

**VILLAGE OF PENINSULA
MAY 22, 2018 SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

Date: Tuesday, May 22, 2018
Time: 4:06 PM to 5:40 p.m.
Location: Peninsula Village Hall

DRAFT

CALL TO ORDER: The Village of Peninsula Council convened from 4:06 p.m. to 5:40 p.m. at the Peninsula Village Hall. Mayor Douglas Mayor called the meeting to order and initiated the roll call.

Council Members Present:

Mayor: Doug Mayer

Councilpersons:

Michael J. Kaplan

Mike Matusz

Mary Booth

Dee Holody

Christopher Weigand

Dan Schneider

Purpose: Waste Water Project Feasibility Discussion with Village Council and Representatives from:

Ohio EPA

Summit County Department of Sanitary Sewer Services

Summit County Division of Environmental Health

Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.

The Mayor stated the discussion in this meeting is between Council and the Guest Speakers, not for the public's participation. If another meeting is needed, a date will be set.

COUNCIL PARTICIPATION:

The Mayor started by stating he knows Mr. Stoll of the EPA through a common relationship, and there is no conflict of interest. He knows Mr. Weant of Summit County Department of Sanitary Sewer Services from work on this project; and there is no conflict of interest. He has no relationship with the Summit County Division of Environmental Health representatives nor with Stantec Consulting Services. The guests' roles are defined by their titles. Their goal is to keep the river and water clean and to keep the public safe. For the meeting, Councilmembers will each have 5 minutes to ask questions, without debate, and find out facts to educate the Council and the Public.

Mr. Kaplan began the question period by asking the representatives to identify themselves. They are:

Ynes Arocho, Environmental Specialist, Ohio EPA in Summit County

Dean Stoll, Supervisor, NE District Office, Ohio EPA

Mike Weant, Director, Summit County Department of Sanitary Sewer Services

**VILLAGE OF PENINSULA
MAY 22, 2018 SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

Tonia Burford, Environmental Health Director, and Donna Skoda, Health Commissioner, Summit County Division of Environmental Health
Gary Silcott, Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.

Mr. Kaplan disclosed that he and Mr. Matusz met previously with Mr. Stoll, Mr. Weant, and 4 representatives from Summit County Public Health to discuss the project and has no other involvement with them past or present. Mr. Kaplan began by asking Mr. Stoll why a letter from their agency dated September 5, 2017 was written. Mr. Stoll explained it was a letter to the Mayor and Council signed by Kurt Princic, Chief of the NE District, Ohio EPA. The letter was a recommendation that if the Village wants to pursue sanitary sewers, a waste water treatment plant, and tie into a regional facility, then it should be turned over to Mr. Weant and his Department at Summit County. Mr. Kaplan stated the letter was not requested by anyone from the Village; it resulted from the EPA having met with the Village, having thought about the issues, and offering the advice from Mr. Stoll's Supervisor. Mr. Stoll thought it was the best course of action for the Village.

Moving on, Mr. Kaplan stated septic systems are legal and acceptable according to the EPA. Mr. Stoll explained it is important to know who regulates what. The Summit County Health Department regulates 1-3 family residential dwellings tied into a septic system; if it is 4 families or more or a business, then it is regulated by the Ohio EPA.

Mr. Kaplan asked Ms. Burford, the Health Director, if properly maintained septic systems are permitted in Ohio. Ms. Burford replied they are. Mr. Kaplan asked Mr. Stoll if the letter stated the cost to a resident for the proposed sewer system would be over \$200/month. Mr. Stoll replied yes. Mr. Kaplan asked if the letter also recommended against the MBR system because there is a problem with flow and operating the system within the Village due to seasonal traffic. Dean Stoll explained that MBR (Membrane Bio Reactor) systems have advantages and disadvantages. There are many different types of systems. MBRs are not as common and most operators do not have as much experience with MBRs. They have been told energy costs with those systems are significant. They require a lot of power, and they work well with a steady flow. When the flow is too high, like in wet weather events, they are not as good.

