RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of Meeting

London City Council

Casto & Harris Inc. Form S-301 E1412692LD

Held 20

January 5, 2026

London City Council

20 S. Walnut Street, London, Ohio 43140

January 5, 2026, at 6:30 pm

Minutes

Swearing in of Council Members
Council President Peters swore in all Council Members, returning and new.

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

Roll Call
Present – Councilman Eades, Councilwoman Jackman, President Peters, Councilman Hitt, Councilwoman Treynor, Councilman Boyd, and Councilman Stahl
Absent – Councilman Hayes

Minutes – Approval of December 18, 2025, minutes, approved by unanimous vote

Public Hearing - none

Communications/Announcements –

President Peters – First off, I'd like to welcome Tommy Boyd to Council and our new Council Clerk, Kris Miller. I emailed and left copies here for you, City Council rules for 26-27. The only changes I've made on this are from the last rules we have under the committees. I deleted the BPU stuff under finance and have this amendment to the local service. Did everyone get a chance to look at the rules? Any concerns or questions? So, all in favor, aye. Unanimously approved. The second, I have City Council committees for 26-27.
-Finance personnel, I've got Greg Eades, chairman, Shannon Traynor, and Lisa Jackson
-Public service, I got Andrew Hitt, chairman, Lisa Jackson, and Thomas Boyd
-Public safety, I have Rich Hayes, chairman, John Stahl, and Andrew Hitt
-President Pro-temp Greg Eades. Any questions or concerns? All in favor, aye, unanimously approved.
The last thing I handed out to you is the 2026 new council seminars given by the Ohio Municipal League, which is for newly elected council members. There are three of them, one on February 7th in Cincinnati, the second one on February 21st, which is in Lewis Center, and the last one on March 7th in Independence. However, I'd recommend and encourage every councilman to go; it's very informative. So, if you would like to go, let me know which seminar you'd like to go to. That way, you can let me know by the next Council meeting.

Audience Concerns
Doug Piles, my address is 323 Bishop Drive. It's been a long while since I've been here to address the council with concerns, but I feel tonight is one of them.
Your council is deciding to eliminate another one of the wonderful services that's being provided by the city of London. So, I'd like to just bring up a little bit about the past history of those decisions. The first decision you made was to kick out an absolutely wonderful company that provided emergency services to the city of London for all those years, and instead brought that responsibility into the fire department. And how has that worked? Well, that was done without any input or any vote by the people of the city of London. Whether they wanted that to happen that left a lot of unrest and regrets by the property

owners, and so much so that the voters have turned down three fire levees. Does that tell you something? Additionally, the fire department went out and bought a brand-new fire truck for a couple of hundred thousand dollars. The fire chief has a brand-new truck now. What kind of image is that presenting to the people out there? Additionally, the council, your council, had to fund the fire department with about two hundred thousand dollars of money just to help them through. You should not be spending general fund money to support the fire department; that's illegal. That's not in the resolutions that were placed. Now, the next thing is a decision to give away to the Mid-Ohio water and sewer district all of our assets, all our trucks, all our equipment, all the facilities, plus 6.2 million dollars in cash. What a wonderful deal 6.2. Where'd that come from? If we had that kind of money available, it seems that the two services could have used that money for their own operation. So, now what has happened? So, I'm always at the presentation at the BPU and the council by the Mid-Ohio representative as to what was going to happen at that meeting. A spreadsheet was handed out to everybody, and I have a copy of it. In year one, the rates in the city of London for water and sewer would go down. I made that presentation to the board up there. In one of the meetings, I said, hey this document, what happened? They looked at me like I was from outer space. None of the trustees had any knowledge that this document existed or that the document was presented to the London council for the summit decision. So, then they told me that the city of London signed the contract. Get this, that allowed them to keep the current rates for three years so that for three years. We're getting the increased amounts of contribution for water and sewer. Now, what has happened we have two representatives on those trustees that supposedly represent the city of London. I have been to the meetings, I have read all the minutes, and I have yet to hear either one of those representatives bring up any issue with the city of London. We're not being represented on that board. The city of London is not. So, then I went to another meeting, and I made a presentation. I said, look we have been paying because the BPU and the London council approved borrowing 18 million dollars to fix the well out there. For the water plant, that's not been existent and also to put in a new sewer line up here. That's supposed to run. That hasn't happened yet. So, what I asked the trustees about, I said, you know what the property owners and users have been paying in increased funds, that was supposed to cover the payment on that loan. I asked them what you done with that money for all this time? Have you put those funds aside, separate them into a fund? So, when you do get a loan, is there going to be a big payment on it? Again, he looked at me like I was dumb.

