

**MORGAN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
RIECKER BUILDING**

The Board of Morgan County Commissioners met in their office Monday, May 11, 2026.
The meeting was called to order at 8:30am with the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

Heidi Maxwell, President
Steve Best, Vice-President
Cecil Mayle, Member

The commissioners did the following over the past week:

On Thursday, Commissioner Maxwell and Commissioner Best visited Tabler Ridge School.
Commissioner Best attended a Malta Village Council in the evening as well.
On Friday, Commissioner Best attended a Family & Child First meeting at All Well. He also met
John Isherwood, the Regional Sales Director from ABM, for a discussion. All three
commissioners attended a Hot Dog Judging contest at the High School.

26-233- Motion by Mr. Mayle and seconded by Mr. Best to approve the minutes of May 4, 2026
Mrs. Maxwell yea, Mr. Best yea, Mr. Mayle yea Motion Carried

Al Eltringham, Riecker Maintenance

Monarch Roofing Re-inspected the lower-level roof again and took a core sample of the roofing
insulation under the roofing fabric. 2-13-26 (Core sample was taken 2-16-26)

All mowing at the Grove Park, Commons, Dirt Pile Lot, EMA Building, Old Transit Garage and
Senior Citizen Building completed 5-4-26

Jason Pierce has finished the quote to install Emergency lights for the Riecker Building 5-1-26

Light Post for the Grove Park has been installed by Jason Pierce 5-3-26

Haas delivered the port-a-jon to the Grove Park 5-5-26

***Staci Duskey—Arnold, Jinnifer Arnold, Terry Duskey, Sandy Duskey, Judy Funk, Tisha
Chichester, Tim Riley, Jane Combs; Concerned Citizens, Sheriff Fisher, Prosecutor Welch &
Auditor Williams***

Initial Shock and Resident Opposition

Residents conveyed their profound shock and emotional distress upon learning about the data center project through unsolicited verbal and written offers to purchase their homes. The news broke for many residents just over a week prior; on the same day local officials were reportedly informed, creating a sense of a coordinated and sudden disruption. A resident received a high-pressure "convenience offer" with a one-week, non-negotiable deadline to sell his property, which is adjacent to the proposed site. This approach, coupled with surveyors being seen in the area who claim the project is in its "late stages," has left residents feeling blindsided and that the development is proceeding without any community awareness or input.

Anticipated Negative Community Impacts

The community voiced a wide array of significant concerns about the data center's potential negative effects on their rural way of life. Environmental issues were paramount, including extreme noise and vibration that can reportedly be felt up to two miles away, massive water consumption, and pollution. The project's enormous electricity demand—compared to that of all households in Dayton—raised fears of increased power bills and more frequent outages for residents. Social and economic consequences were also a major focus, with residents anticipating a rise in crime and a strain on local first responders, like experiences during past pipeline projects. The jobs created were seen as largely temporary construction roles, followed by a small number of highly skilled permanent positions that residents would be unlikely to fill. The potential for the data center to become obsolete in as few as five years added to the fear that the community would be left with permanent environmental damage, devalued property, and ruined roads for only short-term, minimal benefit.

Official Stance and Information-Gathering Process

Local officials, including commissioners and the county prosecutor, stated that they are also in the initial fact-finding stages, having learned about the project at the same time as the residents. They made a clear commitment to transparency, assuring the community that they have not and will not sign any non-disclosure agreements (NDAs). Their immediate plan is to conduct an initial, fact-finding virtual meeting with the company's representative, Lee Bratcher. This meeting will include one county commissioner and one township trustee (Trustee Heiss) to ensure all levels of local government are informed. Officials have begun compiling questions from residents to present during this call and affirmed that the company has expressed a willingness to meet openly with the community and their experts in the future. Staff have been instructed to monitor any official land transfer paperwork, though none has been filed to date.

Analysis of Legal and Political Recourse

The discussion identified the county's lack of zoning regulations as the primary obstacle to legally opposing the project, as it provides no tool to control what a private landowner does with their property. Despite this major challenge, several potential avenues for resistance were explored. Officials noted that a case could potentially be built using nuisance laws, arguing the data center is a "non-natural use of the land" that fundamentally changes the character of the agricultural and residential community. The most discussed strategy was for the township trustees to enact a temporary moratorium, or pause, on such development to allow more time for

information gathering and to explore further options, a tactic used by other Ohio townships. Residents were urged to mobilize politically by contacting their state representatives and senators to voice their opposition, and to sign a petition to place the issue on the November ballot. Residents strongly communicated to the officials that their re-election would depend on them standing up for the community and opposing the project.

