

Darwin McClary

From: matt szadyr <mszadyr@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2026 12:25 PM
To: Darwin McClary; Eric Papacek; Alex Comparoni, Jr.; George Dandalides; Nancy Moshier; Michael Lamb; Stan Ford; Teresa Rutt
Subject: Street Improvement SAD

Dear President Rutt, Members of the Village Council, and Mr. McClary,

I have reviewed the Oct 7, 2026 NFE cost opinion, the Aug 24 Council packet and minutes, the Aug 20 budget amendment, and NFE's December 2025 letters. I am writing because the numbers raise questions that I think many residents will share. I would appreciate written answers before the special assessment roll hearing.

WHAT THE DOCUMENTS SHOW

- Total project cost (NFE, Oct 7): \$909,150
- Less TEDF grant: \$250,000, leaving \$659,150
- Village share (Act 51 funds): \$159,843 (about 24% of the net, or 17.6% of the total)
- Village 25% portion \$ 124,826.060
- Residents' share: \$499,307, spread over 4,889.8 assessable feet = \$102.11 per front foot + plus two other options resulting in a \$76.58 per foot and \$86.87 per foot.

HOW THIS COMPARES TO WHAT WE WERE TOLD EARLIER

- December 2025 (NFE): residents' share was about \$225,425, or \$30–32 per front foot. I know This didn't include the added roads to the project.
- Today: \$499,307, or \$102.11 per front foot. That is more than double the dollars and more than three times the per-foot rate.
- Of that increase, about \$38 per foot comes from higher costs (bid above estimate, a 10% contingency, and about \$82,150 in added engineering and inspection costs). About \$33 per foot comes from reducing assessable footage from 7,228.5 ft to 4,889.8 ft through an undefined "frontage factor."

QUESTIONS I WOULD LIKE ANSWERED

1. The Aug 24 summary lists a \$876,000 project cost. NFE now says \$909,150. Why the \$33,150 difference?
2. The last meeting motion (\$400,000 Major Streets + \$146,000 General Fund + \$250,000 grant) total \$796,000, not \$876,000. What covers the other \$80,000? ((amendment BA-2027-203-01 from the August 24 meeting)
3. The Village has appropriated \$546,000 in cash, yet only \$124,826.06 is treated as the Village's share. Is the \$546,000 a temporary advance to be repaid by assessments, or a permanent Village contribution? If permanent, why are residents being assessed \$499,307 rather than about \$113,150?

4. The budget worksheet expected about \$240,000 in assessment revenue. The roll is now more than double that. When and where was Council told? (amendment BA-2027-203-01 from the August 24 meeting)
5. Village policy (per NFE, Dec 4) is 25% for local streets and 10% for dead ends. Is that percentage meant to apply to the total cost or only to the cost after the grant? Applying it to the total would make the Village's share about \$187,326.65 instead of \$124,826.060
6. Can the Village provide the written policy and the Charter Chapter 12 provisions (including 12.3, excessive assessments) it is relying on?
7. What exactly is the "frontage factor" (the 0.5 and 1.0 values)? Which parcels receive it, why, and who pays for the discount?
8. NFE's December letter said the North Shore drainage work was not included. The bid now includes roughly \$86,000 in drainage items (including \$61,790 of trench drain) and about \$45,000 in structure cover adjustments. Why are storm drainage and utility adjustments, which benefit the public, being assessed to abutting owners?
9. About \$25,700 of ADA ramp, detectable warning and sidewalk items are included. Should these be a Village cost?
10. Residents are being charged a \$75,185 contingency, yet NFE says the need for it is unknown until Flint Street's overlay is removed. Will unused contingency be refunded or credited?
11. The \$6,000 TEDF grant implementation and \$6,000 SAD methodology/resident meeting costs are administrative work for the Village. Why are they assessed to residents?
12. The \$17,408 inspection figure is an hourly estimate using a 2021 rate schedule. Is there a cap, and will residents be assessed actual cost only?
13. Did Council approve the Oct 7 NFE work authorization (about \$23,400 in new fees)?
14. Assessments are scheduled to begin on the July 2027 tax bill and be spread over several years. What interest rate will apply??

OPTIONS THAT STILL FOLLOW VILLAGE POLICY

Based on NFE's own figures, these structures keep the Village at 25% or more and still assess by front foot:

- As proposed: residents pay \$499,307 (\$102.11 per foot)
- 25% of total cost after Local ACT 51, with the full grant credited to residents: \$311,979.96 (\$63.80 per foot)
- Public-benefit items (drainage, utility adjustments, ADA) paid by the Village, then 25% of the rest: about \$407,533.96 (about \$62 per foot)
- Village keeps its \$546,000 appropriation as its share: \$113,150 to the residents (\$23.14 per foot)

MY RECOMMENDATION

Readjust the SAD proposal to the 3 below options:

1.) apply 25% to the total cost before grant funding:

Total cost \$909,150.00

Local act 51: \$159,843.39

Toal Remaining: \$ 749,306.61

25% unit assessment paid by village: \$ 187,326.65

Grand funds: 250,000

Total resident SAD: 311,979.96

Per foot cost: \$63.80

2.) Remove Public Benefit Items from the SAD:

Total cost \$909,150.00

Local act 51: \$159,843.39

Toal Remaining: \$ 749,306.61

25% unit assessment paid by village + Public benefit items: \$ 187,326.65 + 154,446.00 = \$341,772.65

Grand funds: 250,000

Total resident SAD: 407,533.96

Final Per foot cost: \$83.34

3.) Total Project Cost: \$909,150.00

Village Total Appropriation (Major Street + General Fund): \$546,000.00

Total Remaining: \$363,150.00

State TEDF Grant Funds: \$250,000.00

Total Remaining for SAD: \$113,150.00

Final Per-Foot Cost: \$23.14

(AMENDMENT # BA-2027-203-01)

I am relying on the documents published in the Council packets. If I have misread anything, please correct me.

Please also consider this email my written protest and objection to the proposed assessment options, and please enter it into the record for the roll hearing.

Thank you for your time and for the work you are doing on our roads.

Matt Szadyr

7 N North Shore Dr