The other thing that happened recently, which is really something, as you know, out on the other side of town, there are 350 condominium owners out there. The Mid-Ohio water and sewer district has said that it is all your responsibility, even though for the total time that I've lived in Kensington, any service that needed to be done on the water or sewer line was graciously taken care of by the city of London. Units fixed two water leaks that we had. London came in and fixed those water leaks. We had a sewer backup, they came in and opened those lines up, and we had a fire hydrant that got knocked over. The water department came in and replaced and fixed that hydrant. So, a precedent has been set as far as everybody else thinks that the city of London was supporting, and our hydrants were flushed. At least in my time, they were flushed twice by city service people. Now they're saying nothing. I'd say that on those operations, it's all the homeowner's responsibility. So, if we have a water leak, the property owners have to pay for the repair now. Is that good service? Has that been worked out for us?

You know, the other thing is all the conversations that are being done by the board of trustees and so on, are projects that are north in Plain City. They're going to put in a new sewage treatment plant at 40 and 70, 42 and 70, and they're going to run a line all the way from Plain City. To pump their sewage down into that plant. That plant's going to cost multi-million for that. They're also running more lines through the city of Lafayette and

Somerford, and they get help. What have they done in the city of London? Nothing. They're still collecting these high rates. One of the key factors that was mentioned in these presentations was that any work that was being done north of London would not place the financial burden of that work on the City of London. Do you think that's going to happen? I can't believe that's a new sewer plant that they're going to put in. Our rates are going to go up to help pay for that. I don't think they're going to honor that commitment. They have.

So, what I'm saying now, I'm worried about the experience you're going to have if you turn over our trash system and sanitation. To an outside contractor. How do you think that's going to work? Our history that I've just told you has not worked. By giving up the control you have. No control when you give it up to somebody else. You think the trash company is going to provide the level of services we're currently getting. You think they're going to offer bulk pickup once a month for people at no charge? Do you think they're going to pick up and provide curb support for elderly people? I don't know what services are being provided. I understand there are issues with the truck with sanitation, but the level of service, do you think we're going to get that from Rumpke or whatever? No, they're going to give you a proposal. That's going to cost a buck 298 this year, but look what's going to happen the next year. As far as rate increases. That's been their history. Go to West Jefferson and talk to those people. Ask what's happened to their trash expenses. I'm worried about you giving up again, and you have no control. I'm worried about this proposal. You have to give up another service to the city of London to outside people. If you're giving away all the services, why do we need an administration group? And again, we're not going to manage anything because the only thing he's going to have is a street department. So, that's my comment. I'm sorry, I hope you consider this and that you think about the property owners in this town. Thank you very much.

Jim Boyd of 364 Ashford Avenue. Good evening, Council members and members of the public administration. I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak this evening. I'd like to begin by addressing the three pieces of legislation currently before you, concerning the city's sanitation department. Taking together these items represents a significant and far-reaching decision. About how a core city service will be delivered and how much residents will pay for that service, before discussing those items directly. I want to briefly reflect on a decision this city has already experienced, and that's the transfer of the water and sewer department to Mid-Ohio. At the time that decision was made, I believe everyone involved acted in good faith.