Corporate Strategy and Regional Context

Attendees analyzed the company's approach as highly strategic and aggressive, noting the simultaneous timing of purchase offers to residents and notifications to officials. This strategy appears designed to advance the project quickly before organized opposition can form. The project draws parallels to a similar data center development in neighboring Washington County (the "Waterford" project), which has been in progress since 2021. Experiences from that situation highlighted the likelihood of the company requesting significant tax abatements, despite current claims to the contrary. The region's appeal is driven by its power generation capacity, water resources, and available land. Officials and residents agreed that Morgan County must adopt a "hardliner" stance, demanding that if the project proceeds, the company must pay fully for its resources, invest in local education for jobs, and be held to strict contractual obligations rather than being offered a "sugar-coated deal."

Steve Redrup, EMA

Submitted EMPG Grant request for FY25 Q6

Met with State EMA about our upcoming LEPC exercise

Updated parts of the EOP

Worked on TIER2 filings

Building Maintenance inside and outside

Vehicle Maintenance

Shannon Wells, Development Office

Shannon Wells met with Michael Day on May 8, 2026, for a jail planning update. He is waiting for office procedures, budget items, and staffing numbers for the new jail with a due date of Friday to move the process forward. He needs to know also about the control room moving locations.

Shannon Wells met with Rick Welch on May 8, 2026, to discuss an easement for drive access for Riverside Landing on Morgan County property.

Shannon Wells will attend the State of Appalachian Region Conference at Ohio University on May 12, 2026.

A signature is requested on Certifications & Assurances for the FY2027 grant for transit.

The ARC pre-application is due to Buckeye Hills on June 12, 2026. Projects must align with ARC goals and strategies to be competitive and have a 30% match. Nonconstruction projects can apply for \$250,000 and construction at \$500,000.

26-234- Motion by Mr. Best and seconded by Mr. Mayle to write a letter of intent to ABM Technical for an audit on our facilities for an energy project for Morgan County, Ohio.

Mr. Mayle yea, Mrs. Maxwell yea, Mr. Best yea Motion Carried

John Isherwood, ABM

Meeting Notes

- Topic Title: Development Fee and Self-Funded Project Structure
 - The goal is a fully self-funded project covering energy and operations.
 - If no viable project or energy savings are found, no development fee is owed.
 - If a viable project is identified and the county does not proceed, a partial cost offset is requested via a development fee.
 - The proposed development fee is 25,000 dollars, documented in the provided agreement.
 - If the county proceeds with a self-funded project, development costs are rolled into the project rather than billed upfront.
 - The fee does not cover all development costs; it helps offset efforts if the project is delivered but not pursued.
 - ABM would only invoice if they can deliver as promised, and the county chooses not to proceed.

☐ Topic Title: Project Timeline and Investment-Grade Audit Scope

- The target is to complete and present the phased plan by August 2026.
- There will be check-ins as teams assess windows, HVAC, roofing, and other assets.
- The process includes an investment-grade audit with detailed asset inventory and useful life ranking.
- Check-ins will align scope with county priorities, e.g., excluding roof work if covered by warranty or insurance.

☐ Topic Title: Next Steps and Approvals

- Commissioner Maxwell is identified as the president who needs to sign the agreement.
- The team will mail the document for signature.

- Commissioners indicated readiness to move ahead to affect change in county infrastructure.