Mr. Matusz asked Mr. Stoll if the EPA and the Village businesses are working together to be compliant. Mr. Stoll responded yes, but they haven't been to every business. Those they have been to and inspected are working with the EPA to come into compliance. Some are already in compliance. Mr. Matusz asked whether the EPA is coming down on the Village of Peninsula with findings and orders. Mr. Stoll replied no, not at this time. Mr. Matusz asked if they are looking to do that because of non-compliant businesses. Mr. Stoll explained what would spur that would be a complaint from the Summit County Health Department about unsanitary conditions. That is normally how findings and orders happen in this type of situation. To the Health Dept, Mr. Matusz asked if they are looking for findings and orders on the residents. Ms. Burford responded that it is complaint driven and they don't have that level of complaints in Peninsula. That does not mean that

**VILLAGE OF PENINSULA
MAY 22, 2018 SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

problems do not exist. Peninsula is not required to test stormwater because of its size. To do sampling, the outfalls and complaint locations need to be identified.

Mr. Matusz asked whether there had been complaints. Ms. Burford responded yes, and they are based on addresses. Mr. Matusz asked if the Health Department could work with the Village to get residents to be compliant with their septic systems. Ms. Burford responded to some degree. Many systems are older. An MPDES system, used for smaller lots, could be installed with a permit under the Health Department. It's possible to go that route, but, as a community, the Village needs to decide about the direction it would like to take. Ms. Skoda responded the Health District would help. It depends on the community and some do not want growth. In Norton, there was a different situation because it was a health issue. If you ask any public health official what the best solution is, they will say it is to sewer because it is a permanent solution. That doesn't mean it is right for this community. That is a personal decision that needs to be made on evidence, data, and information. The Health Department would help in conjunction with the Ohio EPA and Sewer District to help in the capacity they are allowed. The Health Department will not issue orders because there are too many septic systems. There may have been some inspection or a bill due to State rules. Then the Health Department will be out looking at those systems. The intent is to improve the infrastructure. Meetings like these are important to help the community decide on a solution.

The Mayor explained that findings and orders are often referred to, and this is what that means: It's basically; if they find a problem, they order us to fix it. If they find enough problems and order us to fix it and we don't, then this can really turn around and a community can really get in trouble.

Ms. Booth stated she would address the Health Department, asking do we begin with a complaint on all the 152 small lots in the wastewater district, so you can test them and see if we are compliant or not? Ms. Skoda stated they can check data and records on specific addresses for what they already have internally. The Health Dept needs to refer to the operation maintenance state rules and decide what they can do. They don't want to offend folks by inspecting a second time if they have already been there. The Department would be glad to look at a list of properties by address and bring back information to the Village. Councilmembers indicated the address list has been sent.

Ms. Booth referred to the Sept 5, 2017 EPA letter speaking of the future. We understand the discharge requirements are going to be made more stringent in the next couple of years, and that may require a solution such as an MBR. If a traditional system were put in, there would be upgrades needed in a couple of years. Could this be addressed? Mr. Stoll responded that was not accurate and explained further. There are current and future limits outside of the MBR. An MBR is another activated sludge system and does the same thing as every other activated sludge system. It reduces carbon and converts ammonia to nitrates. Whether you use a batch reactor, aeration tanks, oxidation ditches, or MBRs, they

**VILLAGE OF PENINSULA
MAY 22, 2018 SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

are all doing the same thing. The MBR doesn't need clarifiers to settle out the solids, because the solids can't fit between the pore spaces in the membranes.