There was urgency, there were legislative timelines, there were pressures to move quickly, but I asked this question honestly, and I asked it without any accusation. Did the council truly have all of the information that it needed at the time to fully understand the long-term impacts of that decision, and looking back now, are there any regrets about how that decision was made? I would ask on you to ask you to reflect on that just for a few minutes. This is not a question to assign any blame; it's about learning because the decision now, before you decide, sanitation is also significant. Because it's difficult to reverse. It will affect residents for decades and not years. My goal tonight is not to argue either for or against outsourcing; it's not to argue for or against rate increases. My goal tonight is to ensure that this Council administration and that of the public have the best information possible so that this Council can make the most informed decision. About the future of the City's sanitation department, with that goal in mind, I would respectfully ask several questions of you. First, as you sit here tonight, do you have a clear side-by-side comparison showing the pros and cons of each available option in keeping sanitation in-house? Outsourcing some combination of the two, along with the short and long-term costs and the risks associated with each option? Second, do you have all of the information necessary to responsibly approve spending one and a half to 1.7 million dollars in capital

improvements in order to continue providing the same level of service that taxpayers are already receiving today? Do you know what that investment would fix? Do you know what it would not fix? How long will it sustain these operations, and what additional capital investments would be required in the future? Third, and this is with respect to rates, you have the information in front of you that would allow you to clearly explain to any taxpayer why you approve an eight-dollar rate increase, a rate which amounts to roughly a 36 to 38 percent increase, to simply provide the same existing services? And just as importantly, do you have the answer to the follow-up questions that these residents will eventually ask? Will there be any additional rate increases? When might they occur? How large might they be, and exactly what will those future increases be funding? These are not unreasonable questions. These are questions that these taxpayers ask while they're around their kitchen tables. During the activities throughout the community, and some of them, mind you, will bring those questions right here to these very chambers to ask you directly. The answer to any of these questions I've just asked you is not yet fully, but I believe we all share the same interest, and that has been slowing down just enough to close those information gaps. I want to be very clear about something: this is not about winning any sanitation employees or any city staff. Everything I've seen suggests that they're working within real constraints. Equipment limitations, staffing shortages, and financial pressures. These are the same kinds of challenges that any business or employer faces every day. Those conditions do not point to people's problems; these point to process and system problems. By way of my background, a little bit about me, I hold a Lean Six Sigma black belt equivalent certification from Villanova University. For those of you not familiar, Lean Six Sigma is a widely accepted process improvement framework. It's used globally to identify more efficient processes. A local example, Stanley Electric, for example, where structured process improvement and data-driven Decision-making is, I'm sure, part of their everyday operations. I personally have experience examining complex operational systems to identify root causes of waste, inefficiency, and unnecessary costs. That experience is fact-based. It is not based on data. It is based on experience, causes of waste, inefficiency, and unnecessary costs. That experience is fact-based; it is not opinion. Based and focused on solutions rather than blame. I'm willing to volunteer my time as a concerned citizen. Bringing the education, the practical experience, and now, with my retirement, time. Necessary to help facilitate a structured team-based review of the sanitation operations. Where staff supervisors, administration, and other stakeholders actually walk through the work as it is actually performed and identify where problems occur, and agree on practical improvements. The review would be designed to identify the root causes of recurring service issues. Separate avoidable costs from unavoidable costs. Identify actionable improvement opportunities. Attach realistic cost estimates and a return on investment analysis of those actions. And summarize these findings in a clear pros and cons cost versus value report to the council. That the council, the administration of the public, can understand the purpose of this effort. Would be able to give everyone involved the confidence that when the decision is made, it is informed, it's deliberate, it's transparent, and it's defensible. For that reason, I respectfully request that the council table the sanitation regulation-related legislation for a defined period, say 60 to 90 days. That will allow time for this review to be completed and for the findings of the report to be presented to the council. So that this council can make the best-informed decision possible. Ultimately, I believe that every major decision made by this council should be weighed against one overarching question. How does this decision impact the quality and the value of the services provided to the taxpayers? This council and administration represent, let me repeat, how it impacts the quality and the value of the services provided to the taxpayers. This council and administration represent that's what we're here for. Not just this year, but over the long term, sanitation. Is one of the most fundamental services that this city provides. Decisions about outsourcing capital spending and rate increases

deserve the same level of care, analysis, and transparency that we would expect from any other essential service. Especially when the public is being asked to pay more for this service. My comments tonight here are offered in the spirit of collaboration and shared responsibility for making the best possible decision for the future of the city of London. I want to thank you for your time, your service, and your willingness to consider this approach. Thank you. I'll offer any questions if anyone has any. Thank you, President.

