London City Council

20 S. Walnut Street, London, Ohio 43140

October 1, 2026, at 6:30 pm

Minutes

Call to Order

President Peters called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. The Council recited the Pledge of Allegiance, followed by a moment of Silent Reflection.

Roll Call

Present – Councilwoman Jackman, President Peters, Councilman Eades, Councilman Stahl, Councilman Hays, Councilman Hitt, Councilman Boyd, Councilwoman Treynor

Absent – none

Minutes – Approval of September 17, 2026 minutes by unanimous vote

Public Hearing – none

Communications/Announcements –

- Mid-Ohio WSD
  - Tia Sexton, Mid-Ohio Board Member
  - Mark Landis, City of London representative
  - Nick Daly, Mid-Ohio Executive Director

Mark Landis - Nick got his civil engineering degree from the University of Dayton and quickly went to work for the City of Dayton as a civil engineer. He quickly became lead engineer and ran a team of other engineers in... leading $80 million worth of capital improvements per year. We're very happy to have him at Mid-Ohio as new leadership. It was a good process to find Nick. We're very happy he's here, and we've reviewed what information we thought would be best for you guys, and Nick has it. So, we'll get out of his way unless you have questions for us at the end.

Nick Daly - Yeah, I was going to introduce myself with some background, but Mr. Landis did a good job. So just want to make sure you have a face to a name. You can't hear me. Can everybody hear me now? What prompted, obviously, us arriving is: one, I wanted to make sure you were introduced to me. I'm new. I think Councilman Eades referenced some past minutes with my name, so I want to make sure you have a face to that name and make sure you're aware that you can reach out to me whenever you have questions. I don't want you guys to not have information from Mid-Ohio. I want that to be available to you. I brought some cards, some business cards, so if you guys each want one of those, I can share those with you. Made in the last meeting, and keep in mind I've only been with the district for three months, so the information I'm going to share with you is the best information I have thus far through three months of being with the district and leading the district, but I just wanted to make sure you understand where Mid-Ohio is on some information that was shared in the last meeting brought to your attention. So, one focal point was the Raftelis report that was done for Mid-Ohio. I want to make it very clear that the report is a draft. That was the first time it was shared with the board. Nothing in there is final, so keep that in mind. That's a baseline, really, for the district, just to know what we could potentially be up against should that be what we do. Sorry, now I'm suddenly yelling into it. But I've given

you all a handout, which I plan to talk about at the end, if you don't mind. But I wanted to address some specific things that were mentioned in the last board meeting by citizens of London. I think Councilman Eades spoke to some of the information as well; I read through the minutes. So, one thing that got brought up is this north and south district thing. I wasn't here in the past. And I think, Councilman Peters, you also referenced that you remember some things. I wasn't here during that time. I want to make that clear: I might not have all the information available to me, but I have reviewed all the transfer agreements for the district, both the county's, Plain City's, and London's transfer agreements. There's no mention in any of those documents that Mid-Ohio is currently operating under that makes those statements, that there are plans for different districts within the district. And spread any capital improvements and the long-term infrastructure across a larger customer base. And in theory, that makes rates lower. I know the rate study came out, which shows rates increasing. But there's some information that I also want to share with you about that. And maybe most of you know this. You've been longtime residents of London. I have not. My family's from here. But I haven't been privy to some of this information until I came on board with the district. So, sewer rates, just sewer rates here in London. So, I've looked back at the ordinances that were passed in 2012, I think 2023, that were passed here in London. So, rates from 2015 to 2022 on the sewer side, there were no rate increases. So, for eight years here in London, there were no rate increases whatsoever. In 2023, and I think this was specifically spoken about by the resident who addressed you all at the last council meeting, there were increases to pay for the east side trunk sewer. And that's in one of the ordinances that was passed by London before Mid-Ohio took over. There was an increase in 2023 from 582 all the way up until that point for the eight years prior. Rates here in London were 582 per thousand gallons. There was no base rate. Or volume rate. It was one rate, and for every 1,000 gallons you used, you paid that rate, so 582. In 2023, that rate was bumped up to 749, and that was the minimum rate for the first 1,000 gallons; then after that, it was 582 for every 1,000 gallons after that. 2024, it bumped up the 599 that was referenced in the last council meeting. So, the rate was 1348 and 582 per thousand gallons. That is currently where London's rates sit. There were more increases planned in that ordinance that Mid-Ohio has not enacted yet. So, when it's said that the east side trunk sewer was fully funded through the rates, I want to make it clear some of those rates actually just didn't get, I don't know if it was through the transfer that some of this stuff got missed. I actually don't have good answers for why those increases didn't happen. But London was supposed to be at 947 in 2025, 1947, and that 582 volume in 2025. And then from then on, the ordinance finishes with 3% increases to both that minimum rate and the volume rate, and that's how it finishes. So, some of what you have on that document I shared shows that, and I'll explain that to you when I get there. Now, on the water side, I want to make sure it's a different utility now. From 2014 to 2017, there were large increases here in London. So, for those four years, there were large increases: 15% rate increases. And that was supposed to be for the Water Tower and the East London Water Treatment Plant. But from 2017 to 2022, that six-year period, there were no rate increases at all. We bumped them up real high for a few years to cover costs, but then we didn't do any, no inflationary rate increase. Same thing on the sewer for eight years. So, I just want to make sure we're all on the same page; that's the information that I've read thus far. If you guys know better than I do, which you may, I'm willing to hear that information, but this is what I see in the ordinances. And then from 2023 on, after those no rate increases, there was an ordinance passed in 2023 at 3% to both, 3% to the base rate. The volume rate for water. So, I just want to make sure we understand that. There was another comment about the capital improvements that were being planned by Mid-Ohio. There were some numbers shared: $ 531 million, $550 million over the next 10 years. I took that capital improvement plan and actually want to give you the most accurate number. The accurate number for the next 10 years is $ 591 million. $591 million is planned by Mid-Ohio. But it was also stated that none of that is coming to London. And it's probably because of how the district is starting to name things. We're changing names. We don't

want to always call everything London and Plain City and the county anymore. We're trying to, as you know, some of the facilities have new names associated with them. It's the same thing that we're doing in the district. We're calling what you would all think of as Plain City the northern region of the district. London is considered the central region of the district. Mt. Sterling and the southern part of the county is considered the southern part I know in so that's how I think of north central and south I know there's this idea that there's a north and south and that's just plain city in London just so you know how I refer to this and the how I plan to refer to this moving forward is this is the central region of mid-Ohio is London And if you look at it in that frame, $197 million over the next 10 years, a third, roughly, of those costs are planned to be spent here in London or our central region, as I would like it to be called. And that's what Mid-Ohio is trying to do. We're trying to separate ourselves from some of the naming. There was a statement about us taking on too much debt. I don't know how to answer. I don't know that that was said. Maybe it was said. But the infrastructure that the district has taken over requires capital improvements. I don't know how to answer. I don't know that that was said. Maybe it was said. But the infrastructure that the district has taken over requires capital improvements. And capacity in both the northern region and the central region has a time frame in which we'll run out of capacity. It's more pressing in the northern region. But I think all of us are aware that there's a lot of development happening here in London, too. There's a time when capacity here in the central region will also need improvements. And those improvements are on that list. And there's... So, I just want to make sure we're not I don't know that no one said to me that we're taking on too much debt. We're taking on the debt we have to meet our regulatory and compliance obligations and to make sure that we're ready to serve the development that's happening in both the north and here in London. We're doing our best to expand and keep up with the development that's happening here. So that does require us to take on debt because we don't have a bunch of cash. As many of you know, we're three years old. We don't have a lot of cash. We have to take on debt to fund what's needed for the district. So, all benefit is going to, I'll say the name even though I don't want to, Plain City, and none of it is going to London. I already explained that a third of what's planned in the next 10 years is here. But what isn't quite clear and easy to see when you look at our capital plan is all the planning that's being done by the district. Deer Creek water reclamation facility up off of I-70, the big improvement that is currently being built to deal with capacity issues in the northern part of the district. There is a time when the current facility, what was referred to as the London wastewater treatment plant, we call it the Oak Run water reclamation facility now. will reach capacity. It's landlocked. It's in a flood zone. We can't build any more there. There will be a capacity restriction at that facility. They're in the plan, and we have feasibility studies already being conducted and consultants that are hired. There is a point where flow will have to be routed to Deer Creek. So, to think of that improvement as only for the north in the short term, maybe the near term, that's an accurate statement. Long term, though, that facility is designed to expand and take on flow from London or the central part of the region. Same thing with the water side. On the water side already, we provide water here in London, and we did take over the prison facilities as well. And that was before taking on London. The county took those over when they were the sewer district, the water and sewer district. We have mains that already go up to 42 and 29. We have mains that come from that prison facility and go as far north as that already. There are plans, and we already have consultants working on this, to connect the two systems. What you refer to as Plain City and London, the northern and central region, we planned a future state where those will be connected. It provides sustainability, redundancy, and resiliency not just Plain City, not just London, to the region by connecting those systems. So, we have plans to... So, in the short term, it looks like we're spending all this money up there. We have plans to make the region stronger, not just any individual portion of the region. So, I just... I want to make that clear. Do I pause so you can ask some questions? Do you have any questions? I just kind of want to talk to the points that were brought up last time, just so you see where mid-Ohio is coming from or where I'm coming

from three months in.

