



April 4, 2025

Meeting Notice
Village Council Meeting As
A Committee of the Whole
April 8, 2025
6:30 p.m.

The Whitehouse Village Council is encouraging citizens to consider accessing public meetings remotely. You may do so by phone at 1-567-318-0438. You will then be prompted to press the following Meeting ID 708107151#. You may also access the meeting online by going to the Village website at www.whitehouseoh.gov and clicking on the link from the home page. Please make sure you mute your microphone.

Notice is hereby given that the Whitehouse Village Council will meet as a Committee of the Whole on Tuesday, April 8, 2025, at 6:30 p.m.

AGENDA

- I. Call to Order
- II. Roll Call
- III. Review and Approval of the March 11, 2025, Committee of the Whole Meeting Minutes
- IV. Citizen Comments on Committee of the Whole Agenda Items
- V. **General**
 - A. Discussion of Electric Aggregation Next Steps
 - 1. **Supporting Information** – Memo & Comparison Analysis (Exhibit A)
 - B. Report of Engineer's Estimate for Rue Du Lac Subdivision
 - 1. **Supporting Information** – Engineer's Estimate (Exhibit B)
 - C. Discuss Committee Workplan For 2025
 - 1. **Supporting Information** – Initial Priority List (Exhibit C)
- VI. Citizen Comments
- VII. Consider Other Business as Appropriate Under the Village Charter
- VIII. Adjourn

**Village of Whitehouse
Village Council Meeting As A
Committee of the Whole
Village Hall, Whitehouse, OH
6:30 March 11th, 2025**

CALL TO ORDER – ROLL CALL

Meeting called to order at 6:30pm by President of Council Dave Riggenschach.

Council Members Present: Louann Artiaga, Carrie Tuohy, Steve Connelly, Larry Yunker and President of Council Dave Riggenschach

Council Members Absent: N/A

Staff Present: Administrator Jordan Daugherty, Deputy Administrator Joshua Hartbarger, Fire Chief Jason Francis.

Guest Present: None

Motion by Councilman Connelly, seconded by Councilwoman Tuohy to approve the minutes of the February 11th, 2025 Committee of the Whole meetings. 6 ayes

CITIZEN COMMENTS ON COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE AGENDA ITEMS

Council President Riggenschach asked if there were any citizens present to comment on the Committee of the Whole agenda items. There were none.

GENERAL

Executive Session

A motion was made by Councilman Connelly and seconded by Councilwoman Artiaga to enter executive session for the purposes of possible litigation at 6:32 p.m. Motion passed all ayes.

A motion was made to reconvene from executive session at by Council President Riggenschach and seconded by Councilman Connelly at 7:11 p.m.. Motion passed.

A motion was made by Councilman Connelly and seconded by Councilwoman Tuohy to enter executive session for the purposes of economic development at 7:12 p.m. Motion passed all ayes.

A motion was made to reconvene from executive session by Council President Riggenschach and seconded by Councilman Connelly at 8:13 p.m. Motion passed.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

Council President Riggenschach asks if there are any citizen comments to be heard. There were none

OTHER BUSINESS

Council President Riggenschach asks if there is any other business to discuss from Council members. There was none.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Councilwoman Tuohy, seconded by Councilman Fine to adjourn the meeting at 8:14pm. 6 ayes

Respectfully submitted by Joshua Hartbarger



WHITEHOUSE · OHIO

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION

Jordan D. Daugherty, CAO
Municipal Administrator

MAYOR
RICHARD BINGHAM

COUNCIL
LOUANN ARTIAGA
DAVE RIGGENBACH
CARRIE TUOHY
STEVE CONNELLY
LARRY YUNKER
STEVE FINE

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor and Village Council
FROM: Jordan Daugherty, Municipal Administrator
SUBJECT: Electric Aggregation Approach
DATE: April 4, 2025

Included in your packet is a document summarizing decisions that Council faces as we begin implementing the electric aggregation program. Much thanks to Steve Fine, who authored the document and helped gather the information. You may note that one of the decisions is determining which Council of Governments (CoG), if any, we want to join. While there are a few options, my recommendation is that Council consider either the Northwest Ohio Aggregation Coalition (NOAC) or the Sustainable Ohio Public Energy Coalition (SOPEC) option. Conceivably, NOAC is a "local" COG whose members include our neighboring northwest Ohio municipalities. NOAC contracts with an energy consultant for much of its technical and negotiating work. Comparatively, SOPEC is relatively newer and has strong representation in central Ohio. It is growing, offers a couple more amenities, and the majority of its technical and negotiating work is in-house. In my opinion, either CoG would work well. As competitive as these two options are, I give a slight lean toward SOPEC, who, in my opinion, appears to have stronger negotiating influence with its power provider (AEP).