Ms. Booth asked Mr. Stoll if he recommended a different system. Mr. Stoll stated the MBR has nothing wrong with it, but it would not be his first choice. Ms. Booth asked if he agreed the discharge standards would be increased in the next few years. Mr. Stoll stated he doesn't see them being relaxed, and he doesn't see anything coming down the road that would be any different in another system. Ms. Booth stated that in the letter it was recommended if we tied into a regional system, we should use the County for the system, and at the many meetings about this we have found out from the County that tying into a regional system is not feasible. Why was this all that was addressed in the letter? Mr. Stoll stated, either direction you go, building a collection system and a plant, or tying into a regional facility, we recommend that you let Mike Weant and his Department oversee the project. This is because they design, install, and maintain sewers for a living. They have experience and know the process and how to get permits. It's not an easy undertaking. It's nothing against Stantec or any other engineer the County would use. It's that the County will be taking the lead, and they have experience in these projects. They know the process and pitfalls. It would be more efficient, and they would have a greater chance of success.

The Mayor asked Mr. Stoll if Peninsula must put in a sewer system. Mr. Stoll responded no, however, his Department would be supportive. He commented that he could detect the problem in the air where he parked. The Mayor asked if at this time the Village works with the Health Department to take care of the septic systems, would the Village be ordered to put in a sewer system. Mr. Weant responded no on both accounts.

The Mayor asked the Health Department if the Village should be put into an order to put in a sewer system. Ms. Skoda responded there have not been enough complaints to validate that. The Mayor further expanded that if the residents became better stewards of their septic systems, then the Health Department would not order the EPA to come to us. Ms. Burford commented that is the way it works. We routinely approve permits for MPDES systems in this area. If a homeowner asks us for help with a failing system, we help them with a permit. The Mayor referred to 17 residents' addresses that have put in mostly MPDES systems in the last 5 years. By installing them, we are getting ahead of polluting the ground. Ms. Burford indicated that even the MPDES has its limitations. If they are installed as required, they are allowed under the general permit. You still have very small lots in a large concentration. Ms. Skoda stated that there are businesses in the Village with room for improvement on their systems. Ms. Skoda stated that thinking about the sanitary sewer solution, we've expressed this is a Village decision. With the sewer system will come development. You must have the philosophy as a community how you want to grow or not grow.

Ms. Holody referred to the Sept 5, 2017 EPA letter's last paragraph about the high degree of tourist traffic that can pose a challenge in operating a wastewater treatment system. The letter states the aeration treatment operates

**VILLAGE OF PENINSULA
MAY 22, 2018 SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

best under constant flow. Ms. Holody stated that this is the same problem as indicated about the MBR. Mr. Stoll said yes, that is so, and some are better than others at that. Ms. Holody asked Mr. Silcott why the use of an MBR would counter this paragraph. Mr. Silcott stated that the MBR has much greater flexibility to deal with the fluctuations in the strength of the sewer flow because of the flow print and the ability to isolate tanks. For a smaller amount of flow, we can run it through one tank instead of two, so we can fluctuate with a smaller amount than we could with the aeration plant.

Ms. Holody asked about the 1 million dollars referred to in the letter for the design of the plan and where that number came from. Mr. Stoll indicated if he remembered correctly, it was on a document provided by the Village. Ms. Holody stated that the design-engineering budget was embedded in the project budget and that was what they have been working off. She stated the information could be provided and that she believes the information in the letter is incorrect. She stated that we were thinking about where the Village will be in 5 or 10 years and how we want to grow. She stated that she understands the MPDES systems are legal and she questions whether the Village will continue to monitor them on individual lots and will we have multiple package plants. She further stated that if another business wants to come in or to have more control on economic development, we would anticipate that there would be more package plants in the Village. Why do we have open-air package plants? Mr. Stoll stated because we don't have sanitary sewers. Sanitary sewers would allow for growth. Businesses in this community are very limited based on small lot sizes and poor soils. It's unlikely that those businesses with plants now would be able to expand and make the plants bigger.

Mr. Weigand asked Mr. Weant if the County designs, builds, and operates our sewer system, does the Village have full control of how many and the type of customers the system accommodates now and in the future. Mr. Weant responded sure based on other examples. First, they define the current and future service area that determines the size of the sewer and whether the plant is compliant with the stream or not. Only so much loading or discharge is allowed in the stream. The City of New Franklin is an example where they have 100% control of the contracts.

