

A Workshop and Trustee meeting of the Newbury Township Trustees was called to order on Wednesday, February 19, 2020 at 3:00 p.m., with Glen Quigley, Bill Skomrock and Greg Trof present.

Also, present were Newbury Township Service Director Doug Zipperman, Bev Sustar, Fiscal Officer elect for Newbury Township, and Lorraine Sevich, Zoning Assistant. Following the Pledge of Allegiance, Trustee Bill Skomrock noted the reason for the special work session meeting was to discuss the study that was put together by Miller Dodson Capital Reserve Consultants (referred now to as MD report), at the request of the Newbury Township Trustees. He explained there were a lot of items in the report that he and the other Trustees need clarification on. The Trustees wanted to come up with questions for Pete Dodson, (from Miller Dodson) and they requested a meeting with him, so that they can go over the report in detail. Skomrock said he studied the report, and some of it he understood, some of it he didn't. He didn't understand some of their methodologies and processes that were used in the report.

Trustee Glen Quigley explained that MD report methodology was accepted standards that were used industry wide. Quigley didn't know how important it really was for the Trustees to understand the methodology of the whole report; as their report was based on proven standards. Quigley questioned what portion of the report they were going to start to fund. Quigley felt that the whole back section, which was devoted to the roads and road equipment – (that all comes out of Road Department funds), both he and Skomrock didn't see the need to add to funding these projects. Quigley said the MD report looked at everything Newbury Township owned and said, "This is what the Township is responsible for – buildings, fixtures, etc. Over a period of time, there was a standard table that says this is going to fail." The Trustees want to know how they will provide for that in the future. Quigley explained that the MD report said based on industry standards, these pieces of equipment will fail at a predictable time. So, this is what is expected to fail, and this is how much money you should have, based upon the failures anticipated in future years. Quigley said it comes down to they should be putting away \$134,000 per year – if they buy into the whole program.

Trustee Greg Trof said if they buy into the whole program, it will cost \$879,000 – for everything. Skomrock clarified that Quigley said they have road levies to cover some of these expenses. When it came to the Fire Department equipment (not the building), they pay for that out of the levy monies, and the contracts they have with the Fire Department on a year to year basis. Skomrock thought that amount of money would be cut down significantly.

Trof said the number he gave did not include fire equipment. Trof said the MD report had them down for 52 miles of roads – which was high. He took 32% off of the road number. Instead of having to put away 1.2 million dollars – it actually came down to \$879,000.

Trof thought one of the first things they needed to address was the Service Department. Were they going to fix up the buildings as they stand? Or build new buildings? If they were going to put up new buildings, they could take that section, along with the fire equipment – and set them aside. Then it would become a new number. Trof noted they took over the old fire station – which was a temporary fix, to get more storage. Trof asked if they would build a new service garage. Trof said they could put away money and fix what they have, or bite the bullet, and put up a new building, of which they can still put away funds for. Trof thought those questions, and more needed to be answered.

Skomrock agreed, but wondered how long it would be before they had the funds to build a new maintenance garage, and add an addition on to the fire station. He noted that they all have to be maintained up until that point. Skomrock thought the numbers should be kept in until that point. Trof agreed.

Trof thought if they were going to do something to the fire station in the future, not to put any money into it, except to keep it safe. Quigley said that was their decision, to make it safe - that was step 1. Quigley said it could not be a general fund expense, as they did not have money in the general fund to build anything. He thought their choice was to pave roads, or use funds to build a building. He felt they had an obligation to pave roads, and in order to build a facility, that would require some additional levies.

Trof said as far as roads go, they do 2 miles of roads a year, which was \$450,000, just to pave the roads. What's left was for equipment and fuel and payroll.

Service Director Doug Zipperman agreed with Trof's statement, and thought the question was if they were on the 15 to 18-year schedule, they would need to generate more funds. Did they want to prepare for roads - and noted that roads don't last for 20 years, like they did years ago. Trof wondered if they were spreading themselves too thin – should they be paving 3 miles of roads per year. Trof agreed.

Quigley thought they should talk to the Engineer's office. He said they were in the process of gathering information as to when the roads were paved, what year. He wanted the experience of the County Engineer's - how long they anticipate a road should last. Would it be 10 years, would it be 20 years. He would like to see their opinion. Trof thought the MD report was a great baseline for everything.

Quigley addressed Trof about building a new maintenance building, and said that would require a levy. Trof agreed. Quigley asked if he had any idea or recommendations about that. Trof said that was up for discussion and noted in order to make the MD report work, they had to make that decision first. Quigley recognized that the MD report would take care of the existing facilities.

Quigley asked Zipperman to prepare some type of document - justification - as to what was needed (repair, enlarge or replace the existing service garage) before they can figure out what monies a levy would have to generate to repair/enlarge/replace. As Zipperman was the Road Superintendent, he was more in tune as to what the needs were. Quigley explained once they know what the needs are, they can see what they have and fulfill those needs. Do they need to build an addition, or a new building. Then they would have to get pricing on it and seek additional funds. Quigley wanted to find out what the needs were before they talked about an increase levy.

Skomrock thought that brought up three questions – do they repair, do they replace or do they relocate.