- *President Peters* - All the facility out there at Deer Creek Office 70 in Plain City, Lafayette Road. So, our east trunk, that eventually could go to there, correct?
- Mr. Daly - Not necessarily that infrastructure. We have a plan for a new force main that would go down US-42, actually taking it all the way to Deer Creek. So, the east side trunk is currently designed to take flow to Oak Run, the former London wastewater treatment plant. There would be another piece of infrastructure that would have to go basically along Spring Valley and US-42 all the way up to Deer Creek. We already have 30% roughly like designs on these things because that is the future of the district to take flow when capacity is exceeded here to that facility.
- *President Peters* - Yeah, because for some reason I was thinking that once we did get to capacity, that east side trunk could also divert over that way as well.
- Mr. Daly - You have brought up a point that I probably didn't make very clear. As a part of that project, there is a pump station being constructed at Spring Valley. It's called our Spring Valley Pump Station. That pump station is being designed currently, at least for the foreseeable future, through the initial development here in London, to send flows all to Oak Run. But at some point, in the next 10 to 15 years, Oak Run will meet its capacity, and we'll have to take the flow somewhere else to be treated. Protect the environment. That's what the district's here to do. Those flows would be routed to Deer Creek, and Deer Creek has future planned expansions, which you see in the capital plan, that would take on that new flow. We'd have to build additional facilities at Deer Creek, and it would benefit this part of the district.
- *President Peters* - So everything that's going to that east side trunk. It's basically out there at Lafayette Street, that development out there. Yep. That'll flow up that way and then down to Oak Run. And then once it gets to capacity, then...
- Mr. Daly - Then we'll take it north. Yep. Because we're looking, mid-Ohio is looking at the region. We're not just looking at each system. That's not what 6119s are set up to do. We're set up to try to look at the region and not focus on the specific. And I know that's a change in thought, right? It's a change for me. I come from the city of Dayton, where for 21 years we were focused on protecting our utility. Now I'm having to flip a switch in my own head to think about the region and not just each facility.
- *Councilman Boyd* – So, I was just going to see if there was anything specific in the city limits. Did that 591 include the sewer trunk line at least?
- Mr. Daly - Are you talking about the one I'm referring to, to take it to Deer Creek?
- *Councilman Boyd* - The one from 42 to 142 there on Lafayette, that guy.
- Mr. Daly - The east side trunk sewer? So, the east side trunk sewer is already a part of what we're absorbing. And I have some other comments to speak to the east side trunk to make sure we're all on the same page as it relates to the funding of that project. But yeah, that's all on our books already. We already have the loan in place and everything associated with that.
- *Councilman Boyd* - That sounds good. I was thinking at one of our last meetings for you guys, I had heard something about three years until Oak Run was getting near

its full capacity, actually. 10 to 15 is a little bit different.

- Mr. Daly - Yeah, I've not heard predictions in my three months of that short. Yeah, not that short. But within the capital plan that you can see in Reftelis' report, there are improvements planned. Actually, one of the things I plan to put out next year is an RFQ to bring on a consultant to help us design improvements at Oak Run to make sure it can expand as much as it can, and what improvements we need to do at that facility to keep it going, 5, 10. As long as we can, the development drives this right development of residential homes, commercial homes, industries that come to the region; we need to be set up to take on that for all of us, right for the region.

- *Councilman Boy* - it was about 50 when we joined Mid-Ohio, and so that's kind of where it's one of the how quickly is it filling up because that was a big one, I had kind of been looking into of where our capacities were at the moment anyway but it's uh seems to be filling quickly but is one of those Is London really seeing the full benefit from this is kind of where I'm trying to look into. The High Street Water Plant, is that one being pursued at all, still at all? We had that project as well for removal of ammonia.

- Mr. Daly - I believe that's the East London Water Treatment Plant. I don't always like delivering this type of information, but that's what I'm here to do. So, again, three months. Take away what I say about East London. My understanding when Mid-Ohio to that on, London previously built that facility. That facility sits unused as of today. The water tower is in service. Let's clear up any information about that. But that East London water treatment plant does not run. There is ammonia within those wells that I don't understand the history of. I don't know why it wasn't tested for. It might not have been a requirement at the time. I actually don't have statements on that, but there's ammonia within those wells. The way the current plant was designed, it can't treat for ammonia, and it's an issue. I do have a consultant actually right now looking at it yet again. I know my predecessor and others have looked at this. London looked at this for a long time. I think I'm looking at it one last time to make sure that's not just a shelf ornament for the district that just sits there. We make use of the facility. We use it for other things that we need to operate. But producing water and treating water, it does not do.

- *Councilman Boyd* - And your president might have some good ideas because he was on our Board of Public Utilities at the time when they brought that to us and finally figured it out. So hopefully he has some extra intel for you. And that's kind of were looking into this, it's tough to see where London's really seeing the full benefits of this. You know, we have two different water plants. We've produced our own water for 110 years. And so, giving all this away, saying, hey, these rates are going this way. I'll say, looking at these bills that you showed, mine wasn't over $45 until about 2021. And so that kind of averages these out a little bit differently. Where the percent increase has gone since then. There are bills that we can bring in to kind of show where these prices actually were. And so, it's one of those items that it's tough to really see the benefit for London. That said, we're now in a central district to pay for the rest of these items when we have a sewer trunk line that hasn't been finished, which we were told would begin in 2024. And so.

- Mr. Daly - Was that, that was by London, though, right? That wasn't, that was by the BPU, I presume? Yeah, so some of the history, obviously, I'm not going to understand.

- *Councilman Boyd* - Yeah, and it's very tough to kind of look into. And it's one of those items that just kind of gauges where our hesitant thoughts are on kind of

seeing new prices coming.

- Mr. Daly – I appreciate that. You said in the last, what I believe is the last council meeting, that that project is going. It is. We are reviewing submittals. That project is moving forward. But while we're on that topic. I want to make sure we understand that because some numbers were also floated on the east side trunk sewer, and I just want to make sure we're all on the same page for myself and for you all and for the citizens of London. I think at some point in the past, there was a cost estimate for that project somewhere between $14 and $16 million. I don't have that information in front of me as to how that was arrived at, but I think that number was floated in the last meeting. And the bids that we took in for construction of that are $22 million. That does not include all the costs associated with that project either, though. There are design costs in the background. That's just the construction. We have consultants on board that are getting money as well. That total project, just in today's dollars, is somewhere around $24 million; that's the number I use for that project. So that's what Mid-Ohio looks at that project as costing: $24 million. However, we had to take out a 30-year loan for that project. The project did not get 0% interest. It was submitted as regionalization, but the Ohio EPA has discretion on what they determine is regionalization or not. If it appears to only affect a smaller portion, they often don't give that regionalization credit. So, you don't get the $10 million in the 0% interest at 0% interest. So, we didn't get any 0% interest for that project. The project is around 3.5% to 3.6% interest over a 30-year loan. That's costing mid-Ohio $1.4 million a year to make payments on for 30 years. So, the true cost of that project is somewhere closer to $44 million. So, when we talk about 14-16, the true number that we have to pay back is $44 million. So that's what's in the budget, and that's what might be throwing off some of the rates. Big differences, and I know we all went through 2020 and know what happened then, and I lived through this in the city of Dayton. I watched costs drastically jump after 10 years in the water utility, the decade before that. True for most water mains. I used a number of 225 to 250 linear feet for an 8-inch water main. When I, after COVID, that was at 350. So, the cost for utilities to operate has gone up drastically. That could be some of the explanation for why 14 and 16 were in the past, but 44 is the real number we have to pay back. And Mr. Eades, you brought up that you wanted some clarity on 0% interest. And I misspoke in that meeting. And I misspoke because the Ohio EPA's own documentation was wrong. And I called them on that. Because I was operating under what you quoted in the last council meeting, which was only one entity. Can get one $10 million 0% interest loan. It says it in their final approved program management plan, where they list out who's getting what funds. That's an incorrect statement in their own documents. Actually, every single project that they deem a regionalization project is eligible for $10 million of it at 0%. I don't know the history of why the east side was not, but it was not. That loan's already in place. I know there was a question by my own board member, and Councilman Eades asked the question of whether we need to entertain that. We're in the loan already. We'll keep looking for funds constantly, grants and those things, but the loan is already in place. It's at 3.4% for 30 years.

- *Councilman Eades* - Okay, a clarification on that. I had that in front of me. The 0% interest, $10 million, Mr. Chaley added that the Eastside Trunk Project was originally nominated by the City of London, not a mid-Ohio regional project. That may be why it's not considered regional. He noted the City of London has already applied for tax increment financing and joint economic development districts for the parcels in the project area. I'm not aware of any JEDs. And the City of London, not Mid-Ohio, will receive those revenue funds. I just wanted clarification on that

because any funds that came in, you've taken the debt, and you've taken the project and the debt on as long as we're clear on that. That's a true statement, right? So Mid-Ohio owns all of that now. So, I was curious about that. Now I realize this was two months ago. It was August 25th, and you might have clarification since then, and you just started that.