Mr. Weigand asked if the Village has any say in the rates. Mr. Weant responded the rates are determined by County ordinance based on either a metered public water source or a flat rate because they don't have metered water. There is a blend of the different costs across the County. Maintenance costs on the infrastructure go into a rate model that determines what the single rate is going to be regardless of the cost of each subsystem. There is a single rate that covers that expense that relates to the revenue generated to support the ongoing maintenance and capital investment in the infrastructure. The last rate increase was in 2011. We discounted rates 2 years ago by 10%. We do have upward pressure on our rates due to the flow we send to the NEOSD for treatment and the flow we send to the City of Akron. The NEOSD is under a 3.3 billion dollar consent order and the City of Akron is under a 1.4 billion dollar order. That is another cost that goes into the cost model to give the Cost of Service. The Cost of Service is paid by 51,000 customers.

**VILLAGE OF PENINSULA
MAY 22, 2018 SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

Mr. Weigand asked Mr. Weant if we had the County put the sewers in, would we be metered? Mr. Weant responded no it would be a flat rate based on household size tied back to the census, which has been decreasing rather than increasing in the County. What we will be doing for the next rate model is taking the average usage of the 51,000 customers (9,000 well water and 42,000 metered) to set the average usage of a flat rate account. This helps consider a customer base that includes a single individual up to 14-acre properties. That new model will maybe be done in 2020.

Mr. Weigand asked Ms. Burford if the Village continues as is with the septic systems, is that just between the resident and the Health Department or does the Village play a role in that scenario? Ms. Burford responded the Village would only be duty bound to step in if there were a significant nuisance, which would result in findings and orders. Ms. Skoda commented that is how it is now.

Mr. Weigand asked if the Village took a vote and decided to have the County put in the sewer system, then are we "off the hook" for problems that occur? Mr. Weant responded that if the Sewer District is the provider, then they are "on the hook". At that point, any fines issued would be to the Sewer District. Mr. Weigand then asked if the Village has its own sewer system, whether any fines would go to the Village from the EPA. Mr. Weant stated that it follows ownership. He further stated that individual systems that have sporadic failures would be handled between the individual and the Health Department. However, if there were a group or subdivision with a failure, then it would be a Village problem.

Mr. Schneider questioned whether the County is interested in putting in a sewer system in the Village. Mr. Weant stated no. With Stantec under contract, I'm not in control, so the County is out of the game. If it's my contract and I want to direct Stantec, that's my cost. If it is not my contract, I can't direct Stantec and can't influence them since you have a binding contract between you. There was an ongoing conversation with Council when I meet with them about whether the County will accept ownership at the end of the project, which is a problem because you created a rate structure that doesn't match my rate structure in the County ordinance. We have a procedure we go through when we are asked to take over a privately or municipal owned system. We would come in, and there have been conversations with Stantec about what our construction and design standards are. If I were going to do that, I'd want to take over. The only thing that might affect that is there might be a grant available due to the Village's size or economics that I wouldn't have. Once the engineering project is in place, you are directing Stantec on how to design the plant, and you are making decisions and I am not. That is why I say I don't have any interest. Mr. Schneider responded is there no way you two would work together so we could get money? Mr. Weant replied that as soon as he would make a decision that drives up the cost of the project, he'll be accused of undermining the contract, and I'm the bad guy. It's very thin ice. I would give Gary Silcott my opinion, if asked, and he has our construction standards.

Mr. Schneider asked the Health Department if they get all these addresses to them, will there be someone out here looking at all these septic systems? The

**VILLAGE OF PENINSULA
MAY 22, 2018 SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

Village can't turn people in. Ms. Burford replied that there are 3 buckets of people. First, those under the Health Department's operation permit who have already had inspection. Second, there are those with recently installed systems. And third, there are the unknowns with existing systems where an inspection port might need to be installed and it takes time. If we find nuisances, we order a new system. There are those who have paid \$10,000 to install a new system, so why would they want the sewer system. We are willing to work with you as a partner. We need to know the direction you are trying to go.