Quigley agreed. Skomrock thought they needed to have more conversation going forward, and noted their work session today stemmed from the MD report. Skomrock said the study was done for a reason – so they knew where their money was going to go, and what the potential costs were. He said the costs in the MD report were estimations – based on the status quo. He felt if they decided to go through with anything in the report, they needed a project manager, which had a cost, also.

Quigley said there was little doubt that they had to maintain what they had. In the short term, that's what they had to do. Quigley asked the Trustees if they wanted to concentrate on one part of the report, the part that had a direct impact on the general fund. Should they do the report in steps, rather than its entirety. He thought in some ways the roads would take care of themselves, as they already had an ongoing funding source. Based on that source, they could do "X" number of roads. It might be 2 miles; it might be 3 miles. If

they choose to do 3 miles, they would have to increase the levy's, but they don't know that yet – they would need a better idea as to what the history will show and science showing how long the roads will last. Then, he felt, they could make a more informed projection. He noted they need a lot more information than they have – they need a better road map as to how to get to where they want to go.

Quigley said they could accept the MD report as it is, but if they chose to have some sort of expansion, the report would need to be adjusted. In the short term, he thought they could look at a 2, 3- or 4-year projection, and thought it should be doable, from general fund expenditures. Tropf thought in the short term – the 5 years or less – at least on the buildings – he didn't think there were any issues. Quigley noted there was another thing that came into play – the school, and what will happen with that building. Would they have some sort of ownership of that building – that was yet to be determined and noted there were a lot of things that were dangling, making it more difficult to make a decision – there were too many variables. Quigley thought decisions about the school buildings could change everything. He said they had a limited set of facts to deal with.

Skomrock said he would talk on that subject at another meeting. Quigley addressed the Trustees and asked what they wanted to do. He said he could look at the short term and think it was acceptable. He noted they would have to have money set aside in different funds to cover some of the things in the 5 year – 40-year plan. Tropf felt they didn't have to adopt all of the MD report, and noted nobody had to force them to do any of it. Tropf felt they could pick and choose what they wanted to do. He didn't think \$133,000 for building maintenance in year one was extreme. He said they were doing that now. Quigley agreed and said they were building that into their budget, and said they already do that. He felt it was basically creating a capital improvements account. So, when something fails, they have the money to buy it.

Skomrock thought the report expenditures were \$68,000 per year. Tropf said it varies year to year, and \$68,000 was for year one. Quigley said they anticipated that there would be things that would fail, in a given year, and it would cost that much, based on industry standards. If the money was put aside in a capital improvements fund, the money would be there. Quigley noted they put the money aside already. Quigley felt the MD report supported what they were already doing - it just provided a road map. Tropf said if they put the money into a capital improvement fund, then go to the County, and if the County questions why they have that money in that account, they can show the reason. Tropf said the money had to be put into an account for capital improvements fund – not the general fund.

Fiscal officer elect, Bev Sustar, said that was the beauty of the MD report – it proved that even though the money may have not been spent this year, they would have to spend it in the future. Skomrock asked Sustar if the money was in the capital improvement fund for 5 to 8 years, if they were still protected. Sustar said she thought so. Quigley said based upon the MD report, if they didn't spend the money in a particular year, if it could be carried over. Quigley noted Tropf said he spoke to the auditor and the answer was yes. Quigley summed it up – they put the funds in a capital improvements fund, and when someone asks what evidence do you have – then they show the MD report, explaining they had a study done and the supporting documentation. Even if they don't spend the money in a particular year, they don't have to be criticized for carrying the money forward, and having the money in the bank. Skomrock clarified that the money they were talking about to fund the projects would be in the general fund, because that is where the capital improvements come from, and Quigley agreed.

Skomrock addressed the roads next – he asked if they could carry funds over for road projects, and asked if the monies would have to be in a separate fund - a road fund. Quigley said it was his understanding that you could only have a percentage of your total budget into a capital improvements fund. He thought they would need to find out more about that. He gave an example – if they put in 10% of their budget, and next year they don't spend 10%. The rollover is documented or justified because of the MD report. He wondered if a capital improvements funds gets capped off at what they can put in, or can the capital improvements fund have more than 10% of their budget. Quigley felt they would need more money in that fund because of the MD report.

Sustar said based on her understanding of government fund accounting, you can have a fund – capital improvements – but it had to be for a specific project. And you could only have that fund for 10 years. She explained that it wouldn't be to replace water heaters or furnaces – it would have to be for - she gave an example of - a new building – for a project that has a beginning and an end. Within each fund, she explained, you can have a maintenance account, an expense account for maintenance, improvements, repairs, etc., and that stays with the road fund, or within the general fund, where you can continue to carry over your balance. Quigley asked if they could have 2 capital improvement funds – one for roads, and one for general township expenditures. Sustar said it could not be the general fund. Quigley explained out of the general fund – but the expenses would be specific to the items in the report. Sustar noted you cannot do repairs and maintenance out of the capital improvements fund, but you could do a project. Quigley asked Sustar to get that in writing from the auditor. Sustar said that within the general fund, you can have a reserve account, for maintenance and repair. Then you could open up a new capital improvement fund, for a maintenance garage. Tropf clarified that account would have to be used in a certain number of years. Sustar said yes. Quigley asked again if they could have multiple funds for multiple funds for multiple projects. Sustar said yes. Quigley asked Sustar to make sure they had documentation for that. Sustar said sure.