- Mr. Daly - I have a little clarification, but that was a statement by the previous executive director. Again, that is not a document I can present to you and say I'm factual and confident about. But what I understand, I'm not aware of a jet existing. What I believe is there's a tiff in place on some development within London. I'm not sure which one. And mid-Ohio is not a part of that tiff. That's what I feel I do know. So, there are no funds in the TIF to pay for the water and sewer utilities or pay us back to help pay off the debt.

- *Councilman Eades* - Right. So, if the TIF is in place, is paying back the developer to put in the lines at that point within that area, I mean, that's their responsibility, I think, to run the lines. You'll run the main to that point. So, you're suggesting that you should be included for that part.

- Mr. Daly - I have different thoughts on that, and I don't know that I have landed on my opinion for how that should work, but a TIF helps fund debt often, and I don't even know what TIF is; that's what development. I have no history on that, so I want to be clear, but my understanding is TIFs and jets can be used for utilities to help pay for our debt payments for projects associated with development, and the East Side Trunk Sewer was put in to allow development. So, it could have been an opportunity where some economic development tool would have been set up to carve out a piece for Mid-Ohio to not only, yeah, the developer pays for the infrastructure, but there's debt sometimes with us extending service to that development.

- *Councilman Eades* - All right. Well, that answers that part. It sounds like you've got more information now than maybe what you had on August 25th. A couple other things. Mr. Taylor was here and gave a presentation, I believe, in April. I don't know if you've seen that, but during that presentation, we have it. You can watch it. During that presentation, he discussed the East Side Trunk project and turning it north to that plant. So, I was under the impression at that point that that was the plan at that point. Mid-Ohio planned to turn that north. Now he may have said we would have the ability to do that later, but I just remember that it stood out in my mind. I couldn't believe we would want to run a line that far up there when we already have a trunk line close by that we could tap into, but I see if there are, you know, problems with having enough capacity that you might want to do that. And then also on this handout, there are a couple of things to bring up. That 3% was not in perpetuity. It was a five-year stop, at least a five-year look. We agreed to this for five years, and then we asked to look at the rates at that point before they went on. So that would not necessarily go on. Now, what this does not show is anything from the pro forma that we were given before we ever made that decision, and I still have that. It was quite extensive, and it showed how the rates would be lower with mid-Ohio. Starting at this certain point, we're going to lower the rates. I don't think anybody's actually experienced that.

- Mr. Daly - Yeah, I can't speak to that. I'm not going to try to speak to that. I need to see the pro forma that was submitted, and maybe some of this presentation that was given by my predecessor in April might help me. So, I did not have that ahead of this. But I'll definitely look into that because I need to understand it, too.

- *Councilman Eades* - Well, no, there's a lot of history that you have to catch up on

still, I'm sure. The north and south, you mentioned that earlier, where we were given, I think, the impression of a north and south district. You know, it was mentioned. I guarantee it was mentioned. However, it was a shame that it was never added to any documents. And, you know, I went back and read through what we had at that time, and I didn't see that. Obviously, you know, we can't hold anybody to something that's not written down and accepted in a contract. So that was never added, whether it should have been or not. That's a whole different discussion. But, you know, I agree with President Peters that that was a discussion, and that was kind of the impression I think a lot of people in London had, that we weren't going to be responsible for debt for Plain City, you know, and it's always come down to that; it's always been that in our minds because that's how it was pretty much presented up front. So, but I appreciate you being here tonight, and I'll let you go on

- Mr. Daly - Well, if you don't mind, I don't know if somebody else has something. I do want to speak to one thing the district is looking at. The district can't do some of what cities can do. We can't set up in townships and counties. We can't do GEDs and TIFs and CRAs and NCAAs. But what we can do are special assessments and riders. And I will tell you that one of the ways we, the double digits, the 215s and the 220 percents that you see in the Raftelis report, one thing that is being considered, assessments on those folks that are benefiting directly from the project and assessing those to those benefited properties but remember what I said right now in the short term that is happening in the north so maybe we end up putting some special assessments or riders to help offset those debt payments to the folks benefiting from those projects in the northern region at some point that same idea would be utilized when we do improvements here to ensure that folks benefiting from the Eastside trunk sewer, for instance, could have had a special assessment on it to ensure that the folks benefiting directly from that project were paying for that project. So that is something we're looking at right now. That's why I wanted to make it clear this is a draft. It's not final. We are looking at ideas. And the other thing to make clear, at least as of today, so they might not like me sharing this, but I only plan on submitting to the board a rate increase for 2027 right now. There are too many things in motion. I'm still too new at the district. I don't feel confident in just going with this draft report and putting it in place. My plan, at least as of today, could change, but as of today, I only plan to do a rate increase in 2027. We have a lot of projects in motion. The situation is very fluid, especially for me, but the district is very fluid. Looking at a lot of things. Mr. Boyd brought up the idea of the East London. I have folks looking at that. It may be able to offset some costs that you see within our capital plan for expansion of the old Springfield water treatment plant and the well exploration that we have planned and are actively trying to do right now at that facility. The Chrisman facility, the workhorse for London, already has wells that compete with each other. They are too close, and they are within each other's cone of influence. means that you can only get so much production out of those wells. We're doing everything we can to produce as much water out of that facility, but that facility is at its capacity. Old Springfield, when it came as part of the district, is providing benefit to the City of London and to the county and the region by being online. There is an interconnect directly between that plant and the Chrisman facility, the London Water Treatment Plant. So, the regionalization is already working to help keep up with aging infrastructure and things going on at the Chrisman plant. I know in the last meeting it was brought up: are you all happy with what Mid-Ohio is doing with this? We're doing what we can to keep the residents that are in place and existing with the capacity they need. The Chrisman facility has some obstacles against it, and we can't seek any additional wells there, at least from what I've been told thus far. There's no room for additional

production at that facility. So Old Springfield, the London correction facility we took on has room for well expansion and that well expansion if it's successful will be able to provide additional capacity to not only those facilities it will be an interconnect between London so when London's tanks start draining we can open that interconnect and keep this system pressurized so I know that was brought up in the in the in the last meeting too so I think I've covered the main things if there's any I wanted to walk through this but is Just so you understand what I've done here because I put all sorts of color coding and I just want to make sure it makes sense to you all. Are there any other questions about what I've talked about so far? Maybe even something I've not talked about.

- *Councilman Hays* - I'd like to ask you: the East High Street plant, the one with the ammonia, is that ever going to be able to be used for anything at all?

- Mr. Daly - It can. We would have to put investment into it. There are ways to remove the ammonia. The current plant cannot. The current plant, just so we know, and I don't want to get overly technical, is an ion exchange plant. It cannot remove the ammonia. And we tested this all out in Mid-Ohio when we took over the facility. And what happens is, when you have ammonia and you disinfect water, right? We have to put some chlorine into the water. You get something called chloramines. That's hazardous to all of us. We can't do it. We can't turn it online. The EPA wouldn't allow us to bring it online, and Mid-Ohio is not going to bring it online. So, our reverse osmosis is a technology that can remove it. There's a cost to tearing out all that new unused equipment and putting in the RO units. Also, currently the capacity out of that facility is roughly three-quarters of a million gallons per day, 750,000 gallons per day. Does that make the most sense for us to invest there if we can get better production out of Old Springfield? And that's what Mid-Ohio has to do. What's the cheapest? What's the best solution? And what's the best solution for the region? I found out about that during my interview process for this position. And one of the questions directed at me was, " What would I do?" At this point, it's a sunk cost, so I have to think of it that way. But if there's an easy, cheaper fix that we can do to that facility to bring it online and make use of that infrastructure, Mid-Ohio is going to do it. But as I said, I have consultants looking at that right now. I've got to wait until they complete their study and give me some numbers so we can factor that in. Yeah.

- *Councilman Eades* - I think the confusion on that is before this decision was made, I believe he's a former employee now of Mid-Ohio, sat right at this table and explained how... now we didn't have anybody that knew how to run that plant but he did and he knew that it would work and we could get that up and running and that's before this council made that decision because we were told it sounded like you know it could we could make that plant work at that time, former employee of Mid-Ohio, sorry I don't remember Russ's last name right now but Russ is that it yeah I think so yeah and he sat right here and explained the process to us and I think that's why the people in the council thought that that plant should be operable at this point. And before that, when the Board of Public Utilities still owned that, they were testing water, and they came and said, " We're going to have this up and running; we can produce water." In fact, Mr. Lalonic brought water and said, " You can drink this water. We produced this today; you can drink it right now." And so, it gave us the impression that it was going to work. You know, and unfortunately, it doesn't sound like that's a true statement. I'm just giving you the history of why we would think that.

- Mr. Daly - I appreciate that. I don't have all of that information. I've heard the name Russ, and I have heard evidence that he was doing a lot of work to try to bring that

facility online. That's the extent of what I know. I believe everything was submitted to Ohio EPA, though, and Ohio EPA is who ultimately said it can't come online. So, I think Russ, the calculations maybe, were showing that it could. It was submitted to the regulator, and they said no. I believe it's because of the chloramines that we just couldn't remove. You would produce them with any, I don't know any, I'm not a chemist, but if you have ammonia at all, it's going to combine with the chlorine and create what's called chloramines. It's cancerous and hazardous to our health.

- *Councilman Eades* - Well, and that's also not what was explained. You know, we could super chlorinate that water, and it'd be fine. And, you know, at one point we were told there was... This was the only type of problem east of the Mississippi. This was the only place that had that problem. And then we found out that just down the road in South Charleston, they have that problem. But they somehow had a way to treat it.