Councilman Eades - Mr. Boyd had contacted me and offered these services, which are well above the things that I've considered, and I felt that it needed to go to the safety service director, so we extended an invitation, or I extended an invitation to the safety service director. And we did sit and have lunch. He discussed many of the same points at that time. I will say Mr. Saltsman shook his head in agreement with a lot of things he said. However, there's been no decision made on his part that I'm aware of. That he wants to move forward. I would like to know whether Mr. Saltsman wants to move forward with this. I think that what Mr. Boyd has proposed would certainly give us more information. I just want everybody to know that Mr. Saltsman is at least aware of this. We just don't know how he wants to pursue them, and Mr. Boyd. You know, there's some new information that you brought forward, at least new arguments tonight. I have to agree that when you go back and ask your questions, you did. I feel comfortable making the decision that I have enough information. I don't think I do. I think there's a lot that we need to know more about or to examine further. Whether it's step one or step two, what we do. I appreciate that you're at least bringing those points up tonight. All right, thank you.

Brent McDaniels 1051 Ambrose Boulevard. I would just like to reiterate the fact that it was such an honor and a privilege to work up there for the taxpayers. Touch on this sanitation, actually, they're right on. Them on everything. I mean, I heard nothing wrong, especially about the information part. I toured the facility on September 4th and thought it was horrible. I kind of stated at the last council meeting that this didn't happen overnight. This has been from years and years of neglect. It's unreal what these people in the sanitation are working through, working with, and that's all I have to say. I think it's time for the excuses to end. The accountability begins. Stopping the giveaways. All right, thank you.

Committee Reports

Councilman Eades - The finance committee has not met. We are due to meet after the other two committees. I believe that is on Tuesday, the 13th. So, we will meet no earlier than 6:30. However, if the others run over, we'll meet a few minutes after that. If they run early, we'll wait till 6:30 pm because that's our announced time.

Councilman Hitt - Public service committee meeting is next Tuesday at 5 o'clock in the meeting room next door.

Councilman Stahl – Public Safety committee meeting is next Tuesday at 6 o'clock after the Pubic Service meeting.

City Official Reports

Mayor Closser

Mr. Saltsman

Old Business

3rd Reading

RESOLUTION 190-25 Sponsored by: Andrew Hitt and Lisa Jackman A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE SAFETY SERVICE DIRECTOR TO ADVERTISE FOR BIDS FOR SANITATION DEPARTMENT SERVICES

Councilman Eades - Mr. President, so I'm a little torn. I'll say that up front because I think Mr. Jim Boyd brought up some points that make me think that I don't have enough information. Which at the last meeting, I did discuss the fact that maybe we would bring this to a ballot. So, I do have some comments. So, I brought that idea forward as to whether or not we should continue to put it on the ballot. Whether or not we want to continue sanitation services or get them privatized. Mayor Clauser questioned whether this had to be a citizen's initiative and made a point of reminding us that we were elected to make decisions.
The way this administration has handled things in the past is to get council to make the decisions, especially when there's a feeling for maybe public outcry. That started when the city withdrew from the Emergency Medical District. Continued when the city took action to stop allowing the income from those who worked in paid income tax outside of the city. And the council then made the decision to join the Mid-Ohio water sewer district. I don't believe any of these items were council-led initiatives, but were first presented by the administration, and the council took action from that point. The fact that the voters were asked years ago if we should privatize, and the voters chose to keep our services, should be the reason why we ask again and do not decide for the people of London. The city should act. Can ask a non-binding advisory question of the voters and can proceed from that point. I've asked the law director for further information. If you're not aware that her grandmother passed away. So, she said she needed a little more time to get that done. She emailed today and said she is looking into this now.