Quigley clarified again – they would have a fund set aside for general maintenance - Sustar said they could have a line item on that account, within the general fund. Sustar said they could grow that balance in the general fund, as part of that. Quigley said that would explain if they had a carry over, and Sustar said yes. Quigley said the way he understood it, there was a cap on what that is – and if they go with the MD report, it could exceed that cap. He asked Sustar to find out what the cap was on those reserve funds. Sustar said sure.

Skomrock gave an example of a road project – where they had funds set aside – they couldn't do it and had carryover the next year – which they got chastised for. In his example, he asked if the road project went up another \$50,000 – over what they had set aside at a 10% cap – then they decide they aren't going to do it, because it will cost too much money. He wondered what would happen in that case. Quigley thought that question would be answered by the questions he asked Sustar to get answers to from the Auditor's office. Quigley said whatever the item was – and gave examples of a truck, a fixture, building, etc., - it would fail at some point. The MD report was based on an industry standard those things have certain life expectancies. Skomrock said the report stated, you have expenditures for capital improvements. The normal items – the

day to day items – like a water heater, were not included in that. Quigley said that everyday operating expenses would be covered in the general fund.

Skomrock said that between years 2020 and 2025, they need to be able to follow the plan, so they can maintain the status quo. Quigley said the danger in that is they establish the accounts and don't spend the money – the money would be set aside for a specific purpose. Sustar said she thought based on the way the MD report was set up - she didn't think if she set up the improvements and maintenance account in the general fund, she didn't think they needed to be specific. She explained she would say what items were expected in years 1 through 10, and what funds they have set aside for that, and what funds were paid out of that. They could have a running total – and that would be proof for the budget commission to say – these are legitimate expenses they expect – and they have only spent 25% of them this year, but they have an expectation – and Quigley finished saying – so that needs to be carried forward, without being criticized. Quigley asked again where the cap was, and said that is what they need to find out. He said the state of Ohio said they can have "X" amount of dollars, and they cannot exceed that cap. He asked if the MD report allowed them to do that, and he wants to see some sort of approval for that idea. Tropf suggested they could not exceed the cap by not putting more money into it. Sustar said theoretically, as money is being put into an account, it is also being taken out. Quigley said based on the life expectancy of things, something could last 5 or 10 years, and they have money for it today. He just wanted to make sure they don't repeat what happened in the past. Sustar said she would check with the LGS and the Auditor's Office – she thought that percentage limit is if you set up a separate reserve fund versus, if you set up a maintenance and improvement fund within the general fund – she didn't think you were limited. Quigley said if Sustar would find out the answers to the questions they had today, he would have a different comfort level going forward.

Quigley asked how they begin a plan right now, when they have more questions than answers; he thought there were more variables than what they could discuss. Skomrock said that was the reason for this work session – to bring these things up.

Skomrock thought right now they were at a standstill, because they had more questions than answers. He didn't know if Pete Dodson could answer their questions. Quigley thought in the short term, they could go 2 to 3 years. He asked how much money they want to set aside now, and if they change their mind – have they committed those funds permanently to something they can't take back. Sustar said if you leave it within the general fund, no – you were not committed. She stated you can change the appropriation at some point in the future. Sustar noted that if a brand-new fund was created – a capital improvement fund – once you commit those funds to that purpose – you would need a court order to change them back.

Quigley felt they had to be careful on what they adopt – even at this stage – because if they adopt the first five years of the MD report, and it doesn't pan out, then they would need a court order to get the funds back to use in a different fashion than for what they were originally set aside for. Sustar said not if they left the funds in a general fund.

Quigley asked about doing a capital improvements reserve account – Sustar said if they were talking about an account – then they were fine. They could use the money and change the purpose – at some point in the future. Sustar said there were different funds, and explained that with the Auditor of State's approval, they could open up a brand-new capital improvement fund, but that has to be for a specific purpose. For maintenance, Sustar said you could not open up a capital improvement fund; it would have to be within the general fund - you would open up a new account, and the money would stay in the general fund. Quigley clarified that it would just create a line item in the general fund that says reserve - replacement. Sustar said right. Sustar explained that this year it could be \$68,000 and next year could be \$138,000. Skomrock asked if the money could be accumulated as Sustar just said, and Sustar said yes. Skomrock and Quigley both confirmed that would be a legitimate carry over, and Sustar said sure, because you have the documentation for it. Tropf said they now had a document. Quigley asked Sustar to find out the answers to their questions.

Skomrock felt they needed to fund some monies to take care of things that aren't specific to the roads. Tropf said they already are. Skomrock clarified they wanted the funding to be more transparent. Tropf said if they don't spend the funds, they have a reason to say why they didn't spend it. Quigley clarified it was still within the general fund, and it was a line item expenditure, and monies could be moved around in the same fund. Skomrock asked the Trustees if he should cancel the meet with Pete Dodson. Tropf and Quigley both said yes; as they needed more answers to their questions.