- Mr. Daly - Reverse osmosis does treat it, and most of the new facilities that Mid-Ohio is bringing on are reverse osmosis plants. They will remove ammonia. And there are some side stream things you can do with that existing facility to remove the ammonia. We're looking at all of that, though. I'm going to make sure it's done while I'm here so I can speak factually to you all, and I really don't want to speak too much to the past. But although I think it came from employees that once the old Springfield plant is, the capacity is increased, that you'll take this offline. So, then we would not be producing any water within the city of London. I'm not going to tell you that's not going to happen. It could happen.

- *Councilman Eades* – The Chrisman plant, this has just been scuttlebutt, although I think it came from employees, that once the old Springfield plant is, the capacity is increased, that you'll take this offline. So, then we would not be producing any water within the city of London.

- Mr. Daly - I'm not going to tell you that's not going to happen. It could happen. There's no timeline on that. Right now, Chrisman is providing the bulk of the water to the City of London, and that's how it's working right now. But as I explained, the capacity of that facility is there. There's no way to sink more wells. Existing wells are already competing against each other at some point with the development that we know is coming to the region. We're going to have to maybe not take it offline, but we have more opportunity at the old Springfield location.

- *Councilman Eades* - Okay, I'm going to ask one more question. A little off the path here. I think we have to be concerned because you're bringing it up about capacity. And, you know, we've got 1,500 houses being built. Do we truly have the capacity in our water and sewer systems that we can handle this many houses and can we handle more? Because it's not over. I mean, there's going to be more development and more development. And at some point, if we don't have the capacity, we have to know that because we have to stop it at that point if we can't provide that or you can't provide that. So, what are your thoughts on that?

- Mr. Daly – I think thus far, from the three months on the job and what's been shared with me is mid-Ohio has been in close coordination with the county London plain city on their comp plans and what's planned for the development we talk to the developers every day sadly I spend more time doing that than some other things i should probably be doing but um We're making sure that all these studies that mid-Ohio is taking on right now, all the feasibility studies are factoring that in and we're trying to build to make sure that's not a problem. We know the capacity constraints in the north are more immediate. The capacity constraints will come here at some point based on the planned development. But we're going to build,

and we're going to make sure we're here to support the region. Not at this point, no. Well, I just want to walk through this real quick, and then that's all I have for you. So, the terminology, I just want to make sure you understand it. So, I put draft on there in yellow. Yellow is clearly Raftelis' draft recommendations. What's labeled plan London combined rates, this is what I've based off the ordinances. And what would have happened had Mid-Ohio and maybe Councilman Eades said that those 3% wouldn't continue forever. So, take that with a grain of salt, what you see on there. I have assumed that. And it's a fair assumption, too, because at a minimum, we probably should be raising rates by inflation. Everything costs more. The water utility has to pay more. It should do that. So, whether that was the plan, that's, and the other, what's in red, so that's in blue, what's in red is a 3% increase. What would have happened if we just did the bare minimum starting in 2015? And keep in mind, these are combined rates. These are both water and sewer combined in the 4,000-gallon number that has been referenced in the previous council meeting. And it's actually the number we use. We use 4,000 for comparison. So those are the tables on the left. Those are the three different iterations. And you can see in the green, the planned; I color-code them because blue and yellow make green, right? So those two are related. You see some arrows associated with the two. If you look at what was planned in London versus what Reftelis is currently recommending, the rates that were planned in London in 2026 are $28 higher than what the rates are today, and you see those negative amounts; technically, if Mid-Ohio wouldn't have come here and the district wouldn't have been formed, you guys would have been operating closer to the blue. And with Mid-Ohio as of right now, it isn't until 2029 that you see a rate increase that's above what you would have been paying anyway. That's how I understand the data. So, I just want to explain what I've put on here. The other one is the orange. So, the yellow is the Reftelis, and the red is compared. They make orange. You can see that not until 2029, 2028 would have been the first real increase based on what would have been happening anyways. So, if we would have done a 3% increase this whole time, even Raftelis' draft report is lower. than where you would have been if, in 2015, you would have said 3% minimum. And that's a standard. A lot of folks do that. When they don't have money for consultants, and they don't have money to bring in experts, they just put in an ordinance or a policy or resolution to say, we're doing a minimum of 3% increases every year. You can see that in your past ordinances. That's kind of what you guys did too. So that's what the Red does. It assumes that way back in 2015 you guys did a 3% increase and just held to that. And that's how the Raftelis report. in 2015 or you would have held to your London rates that you had planned anyways the Raftelis report is showing only a seven dollar increase in 2030 and the three percent versus the draft report versus the three percent would have been a four dollar and nine cent increase in 2029 so just i just want to frame some of what our ready rate increases are doing I think you guys would have been paying higher rates And remember, mid-Ohio, or I'm not exactly sure how it occurred, some rates were in your ordinances that we have not done. The $6 increase and the 3% on top of that should have been in place this year. The $13.49 should have been $6 higher in 2025, and we should have done a 3% increase this year. We haven't done a rate increase in 26. And then these are just the graphs. They show the same thing, color-coded the same way. Red, Yellow, and Blue, just so you can follow what those lines would look like. And you can see where the lines cross. So roughly in 2028, what Raftelis is projecting, that's when your rates would really increase. And based on the planned ordinances that I've had, the rates wouldn't have increased until the middle of 29, 2030.

- *Councilman Eades* - However, your assumption is that we would have raised it by 3% when, in fact, we didn't until 2022 or 2023. So, the assumption of, well, if you

would have had done 3%, this is where we are. That's, I think, an invalid assumption because we didn't make that raise until 22 or 23. We see 0% for many years there. And maybe they should have raised their rates, honestly. But we had not. Yeah.

- Mr. Daly - At the bottom of the ordinances, I could have sworn I saw 3% from that point on. So that's what I've assumed here. That was both in the sewer ordinance that was done, and I have them here as well. I brought them just in case there were questions about where I pulled this information from. But I have those ordinances here, and I can share those if you guys don't have what I based this on. So, it was just to show that I know it seems as though we're going to be raising rates, and we are. If you had just done inflation dating back to 2015, what Raftelis has drafted and what Mid-Ohio's planning would have been lower than that. And that's kind of a minimum standard that's recommended. It's a 3% increase every year. So that's the last of what I wanted to share. I wanted you all to have a face with a name. So, I'm Mr. Daly. I'm the new executive director for Mid-Ohio. If any of you have any questions ever or need some information from me, feel free to reach out.

- *Councilman Boyd* - All I would really like to ask is, if you could, please go back to the 2023 meetings where we were having the rate increases come up. Because, you know, the $13.5 million sewer trunk line brought for us was not being done. The $750,000, I think it was, for the new water plant additions to make that up and running to not be done. And then the $500,000 connector to be done for your services. If you can just look into that, would you consider, you know, altering prices at all if you see that, hey, those were items that were already covered or should have been?

- Mr. Daly - To be as honest as I can, right, I'm going to stay as true as I can to the agreements that we have with everybody. That's the best thing I can do for the time being, but I will at least make sure I understand the history of what happened here in London as it relates to the BPU and what was promised. That is before me.

- *Councilman Eades* - Just one other comment reading back through these minutes. Mr. Landis, I really appreciate the fact that you Ask a lot of questions at least in the minutes and you ask a lot of the same questions I think the people of London want to ask you know how you know how can we do this? How can we do anything to lower the rates for the people because of these additional costs? So, I do appreciate that.

Audience Concerns – none

Committee Reports

Public Service Committee –

Councilman Hitt – Public Service Committee meeting is in the room next door on the 13th of October at 5 o'clock.

Councilwoman Jackman – I have nothing new.

Councilman Boyd - I guess for the Public Service Committee. Recycling. I saw that one came up. That Rumpke is now not picking up recycling if it has too much trash in it. So really make sure. I know London posted that out also. Thank you so much. But really make sure that, hey, if you're surprised your recycling isn't getting picked up, you might have a couple of things in there to check out. Also, road repairs are going through. Lafayette's going.

Excited to see all that. Fingers crossed. Keeps going well.

Public Safety Committee –

Councilman Hays – Safety meeting, October 13th, 6 p.m.

Councilman Stahl - I have nothing.

Finance, Budget, and Personnel Committee –

Councilman Eades – Well, the next finance meeting will be on October 13th at 6.30 p.m. I think we're going to have some new information to discuss. I know our police chief would like to address the finance committee on some issues that maybe we do need to look at. I did discuss those briefly with Mr. Saltzman today, so that'll be some new information that's going to come forward. But that'll be October 13th at 6.30 p.m.

Councilwoman Treynor – I don't have anything.

City Official Reports

Mayor Closser - Good evening and thanks to everyone for coming out.

I am very encouraged by the possibility of a new owner purchasing the former Honeywell/Intelligrated building here in London. I hope to hear soon that the purchase is finalized, but the potential project could bring an estimated 75 to 100 new jobs to a building that has been vacant for some time. This would be a significant opportunity to put an existing property back into productive use, bring new employment opportunities to our community, and continue building momentum for economic development in London. We remain hopeful and look forward to sharing more information as things progress.