During Tuesday's meeting, we plan to walk through the documents with the goal of charting next steps. Reach out if you have questions.

Respectfully,

Jordan Daugherty

Exhibit A

Choosing an Aggregation Approach/Partner

Questions Council May Want to Consider:

- Focus on joining an electric aggregation Council of Governments (CoG) or explore the Village having its own contract with an energy broker?
- Pursue a fixed electrical rate that is set every 1-3 years or rates that change monthly?
- If want to join a CoG and want fixed electrical rates, join the Northwest Ohio Aggregation Consortium (NOAC) or the Sustainable Ohio Public Energy Council (SOPEC)?

Potential Approaches for Implementing the Aggregation Program

Per State requirements, steps for implementing the Village's aggregation program include the following:

- Establish a plan of operation and management.
- Hold at least two public hearings to allow consumers to raise any concerns over the proposed plan.
- Seek approval from the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (PUCO) to begin the Village's aggregation program
- Establish a contract with an Ohio-registered competitive retail electric service (CRES) (e.g., Energy Harbor, Dynegy, AEP) to be the default electricity supplier for eligible customers in the Village

Since the Village has limited expertise and capacity to negotiate and manage large contracts for electricity and to work with the PUCO, the Village will likely need assistance.

At least two general approaches are available for obtaining assistance with managing most aspects of the aggregation program:

- Contract with a commercial energy broker
- Join a regional council of governments (CoG) for energy aggregation (Such CoGs are authorized under section 4928.20(A) of the ORC.)

It appears that many municipalities choose to work with a CoG. Benefits for the Village include the following:

- Potential to obtain more competitive rates from a CRES because the Village will be part of a larger pool when bids are requested

- Share the expenses of establishing and managing CRES contracts and providing customer service
- Access expertise focused on achieving the CoG's goals
- Forum for partnering with other communities
- May provide opportunities for additional benefits by partnering with other communities (e.g., support for local energy projects)

Have focused efforts on exploring the following CoGs:

- Northeast Ohio Public Energy Council (NOPEC)
- Northwest Ohio Aggregation Consortium (NOAC), which is operated by Palmer Energy Company, based in Toledo
- Sustainable Ohio Public Energy Council (SOPEC), which has offices in several Ohio cities

NOAC/Palmer Energy and SOPEC negotiate contracts with CRESs for fixed rate electricity for 1-3 year terms. NOPEC negotiates contracts for variable rate electricity, where the cost per kilowatt hour (kWh) varies monthly. To provide predictability for Village residents and businesses, the exploration of options has focused on CoGs that provide fixed rate electricity, NOAC and SOPEC.

There are many similarities in the services NOAC/Palmer Energy and SOPEC provide and in their relationships with their member communities:

- Will provide a plan of operation and management for the Village, support the Village with the public hearings, and work with PUCO to obtain approval for the Village's aggregation program.
- Will work with one or more CRESs to arrange electric rates for member communities that generally provide a discount over standard service offerings.
- Is led by a managing board composed of member communities
- Will provide expertise regarding the electrical industry, legal issues, etc. to support establishing effective contracts and managing programs.
- The costs of operating the CoG and managing aggregation programs is covered by a very small fee included in electric rates. The Village does not pay a direct membership fee.
- Provide the opportunity to leave the CoG, with the timing tied to CRES contracts or customer opt-out deadlines. However, both CoGs report that no community has left their CoG.

With either COG, the experience Village residents and small businesses who participate in the aggregation program would receive appears to be similar. This includes receiving letters explaining the program and offering the opportunity to opt-out, continuing to receive electricity over electric lines owned and maintained by Toledo Edison, receiving bills from Toledo Edison, contacting Toledo Edison regarding outages, having access to customer support for the aggregation program, being able to join and leave the program when they want and without penalty. Informal information indicates that both Palmer Energy and SOPEC have provided good customer service.

If the Council chooses to work with a CoG, Kevin has recommended that, at the appropriate time in the process, the Council enact an ordinance to authorize the required steps, e.g., establish an agreement with the CoG and authorize the Village administration to pursue necessary actions to implement the aggregation program (Kevin would provide the exact wording). Kevin has said that formal bids would not be required to establish an agreement with a CoG.