The secretary clarified – **Sustar will report back to the Trustees about capital funds, capping of the funds, general funds and all of the rules for spending. Trustees said correct. Sustar will provide the information to the Trustees by April 1, 2020.**

Zimperman will prepare a report to the Trustees on the immediate, short- and long-term projections for roads and maintenance. Zimperman will have report ready for the Trustees by April 1, 2020.

Quigley said the Trustees also need to have a better idea of what is going on with the school building.

The secretary clarified that The Miller Dodson report and meeting with Pete Dodson will be tabled to a future date. Trustees said yes.

Tropf made a motion to adjourn the work session meeting at 3:50 p.m. Quigley seconded the motion, and a unanimous affirmative vote by all.

The meeting of the Newbury Township Trustees was called to order on Wednesday, February 19, 2020 at 3:52 p.m., with Glen Quigley, Bill Skomrock and Greg Tropf present.

Also present were Newbury Township Service Director Doug Zimperman, Bev Sustar, Fiscal Officer Elect for Newbury Township, and Lorraine Sevich, Zoning Assistant.

Skomrock said that he and Zimperman had met with Nick Gorris, county engineer, on Friday, February 14, 2020 to discuss line striping, guard rail replacement and road projects for 2020. Gorris came up with a resolution and Skomrock thought Gorris sent everyone an email regarding the resolution. Quigley said he did not receive the email. Skomrock apologized – he thought Gorris sent it to everyone. Quigley said he has asked before and he'll ask again – that everyone be copied on all emails and communications. Skomrock said he would like to pass this resolution - it would put Newbury Township on the County's contract for the line-striping. Zimperman explained this meant that Newbury Township would be in under the pricing the County receives. Zimperman said the County would set it up, just like they do the paving projects; bids will be put out, and the Geauga County Engineer's office will award the bid to the lowest and most qualified bidder. Skomrock thought this would make it cleaner, and Newbury Township would be

paying the same rate as the County. He noted that if Newbury did this on their own, they would be charged a lot more per mile, and said that roads that were already striped – had to continue to be striped. Quigley asked Zimperman if he had some type of idea what they wanted to spend per year on striping. Zimperman said only about half of the roads in Newbury are striped, and they try to do about 1/3 of the roads per year. Zimperman said the County average is to try to stripe everything – every other year, and he noted their traffic counts were higher than Newbury Township. Zimperman noted that some roads, like Munn Road and Pekin Road had more traffic flow than perhaps Music Street and Stone Road. He said some of Newbury roads could go 3, 4 or 5 years before they need striped, so they try to stripe as needed. The bids will be for approximately 6.51 miles of Newbury Township maintained roads.

Tropf made a motion to adopt Resolution number 20200219-01 for the application of pavement markings. Quigley seconded the motion, and a unanimous affirmative vote by all. All Trustees signed, and the document will go to the Fiscal Officer, Marcia Mansfield, to sign. After that, it will be mailed to the County for them to sign, and they will mail Newbury Township back the complete signed copy.

Quigley asked Zimperman if he fixed a mailbox on Munn Road. Zimperman said no. Quigley said a resident who was in Delaware called, and said his mailbox was fixed. Zimperman said if someone calls, they fix the mailboxes, or if they know they hit it, they will fix it. Quigley asked Zimperman if the policy for Newbury Township was to replace up to the mailbox. Zimperman said if they can repair it, they repair it. Typically, they would replace the damaged mailbox with a \$20 mailbox, numbering and post. Zimperman noted that they recently repaired a \$250 mailbox, and the resident seemed to be happy with it. Quigley clarified that the policy of Newbury Township was not to replace like for like. Zimperman said correct. Skomrock spoke about road paving projects for Newbury Township in 2020. First was Chatham Glen Drive, second was Portlew Road and Sperry Extension was number three. Gorris put together a total price report for the 3 roads. Skomrock said Gorris also came up with another added cost that some Townships in the County were opting to do – the driveway approaches where they roll in the asphalt. Some are going to the extremes where they are cutting out and replacing with concrete, if it is a concrete driveway. Some stamped driveways are also being cut out, and replacing it to that degree. Skomrock noted Newbury Township has never done that, and the cost of that was astronomical. Quigley thought the approaches were always included in the paving. Skomrock said they were and explained this was an option they could do, in addition to paving. Zimperman explained this was pertaining to concrete for decorative driveways, not gravel or existing asphalt. Skomrock said that Chatham Glen Drive and Charlton Lane was \$170,000 for the road project. If they want to add \$48,750 – they can remove the pavement and replace with concrete, or reinforced concrete. Or, to remove the concrete and add asphalt based would be \$19,000. Skomrock said they would do the driveway approaches they normally do now, and that was included in the \$170,000 price. If they want to upgrade, it would cost another \$48,750 or \$19,000. Skomrock said he opted for the \$170,000. Skomrock said that was just for one project, and it did not include Portlew Road. Portlew Road would cost an additional \$7,000 or \$18,000. Sperry would cost an additional \$2500 or \$6000. Skomrock noted those additional costs would add another \$75,000 to \$100,000 to their paving costs. He noted that was the cost of paving another road. Quigley concurred, and recommended they go with the current program of not adding the additional cost. Tropf opted to abstain.