City Council recently passed legislation authorizing me to prepare and submit an application to the Ohio Public Works Commission (OPWC) for funding through its State Capital Improvement Program. We will now be moving forward with an application seeking approximately $1.4 million in grant funding for Phase 2 of the South Side Storm Water Sewer Project in the 3rd Ward. This funding, if awarded, would provide significant financial assistance toward addressing stormwater infrastructure needs in London without placing the full financial burden on our local taxpayers. This is another important step forward in continuing to improve our city's infrastructure, and we are hopeful that our application will be successful. I want to thank Council for supporting this next step in pursuing these outside funding opportunities for our community.

October has been a very busy month, and I wanted to take a few minutes tonight to share some of the things I've been involved in throughout the month.

As Mayor, a big part of my job is being out in the community, meeting with people, representing the City, and looking for opportunities to continue moving London forward. October certainly kept me busy in all of those areas.

One of the highlights was seeing London Police Chief Donovan Cooper recognized by the Ohio Department of Public Safety with the 2026 Ohio Patriot Award.

The Ohio Patriot Award is presented annually in connection with the anniversary of September 11 and recognizes public servants and first responders who demonstrate extraordinary leadership, selfless service, and dedication to public safety. I want to congratulate Chief Cooper on this well-deserved recognition and thank him, along with all of our police, fire, and EMS personnel, for what they do for our community every day.

I also had the opportunity to meet with London City Schools, Stanley Electric, and Junior Achievement to talk about the Junior Achievement program and ways we can continue expanding its impact in our community. I believe strongly in connecting our schools, our businesses, and our community, and Junior Achievement is a great example of how those groups can work together to prepare our young people for the future.

I spoke to the Coover Society, providing an update on what is happening throughout the City, and I also had the opportunity to speak with the Daughters of the American Revolution about the City and present them with a proclamation recognizing Constitution Week.

I spent some time at London Elementary School for their Lemonade Day, an event honoring and remembering Mrs. Carol Daniels. It was great to see our students recognizing someone who meant so much to our community.

I also joined the London Middle School, along with members of the London Police Division and the London Fire and EMS Division, for their 9/11 remembrance ceremony and photo. It is important that we continue to teach our young people about the significance of September 11 and remember those who lost their lives and those who continue to serve our country and communities.

Another great community event was the Mayor's Day Sale at Shoe Sensation, which raised $500 for the London City Schools Raider Rack. I want to thank everyone who participated and especially the team at Shoe Sensation for helping make that possible.

The Raider Rack does some incredible work for London students, providing shoes, clothing, toiletries, winter coats, and other essential items to students who may need a little extra help. It is another great example of our community coming together to support our kids.

I also participated in the London City Schools Homecoming Parade, which is always a great opportunity to get out and see our community come together and support our students.

October was also a big month for the London Police Division as I had the honor of swearing in three new officers — Brandon Church, Cameron Edley, and David Trujillo.

These three officers have worked hard to reach this point, and I was proud to officially welcome them to the London Police Division and to the City of London. We are fortunate to have people willing to step forward and serve our community, and I look forward to seeing their careers develop here in London.

I also attended the Farm Science Review, which is always a great opportunity to learn, make connections, and see what is happening throughout Ohio.

And, of course, a significant part of my time continues to be spent on economic development. Throughout the month, I met with developers regarding potential apartment, housing, and retail projects. Some of those conversations are very early in the process, so there isn't always something I can announce publicly, but those conversations are important. I do look forward to potentially announcing some new retail/restaurant very soon.

We have to continue working to bring new housing, new businesses, and new investment to London, and I remain committed to making sure the City is at the table and doing everything we can to help good projects move forward.

And somehow, in between all of those meetings, events, and responsibilities, I also managed to perform three wedding ceremonies during the month of October.

So, needless to say, it was a busy month.

But that is what makes this job so rewarding. Whether I'm sitting down with a developer talking about a new project, standing in front of students at one of our schools, welcoming a new police officer, recognizing a community organization, or simply being out at a local event, I'm proud to represent the City of London.

There is a lot happening in our community, and I appreciate everyone who continues to contribute their time, energy, and ideas to making London a great place to live, work, raise a family, and do business.

Starting this week, Rumpke will no longer collect recycling carts that contain trash or non-recyclable items. It was a kindness from them to pick these up when they should not have been. If improper items are found in your cart, drivers will leave a tag on the container and leave the container as it is. You will need to remove the trash yourself before your next collection day. Check out the image on our Facebook page to see what these tags look like, and please double-check your carts before rolling them to the curb!

For more information on what is or is not recyclable, you can visit Rumpke's website.

This is for those who are putting dirty diapers, animal waste, and paint in their recycle can. It is understandable if we throw a straw in the can, or if we add a food waste box that turns out wasn't recyclable. This is NOT about those making a good faith effort- and if anything, this information should help those making a good faith effort! We have people who seriously put dirty diapers in recycle cans.

The City of London will be hosting the Pumpkin Palooza in Cowling Park on Saturday, October 24th from 11:00am – 3:00pm. This event is back by popular demand after such a successful event last year. There will be free pumpkins for the kids, face painting, bounce houses, food trucks, many community partners and vendors, and more. This is a free family friendly event, and I hope to see the park packed. I do want to thank the London Parks & Recreation Department and our executive assistant, Eve Breedlove, for putting this wonderful event together.

City of London Trick or Treat will be held on Thursday, October 29th. Please remember that

there is no inclement weather makeup date. Trick or Treat will happen no matter what the weather is. I do encourage people to attend a local trunk or treat in the days leading up if they are concerned about the weather on our date. There are a lot of trunk or treats around London, and I will put out information on the events I know about heading into Halloween. If you have a local group putting on a trunk or treat or event, please send the information to me.

Now on to the MOLO fun fact, which is the number 11,431. That is the number of food items we collected last year for the Battle of the Cans. The Battle of the Cans is coming up October 5th through October 9th. This is a great community food drive that brings together our two rival school districts for a little friendly competition, while ultimately helping people right here in our community. Last year, together we collected an incredible 11,431 items. Two of our biggest supporters were our local Walmart, which donated 5,080 items, and Tom Coughlin and Coughlin Auto, who donated another 3,020 items. That is an incredible contribution, and I want to publicly thank both Walmart and Tom Coughlin and Coughlin Auto again for their generosity and for agreeing to support the Battle of the Cans again this year.

Now we need everyone else to get involved and help us make this year's Battle of the Cans even bigger. You can donate by sending items with your child to London City Schools or dropping them off at London City Hall throughout the week. Every can, box, bag, and donation counts. At the end of the week, we'll see which school community can collect the most, but the real winner is our community and the families who will benefit from these donations. So, let's fill up those boxes, support our students, and show what London can do when we come together.

Safety Service Director Saltsman - Just a couple of quick things. As you come in tonight, you may have seen the new LPD building. We're moving forward finally with landscaping. Hopefully they'll finish that portion. I doubt it's tomorrow with the rain, but I think by Monday or Tuesday with the hydra seeding. Hopefully it happens by Tuesday; if not, next Wednesday. Still waiting on Securitas. I think I spoke about its last meeting. Securitas is the company that does all the electronic locks, the video, and the locking mechanism for the jail. They have about 11% of the work to be done. We cannot get our final inspection for the occupancy from the city until that's done and/or the jail inspection. So, for those who are waiting, I don't have a date, but they're moving forward. So, we know they've been working closely with the electrical contractor to try to get some of those final issues resolved. LPD, we're going to promote an officer. Mike Combs will be promoted this Sunday, the 4th, to Sergeant. And then that will create another vacancy. So, we're two officers short to have one that we're looking at offering conditional. We're looking for a second officer that probably will be; neither one of them is trained, so they'll be going to school in the spring. Street Department offered a position, so we were short; we have been short one member. Bill offered a position to a member that will start, I think, I think it's in two weeks he'll start. And then we're still going to be one short; the foreman retired effective this week, to effective the fourth next, yeah, this Saturday. And that's all I have. Thank you.

Old Business

3rd Reading

RESOLUTION 166-26 Sponsored by: Greg Eades

A resolution increasing appropriations. The Recreation Department has received a donation from a private citizen.

Councilman Eades - As stated before, if we receive donations, we have to then appropriate the money for the departments to use. I want to personally thank whoever that person was out there who thought enough of our recreation department to make a donation of $100.

Motion to adopt RESOLUTION by Councilman Eades, 2nd Councilman Stahl. The motion carried by the following vote:

Abstain:	**0-**	
Affirmative:	**7-**	**Eades, Hitt, Jackman, Hays, Stahl, Treynor, Boyd**
Against:	**0-**	

RESOLUTION 168-26 Sponsored by Shannon Treynor

An ordinance authorizing elected officials and appointed officials wage adjustments. City Council has determined the City Auditor requires a wage adjustment; and City Council has also determined that the City Auditor salary be increased by 1.5% per year during the next term, 2028-2031. City Council has determined any wage adjustments approved should commence January 1, 2028.

Councilwoman Treynor - This is specific to the auditor position with a one-time bump and then an annual increase of 1.5% thereafter through the term of 2028 through 2031.

President Peters - Is everybody okay with that big of a jump?

Councilman Hitt - Yeah, I just want to note it's almost a $23,000 increase and really not a change in duties as opposed to no increase for the mayor and the law director, which seems extremely inequitable to me.