Mr. Kaplan referred to the Beacon Journal stating that in Clinton there were 75 failing systems and asked Mr. Weant if that was correct? Mr. Weant replied it was that or more. We worked with the Health Department which found there were failings in septic systems in groupings called "hot spots". Mr. Kaplan stated in Clinton you and the City didn't always agree but you came to an agreement. Mr. Weant responded yes.

Mr. Kaplan asked how much the rate for a home system in Summit County was. Mr. Weant responded \$56.03. Mr. Kaplan asked if Stantec wasn't in the picture and we asked you to design, build, and operate the system, would you charge us for the engineering. Mr. Weant replied probably not. Mr. Kaplan asked would you be interested in building and operating it for us. Mr. Weant replied if we built it, we would have to do that. We must maintain it, and if it wears out, we must replace it.

Mr. Kaplan addressed Mr. Stoll regarding businesses plus semi-public facilities, like a 6 or 7-family home, churches, public buildings, and their wastewater. So, they can have a package plant or central sewer systems. Mr. Stoll responded there are also other types of systems such as on-site dissipation systems (for large sites). We have issued PTIs for holding tanks which our Director is allowing for a temporary measure until the issue is resolved. A few businesses are pursuing that. Basically, the businesses are looking at a discharging wastewater treatment plant regulated by a MPDES permit or tying into a central collecting system.

Mr. Kaplan addressed the Health Department about if we don't want to have considerable growth going forward, you referred to Bath's community decision to not go with a sewer system. For example, if an individual in the community needs a new system, could you work with us and can we help with financing for that citizen? Ms. Burford stated our role is to issue a permit and make sure it is done correctly. We don't do the financing portion of it. There is some money through the County called the Water Pollution Control Loan Fund that is income dependent. Ms. Skoda commented it is graduated, so you might be able to get 80% of your system paid. It's not an all-or-nothing deal.

Mr. Matusz asked Mr. Weant if Stantec weren't in the picture, if you would be interested in doing the system if the Village came to you. Mr. Weant responded this project has history with our agency dating back to a report from 2003. In the report, at a cost, the consultant was directed to not consider a wastewater treatment plant solution. They looked at gravity sewers and pump stations. Later,

DRAFT

**VILLAGE OF PENINSULA
MAY 22, 2018 SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

between 2006 and 2008, we did another report for \$25,000 that focused on the Park because it is a burden on the Village and the Village was strapped for cash. We paid to update that report. We told the consultant at that point in time to consider a pump station wastewater treatment plant solution. They came back with a life cycle analysis between the treatment plant and pump station solutions. The pump station would pump up Quick Rd. to an existing sewer we own in front of the high school. It was a very expensive solution with 5 pump stations, was energy intensive, and did not have the life span that a treatment plant has. We decided to pursue the wastewater treatment plant option and presented that. The Council's sentiment was that they didn't want the County involved and the Village would do it on their own. I was asked to leave it at that time. I supported it to promote growth, tourism, and to provide clean water to the stream. Council later concluded a wastewater treatment plant was best. I would have suggested an MBR system because of the small footprint and real estate is at a premium. Then, the sewer committee started going through other options. Does the County have the financial resources to buy down the assessment? The upfront fee does not coincide with the County methodology. The County has the final construction cost assessed over years on property taxes. For the County, it started with the Park. It's an expensive solution here. The County spreads the cost over the customer base except the construction cost that is assessed to the community. The maintenance is spread across the County.