Skomrock said he wanted to also take care of some other business from the Fiscal Officer. They have \$348,000 for road paving projects right now. There was an additional \$240,000 that was unappropriated. The Fiscal Officer suggested they move some money out of the unappropriated funds to cover the \$415,000. Skomrock asked if that was something they should do - if they moved \$100,000 to the 2141 fund, and get it started. He noted they may get a better price. He said Zimperman already did a lot of road repairs last fall on Chatham Glen Drive and Charlton Lane, and there were 1 or 2 culverts on Portlew Drive. Quigley thought perhaps they could do all four, and Skomrock agreed. Zimperman said when he met with Gorris, their initial thoughts were they would have to cut Sperry Extension or Portlew Road, and stay at the three roads. He thought if they had the money to move around, they should do all of the roads. Quigley asked if Gorris needed the resolution today. Skomrock explained that the Fiscal Officer needed it, so that she can transfer the funds, and the funds would be available before they pass the resolution.

Quigley made a motion that they pass Resolution number 20200219-02 - \$100,000 from the unappropriated funds to the 2141 road fund. Tropf seconded the motion, and a unanimous affirmative vote by all. Skomrock noted that the Fiscal Officer will prepare the resolution, and she will have the Trustees sign the resolution.

Quigley noted they need to find out what they will do with the unappropriated \$140,000.

Skomrock clarified that they will do all four roads – Sperry Extension, Charlton Lane, Chatham Glen Drive and Portlew Road. Quigley made a motion that they accept the Newbury Township Road Program as presented by Geauga County Engineer's office, RS-NEW-V-2020. Tropf seconded the motion, and a unanimous affirmative vote by all. Skomrock explained that the county will bid out the projects, and takes care of it. Secretary clarified that the administrative assistant will mail this signed road program to the Geauga County Engineer's office.

Sustar will send everyone her email, as set up by Newbury Technologies.

Tropf made a motion to approve the minutes as presented from the Trustees meeting of January 22, 2020. Quigley seconded the motion, and a unanimous affirmative vote by all.

Tropf made a motion to approve the minutes as presented from the Trustees meeting of February 5, 2020. Quigley seconded the motion, and a unanimous affirmative vote by all.

Skomrock stated that Zimperman requested the purchase of a new backhoe. Skomrock said he spoke with the Fiscal Officer and the funds were available - \$125,000. That was without the trade in, confirmed by Zimperman. Zimperman said the list price was \$175,000, less \$50,000 with the state contract price. With the trade in, Zimperman said they would be under \$100,000. He said the price of \$125,000 was within \$100 of the Newbury Township cost without the trade in – all of the other discounts were applied. Zimperman explained the price was \$178,000 – but with state pricing, it was cheaper. Tropf said less the trade in which was, and Zimperman said like \$25,000 to \$28,000. Quigley asked if was better to sell the old one or trade it in. Quigley noted that they want to deal in retail, not wholesale. With a trade in, they would be dealing in wholesale and he felt they would do better in retail. Zimperman said the backhoe would take 6 months to build, and they would have to decide, because if they wanted to sell it on govdeals.com, they would have to have a 2 or 3 week buffer to advertise.

Zimperman said once they place the order, they will get a tentative date of when it will be delivered.

Quigley asked if these were available to buy on a lot somewhere, or if each one was built to order.

Zimperman said to get the options they want, it had to be built. Zimperman said they will order a backhoe with 4-wheel drive, extended hoe, ride control, option for auxiliary tools plumbed in, jaw or clamp – he noted those all had to be added at the factory, they could not be added later. He said they looked at adding an integrated tool carrier on the front, so they could take the bucket off, and for the cost, they thought they would probably never take the bucket off – and that was an \$8,000 savings. Quigley thought they should sell the old backhoe on govdeals.com, instead of doing a trade in. He felt that trading it in was never a good deal. Zimperman said it has gone both ways – they have done well on some things, and fell flat on some others. Quigley asked Zimperman if time permitted, if he would check out govdeals.com. and see what is for sale. Zimperman said there was a lot of different backhoes listed on that website. Quigley asked if he could make a price comparison. Zimperman said the price varies. Quigley said it will give them an idea of what the pricing will be.

The salesman told Zimperman he did not think Zimperman would be able to beat his price with a trade in. Zimperman said if they sell it on govdeal.com, they would put a reserve price on it, then add administrative fees and other costs. He explained they sold a trailer on govdeals.com, and did not take into account the administrative fees, and ended up with a loss – they were within \$100 of a trade in, so he felt it wasn't worth all of the extra work for \$100. Zimperman said govdeals.com charges 6.5% for their fee, and he explained you can add that cost back on to the buyer, by charging a higher price. Quigley asked if Zimperman he would look into govdeals.com, and if could get more than \$25,000 for the backhoe, then it made sense to sell on govdeals.com. Zimperman said if they timed it so they could sell it within a week of the delivery of the new backhoe – what he didn't want to run into, was to sell it on govdeals.com, then find out that they don't have a machine for 4 more weeks.