NOAC vs. SOPEC

There are also some differences between the two COGs, summarized below (based on information provided by Palmer Energy and SOPEC and a non-expert's understanding of the situation):

	Palmer Energy/ NOAC	SOPEC
# of communities	15	30
Examples of participating communities	Toledo, Sylvania, Perrysburg, Maumee, Waterville, Delta, unincorporated areas of Lucas County	Dayton, Gahanna, Portions of Cleveland
# of households	Approx. 125,000	Approx. 123,000
Year started electric aggregation	2002	2014
Default price to compare for new electrical contract starting June 2025 (cents/kWh). (Note that customers' actual rate will be higher.)	9.75*	??*
% guaranteed "green energy" with default rate **	0%	100%
Optional plan: Percentage of green energy and corresponding price to compare	25%/9.83	0%/??
Estimated time from completion of public hearings & Council approval to residents/businesses receiving new electric rates	Approx. 5-6 months	Approx. 2-3 months
Contracting flexibility	By the second year the Village would be using the same contract as the other members	By the second year the Village could choose to be on the contract used by most SOPEC communities (renews in June) or be on the new contract with the 50,000 households in Cleveland (starts in August), which could offer some pricing benefits

	Palmer Energy/ NOAC	SOPEC
Process for joining	Sign contract with Palmer, then hold public hearings	Two options: • Adopt SOPEC “charter”, bylaws, and plan of operation and governance, then hold public hearings • Hold public hearings, then adopt SOPEC documents
Initial Electricity Contract	Palmer Energy would negotiate a separate contract for the Village to cover until June, 2026, when the Village could join the NOAC-wide contract	Village could have options, including joining Cleveland’s contract in August or having SOPEC negotiate pricing for just the Village
Relationship with CRES	NOAC does not have a long-term contract with a CRES, but it has used a series of CRESs (including Energy Harbor, and Dynegy) that derive from the first CRES NOAC used, First Energy Solutions.	SOPEC exclusively works with AEP Energy, which is a CRES. Their agreement includes AEP Energy providing SOPEC three market representative quotes to ensure competitiveness and full transparency on price components.
Support for certain types of local energy projects	No	Yes

* The default price to compare applies to existing CoG members.

** Both CoGs obtain “green energy” by buying energy that is generally not renewable and then buying renewable energy credits (RECs) for the non-renewable electricity that was purchased. RECs are sold by entities that generate energy from renewable sources. Each REC represents the environmental benefits of 1000 kWh of electricity generated from renewable sources.

Managing Expectations on Electricity Costs

- **Bottom line:** Even with aggregation, residents' and businesses' electric rates will likely increase this year. While aggregation will likely still provide savings relative to the standard service offering from Toledo Edison, those savings may be smaller than in previous years.
- Electricity is a commodity with prices that fluctuate based on multiple factors.
- Examples of previous annual savings compared to the standard service offering (these are probably not apples-to-apples comparisons):
 - NOAC: Typical residents' savings \$75-100
 - SOPEC: First year savings for residents and small businesses:
 - Cleveland: Approximately \$250 per enrolled customer account
 - Riverside: Approximately \$377 per enrolled customer account
- Electric rates going up this year
 - Electricity rates in the electrical region that Ohio belongs to will increase this year due to a component of the electricity cost negotiated 3 years in advance that helps ensure there's sufficient power available ("capacity rate").
 - The Palmer Energy representative also explained that the strong cold period during the winter and national economic factors have contributed to higher prices.
 - In June the default price to compare for NOAC customers will increase from 6.3 to 9.75 cents/kWh. The NOAC contract that is expiring had a 3-year duration and was negotiated when electric rates were much more favorable. SOPEC also expects its rates to increase.
 - According to a news report, NOAC estimates that annual household savings for the coming year will be \$36/year.
- NOAC and SOPEC will lock in rates again next year.



Engineer's Opinion of Probable Project Costs

Rue Du Lac Road Reconstruction
Village of Whitehouse
Project Number: M2500083.001P

Date: 3/21/2025
Calculated by: DPF
Checked by: JLW

Description: Road Reconstruction of Rue Du Lac Subdivison to meet current Village of Whitehouse Subdivison regulations. The project involves new 6" curb and gutter with 29' wide streets to be reconstructed. New lighting, sidewalk and catch basins to tie into the existing storm sewer. The roadway will be crowned at the center of the roadway and drain to catch basins. A new cul de sac will be placed at the NW end of the subdivision and a new entrance at the SW end of the subdivision to connect into Claystone Court.