Councilwoman Jackman - Can I add that our committee, our group, has had a lot of discussion on this. It is kind of an awkward situation to be in. Some things that we have to remember are: these are salaries we're discussing for the job, not the person who is in the job. And I agree, Andy, that it is not a very equitable situation here to offer a giant raise to one position and zero to the others, one of which requires a law degree. And none of those positions have had a raise in eight years. While they are union, and even I think the non-union counterparts, other city employees have gotten a cost-of-living increase, and these elected positions have had nothing for eight years. That's just, I don't know. It's a lot, a lot to consider.

Councilman Boyd - Had we said that the assistant auditor was $10,000 above our current auditor's pay, that was correct. And so, I think that was a big reason for kind of having that initial step up is, you know, hey, if we have a person below this position, it doesn't make it quite as appealing. And so, I know that was a big reason that had come up. Looking into the actual other salaries that were kind of brought forward, I saw there was one other city with $80,000 and one with $103,000. So, it seems we're right about the mid-average for that. And I know that's kind of what we were hoping to look for with the auditor's pay: what this will do.

Councilman Hitt - How long has Kim been in the auditor's office? Do you know? Does anyone know? Compared to Kenna has been there for a what?

Councilwoman Jackman - I think that is a good point that Kim has been here a lot of years, and her raises have built upon each other to get her up to the salary that she's at. It's hard to make it fair when you... You know, are looking at the time that someone has put in, but you can't take away those years of service that Kim has put in here.

President Peters - I would almost guarantee that even at the county level, their top employees are probably making more than the county auditor. And probably even at the state level, their high executives in that office are probably making more than the state auditor. So, I mean, the longer you work in the government, the more you're going to make. So, you technically don't have to be the auditor and have to be paid more for that position.

Councilman Hitt - Well, I understand the issue is it doesn't incentivize people, subordinates, I guess, to go for the higher position if they're not paid as much as what they would get if they remain in their current position. But also, it seems wrong to me to negate the number of years that a person has worked. Just because they're a subordinate to their supervisor, possibly. I mean, suppose Kim left and a new one person come in, then there would be a huge margin of income compared to, in comparison to the two positions.

Councilman Hays - I'd make a motion to take this back to Finance Committee and restudy it again, since there's so much division on it.

Councilman Hitt - Yeah, I'd like to see, as I'm not seconding the motion, but I'd like to see this possibly voted down and then the auditors incorporated into the next legislation. That would be my position.

Motion to take this back to Finance Committee by Councilman Hays, 2nd by Councilwoman Treynor. The motion failed by the following vote:

Abstain:	**0-**	
Affirmative:	**3-**	**Hays, Stahl, Treynor**
Against:	**4-**	**Hitt, Jackman, Boyd, Eades**

Motion to adopt RESOLUTION by Councilman Hitt, 2nd Councilman Boyd. The motion carried by the following vote:

Abstain:	**0-**	
Affirmative:	**4-**	**Eades, Stahl, Treynor, Boyd**
Against:	**3-**	**Hitt, Jackman, Hays**

RESOLUTION 169-26 Sponsored by Shannon Treynor

An ordinance authorizing elected officials and appointed officials' wage adjustments. City Council has determined the City's elected officials and appointees require a wage adjustment of 1.5% per year for the next election term 2028-2031; and City Council has determined any wage adjustments commence January 1, 2028, or upon election or reappointment, whichever is later.

Councilwoman Treynor - This is for every other position within the city to have instead of a static salary as either advertised for appointment or for choosing whether or not to run for that office for a... 1.5 per annum increase over the previous year. And this would be for the

term 2028 through 2031.

Motion to adopt RESOLUTION by Councilwoman Treynor, 2nd by Councilman Boyd. The roll call is on hold for more discussion.

Councilman Hays - I have some discussion I'd like to make. I talked to some people in a restaurant this week, and I'll be honest, they're not big fans of the mayor. But they said what's right is right, and what's wrong is wrong, and this is definitely not right. I did some figuring last night, and I'm not playing sides or anything here, but my figures are correct. It's like 2 o'clock this morning; I was doing this. The mayor's going to get an $899.73 raise. After eight years, it comes out to about $112 something a year. If you take it down to a month, that's $9.38 a month. That's wrong. I don't care how you feel. That's wrong. Same way with the law director. In Cambridge, same size city, they've got 200 more people than we do. They have two attorneys working here. Combined salaries: $123,353.29. Our law director right now is at $93,000. Is that correct? Okay. After 11 years, taking in the eight years and then the three years, her salary would only come up to $6,040.08. If my figures aren't wrong, that's about... $214.22 a year. It's about $17.85 a month. The lady has a four-year degree. She went to law school for three years, and she had to pass a bar exam. That is certainly the only position in the city that has to have a college degree. It's certainly worth more than what we're offering. I think these need to be readjusted. I have some figures here if anybody cares. But I think these two positions need to be readjusted. I think when I jump up the mayor in 2028, I think you ought to go to 63.5 and then 1%, 1.5% after that. The difference is only $2,737.87 from what we're proposing. As far as the law director is concerned, I think we ought to jump her up to 98.5 and then 1.5% after that. The difference, if my math is correct, is $3,959.24 from what is being proposed. It's not that big of a difference. I think it's a lot better than what we're looking at giving them initially.

Councilman Hitt - Is that a certain percentage?

Councilman Hays - I'll be honest. I didn't think about the percent. I just went for a percentage. I just cut a number. I'll tell you, I was so tired when I was doing this.

Councilman Hitt - I think 5% is $3,000 approximately for the mayor, and then $4650, I think, for the law director, if that's 5% of what they currently make. So, it would be a little less than that, I think. What did you say? $63?

Councilman Hays - Start the mayor at $63, starting at $63.5 in 2028, and then 1.5%. Each year thereafter, he would end up at $66,458. The law director would start at $98,500 in 2028. And remember, the law director has not had a raise. We're not giving it to the person because this person may not be the one who's in office. She may decide not to run, or somebody may beat her. But we're giving this to the position. 2028 B98,500. She would top out at 102,999, 32, and 20, 31.

Councilman Hitt - So that's a little over 5%, it sounds like, because I think 5% would be about $46.50. So, $93, and that would be $ 97-something. And you were saying $ 98-something?

Councilman Hays - Yeah, $98.5 would be her salary starting in 2028. And then with the increase in 2029, $99, $97, $750. And then 2030, 101, 477, 16. 2031, 102, 999, 32.

Councilman Hitt - So, I mean, it seems like, to me at least, if we came up with a certain percentage, that would be the most fair way to do that and possibly a bump in addition to the percentage annual increase for the next four years. Of course, that means we'd have to make an amendment.

Councilman Hays - I would make the amendment to change the mayor's salary and the law director's salary and at least use these numbers as a guiding tool. The new numbers that I come up with.

Councilman Eades - I think there was a motion to adopt and a second?

Councilwoman Treynor - There was a motion to adopt and a second. Yes, there was.

Councilman Hitt - So that's not a certain percentage increase, though. I mean, how did you come up with those numbers?

Councilman Hays - I went to where he would end up at, and then I just took some off from where he would end up at and went backwards with it. Because normally he would be ending up with what is proposed in the legislation at 63-62-71 in 2031. And I just took it back to 63-5 to even it out.

President Peters - So since there was a first and a second on that, we can't amend anything. So, I don't think I can say maybe go back to the finance committee and see if I bring legislation up for full time.

Councilwoman Treynor - Can I just interject with all of the... months and months and months of discussions that we've had in all of the salary reviews that we've gone through the panels and the inquiries and going through and ask, you know, even talking to various positions about what they feel about their job responsibilities and whether they've increased, and it was not a single person who had asked for an increase of their salary until we're here at the 11th hour on the third reading before council meeting. I would just remind everybody that has a dog in this fight that this is for 2028 through 2031 if you believe that there's a... obviously that we're not done with this discussion but that we do have a very firm deadline in front of us with regard to how these jobs are going to be posted that whether or not you choose to run for these things that has to be advertised and it's a lot to ask at the very eleventh hour to make giant changes for what is been thoroughly, well, maybe not thoroughly enough, but significantly vetted before we were coming in here this evening.

Mayor Closser - Should have asked for a raise? You said the positions didn't ask for a raise? I didn't know that was our responsibility to ask for a raise.

Councilwoman Treynor - No, no, I'm not saying that it was a requirement.

Mayor Closser - Well, you said that the positions didn't ask for a raise. And I think it was made abundantly clear that it's not the person. So, I shouldn't be coming and asking for a raise because it's the position, and that's the City Council's doing if they would like to give a raise to the position. And so, when you said the position never came and asked for a raise, I didn't know that's what you guys were wanting from us. We were never asked that.

Law Director Davis - I agree with the mayor that I don't believe it's up to the positions, the people in those positions, or the positions at all to be asking for a raise. It is the council's prerogative, whether it's appropriate or not. I don't think it's for anybody to ask. So, I do think that's a little inappropriate to insinuate that anybody's asking at the last minute. And I think if it's taken that way, it's because there was zero discussion once the motions were made at the Finance Committee or at the Finance Committee meetings leading up to it. I was in attendance. I was ready to hear the thought process, and that didn't occur. So, until it was brought to full council, I didn't know what the thought process was, and I did do

some research, so if that's being taken as asking for a raise at the 11th hour, then that's what it is, but I was very shocked that the decision was made with zero discussion. Once I asked for information, I saw the information that was provided, and to me it was incomplete information that decisions were made upon. Thank you.