Quigley suggested they play it safe, and see what similar backhoes sell for on govdeals.com. Zimperman said he would and would try to get as close as he could to a trade in price. Skomrock told Zimperman all they were asking for was him to get a few numbers.

Tropf made a motion to purchase a new backhoe up to \$125,000. Quigley seconded the motion, and a unanimous affirmative vote by all.

Quigley made a motion to approve the financials for January 2020 as presented. Tropf seconded the motion, and a unanimous affirmative vote by all.

Cemetery deeds were signed by the Trustees, and Zimperman notarized them. Sustar said she was not a notary, and Zimperman noted that she could not notarize the documents for the Township, as she was the Fiscal Officer.

Skomrock shared correspondence he received from Sudden Link about internet service of which no action will be taken. Quigley noted there was map which was drawn up by the PUCO years ago that showed who the internet providers were. Skomrock said it all depends on where you live, as to what internet providers you can choose from – Newbury Township had nothing to do with that, nor do they have any authority over that.

Skomrock said he sent in the Census map for 2020 and reported that Newbury Township had no boundary changes.

Skomrock said the Sheriff's report had 212 911-calls reported in January 2020, plus numerous traffic stops. Skomrock said the Geauga County Health Department is going to have their annual meeting on Wednesday, March 25, 2020. Skomrock said he will attend. He also said if any one is interested in being a Geauga County Health Board member, they can send in a resume. Sustar noted that was an unpaid position.

Skomrock said they decided they will sign the contract for the Fire Department at the first Trustees meeting in March, 2020. He has the contract, and it will be signed on March 4, 2020.

Skomrock said that he wanted to set up a Tri-Board meeting – a meeting to include the Trustees, The Board of Zoning Appeals and the Zoning Commission. He noted they have not had one of these meetings for a number of years. Skomrock attended the Newbury School Board meeting last night, and added he will be receiving more information. He reported that both the Newbury and West Geauga School Boards met last night, and basically, looked at the school buildings and football field. They had an attorney present as well. They will communicate through Skomrock, who will act as a liaison between the schools and Newbury Township; they may have additional meetings for discussion and fact-finding. Unofficially, the attorney told them, the building will go somewhere, and Skomrock did not believe they would retain the buildings, to include the property. If there are any Charter Schools in the community, they have the first right to the building – by law - they would have the right of first refusal. Second in line, is the taxing authority, or community, or Newbury Township. The third option in line is that it goes up for auction – it cannot be sold outright. Skomrock said that is as much as he knows right now. From the way he understood the process, there would be a couple of town hall meetings, with both School Boards present. They would have a facilitator at that meeting and there may be break off groups that have discussion. He does not know when those meetings will be – but they will be before June of 2020. Sustar asked if any of the parcels would be split up, and Skomrock said they did not say anything about that. Skomrock noted this was a conversation and whatever was decided – he did not think there were any Charter Schools to take it over - the Township is on the list, and/or is up for auction. Regardless of which way it goes, that property is zoned residential. The School Boards said the property was appraised at approximately \$500,000. Skomrock said he didn't know if that price was documented, or in writing, and it was not a fact he was stating, at this meeting. Skomrock said for that property to be worth anything, the zoning needs to be changed, or adapted, in his mind. He didn't know where it would go. Skomrock did not want a white elephant to be in Newbury for 20 years. Quigley noted that it was about a 6 to 8 month process to rezone a property.

Quigley wanted to know who was going to make an application for the rezoning, and what was the request for the property to be zoned to. Skomrock said that is what will be discussed at the Tri-Board meeting.

Skomrock wanted input from more people. Quigley thought they needed input from a potential buyer.

Quigley said if the property were to change hands, the new owner would have to adhere to whatever the zoning is, unless it was a government institution. Quigley explained if Newbury Township were to take it over, there was no issue, as Townships don't have to adhere to their own zoning, as was with the school district. Quigley thought it was doubtful that they would take over the whole facility – he didn't want to spend a million dollars to take out the asbestos. He thought there may be some interest in the elementary building. Tropf said gifting would be out – Quigley clarified - from West Geauga to Newbury. Tropf said from West Geauga or Newbury to Newbury Township – and said they would have to purchase the property. Tropf added they could sell it to Newbury for a nominal fee.

Quigley thought a Tri-Board meeting was long overdue. Skomrock thought they needed to meet and greet, they need to talk, the BZA needs to present what their needs are, as far as the recurring cases. Quigley explained that the variance process was in place for relief from the strict interpretation of the zoning position as it is. There was a lot of time and energy that went into the existing zoning resolution. It cannot cover every example, or everything, as evidenced with the letter they just received from the Zoning Inspector about the property on Route 87. Quigley emphasized that the zoning is all encompassing, not specific. There was a relief process in place to address those specific needs. And if you try to change the Zoning Resolution to cover all of the anticipated needs, there was a place for those at the BZA hearings, and he felt they should stay there. He said there may be some additions to home occupancies that may be appropriate, and he realized that times change, and perhaps Newbury didn't change with the times. Skomrock said he was using that as an example, and perhaps it was a poor example. Quigley said he was giving legs to the process and why it is, and they shouldn't change it just because there are some requests. Quigley said he thought one had to be careful about how they solve the problem. Just because someone came to the BZA was not the end all. He thought 9 out of 10 times that was the best place for the decision. Skomrock agreed, and said the BZA was the judicial part of the process. Quigley thought it was very important to adhere to what Newbury Township already had. He didn't think wholesale changes should be made to address specific questions. He would look at the entirety of the whole situation.