Ms. Booth stated that she thought it was difficult to get a price from the County. Mr. Weant commented that the engineering firm has given an estimate of 6.5 million dollars that the Village is running with and that will not be the number. Ms. Booth stated that having a number gave them something to work with. Mr. Weant stated that he gave a number a long time ago. He didn't have the specifics to give an accurate number. He gave a figure of around 7.2 million dollars based on an approach of size of service area, flow, size of plant, past typical costs for that capacity, and coming up with an assessment. There was zero detail at that point, so he was hesitant to give a price in public. Ms. Booth commented that we must have a leap of faith to go with that at that point, and that they understood Mr. Weant didn't want to enter into an agreement with the Village. Mr. Weant stated that was not true. He said it was not as attractive as a larger project with more customers. Ms. Booth stated she thought Mr. Weant pointed out we wouldn't get additional funding or a grant if we went with the County. Mr. Weant stated the County has funding limitations. If he wasn't interested, he would not have put another \$25,000 into the preliminary engineering report. He didn't put in another \$25,000 to pursue another solution.

Ms. Booth asked since we aren't water metered, would the County use the EPA EDU standard? Mr. Weant responded that is what we use now. I believe it is overstated now because people use water saving devices and conserving water usage. When averaging over 41,000 customers, that is more representative of water usage. From a planning perspective, when you size a pipe or a plant, we use EPA Flow parameters. A single residential home is considered 1 EDU. A Winking Lizard is calculated based on number of seats, parking, if there is a

DRAFT

**VILLAGE OF PENINSULA
MAY 22, 2018 SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

kitchen, and the discharge flow off that site. Then you divide it by the EDU, which is 400 gallons, and you come up with some equivalent EDU. Your house might be 1 EDU and the Winking Lizard 10 times that. That's the logic of the theory behind that.

The Mayor continued that question by stating if I'm paying as a resident \$5.63, then the Winking Lizard is paying \$56.30. That's not encouraging to businesses in the Village. Mr. Weant stated it's the fair way to do it. The business uses a larger share of the pipe. The Mayor asked if the County assessment would be different for a resident vs the Winking Lizard. Mr. Weant stated yes. The Mayor asked why as each is one building. Mr. Weant stated they have more opportunity to generate money by increasing the size of their building than you do by increasing the size of your house. There are different factors that can be used to divide up the assessment; one is zoning, and one is land usage. The Mayor surmised that an individual then might pay \$5 for the assessment while the business pays \$50. Mr. Weant brought up that another method is by frontage, but that can be unfair if two properties are the same in area, but one is deep and the other is wide. Assessments need to be fair to hold up in court if challenged.

The Mayor asked the Health Department if they are still willing to work with us if we decide not to go forward with the sewer system. They responded yes. The Mayor stated if we keep moving forward putting in better systems, then we should be ok. Ms. Burford commented on the mix of properties and the difficulty in finding where the problems lie.

Ms. Holody commented she read on the Health Department website that a large percentage of the on-lot systems in Ohio are not maintained appropriately and asked if this was so. Ms. Burford responded that in 2015, new rules were designed to provide an ongoing and ultimate solution for operation and maintenance of systems. People don't always think about the operation and maintenance. It's still up to the individuals.

Ms. Holody referred to Mr. Weant that they didn't think they were writing the County off, they were deciding what system to go with and trying to get grant money. Say we got to that point, would you redesign? Are you ok with the gravity collection system? Mr. Weant stated the gravity system is cheaper to build. Ms. Holody stated that if 75% of the money is for the collection system, I'd be surprised you would have to re-engineer if we are already designing it to include your specifications. Mr. Weant stated he is not talking about re-engineering, what he is talking about is the Village engaged someone to design the system and his agency is not involved in that at all. If you build it and ask us to then take ownership of it, we have a process we go through where we provide logs, so we can look at the sewers and the testing results. Theoretically, since it is brand new, there should be no problems. At that point in time, we would decide if we would take ownership in the system or not. Ms. Holody asked whether the County would bid on constructing the project. Mr. Weant stated we do not bid on contracts; we are not in the construction business.