Data Center Zoom Conference

Panel Discussion: Rural Infrastructure, Zoning, and Data Center Governance

Introduction

1. Phillip Jones: Community engagement associate at the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia who opened the Rural Community Action Assembly on Planning for Downtown Development, outlining objectives, recording/logistics, and the rising relevance of data centers for rural economic development.
2. Matt Duthie/Matt Dunn: Moderator from the Center on Rural Innovation, with prior Google experience during early data center deployments. Positioned to guide discussion on rural tech economies, AI-fueled demand, and data center opportunities, requesting video access to commence.
3. Jim Ladlee: Penn State Extension leader for Emerging and Advanced Technology. Provides neutral, fact-based foundations, a taxonomy of data center types, sitting drivers (power, water, grid, land, proximity), job heuristics, and a living guide of common questions to standardize evaluations.
4. Mike Turner: Loudoun County supervisor with non-advocacy best practices drawn from the world's densest data center market. Details zoning evolution, power constraints, noise and setback standards, fiscal impacts, and likely shifts to microgrids and future SMRs.
5. Local participants engage on bridge work and traffic control, utility ownership for lighting, USDA agreement modifications, permitting and floodplain oversight, meeting compliance and minutes, local enforcement, zoning desires, and community education around data centers.

Key points

1. Bridge and traffic management: Two-way traffic will be maintained using flaggers; temporary lights remain until replacements are installed. One-way restriction was rejected.
2. Utilities and ownership: AEP believed to own certain bridge lights even if locality pays; multiple utilities (Spectrum, Bright speed) complicate coordination.
3. Project timelines: Plans approved at a Malta meeting target work by next spring; stakeholders accept the schedule despite concerns.
4. USDA agreements: Transition to a locally led model expected in ~two months, enabling local bidding, construction administration, and audits.
5. Administrative compliance: Township meetings require public notice; two trustee signatures can trigger public meeting requirements; permitting emphasizes floodplain oversight; meeting minutes corrections and pagination clarified.

6. Zoning debate: Small but vocal support for zoning amid broader uncertainty; proposals for “light zoning” with basic land-use categories; concerns about implementation time (≥ 3 years), inspector costs, enforcement roles, and building permit scope.
7. Data centers as opportunity and risk: Assembly frames data centers as catalysts for rural jobs, tax bases, and investment, but resource intensive with siting, power, water, and community impact concerns requiring transparent planning and engagement.
8. AI-driven demand: Data usage growth to well over 100 zettabytes and rising AI workloads accelerate data center needs; 65–80% of AI infrastructure may land in rural areas but fit depends on local priorities and resources.
9. Taxonomy and impacts: Hyperscale vs. cloud, enterprise, micro, and crypto differ in power, land, and water footprints; operational staffing scales sub-linearly with site size (approx. 15–35 FTEs per 100 MW).
10. Attraction factors: Energy availability (e.g., natural gas), existing grid, water resources, land, and proximity to markets (latency) draw projects to regions like Pennsylvania and the Northeast Corridor.
11. Loudoun County lessons: By-right approvals (2000–2025) fueled rapid growth to 253 centers; AI-era racks (~ 100 kW) stress grid capacity; utilities may constrain loads; shift toward on-site baseload via microgrids (near-term natural gas turbines with SCR, longer-term SMRs); renewables insufficient for primary on-site baseload; adopt strict performance standards (noise, setbacks, siting, height/FAR, integrated substations, power/water disclosure).
12. Fiscal impacts: Data centers can generate substantial local revenue (e.g., Loudoun: $\sim \$1.3$ B of $\$2.9$ B projected FY27), with low service costs per tax dollar; tax structure (real vs. personal property) and incentives shape ROI; avoid overdependence on one industry.
13. Geothermal cooling: Highly situational; promising for cooling and smaller-scale deployments, with potential in favorable geologies and future tech; shale-well repurposing under research; limited near-term feasibility at hyperscale.
14. Noise and health: Persistent 24/7 noise (~ 53 – 55 dB) can be debilitating; incorporate low-frequency DBC measurements; maximize distance, orient exhaust, and use hospital-grade mufflers; standards must address baseload noise, not just transient events.
15. Developer credibility and NDAs: NDAs common in early negotiations for billion-dollar projects but erode trust if extended into public decision phases; elected officials should avoid NDAs; vet credibility via tough technical questions, PJM interconnection status, and transparent power/water/cooling plans; speculative developers self-select out under scrutiny.

Insights

1. Phillip Jones: Frames data centers as emerging rural economic opportunity; emphasizes actionable research, structured Q&A, and community-informed planning; presenters’ views not official Fed positions.
2. Matt Dunn: Rural broadband and AI enable smaller, capital-efficient companies; data centers can anchor long-term investment but consume significant resources; communities should avoid overreliance and negotiate from local priorities to capture benefits inside and beyond the fence.