Councilwoman Treynor - I just did quick research on this, would be what's considered an advisory election. The Ohio Secretary of State has put out a pamphlet that addresses current changes in the law. So, this would be effective for 2026 and subsequent. Basically, an advisory election is a non-binding election on a question that municipal officials submit to the electorate to gauge voter attitudes on a particular topic. An advisory election is not intended as a substitute for the election on a municipal ordinance, resolution, charter amendment, or other measure. Rather, the advisory election only initially tests the appeal of the proposed legislation, with the second election on the legislation itself to follow if the municipal officials so choose. It does cite the authority granting the right of a municipality to hold advisory elections and the procedure that would follow. Basically, we'd have to certify a question to the board of elections. We are not a charter municipality, so there's no prohibition there. Then basically, there are some languages there are some word choices that would need to also accompany anything that would be on the ballot. The timing for this would be 90 days before the election. I don't didn't get deep enough to know whether that's the primary election or the general election. I do know that we have, obviously, there are some very real funding concerns for the state of the current department, but should the council want to put this matter, basically, to stick a toe in the water, regarding the public's feedback. Provided we have sufficient information to give the public. All of the pros and all of the cons, including the level of service, whether or not there's going to be a rate increase. Which there would be, and I believe my notes from the Finance committee suggest not only an initial rate increase but a continuing rate increase for subsequent years. You know, and obviously, there's the human factor with the current employees of that

department, and you know the home rule. You know, and everybody wants to keep these kinds of services in-house. Again, if we can submit all of that in a chart that's nice and compact, and put it to an advisory ballot. Then that is permissible according to what I read.

Councilman Eades - Okay, so just a little further on that, Mrs. Treynor, it appears that the deadline, if we were going to submit, would be February 4th, that's 90 days before the primary election.

Councilwoman Treynor - I don't know if that's a primary or if it's a general election. Got to get into that.

Councilman Eades – Well, we do have the law director looking into that, so hopefully we know something about that by the next meeting, but again, I'm torn, you know. Do we do this? It's been brought up to me by a friend of mine. What do you gain from this? Will you really gain any insight because it's a primary election? There'll probably be less voter turnout, and he also impressed upon me that we were elected to make decisions, and maybe we should make the best decisions we can with the best information we can get. So, that's what's making me torn about all of this. However, we also have a new council member, whom I don't want to speak for tonight, but this is an awful lot on his plate for the very first meeting. If nothing else, we don't have a law director here. We could leave this on and buy a little bit more time, so maybe we can find out. If the safety service director is interested in the process Mr. Boyd brought up. We still have time if we don't have any legislation tonight. If we want to put it on the ballot, that will have to be at the next meeting, and that would also have to be under an emergency because it would have to be done before the February 4th date. So, that's just my thoughts on this, and my suggestion would be to leave it on tonight.

Leave for 4th reading

RESOLUTION 191-25 Sponsored by: Andy Hitt and Lisa Jackman A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE SAFETY SERVICE DIRECTOR TO ADVERTISE FOR BIDS FOR TRASH HAULING SERVICES

Councilman Hitt - I assume these are all three related. So, I assume we would most likely do the same thing. Just put it off till we can get more input. Are there any objections?

Councilman Eades - No, I don't object. I do want to just bring up the comment that the safety service director mentioned that he could extend the services to our current contract. I believe he also advised me that the rates Rumpke said would stay the same to transfer from now until that point, they were going to raise the rates on us from now.

Leave for 4th reading

ORDINANCE 192-25 Sponsored by: Andy Hitt and Lisa Jackman AN ORDINANCE ADJUSTING THE RATE OF SANITATION DEPARTMENT SERVICES

Councilman Hitt - This also relates to the same topic, so I assume we would leave this on.

Councilman Boyd - Are there any emergency reasons that they would be needing us to get one of these past nights, or are we all good on their line, kind of make sure everything's still functioning, because I mean, yeah, I agree with everything you're saying. I just want to make sure nobody's kind of having a paycheck.

Councilman Eades - No, I don't think that's an issue, and I believe the biggest issue immediately was whether or not we were going to have to raise rates immediately, and the thought was we would have enough, at least at the last meeting, we can carry over till May. We should be able to be good until then. Whether a decision is made one way or the other, but if we continue with the service and we know that we're going to have to raise rates, and if we're not, I mean, we'll have more information by then. Unless anybody has anything. I think the rental truck, the lease could be extended. Yes, I think it was until March. It wasn't by the month. I think he said it was by the month, and it was supposed to go through January, but they can continue that on. I believe so, yeah, and Jim Boyd is shaking his head because Steve Saltsman mentioned that.