Councilman Boyd - One of the things I kind of look into with that route is possibly the usage of outside counsel and the cost for that, you know, as where, you know, the lack of giving that increase out right now, since I know we've had to use that in the past already. And so that was one piece. However, the bigger one I wanted to bring up was: can you ask which part of?

Law Director Davis - The use of outside counsel. What are you referring to?

Councilman Boyd - Any other legislation? Because one item that came up was the annexation of the prison that is kind of an item actually having to be looked into that I'm hoping to hear back from some individuals for providing outside counsel for items that we discussed that might have other possibilities. It's okay.

Law Director Davis – I will make it clear that the only reason you're seeking outside counsel is that you don't like my answer. Not that I didn't provide you with an answer. I just want to make that clear. It's not that an answer wasn't provided or that a legal opinion wasn't provided. It's that you didn't like the opinion, so you are seeking it on your own. We'll come back to that discussion.

Councilman Boyd - We'll come back to that discussion. However, I wanted to get into the comment from Mayor Closser. The most significant change since 2020 has been the unprecedented level of economic development occurring throughout the city. In many communities, the mayor and economic development director are separate positions. In London, I have taken on both roles. Then requesting what the job requirements or duty of the economic development director in London was, and we don't really have a job position for that. And so that one was a little curious there.

Mayor Closser - Yeah, so we don't have the job description because we don't have the position. If you want to know what an economic developer does, that would have been an easy Google search.

Councilman Boyd - No, I think that it would be good to invest in having one. Instead of combining the two and just kind of having a mix of...

Mayor Closser - An economic developer is going to cost you a hundred grand a year.

Councilman Boyd - We'd have to decrease on others.

Mayor Closser - Well, I'm just letting you know that an economic developer would cost you $100,000, and I'm doing the job of economic developer and mayor at the same time. I'm the one going after these businesses. I'm the one having these meetings. I'm the one having these discussions, trying to bring businesses in, getting housing here.

Councilman Boyd - Kind of just different views. I don't see that as a necessity for us.

Mayor Closser - You don't think doing economic development is a necessity?

Councilman Boyd - I think having someone who is proficient in the area. I'm not sure if that would require a new degree for having that position again, but that would be my main

thought: yes, that would be a good position to have along with our safety director to help run the city well.

Mayor Closser - There'd be a lot of great positions if you want to spend the money to bring them in, right? We could probably use a full-time IT person. You know, that's fallen on other shoulders. So, yeah, I mean, it's what you want to spend to do it, but I decided to step up and do it. I didn't come and ask for more money. I didn't ask for a raise. I've never said one thing about a raise. I just stepped up and did the job because the job needed to be done.

Councilman Eades - Mr. President, Madam Law Director, in your course of a law director, we seem to be at a crossroads in parliamentary procedure at this point. If you would like to advise what we should do at this point, we have a motion and a second on the table. I think there might be ways that we could back out of that or not back out of that. Would you like to offer any advice as a law director to this council?

Councilwoman Treynor - I can just retract my motion to adopt, I would think. Resend that?

President Peters - Right. So, rescind it and maybe leave it on for another, for a fourth reading, and maybe amend whatever council wishes if there is a rescind.

Motion to retract my motion to adopt Councilwoman Treynor, 2nd Councilman Boyd. The motion carried.

Leave on for 4th reading

2nd Reading

ORDINANCE 170-26 Sponsored by: Andrew Hitt

A resolution expressing the intent of the City of London in 2026 to sell by internet auction personal property, including motor vehicles and other property referenced in Revised Code § 721.15 that is no longer needed for public use, or is obsolete or unfit for the use for which it was acquired; authorizing the Safety Service Director to enter into an agreement with an internet auction site to perform the sales; and authorizing the sale of specific personal property by internet auction.

Councilman Hitt - So this would allow the Safety Service Director to enter into contract with an auctioneer on internet online and the advantage of that would be to get more exposure and possibly better bids, more opportunities for additional bids or improved revenue.

Director Saltsman - Last time, I still haven't decided who I think is the best. I talked to Richie Brothers, who is local. They are the largest Internet auction site in the country. They do all kinds of equipment, heavy equipment, things like that. The exposure would be tremendous. And I think, as I explained last time, it won't change the time. In fact, they recommend a minimum of 45 days. They're able to advertise and put it out, so we won't do it any quicker. The difference is they do all the advertising. We don't have to advertise once this is approved. So, the biggest is we're not taking sealed bids. I think the last auction we had two trucks wanting to bid on because just nobody locally has the interest. So, we're more likely to get interest from them. No guarantees, but... Should get better attention, hopefully more money and less advertising costs.

Councilman Eades - So this piece of legislation, though, when it talks about personal property, that's probably not going to be done by Ritchie Brothers. But this will just allow you to contract with anybody that you feel is appropriate to do that. Do we have a list already?

Director Saltsman - That's correct. The only one I've got to call back was Ritchie Brothers.

Councilman Eades - I mean, do we have a list of items that are going to be sold?

Director Saltsman - I'll be submitting things to the Service Committee. I'm sorry, I couldn't think of what you called next. So, I've got several trucks and items from sanitation. Most of it is equipment, yeah.

Councilman Eades - So, we can leave this on for another reading because you'll have a list.

Director Saltsman - Yeah, it's not going to hurt. And then, again, to reiterate, this will have to be passed again next year if we decide to keep doing it each year. Each calendar year has to be passed.

Leave for 3rd Reading

ORDINANCE 171-26 Sponsored by: Shannon Treynor

An ordinance declaring the necessity for planting, maintaining, trimming, and removing shade trees in and along the streets of the City of London, estimating the cost thereof and providing for the levy of special assessment

Councilwoman Treynor - This is the two-year renewal of the Shade Tree Commission. It is a line item on your property tax bill in a blank number of mills. However, anticipated collection has remained at $40,000, and I think that's per year. My question, actually, probably for Rickelle, is this millage: I don't know if it's the dollar amount or the millage that stayed relatively flat, but there's been... Since this initially went into effect in the mid-80s, John, is that what it was?

Councilman Stahl – Back in 86. This is the 21st time we've done it in two years.

Councilwoman Treynor - It stayed at $40,000 since the mid-80s. And I know we have a little bit of a I don't want to call it a surplus, but there are unused amounts in that. In that specific fund, I think mostly because there was some confusion about what that fund could be used for and whether or not they could request any funds to be appropriated in excess of their budget amount. But is there a possibility of increasing that $40,000 either by millage or by percentage by way of amendment to this, or is this statutory?

Law Director Davis - That is something that I would need time to look up. I don't know off the top of my head, but if you send me an email, I'd get you an answer.

Councilwoman Treynor - Yeah, I meant to get to that before today. And my next one, I did get your email. Thank you very much for the permission to use any funds that are collected by this. And just so we're on the same page, I was never suggesting that we could use tree funds to repair sidewalks. I was proposing that where the tree is the direct cause, and if you're faced with a rotted or blighted tree and there is a root associated with that tree and that root has blown up the sidewalk, I think if, in the process of taking out that tree, you can repair that sidewalk because that would be, in my view, absolutely ancillary to the treatment of the tree.

Law Director Davis - So, I still say no. So, the statute's very clear what the money can be used for. So, the actual repair of the sidewalk is not a permitted use. So no, it could not be. I'm not saying that the city couldn't pay for it. It couldn't be paid for out of that fund and that money.

Councilwoman Treynor - So, the tree that caused the sidewalk, you can take up this? That means you can't take up the sidewalk either without having specific line items on that bill that say, well, this portion of the cost was relative to the removal of the sidewalk, this part is relative to removal of the tree, and then go back in with a replacement of the sidewalk; that just, I don't know, that doesn't seem right to me.

Law Director Davis - It might not read right, but that's the way that it's written in the statute. It's very clear what the permitted uses for those funds are.

Councilwoman Treynor - Disagree, but that's all right. That's our prerogative. At any rate, can we look into the possibility of changing whatever that millage is so that it's not something that's been static for the last 50 years.

Law Director Davis - Yes. So, send me an email of what exactly you're wanting me to answer, and I'll get that to you.

Councilman Eades - So just a point on that, even though it says it's expected to collect X amount, it's collected more than that amount? No, it hasn't. $45,000 was collected this year.

Councilwoman Treynor - It's been $40,000 since this was enacted in 1986.

Councilman Eades - Right, right. But I think it's actually collecting more than that, only because I think houses have been built; they have to pay into it, and that increases that fund a little bit.

President Peters - But I think it's $40,000, and then they adjust the pricing for all the existing. So, if you've been paying... Yours is going to decrease because there are more people here now.

Councilwoman Treynor - There are more people contributing.

Councilman Stahl - When we've done this before, we always put an amount in. We have to send it to the auditor, and she tells us what. There's a space on the thing. It tells us what percentage it's going to be.

Councilwoman Treynor - Right. You adjust the millage to the dollar amount, I think, is the way it's supposed to work. And there's going to be some fluctuation in that, I suppose, because nobody's math is perfect.