3. Jim Ladlee: Neutral discourse with standardized evaluation guides; clarifies taxonomy and job heuristics; stresses interpreting economic impact studies carefully (FTE vs. peak, direct vs. indirect/induced) and using transparent, comparable questions across proposals; geothermal promising for cooling at smaller scales; advocate zoning away from neighborhoods.
4. Mike Turner: Loudoun's experience underscores neutrality, transparency, and collaboration among governments, utilities, and industry; end by-right approvals, align land-use with zoning, adopt strict performance standards; anticipate microgrids now (natural gas) and future SMRs; warn against elected officials signing NDAs; highlight strong revenues and dependency risks; emphasize DBC noise standards.

Chapter

1. Local infrastructure and compliance
 - Traffic and lighting during bridge work: Flaggers manage two-way traffic; temporary lights remain until replacements; reject one-way restriction.
 - Utility responsibilities: Uncertainty over AEP ownership and contractor activities given multiple utility lines.
 - Project approvals and timelines: Malta meeting approved plans; work likely next spring; stakeholders accept.
 - USDA modifications: ~Two months to switch to locally led agreements for bidding, construction administration, and audits.
 - Enforcement and meetings: Monitoring trouble spots; prosecutor coordination; public notice requirements; minutes of corrections and attachments reprinted as needed.
2. Zoning and permitting
 - Necessity and scope: Mixed support; proposals for light zoning (agricultural/industrial); implementation may take ≥ 3 years; inspector role and funding unclear; county issues building permits with floodplain focus.
3. Community education on data centers
 - Informational sessions explain impacts; consolidate questions via call/email; team attends to respond; morning consensus from a small group leaned toward zoning interest.
4. Assembly framing and moderation
 - Phillip Jones introduces the assembly, format (recording, slides, Q&A, survey), and moderator; notes presenters' views are their own.
 - Matt Dunn requests video access; sets up expert-led session to build common understanding.
5. Foundations: Ubiquity, demand, taxonomy, jobs
 - Data center ubiquity in daily services; data growth from ~1 to well over 100 zettabytes driven by AI workloads.
 - Types and resource profiles: hyperscale, cloud, enterprise, micro, crypto; rules of thumb for size, land, power, water.
 - Jobs: construction peaks ~0.7–2 workers per MW; operations ~15–35 FTEs per 100 MW, with lower ratios at larger scale; local benefit depends on workforce participation.

6. Siting drivers and evaluation guide
 - Attraction factors include gas, grid, water, land, proximity to markets (latency).
 - Common-questions guide: power (demand, sourcing, capacity, reliability, PUE, rates), water, broadband, land use, workforce/jobs, zoning/permits, taxes/incentives, environment/climate, emergency services, community readiness, and interpreting economic impacts.
7. Loudoun County best practices and power paradigm shift
 - By-right approvals catalyzed growth; ended in March 2025 to enable oversight.
 - AI raises power from ~2 GW (2021) to ~5.4 GW (early 2026), possibly 20–30 GW by 2030; Jevons paradox keeps site power high.
 - Grid constraints and proposed lines; centralized paradigms lag; microgrids with natural gas turbines today, SMRs tomorrow; solar/wind insufficient for on-site baseload; long-duration storage preferred; stringent standards on noise (dBA/dBC), setbacks (≥ 500 –1,000 ft), siting, height/FAR, substations, power/water disclosure, emissions (Tier 4 gensets).
8. Geothermal, brownfields, lifecycle, and health
 - Geothermal cooling situational; feasible for smaller scales and favorable geologies; research on shale wells; some centers use cold seawater; require environmental stewardship.
 - Brownfields are viable to convert low-revenue land; avoid tying up all developable land with single customers.
 - Lifecycle: shells 20–30+ years; constant IT refresh cycles; teardown/rebuild requests trigger compliance with updated ordinances and political challenges.
 - Health/noise: continuous 24/7 noise near ordinance caps can be debilitating; incorporate DBC metrics; use mufflers, distance, exhaust management.
9. NDAs, developer vetting, and fiscal context
 - NDAs acceptable early but should not bind elected officials or public decisions; expand transparency at hearing stages.
 - Vet developers via tough technical questions, PJM interconnection status, substations and power/water plans; shell entities common; credible players persist under scrutiny.
 - Fiscal profile: split real vs. personal property taxes; understand state incentives; data centers low cost-to-serve per tax dollar; manage dependency and balance resident impacts.