Round Table

Councilman Eades – So, once again, at the last meeting, we had issues with our video. The sound. I tried to listen to it the next day. I had my volume all the way up. I was at my house, my TV was on in the background, it wasn't very loud, but it was loud enough that I had trouble picking up on it. So, I turned the TV off so that I could hear at all. It was my experience that it was better to turn on the closed captioning. Closed captioning is not always right; it makes up words as it goes, but I could follow it along, and I knew which words were being said at the time. Mr. Anthony contacted me today once again. To tell me of his displeasure about not being able to hear, even though he was here, he couldn't hear it afterwards, and he also once again said that he would really think that the council should take steps forward. If this isn't going to work, how do we fix that? I know Council President Peters might have some additional information about that.

President Peters - I watched it on YouTube when I was on my phone and could hear the recording.

Councilman Eades – Has the administration had anyone come in and check the equipment?

Eve Breedlove - Right now, no new work has been done. Aside from the simple things that we can do here. The gains on the microphones are turned all the way up. It is as high as the microphone can get. I know this is partly why you are hearing that high-pitched, loud sound. It's also why we have had to turn down the speaker who is above you. It's also why we've had to turn off half of the lights over you as well, because the gain that high in those lights creates a disturbance that is a terrible noise. I have reached out to One Vision Solutions, and I'm actually meeting with them on Wednesday to do a quote for a reveal of this room. It is an active process, but it's a process.

Councilman Eades - There was a conversation I know of before to try to use the same type of system to record, and that's what's kind of put on the back burner because this is YouTube, in that room, it is Zoom. That's still your thought process that you think that this should be the same.

Eve Breedlove - I would suggest that they are the same. You are already paying for it. I think there are numerous features for Zoom that would be useful. The transcription on Zoom is stellar. And I would love you all to have that for me, but also, you're already paying for Zoom. You use it in one room, so I don't see why we couldn't use it in this one, but that is part of the quotes and finding out what we need to be able to change.

Councilwoman Jackman – I don't have anything

Councilman Hitt – I don't have anything

Councilwoman Treynor – I don't have anything

Councilman Boyd - Thank you, everybody, for hey helping me finally get a seat up here. I know I was sitting out there right before he got up here. Also, thank you very much. Hope we can do all we can. My question about Zoom, would replace the YouTube videos, then eliminate them, or would you have Zoom videos and the YouTube broadcast?

Eve Breedlove - Due to the storage needs of every council video, I would personally suggest that you utilize Zoom to create those videos, and then you post them on YouTube because the storage for YouTube is much larger than what you have with Zoom. So, they would still be accessible through the same YouTube link, just the recording itself would be done differently.

Councilman Eades - What about the live feed?

Eve Breedlove - You might be able to bounce it to where your live feed is the same link. It's something that I'm going to have to look further into. You will be able to access the video with just one click, just like it is currently on the website. So, whether that one click takes you to a Zoom or takes you to a YouTube, it's still just one click, and you go to a meeting. You don't have to sign in or sign up or do anything; it's a one-click meeting.

Councilman Stahl - Thank you for coming out. It's very interesting to find out people's ideas and what we think we've done wrong, right, or whatever. So, thank you for your information, and those interested in listening today.

President Peters – Computers, I was hoping Steve would be here tonight, but he said hopefully by committee meetings, he might know something, or by the next council meeting. So, that's all we have on the computers. Is everyone still able to get their emails? John, do you still get emails?

Councilman Eades - Mr. Boyd, did you get your emails today? Okay, also while we're discussing that, there was a printout, and I don't know that you have it, but if you don't, I believe you're going to have to ask Mr. Saltsman for it because he handed out which was the city of London sanitation anticipated expenses for the year. There was also kind of a breakdown looking at Plain City that I didn't know if you had that. It may not be up to date, but at least you were given something. I didn't know if you had the opportunity to see that.

Adjournment - Motion to adjourn at 7:17 pm

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

Kris Miller, Council Clerk
2/5/26
Date

Joshua Peters, Council President
2-5-2026
Date