Item No.	Item	Total Quantity	Units	Unit Price	Total Price
Roadway		\$299,036			
201	Clearing and Grubbing	1	LSUM	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00
202	Pavement Removed	3633	SQ YD	\$15.00	\$54,500.00
202	Catch Basin Removed	4	EACH	\$500.00	\$2,000.00
203	Excavation	574	CU YD	\$40.00	\$22,958.52
203	Embankment	287	CU YD	\$40.00	\$11,479.26
204	Subgrade Compaction	4780	SQ YD	\$5.00	\$23,897.78
204	Proof Rolling	2	HOUR	\$250.00	\$500.00
608	4" Concrete walk	15700	SQ FT	\$11.00	\$172,700.00
608	Curb Ramps	300	SQ FT	\$20.00	\$6,000.00
Erosion Control		\$42,786.89			
659	Topsoil	400.0	CU YD	\$40.00	\$16,000.00
659	Seeding and Mulching	174	SQ YD	\$7.00	\$1,217.84
659	Commercial Fertilizer	0.47	TON	\$2,000.00	\$939.15
659	Water	19	MGAL	\$10.00	\$187.90
670	Erosion Control	24442	EACH	\$1.00	\$24,442.00
Drainage		\$179,300.00			
606	Underdrains	3150	FT	\$15.00	\$47,250.00
611	Adjust Manhole to Grade	4	FT	\$750.00	\$3,000.00
611	Catch Basin Type 3	8	EACH	\$4,000.00	\$32,000.00
611	12" conduit Type B	1130	FT	\$110.00	\$124,300.00
611	Manhole Type 3	4	EACH	\$5,000.00	\$20,000.00
Pavement		\$569,650.00			
301	4" Asphalt Concrete Base Course, PG 64-22	530	CU YD	\$275.00	\$145,750.00
304	8" Aggregate Base	1070	CU YD	\$90.00	\$96,300.00
407	Non-Tracking Tack Coat	580	GAL	\$5.00	\$2,900.00
441	1 1/2" Asphalt Concrete Surface Course, Type 1, (448) PG64-22	200	CU YD	\$325.00	\$65,000.00
441	1 1/2" Asphalt Concrete Intermediate Course, Type 2, (448)	200	CU YD	\$300.00	\$60,000.00
452	6" Non reinforced Concrete Pavement for Driveways	800	SQ YD	\$100.00	\$80,000.00
609	Combined Curb and Gutter, Type 2	3150	LF	\$38.00	\$119,700.00
Lighting		\$166,580.00			
625	Light Pole, Conventional	10	EACH	\$3,000.00	\$30,000.00
625	Light Pole Foundation	10	EACH	\$1,750.00	\$17,500.00
625	No. 4 AWG 600 Volt Distrubution Cable	1570	FT	\$5.00	\$7,850.00
625	Conduit 4", Type E	1570	FT	\$45.00	\$70,650.00
625	Trench, 24" Deep	1570	FT	\$14.00	\$21,980.00
625	Pull Box, 24"	4	EACH	\$1,400.00	\$5,600.00
625	Ground Rod	4	EACH	\$500.00	\$2,000.00
625	Control Cabinet	1	LSUM	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00
625	Power Service	1	EACH	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00

Exhibit B



Engineer's Opinion of Probable Project Costs

Rue Du Lac Road Reconstruction
Village of Whitehouse
Project Number: M2500083.001P

Date: 3/21/2025
Calculated by: DPF
Checked by: JLW

Description: Road Reconstruction of Rue Du Lac Subdivision to meet current Village of Whitehouse Subdivision regulations. The project involves new 6" curb and gutter with 29' wide streets to be reconstructed. New lighting, sidewalk and catch basins to tie into the existing storm sewer. The roadway will be crowned at the center of the roadway and drain to catch basins. A new cul de sac will be placed at the NW end of the subdivision and a new entrance at the SW end of the subdivision to connect into Claystone Court.