AI Suggestions

- Convert informal dialogue into precise, directed questions to clarify responsibilities (e.g., contractual ownership and service-level agreements for bridge lighting).
- For zoning, separate principles from the process: define desired outcomes and which light-zoning categories meet within 2–3 years.
- For USDA timelines, ask role-specific, time-bound prompts and contingencies if milestones slip.
- In data center evaluation, request concrete impact numbers (jobs, power/water requirements, tax implications) and written FAQs/flowcharts for permitting.

- Sharpen job discussions with worked examples by phase (e.g., 300 MW campus), role mix, and shift coverage.
- Use decision checklists for sitting thresholds (minimum grid capacity, water constraints triggering a pause) and sample community benefit terms (tax structures, training funds, water reuse).
- Tension-test tradeoffs and mitigations: ratepayer impacts from utility upgrades, governance against hyperscale overconcentration, and early warning indicators to monitor.
- Anchor best-practice claims with ordinance figures (noise limits, setbacks) and grid timelines; probe SMR regulatory pathways and contingencies.
- Frame NDAs as phase-specific transparency commitments (datasets disclosed pre- vs. post-application; triggers for public release of power/water ranges).
- Standardize credibility checks: PJM queue position, committed substation capacity, water sourcing; scenario testing for delays and financing/phasing changes.
- Translate Loudoun's fiscal insights to differing tax regimes with comparative questions to localize ROI expectations.

Jeff Babcock, IT Administrator

New public access PCs were installed in the County Recorder's office. The new PCs were configured to run on a normal Internet/network connection and not through the GovOS domain. Running through the GovOS domain was likely slowing down the older public access computers, sometimes to the point that they were unusable.

Equivant finally completed the JuryTRAC migration at Common Pleas Court. This was a piece that they forgot to include in their Court View upgrade and migration earlier in the year.

Shared drives were added to several computers at the Prosecutor's office in preparation for moving their shared data from the old Samba server to the newer Windows file server. The Prosecutor's office will need to stay out of their shared drive for approximately 24 hours while the data is copied over.

Becky Thompson, Dog Warden

-Submitted report

-Full report can be found online at: https://www.morgancounty-oh.gov/dog_warden_reports.html

Transfers, Then & Now, Supplemental Appropriations & Utility Applications

26-234- Motion by Mr. Best and seconded by Mr. Mayle to approve payment of bills. *See attached*

Mrs. Maxwell yea, Mr. Best yea, Mr. Mayle yea Motion Carried

26-235- Motion by Mr. Best and seconded by Mr. Mayle to approve attachment A.

Mrs. Maxwell yea, Mr. Best yea, Mr. Mayle yea Motion Carried

26-236- Motion by Mr. Mayle and seconded by Mr. Best to transfer \$1,000.00 from 001-0207-5321.00 (other fees) to 001-0207-5304.00 (equipment)

Mrs. Maxwell yea, Mr. Best yea, Mr. Mayle yea Motion Carried

26-237- Motion by Mr. Best and seconded by Mr. Mayle to approve all transfers. See Attachment B

Mr. Mayle yea, Mrs. Maxwell yea, Mr. Best yea Motion Carried

26-238- Motion by Mr. Best and seconded by Mr. Mayle to recess the commissioners at 4:00pm.

Mr. Mayle yea, Mrs. Maxwell yea, Mr. Best yea Motion Carried

26-239- Motion by Mr. Mayle and seconded by Mr. Best to reconvene the commissioners meeting Monday, May 11, 2026, for at CIC meeting.

Mr. Mayle yea, Mrs. Maxwell yea, Mr. Best yea Motion Carried

26-240- Motion by Mr. Best and seconded by Mr. Mayle to recess the commissioners at 5:00pm.

Mr. Mayle yea, Mrs. Maxwell yea, Mr. Best yea Motion Carried

26-241- Motion by Mr. Mayle and seconded by Mr. Best to reconvene the commissioners meeting Wednesday, May 13, 2026, for a Board of Health meeting at 10:00am.

