

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
VILLAGE OF PENINSULA WASTEWATER COMMITTEE
APRIL 23, 2020 MEETING**

Call to Order: Solicitor Brad Bryan called the meeting to order at 2:01 p.m.

Roll Call: In Attendance (via Zoom Meeting):

Mr. Kaplan – Present
Mr. Weigand – Present
Mr. Krusinski – Present

Mayor Daniel Schneider, Jr. and Solicitor Brad Bryan were also present.

PRESENTATION AND CONSIDERATION OF RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

March 10, 2020 Wastewater Committee Meeting Minutes: Mr. Weigand made a motion to adopt the March 10, 2020 Minutes that was seconded by Mr. Kaplan.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Kaplan, yes; Mr. Krusinski, yes; Mr. Weigand, yes. The Minutes were approved.

DISCUSSION OF WASTEWATER MATTERS AND PROPOSED POWERPOINT INFORMATION PACKET AND SOLICITATION FOR PUBLIC INPUT

Mr. Weigand opened the meeting thanking everyone for their hard work and Mr. Krusinski for his time and effort in putting together the proposed PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Weigand stated he would like to go through the proposed presentation page by page and discuss any requests for changes. Mr. Kaplan also thanked everyone for all their hard work. Mr. Kaplan asked Mr. Bryan for a timeline as to how the Committee gets from this point in the process to Council taking final action.

Mr. Bryan stated his understanding as to how the Committee wished to proceed is after the PowerPoint presentation is approved by the Committee, it will be finalized and posted for public comment for 30 days. After the 30 days, the Wastewater Committee will meet to discuss the public comments and make its recommendation to Council. That process should take until at least late-May. Council could then discuss the matter and take action at its June Council Meeting.

The Committee proceeded to go through the draft of the PowerPoint and make the following changes.

The date on the Cover Page was updated to today's date.

On page three, a typo '*that*' was removed.

On pages seven and eight, the highlighted passages in the letter from the EPA were un-highlighted.

On page nine, a bullet point was added to the bottom of the page stating: "For comparison, one lateral equals one connection to a central sewer system."

On page twelve, the titles were changed to: Option #1 – NPDES On-Lot Individual Upgrades for Residents and Businesses; Option #2 - Village Owned and Operated Centralized Sewer System; and Option #3 - County Owned and Operated Centralized Sewer System.

On page thirteen, the *Please Note* area referring to individual system upgrades possibly not solving the Clean Water Act problem was moved to the Pros and Cons sheet and listed as a Con.

On page sixteen, an additional Pro was added stating: People that have properly functioning and approved systems could keep them and not have to transition to and be assessed for a central system. Mr. Weigand noted the Pros and Cons will differ per reader given their particular situation or circumstance.

Page seventeen highlights the EPA's April, 2020 letter, stating the EPA regards septic system upgrades as temporary solutions. Paragraph three on page seventeen was changed to simply state if a Central System is the option chosen, the Village will be in compliance, but if the Village continues with the Individual Systems, it is possible to not be in compliance. Mr. Krusinski wanted it communicated that there is the possibility for an individual to spend a lot of money on an individual system only to have their system shut down and have to tie into a central system and incur additional expenses. Mr. Kaplan clarified the Summit County Health Department stated if we went with only NPDES systems, because of the density of the area, it is possible we might not meet the Clean Water Act requirements. In that case, we will have to start all over again with all this time and money lost.

On Page Eighteen, the wording in number four pertaining to the ongoing costs of individual systems vs. the cost of a central system was changed from 'would likely' to 'could' cost more. Number ten was also changed to read: The OHEPA and the Summit County Health Department do not believe that this option will make the Village comply with the Clean Water Act.

The Chart headings on page nineteen were changed from Worst, Better, and Best headings to Scenario #1, Scenario #2, & Scenario #3.

On page twenty, the heading was changed to make it consistent with prior changes, and some of the Pros and Cons were modified. Mr. Kaplan stated the biggest Pro to the Village with respect to constructing its own Central System is the Village would be able to seek grants and funding for both the design and construction phase that might not be available to the County. The biggest Con is the Village would have a large loan to pay back. Mr. Kaplan stated if the Village works together with the County to make sure it receives County approval through the design and construction stages, the County would likely take over operation of the system if requested to do so. If the Village deviates from the County's advice at any time, there could be issues.

Number two on page twenty-one raises the question of a sewer system Operating Board. Mr. Bryan stated the Ohio Revised Code requires the Village to establish an Operating Board if it is going to own and operate a central sewer system.

On page twenty-two, the heading was made consistent with previous changes, and the word minimum was removed from the chart.

In reviewing page twenty-three, it was stressed that property owners would not be assessed for the cost of the system (over a period of twenty to thirty years) until nine to twelve months after the Central System were to come on-line. The homeowner would also not start paying their monthly fee until after the system was operational. The monthly sewer maintenance fee charged by the County Sewer Department since 2011 is \$56.03 per month for a single-family residence. In 2021, the Sewer Department will conduct a rate study. Mr. Krusinski thought the tap-in and septic system removal fees are paid up front out-of-pocket by the homeowner. A discussion took place as to whether the tap-in-fee could be negotiated into the property assessment. It was emphasized that the cost assessed to each property owner remains with the

property, not the individual. The assessment on each homeowner's property tax would be the construction costs of a Central System.

Page twenty-four was not changed. An important Pro to having the County build and pay for the system is that the Village's involvement and responsibilities with respect to these wastewater issues would be finished.

On page twenty-five, if the Village had the County design and build the Village's Wastewater System, the total cost would not be known until 9 months after it was designed, constructed, and operating. That is a Con. Since it is unknown if the County could help on any grant assistance, the best scenario would be for the Village to stay involved in the project for the opportunity to acquire available grant money the County is unable to get.

Mr. Bryan stated the Committee can approve the PowerPoint presentation as amended in this meeting's discussions. Mr. Weigand made a motion to approve the PowerPoint presentation as amended that was seconded by Mr. Kaplan.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Kaplan, yes; Mr. Krusinski, yes; Mr. Weigand, yes. The PowerPoint presentation was approved as amended.

Mr. Bryan stated he and Mr. Krusinski would make the requested changes and get it posted for public review and comment as quickly as possible.

Adjournment: Mr. Kaplan made a motion to adjourn that was seconded by Mr. Weigand. All were in favor of the motion; none were opposed. The Meeting was adjourned at 3:12 p.m.

Approved by the Committee,