Councilman Hitt - Well, I think it generates more sometimes because after that determination of the amount that's to be paid, additional houses are billed or added in, or 46,000 in addition to the set amount, I believe. I mean, that's probably some question for you, maybe, or the auditor, the county auditor.

Councilman Eades - Well, I will say this. I do hope that the tree commission... comes up with a plan for how to access that extra money they have, even though I would vote to leave this on because I wouldn't want to see it taken off. I may also move to suspend collections if we're going to keep building a fund up and not using all of it. But I think we should leave it on regardless because we may need it. But that would be a later piece. It's just something I've considered here lately.

Councilwoman Treynor - Well, I don't think there's any argument that those funds could

very easily be expended addressing some of the trees. I know there's been some requests from citizens to have the trees that are within the right-of-way taken a look at, and their questions have not been answered yet about when they could expect any service on those.

Councilwoman Jackman - If I may add, it's my understanding that the tree commission didn't realize there was that much money in the account, or they would have tried to utilize more of it. I'm not sure how that happened, but I don't think they realized those extra funds were there.

Councilwoman Treynor - I assume that if we have an individual property owner that has a problem tree within the right-of-way and they reach out to the tree commission, they should be able to...

Director Saltsman - I get calls every week. If they call, we send somebody out. I pass that on to the commission, usually a bill. He'll send somebody out to look at it. They do the evaluation to see if that tree needs trimming or if it's dead and needs to be taken out. What we do find sometimes, including I took two calls this week, is that they're not in the purview of the easement or not in a position that is our responsibility, but they still want us to take care of their tree.

Councilwoman Treynor - So maybe this is a procedural problem? Is the proper recourse then for a citizen to reach out directly? To the safety services director?

Director Saltsman - They can reach out to the administration, and we pass it on.

Councilwoman Treynor - Maybe reaching out to the tree commission directly is not the proper avenue?

Director Saltsman - Well, they can, but they can go right to us, and we get it to them. Absolutely. I will comment. You made the comment about the recent trees and that we've gotten more, but part of it, if you look at the number of storms we've had recently, we definitely saw an increase in trees coming down. We've seen more severe storms in the past few years. So, you know, that extra pot of money, know, recently we spent a lot just on three trees we had to have paid to have taken down. One was on a structure; one was down we couldn't get to, as we're doing two or three others, so um there were additional cleanup costs this year. I don't think we passed John; you can probably address that, but in the future, or in the past, we haven't had that many that we're taking care of, you know, having the private sector take care of big trees, take them down because of storms.

Councilwoman Treynor - Just out of curiosity, because I know the park suffered several trees in the last storm. Does that come out of Parks and Rec, or does that come out of the Tree Commission?

Director Saltsman - It depends. I really can't answer that yet.

Mayor Closser - I think when those ash borers came through, we used Tree Commission money. Did we, John?

Councilman Stahl - I think we did. There weren't that many. We didn't have that many ash trees. In fact, we have one street that's still full of it.

Mayor Closser - Because it's for city property, right? Because the trees at the park are city property, so if they have to be taken down, we can use tree commission money, I would assume.

Law Director Davis - So, the tree commission money, so the statute, the way it reads, ORC 727.011, is to be used for controlling the blight and disease of shade trees within the public rights-of-way and for planting, maintaining, trimming, and removing shade trees in and along the streets of a municipality. That is specifically what the statute lists the money can be used for.

Councilman Hitt - So the ash borer would be diseased trees, I assume.

Councilwoman Treynor - Well, the question is whether they're at the right-of-way or on a street. If they're in the city park, that's city property. I don't know that it's city property.

Councilman Hitt - If they're in the city park, that's city property.

Law Director Davis – Public rights-of-way and a long street to the municipality is the way it's worded.

Councilman Eades - So last year it was $45,435. This year it was $46,891 that was collected. Right.

Councilwoman Treynor - That was on a $40,000 resolution, though, so it's collecting slightly more than anticipated. I think we would like to know if we can. My guess is, depending on future need, based on the level of trees that are likely to need service, if we can increase the $40,000 request.

Councilman Stahl - Can't we just pass this the way it is and then add on to our original?

Councilwoman Treynor - No, I don't think so. We'd have to modify this before we pass it.

Councilman Stahl - Because we have a whole chapter on everything you can and can't do.

Leave on for 3rd reading

ORDINANCE 173-26 Sponsored by: Andrew Hitt

An ordinance amending Exhibit C of 184-24 an ordinance creating a designated outdoor refreshment area

Councilman Hitt - So this would allow West 40 Social to participate in the Dora area. It just requires them to be named as a participant.

Motion to suspend the three-reading rule by Councilman Hitt, 2nd by Councilman Hays. The motion failed by the following vote:

Abstain:	**0-**	
Affirmative:	**4-**	**Hitt, Jackman, Hays, Stahl**
Against:	**3-**	**Eades, Treynor, Boyd**

Leave on for 3rd reading

New Business

None

Round Table

Councilman Stahl – Oh, yes. I have a question for the safety service director and the law director. Gunner's garage is a mess down there. Recently, they put a cover around half of it. But then recently, I know the police and the sheriff and the fire truck were all down there; whatever happened. But now they're parking cars in front of the fence. A couple of them were two feet out in the gutter. And that side of the street is flat. And that's where most of the people walk out that way. The other side is more sloped. So, it's forced other kids and ones that walk; they're walking out in the streets.

Director Saltsman - The recent incident was not actually at Gunther's. It's the second part of that property, the next door. That's an ongoing criminal investigation. I can't comment on that. But what I can say is, on the Gunther side, they have been more than once a target of building and zoning code. And one of the issues we found is we do not have code that defines what a junkyard is, and that's one of the concerns we have. I think in the committee I recently mentioned we need to update our building and zoning codes; I will say, your concern, I mean, we've seen this all summer. We send them a letter. They clean it up. They don't clean it up. They take the things off the front of the right-of-way. They can't have them on that grass.

Councilman Stahl - I'm not sure what a definition of a junkyard is. It is one.

Director Saltsman - We don't define it. So, I can't treat it as one because we don't define it in our code. So, we have to follow the codes that we have, which we are, and we're addressing their issues. It's a slow process. We have the same concerns you do. We shared them with them. But, you know, when you tell them you can't park the car out front and they move it, and it does it again, you've got to go back.

Councilman Stahl - I've had everybody out there where he's been calling me, so I just thought I'd bring it up again.

Director Saltsman - I will say we just literally had that discussion last week because of the police raid next door. It is an eyesore that needs to be addressed. I agree.

Councilman Stahl - It didn't used to be too bad, but just in the past year it's gotten ridiculous.

Councilman Boyd - I wanted to thank Mr. Campana for reaching out and sharing his comments and questions for Mid-Ohio, and hope that, hey, he was able to catch it tonight. I know that was a little tough to really get all of it in and reach out to our representatives quite as much, but hopefully, hey, that got a lot of information for everyone tonight. One of the items I was a little curious about is: I was thinking the 1.5% that we were talking about with 169, is that just for that four-year term? 5% that we were trying to knock out as, hey, something most municipalities are actually looking into or do as a just regular occurring increase that goes with them. You'd have to do it every day. It was written just for that term. All right, and so yeah, I mean, I was seeing it as hopefully something we could have helped out future leaders, but in this case, that's all. Thank you.

Councilwoman Treynor – I'll pass

Councilman Hitt – Public Service Committee meeting is at 5 o'clock on October 13th in the meeting room next door

Councilman Hays – I want to thank all of our city employees for jobs well done. I want to thank our clerk. I know those minutes had to be grueling to do those minutes, and I know you had a detached retina. So, thank you so very, very much from the bottom of our hearts for doing that. I appreciate you very much. I want to thank you; we had a good council meeting tonight. We had a lot of things discussed. I want to apologize to my fellow compadres up here. I missed the last two meetings as far as finance is concerned. And I was on vacation for one of them. And the other one, I don't remember. It was too long ago. But anyway, I apologize. I know we don't have an audience tonight, but thanks, everybody, for listening and watching. I ask the Lord's blessing upon our city and our residents. Lord, keep us safe and keep us well. The Safety Committee meeting will be October 13th, 6 o'clock, in the conference room. That's all I have, and thank you.

Councilwoman Jackman - I just appreciate the representatives from Mid-Ohio that came to our meeting to try to clarify some things, and I just appreciate them being here and sharing their information.

Councilman Eades – I was also glad Mid-Ohio showed up. I didn't know they were going to be here until I looked at the agenda about 4 o'clock this afternoon. So, it was nice that they were here. And all the input on salaries, listen, this has been... This is torturous for everybody. It would be nice if we had one good way to do it, but there were so many opinions on what to do. Here's my suggestion, Rich. If you're going to come back with something, get with Andy, get with whoever, figure out how you want to amend that moving forward, and have the option to amend it. You've had the option; this is the third meeting, but if you have something you want to bring forward, then work that out and bring it forward, and let's see what happens. Thank you very much.

Adjournment - Motion to adjourn at 8:28 pm

Attestation: Minutes approved, filed in the Auditor's Office, and posted on the City of London website for public review.

Kris Miller, Council Clerk

10/15/26

Date

~~Joshua Peters~~, Council President pro tem

Greg Eades

Date 10/15/26