**VILLAGE OF PENINSULA
MAY 22, 2018 SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

Ms. Holody pointed out that Mr. Weant stated the MBR is most feasible for the discharge requirements into the Cuyahoga River, and if he were designing the plant, he would use the MBR. Does the County design MBRs? Mr. Weant stated they hire consultants to design, and his engineers review the design work. Throughout the process, they make comments on what needs to be in the design. Once they are received, the design consultant makes changes to the plans based on the reviews. They then make construction bid specifications based on the plans and put it on the market for bid.

Mr. Weigand asked the County what the cost would be. Mr. Weant said they would use the same process. Our approach would be the same. Mr. Weigand asked if they saw Stantec's plans, could they give a price. Mr. Weant stated they could, but it would probably not have significant changes. As you approach 100% of the design, the estimate will change.

Mr. Weigand asked when it comes to funding, we as a Village can apply for grants, low interest loans, and the OPWC, which affects our bottom line, correct? Mr. Weant commented the County can apply for low interest or 0% loans, but not the Army Corps of Engineers and OPWC moneys. The County front-ends all the costs, so they don't have to build a reserve or wait on funding. 2.14% is the cheapest rate we can get through WPCLF, and this would be a prime project. The income level effects the OPWC, and the County would get that rate for replacing old sewers, not building new ones. I don't know about the Army Corps of Engineers. It was speculated it is based on the community size. The assessment is probably seen the year following construction.

Mr. Weigand asked if the County does anything for individuals with an existing septic system. Mr. Weant replied the most they do is give them a 5-year grace period.

Mr. Weigand asked if the EPA is involved in the MPDES permit. Mr. Stoll stated it is the EPAs permit, but the Health Department helps the homeowners submit the letter of intent and handles problems that occur. If it is for a business, it goes through the EPA. Ms. Burford stated the Health Department does the inspections for residential and businesses and contracts through the Ohio EPA. For enforcement, it is turned over to Ohio EPA.

Mr. Schneider had no questions but commented that we may find we have more problems than may be found in inspections. The lots are small, and the systems are hard to get in. Ms. Burford commented that it is difficult, and you do not have a centralized water system. There is more of a problem if a well needs to be replaced. That must be considered on the small lots.

The Solicitor commented on a meeting at Mr. Weant's office where the Mayor, Ms. Booth, Ms. Holody, and Mr. Silcott were present discussing how the Village was pursuing grants and that completing the design engineering would help with that process. Mr. Weant indicated that if we were interested in future collaboration with the County, it should be designed pursuant to your systems. You talked about the review process at 30%, 60%, 90%, and 100% of the design

DRAFT

**VILLAGE OF PENINSULA
MAY 22, 2018 SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

process. Perhaps there was a communication breakdown. The Village's contract with Stantec requires those reviews with the County, and it doesn't seem you are aware of that. But Stantec is required by the contract to do that. Is that something that at this point you are not interested in? Are you interested in future collaboration if that is what Council wants to do? Mr. Weant stated his only concern is that he doesn't own the contract and what happens if he impacts the contract? The Solicitor stated you said you would be doing that with whoever got your bid as part of the design process. Mr. Weant stated that is right, but I would own that contract and it doesn't do any good to do a cursory review to make recommendations to do it this way or that, particularly if at the end the County owns the project. A cursory review in our opinion doesn't do anyone any good, particularly if it drives up your cost or takes up my resources in review. It seems an extra effort when I don't have any say in changes. The Solicitor stated if you had the knowledge and confidence that the Village was following through on your recommendations and the Village decided to make a commitment to go forward with the County, then would you be more comfortable? Mr. Weant stated that he didn't know how to get away from that.

The Mayor asked Mr. Weant whether you were ever considered for the Peninsula project when we had our reviews and we were looking at engineers. Mr. Weant replied no.

A motion for adjournment was made by Mr. Matusz. Mr. Schneider seconded the motion. All Councilmembers voted in favor of the motion. The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

DRAFT

Douglas G Mayer, Mayor Date

John Stiegel, Fiscal Officer Date
