

The Board of Huron County Commissioners met this date in Regular Session. Roll being called found the following members present: Terry Boose, Harry Brady and Bruce Wilde.

The following were also in attendance: Vickie Ziemba, Administrator/Clerk; Cherise Webb, Clerical Assistant; Valerie Stebel, Administrative Assistant; Randal Strickler, Assistant Prosecutor; Roger Hunker, Lyme Township Trustee/APEX; Patricia Didion, Citizen; Scott Sparks, Airport Authority Board; Shylee Greszler & Jacobi Greszler, Norwalk Ohio News; Brian Gott, Norwalk Reflector.

Pursuant to Ohio Revised Code Section 305.14 the Record of the Proceedings of the March 21, 2023, March 28, 2023, April 4, 2023 and April 6, 2023 meeting(s) were presented to the Board. Bruce Wilde made the motion to waive the reading of the minutes of the March 21, 2023, March 28, 2023, April 4, 2023 and April 6, 2023 meeting(s) and approve as presented. Terry Boose seconded the motion.

***Discussion:** The Commissioners noted the minutes were long and thanked the staff for their good work.

Voting was as follows:

- Aye – Terry Boose
- Aye – Harry Brady
- Aye – Bruce Wilde

At 9:05 a.m. Public comment - none

23-153

IN THE MATTER OF ADOPTING NEW RATES FOR THE TRANSFER AND DISPOSAL OF SOLID WASTE AT THE HURON COUNTY TRANSFER STATION.

Bruce Wilde moved the adoption of the following resolution:

WHEREAS, the Transfer Station has been in operation since 1998, and subsequently, the landfill has been closed for 25 years; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution 19-079 the bid was awarded to Rumpke of Ohio for the transportation and disposal of solid waste from Huron County based upon the lowest and best bid, commencing in April 2018 until its termination date in April 2024; and

WHEREAS, as per Rumpke’s contract for the disposal and transportation of Huron County’s solid waste, the rates for said transportation and disposal will be increased for the duration of the agreement with Rumpke; and

WHEREAS, furthermore, the Transfer Station’s operational costs have dramatically increased due to inflation and will continue to increase during the term of the agreement with Rumpke; and

WHEREAS, the closure maintenance and environmental monitoring costs of the closed landfill have increased due to Ohio EPA regulations; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Ohio Revised Code 343.08(C), the Board of Huron County Commissioners held three (3) hearings on Tuesday, March 28, 2023 at 10:00 a.m.; Tuesday, April 4, 2023 at 10:00 a.m. and Thursday, April 6, 2023 at 10:00 a.m. relative to the proposed rates and/or charges; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to statute, public notice of the hearings was published in a newspaper of general circulation once per week for three consecutive weeks; and

WHEREAS, during the public hearings, the Board heard testimony for and against and has determined an increase is necessary; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that based upon the foregoing, the Board of Huron County Commissioners hereby approves and adopts the following rates and rules effective May 1, 2023 as follows:

ITEM	FEE
MSW, Exempt & Industrial Waste (1)	\$65.00/ton
Minimum Waste Charge (625 lbs. or less)	\$20.00
Garden Tractor, Lawn Mower Tires	\$4.00
Passenger Car Tire (less than 15’’)	\$4.00
Light Truck Tire (16’’) to 20’’)	\$6.00
Semi-Truck Tire	\$15.00
Untarped or Unsecured Load	\$10.00
Compost	\$30.00/ton
Minimum Compost Charge (500 lbs. or less)	\$7.50

Dig Out Charge	\$35.00
Appliance Freon Removal	\$20.00

(1) **Includes all other applicable fees including Host Township Fee, Ohio EPA Fees. Solid Waste Management District/Generation Fee, and all other mandated fees not controlled by the Huron County Board of Commissioners.**

Roadside litter is exempt from disposal fees with the advance approval of the Huron County Solid Waste Mgt. District.

Transfer Station Hours:

- Monday through - Friday 7:00 am to 4:00 pm
- Saturday - 7:00 am to 12:00 pm
- Sunday – Closed

Monthly account customers shall be mailed invoices on or near the 1st day of the month for the immediate previous month’s disposal at the Huron County Transfer Station. Payment is due within 30 days of the invoicing date. Should payment not be received by the due date, a finance charge of 3% will be assessed on all past due amounts. Should payments become more than two months past due, the customer’s account will be placed on a cash basis for the remainder of the year and until all past due amounts are paid in full.

