY: They don't care what we say. Just like the first one.

MR. SULLIVAN: But didn't Matt put a cease and desist on that at one point?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: A stop work order.

MR. SHEELY: Until they started coming up and meeting with Kelly and them and getting their frickin' permits and shit taken care of. They haven't done nothing with their permits. They had no building permits or nothing.

MR. PETERSON: For I guess transparency or to explain to people why we're doing this increase. I know you put it in the paper about the meeting. Should we do anything else to make sure? I'd rather them come to the meeting and I'd rather stay ahead of the problem than be behind it three months from now when they get their bill.

MR. SULLIVAN: You -- well, you know they are gonna beat the shit out of us.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: The water rate study had been on the agenda for months and months but it's been active. This is what, our third meeting on it; and Monday will be the fourth.

MR. PETERSON: And these have been open meetings.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: I know it's been spoken on Facebook that the rates are low and artificially low and that the rate increase is coming about. I've read it myself.

MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah, I have too.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: It's not a secret. But to the public you can -- I don't think it's gonna make difference if you did put it out there unless you're literally telling them what the rates are gonna be, and is it gonna change your mind. You cannot back out of these rates.

MR. PETERSON: No. I mean, it's not gonna change my mind. I mean -- I mean it's a sustainability of the department.

MR. SULLIVAN: Take the beating and --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Yeah. Give me your contact numbers that you would like me to share with the resident when they call.

MR. PETERSON: We had a meeting to explain why we were doing this and we got very little negative feedback, and we did it for a 40 percent increase. So we weren't far off you guys or --

MS. SLUSARCZYK: But did you implement a readiness-to-serve fee on top of it?

MR. PETERSON: No, we did not. No. Okay. Anything else?

MR. SULLIVAN: Did most communities?

MS. SLUSARCZYK: Some have some sort of a fixed fee anymore. Some are -- like Newton Falls was kind of --

MR. PETERSON: Like we have a fixed fee.

MS. SLUSARCZYK: The computer age, the credit card acceptance and those kind of fees. It really wasn't based on -- I can't comment today as to what they are.

MR. PETERSON: Okay. Anything else on that subject?

MEMBER COMMENTS:

MR. PETERSON: Seeing none, any other Member Comments? Member comments?

MR. CAMPBELL: I don't have anything.

MR. PETERSON: Mike? Okay.

ADJOURNMENT:

MR. PETERSON: Motion to adjourn?

MR. SULLIVAN: So moved.

MR. CAMPBELL: Second.

MR. PETERSON: All in favor?

(All respond aye.)

(Meeting adjourns at 6:00 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF OHIO)
TRUMBULL COUNTY) SS.

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal of office at Niles, Ohio on this 3rd day of November, 2023.

____
DEBORAH I. LAVELLE, Notary Public
My Commission expires 4/15/2027

Submitted: Approved by:

Cinthia Slusarczyk, Clerk Christopher Peterson, President