Skomrock said they could not – not talk about this issue, because the people at the Tri-Board meeting are the people that will be heavily involved in that decision. Tropf agreed. Skomrock thought what better format to at least start the thought process. Quigley did not disagree, but said normally, the way the process works is there is an application – somebody was asking a question. Skomrock said he understood that. Skomrock said he wanted to be proactive, rather than reactive, and he didn't know where to begin. Quigley said he was not disputing any of that – he was merely saying there was a process in place and said the Township could be the ones that initiates the question – they want to propose a zoning amendment. Then, Quigley said, there would be something to talk about. Quigley didn't think they should talk about some sort of vague statement, and they need to make decisions based upon facts.

The date of Saturday, March 14, 2020 at 9:00 am was decided for the Tri Board meeting. Skomrock asked the Zoning Secretary if she would contact the BZA, Zoning Inspector and Zoning Commission members about the meeting. Quigley said the meeting should include the topics of general conversation about what topics they should be working on, and the rezoning of the school property.

Tropf passed out some guidelines about the cemetery and they will be addressed at the next Trustee meeting. He asked the other Trustees if they had any changes, to send him an email so they would have it for the next meeting. Quigley asked Tropf to send them an email.

Tropf said he received one price about the soccer field fertilization. He was waiting for 2 more prices.

Skomrock said that will be discussed at the Trustee's meeting in March 2020.

Quigley said the application for tax equalization exemption is completed, and he will send it to the Auditor at the Treasurer's office, before it goes to the state – they have to approve it.

Quigley talked about the Chagrin River Watershed Partners – they received a report from them. The report is about who they are and what they have done. Quigley noted they do a very good job at multiplying their funds.

Quigley said he did not know what the Park Board decided, as he was not at the meeting.

Quigley will notify Independent Tree, on behalf of the Township and the Trustees will thank them for their ongoing care of the trees and their fertilization at the Veterans Park.

Quigley said they are still on hold for discussing wages.

Quigley reported that the Ohio Revised Code (ORC) said they have to notify all parties of interest as to their actions on the uninhabitable properties on Portlew Road. To ensure correct procedure, he thought they should do a title search on the properties, and contacted Lawyer's Title to do a property search on the properties at \$325.00 each. Once they get the title search back, they can then send out the letters to the property owners. Quigley said he wanted to make sure the process was iron clad on their side.

Quigley was notified by a resident in Newbury Township, that one of their relatives is a member of the 87th Infantry Acorns, that was a military group, that was part of the 3rd Army. It was under General Patton's command, at the Battle of the Bulge. What the resident would like to do is to buy a sign that would dedicate a portion of Route 87 in memory of the 87th Acorns. Quigley contacted the state representative, who directed Quigley to two websites of historical markers and grants for historical markers. Depending on what the Township wants, they could get a homemade sign, or a real sign, or a historical marker. He believed a historical marker was the way to go, and if they could get funded by the state, it would save money for that project. They could have a dedication for that as part of the Memorial Day service. Quigley noted that it was, or is, a Newbury resident that was part of the 87th Infantry Acorns group. Quigley thought it was appropriate that it would be on Route 87, but noted that the two have no relationship to each other. Quigley thought Route 87, the 87th Infantry, and Newbury Veterans Park, it all plays in together. He still needs to gather more information. Skomrock asked if there was a name attached – and Quigley said it was the 87th Infantry Division. Quigley said this group is still active and does exist in the military. Quigley said they would like some sort of sign recognizing and memorializing this group on Route 87. Skomrock clarified that it was not one individual, the whole division. Quigley concurred and said there was no singular name on it. It would read something like: "In memory, or in thanks to the 87th Infantry Division", etc. If the funding is approved by the state, maybe they will also create the historical marker, and provide the text for the sign. Quigley said he has a long way to go on this, he just started. He thought it would be an interesting to see on Route 87.

Quigley said that he converted the resolutions Skomrock asked for – for the Nopec Community Energy grant. He had 2 copies for Skomrock that required his signature. They sent Quigley a form for a resolution and an ordinance. Quigley completed both forms, and believed the one they needed to adopt was the resolution, since they were not a city or village (ordinance). Skomrock noted that he did not have the PDF converter to do this, and Quigley did it. Skomrock signed the resolution, as Chairman of the Trustees. The Fiscal Officer also needs to sign the document. Quigley noted this was the beginning of the process for accepting the grant, and if they don't do it, they don't get the money. **Tropf made a motion to start the process to adopt the Resolution 20200219-03 to apply for the Ohio Energized Community Nopec Grant program. Quigley seconded the motion, and a unanimous affirmative vote by all.** Skomrock signed the resolution, and it will go to the Fiscal Officer for her signature.

Quigley said at some point there will be some sort of reimbursement to someone for copies of deeds to file.