Item No.	Item	Total Quantity	Units	Unit Price	Total Price
Traffic Control		\$700.00			
644	Stop Line	1	LSUM		\$300.00
644	Crosswalk Line	1	LSUM		\$300.00
644	Turn Arrows	1	LSUM		\$100.00
General		\$137,000.00			
614	Maintaining Traffic		LSUM	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00
623	Construction Layout and Staking		LSUM	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00
624	Mobilization		LSUM	\$20,000.00	\$80,000.00
Spec.	Preconstruction Video		LSUM	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00
construction subtotal					\$1,442,302
10% contingencies					\$144,230
construction total					\$1,586,533
15% Inflation					\$238,000
Total Construction Costs					\$1,824,532.69
Preliminary Engineering					\$20,000.00
Engineering					\$160,000.00
Bidding					\$5,000.00
R/W Plans and Plat					\$30,000.00
Assessment Assistance					\$2,500.00
Construction Admin					\$10,000.00
Construction Observation					\$160,000.00
Total Engineering/Construction Services					\$387,500.00
Printing					\$2,000.00
Advertising					\$2,000.00
Legal					\$5,000.00
Total other project costs					\$9,000.00
Total Probable Project Cost					\$2,221,032.69

Initial Priority List

In Progress

Completed

Action Needed

- Review changes to Charter(Term Limits)
 - Term Limits
 - Mayor Replacement Ordinance
- Update to Council Rules
- Prioritize Capital Projects
 - Walkability
- Publication of “easily readable” financial reports
- Bridge Dedication
- Close Down Survey
- Petition Signature Day

Identify 2-4 Items to add to the priority list...

Louann Artiaga

- Get old fire truck into cherry fest parade for 2026...100 year old
- Restoration of the caboose
- Sign for front of Village park
- Update Shelter house for use year round
- Update Zoning Issues (New zoning person or other avenues)
- Economic development training for council
- Expansion / remodel of Village Hall to add multi purpose space for community and training room for police dept.
- Bridge Dedication
- Murals around town
 - Garage in Alley by Social
 - Cycle Works
 - Whitehouse Motors

Dave Riegenbach

- Re-Route 64 out of Village Downtown
- Donation Committee
- Sidewalk from Field Ave to Finzel along Weckerly Rd
- Finish downtown revitalization

Steve Connelly

- Review volume of meetings - do we have an opportunity to reduce (similar to Waterville)
 - a. COW was intended to replace committees ... but we have both.
- Improved walkability
 - a. Create prioritized list of areas with target timeframes for completion
- Recreational or activity options for village residents:
 - a. swimming was mentioned by 10% of write-in responses to the survey
 - b. pickleball (expanded courts)
 - c. senior center

Steve Fine

- Enacting a mayoral replacement ordinance.
 - a. As you probably recall, the charter change we made regarding replacing a mayor who leaves office in the middle of the term had some complications, such as the opportunity for the mayor to step aside shortly after their re-election, force the Council president to give up their seat and become mayor briefly, and then the original mayor starts a new term in January, leaving the former Council president with no position. Kevin recommended that we enact an ordinance to prevent such shenanigans, and my recollection is that we were interested in doing that this year.
- Implement the electric aggregation program.
 - a. Following state law, that will require developing a draft plan, holding public hearings, and adopting and implementing the plan. For your awareness, I volunteered to help Jordan with the process and we are gathering information to inform our next steps, which would include Council engagement and decisions.
- Creating and implementing an economic development plan, working with Kleinfelder
- Capital projects.

- a. At the appropriate time we need to discuss plans for capital projects. While we discussed some options in December, Jordan said that we were not making decisions on individual projects yet, just setting the total funding. Among issues I think we should discuss is what improvements staff is recommending for Village Park and the priority of those.
- Mid-year review for Administrator
- Council operations.
 - a. Creating a list of actions and resources for new Council members (e.g., an onboarding checklist). This doesn't have to be long but could help new members on-board more smoothly. Examples could include mandatory training, Village email, phone number and voice mailbox, bio on website, badge for entering building and the Council room.
- Discuss financial planning process.
 - a. I have suggested that an overly conservative approach to financial planning may be making the long-term Village financial outlook appear worse than it is. When I brought this up during budget discussions in December, I believe there was consensus that we should discuss this topic when we aren't on the cusp of approving the budget for a new year.
- Senior center.
 - a. This has come up multiple times but we haven't discussed if we want to do more than ask the Library if there would be a community room in the new facility. I'd suggest that we have a discussion on whether we want to explore the idea of a senior center. If we want to do that, we should start the process, including exploring level of interest in potential services (perhaps using this year's survey), what it would take to operate, and potential resources (e.g., space, funding, in-kind resources). Once we collect information, we should discuss whether we want to pursue establishing a senior center.
- Charitable giving
- Communication
 - a. Routinely sending letter to residents providing Village updates (That was one of the most popular responses to the survey question, "How can the local government better involve residents in decision-making processes and community initiatives?")