Mr. Mayle yea, Mrs. Maxwell yea, Mr. Best yea Motion Carried

26-242- Motion by Mr. Mayle and seconded by Mr. Best to adjourn the commissioners meeting Wednesday, May 13, 2026, at 11:00am.

Mr. Mayle yea, Mrs. Maxwell yea, Mr. Best yea Motion Carried

Approved by Commissioners on: August 17, 2026

Heidi Maxwell, President

Steve Best, Vice-President

Cecil Mayle, Member

Sheila Welch, Clerk

Attachment A:

 MORGAN COUNTY
VETERANS SERVICE OFFICE
135 South Kennebec Avenue
McConnelsville, Ohio 43756
(740) 962-4181 FAX (740) 962-4361
Director@morganvso.com

04/27/2026

Re: 2027 Budget request and Budget hearing request

Attached is the request for the Morgan County Service Commission's 2027 Budget to the County Commissioners. We understand that his request comes before all or most of the other county agency's budget requests, however to stay within compliance with ORC 5901.11 our budget request for next calendar year must be submitted to the County Commissioners before the last Monday in May. The total budget request is a based off historical yearly increases, but the total request will be adjusted once the full five-tenths mill is calculated and provided to the Service Commission.

The Morgan County Veteran Service Commission requests a budget hearing in accordance with O.R.C. 5901.11, so that we may request the full five-tenths mill for the 2027 budget in accordance with this provision of Title 5901.

Thank you for your consideration and your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,


Adam Triplet
Morgan County
Veterans Service Office

RECEIVED
MAY 11 2026
BY: SW

SOLDIERS RELIEF AND VETERANS SERVICE					
VETERANS SERVICE OFFICE BUDGET REQUEST FOR CY2027					
	CLASSIFICATION	REQUEST FOR 2025	REQUEST FOR CY 2026	APPROPRIATION FOR CY 2026	REQUEST FOR CY 2027
A9C1	SALARY	\$ 140,000.00	\$ 135,000.00	\$ 135,000.00	\$ 135,000.00
A9C3	SUPPLIES	\$ 3,500.00	\$ 654.70	\$ 654.70	\$ 1,000.00
A9C4	EQUIPMENT	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500.00
A9C5	CONTRACT REPAIRS	\$ 38,766.91	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 30,000.00
A9C6	RELIEF ALLOWANCES	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000.00
A9C8	TRAVEL	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 6,000.00
A9C9a	PERS COUNTY PORTION	\$ 19,800.00	\$ 18,900.00	\$ 18,900.00	\$ 18,900.00
A9C9b	WORKERS COMP.	\$ 4,200.00	\$ 4,050.00	\$ -	\$ -
A-9c-8	OUTREACH	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00
5370	EMPLOYEE MEDICAL INSURANCE	\$ 35,000.00	\$ 57,629.80	\$ 57,629.80	\$ 66,000.00
-0903-	MEDICARE COUNTY PORTION	\$ 2,030.00	\$ 1,957.50	\$ 1,957.50	\$ 1,957.50
TOTALS		\$ 323,096.91	\$ 300,692.00	\$ 296,642.00	\$ 310,357.50
BUDGET GRAND TOTALS		\$ 323,096.91	\$ 300,692.00	\$ 296,642.00	\$ 310,357.50
TOTAL ALLOWABLE BY LAW (5/10 mill CY 2027 property tax)					
COUNTY COMMISSION APPROVED EXCESS OR (SHORTFALL)					
Veterans Service Commission					\$310,357.50
Other office expense			\$ -		
TOTAL			\$ -		\$310,357.50
X					
Jeffrey Bragg, President, Morgan County Veterans Service Commission					
28-Apr-26					

Jeffrey A Bragg

RECEIVED
MAY 11 2026
BY: *SW*

Attachment B:

Morgan County Court
Michael D. Lowe, Judge
37 E. Main Street
McConnelsville, OH 43756
Telephone (740) 962-4031
Fax (740) 962-2895

May 6, 2026

Morgan County Commissioners
155 E. Main Street
McConnelsville, OH 43756

Dear Commissioners:

Please transfer the following:

\$1,000.00 from 001-0207-5321.00(other fees) to 001-0207-5304.00(equipment).

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,



Kelly Williams
Clerk

cc: Jessica Junn

HRM 5/11/26
SCB 5/8/26
Cmm 5/8/26

\