Sustar told the Trustees she will need to be bonded before April 1, 2020. Quigley said to call the Insurance company, Burnham and Flower, and make the arrangements. Skomrock thought it might be covered under the insurance, so Sustar wouldn't need to be bonded. Skomrock advised Sustar to tell them she was a newly elected official to Newbury Township, and see if there was an alternative that covered her, instead of the bond itself. Sustar confirmed that Newbury Township legal counsel was Linda Applebaum at the Geauga County Prosecutor's office.

Quigley asked Sustar to be sure to copy all Trustees on all emails.

Newly elected Fiscal officer, Beverly Sustar was sworn in today, Wednesday, February 19, 2020 at 5:15 pm by Trustee Greg Tropf. Beverly Sustar will officially take office as the new Fiscal Officer for Newbury Township effective April 1, 2020. Her term will expire March 31, 2024. Sustar was congratulated by all of the Trustees and all in attendance at the meeting.

Tropf said he would give the contact information to Sustar for Burnham and Flower. Quigley said to contact them, and as Skomrock said - maybe the insurance covers the bonding, and Sustar may not need a bond if it was covered in the Newbury Township policy. Quigley asked Sustar to make sure that it is covered, and once she finds out what she needs, to send an email to the Trustees that addresses the bond, so there is documentation for it. Skomrock had a phone number for Burnham and Flower of 888 748 7966 – and contact of Michelle Crockett.

Respectively,
Lorraine Sevich

Warrants approved by signing prior to or at this Meeting:

Warrant

Number	Date	Payee	Amount	Status
28-2020	2/20/20	John Boksansky	\$531.34	O
29-2020	2/20/20	Joseph Colini	\$1,118.19	O
30-2020	2/20/20	Timothy H. Hegedus	\$590.69	O
31-2020	2/20/20	Randal O. Hollis	\$1,562.69	O
32-2020	2/20/20	Randal R. Hollis	\$626.69	O
33-2020	2/20/20	Timothy A. Mansfield	\$1,669.46	O
34-2020	2/20/20	Lorraine Sevich	\$906.54	O
35-2020	2/20/20	Douglas J. Zimperman	\$1,919.28	O
34452	2/11/20	Geauga County Maple Leaf	\$39.90	O
34453	2/11/20	Dominion East Ohio Gas	\$632.49	O
34454	2/11/20	Jodie Swartwout - v	\$18.53	O
34455	2/11/20	Bradford Neal Machinery Inc.	\$16.64	O
34456	2/11/20	Sunrise Springs Water Co. Inc.	\$21.90	O
34457	2/11/20	Centerra Co-op	\$155.68	O
34458	2/11/20	First Energy	\$2,507.22	O
34459	2/11/20	Newbury Auto Parts Inc.	\$38.54	O
34460	2/11/20	Hill Mfg. Co. Inc.	\$100.00	O
34461	2/11/20	Waste Management of Ohio Inc.	\$13.83	O
34462	2/11/20	U.S. Protective Services	\$225.00	O
34463	2/11/20	Bulldog Battery	\$29.99	O
34464	2/11/20	Fisher Auto Parts	\$290.72	O
34465	2/11/20	Lake Hydraulic Service Co. Inc.	\$518.00	O
34466	2/11/20	Chagrin Oil & Gas Co. Inc.	\$2,450.55	O
34467	2/11/20	Star2Star Communications LLC	\$403.78	O
34468	2/11/20	Lorraine Sevich-v	\$2.00	O
34469	2/20/20	Jodie K. Swartwout	\$508.89	O
34470	2/20/20	Ohio Child Support Payment Central	\$406.93	O
34471	2/20/20	Ohio Public Employees Deferred Comp. Program	\$225.00	O
34472	2/20/20	Medical Mutual Of Ohio	\$742.51	O
34473	2/19/20	First Energy	\$293.42	O
34474	2/19/20	Kimball-Midwest Inc.	\$1,844.24	O
34475	2/19/20	Junction Auto Sales Inc.	\$447.75	O
34476	2/19/20	Acquire Fire Protection, Inc.	\$946.13	O
34477	2/19/20	Cintas Corp.	\$1,391.60	O
34478	2/19/20	NEO Electrical Supply Co.	\$204.17	O
34479	2/19/20	Spectrum Business	\$96.06	O
34480	2/19/20	Burton Township	\$126,337.63	O
34481	2/19/20	The News Herald	\$50.20	O

34482 2/20/20 Medical Mutual Of Ohio

\$6,981.65 O

Purchase Orders approved by signing prior to or at this meeting:

PO

Number	Date	Vendor	Amount
5-2020	2/18/20	Burton Township	\$26,337.63
6-2020	2/20/20	Ohio Cat	\$95,974.00

Blanket Purchase Orders approved by signing prior to or at this meeting:

PO

Number	Date	Vendor	Amount
48-2020	2/25/20	various	\$15,000.00

Tropf made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 5:20 p.m. Quigley seconded the motion, and a unanimous affirmative vote by all.

William Skomrock, Jr. - Chairman

Glen Quigley - Vice Chairman

Greg Tropf

Marcia Mansfield – Fiscal Officer