The Transfer Station Superintendent has the right to reject any load entering the facility.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the foregoing resolution was adopted and all actions and deliberations of the Board of Commissioners of the County of Huron, Ohio, relating thereto were conducted in meetings open to the public, in compliance with all applicable legal requirements, including Section 121.22 of the Ohio Revised Code.

Terry Boose seconded the motion.

***Discussion:** Mr. Boose thought there were some things which need to be talked about. Mr. Brady agreed and explained there have been 3 hearings to discuss raising the rates at the Huron County Landfill/Transfer Station. The rates have not been raised significantly for a while and the costs have gone up. There are mechanical issues such as the scale, which needs to be replaced. Part of this was a solution so we could continue to operate as close to break-even as possible. Mr. Brady read the new fees from the resolution.

Mr. Boose asked Mr. Welch about the fee/charge for an untarped load. He thought the next time fees are changed, we may want to think about increasing that fee because it might be cheaper for someone to take an untarped load than it is to go out and buy what is needed to secure/tarp a load. He explained if someone pulls in and are not tarped, they will be charged \$10.00 for not being tarped. If they have to buy a tarp it will cost them more than that. So, it is cheaper for them to pay the fee. Mr. Welch noted that fee has been the same for quite a few years. They explained the fee is there to discourage people from not tarping their load, which can cause accidents if items fly out of their load. They are not trying to make money on this.

Mr. Wilde commented that he and Mr. Welch had reviewed all of this to determine the correct amount to raise the fee in order to cover costs. Mr. Brady noted Ashland scale came up to calibrate the scale.

The roll being called upon its adoption, the vote resulted as follows:

- Aye – Terry Boose
- Aye – Harry Brady
- Aye – Bruce Wilde

23-154

IN THE MATTER OF AUTHORIZING AND LETTING OF BIDS FOR THE HURON COUNTY AIRPORT RUNWAY, TAXIWAY, APRON CRACK SEALING AND PAVEMENT MARKING PROJECT AND APPLYING FOR THE FY2023 FAA GRANT

Bruce Wilde moved to adopt the following resolution:

WHEREAS, it is the recommendation of Richland Engineering that certain work be performed to the runway, taxiway, apron and pavement at the Huron County Airport and there are funds available through the FY2023 FAA grant for this work; and

WHEREAS, the Airport Authority Board has agreed to provide the five percent (5%) local match required for this grant; and

WHEREAS, the grant application must be signed and submitted on May 5, 2023 based on open bids received; and

WHEREAS, the Airport Authority Board, has requested approval for seeking bids for the Runway, Taxiway, Apron Crack Sealing and Pavement Marking Project at the Huron County Airport; and

WHEREAS, notice of this must be placed in a newspaper of general circulation and on the County’s website pursuant to Section 307.87 of the Ohio Revised Code; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Huron County Commissioners does hereby approve of letting bids for the Runway, Taxiway, Apron Crack Sealing and Pavement Marking Project at the Huron County Airport and signing the grant application documents as recommended by Richland Engineering; and further

BE IT RESOLVED, that notice of this will be placed in a newspaper of general circulation and on the County’s website www.hccommissioners.com by clicking on the Legal Notices link until the bid is opened on Thursday, May 4, 2023 at 9:00 a.m.; and further

BE IT RESOLVED, that the foregoing resolution was adopted and all actions and deliberation of the Board of Commissioners of the County of Huron, Ohio relating thereto were conducted in meetings open to the public, in compliance with all applicable legal requirements, including Section 121.22 of the Ohio Revised Code.

Terry Boose seconded the motion.

***Discussion:** Mr. Sparks expressed his appreciation to the Board for expediting this for them. Mr. Brady noted this was last done in approximately 2017 and asphalt has a limited lifespan, so the more you do to extend it, the better off you are. Mr. Brady added the last time they did this, the cracks were so large you could put your foot in them and if you wait too long it will damage the base. Mr. Sparks said they had done a couple of crack sealings in the past couple of years to keep their score up with the state.

Mr. Wilde said he did not know that Richland Engineering did work for airports. Mr. Brady said they are highly thought of by the Michael Baker group.

The roll being called upon its adoption, the vote resulted as follows:

- Aye – Terry Boose
- Aye – Harry Brady
- Aye – Bruce Wilde

ADVERTISEMENT FOR BIDS

Separate sealed bids for the project “Runway, Taxiway, Apron Crack Sealing and Pavement Marking” at the Huron County Airport will be received by the office of the Huron County Commissioners, 180 Milan Avenue, Suite 7, Norwalk, Ohio 44857 until 9:00 a.m. local time, May 4, 2023, and then at said office publicly opened and read aloud.

The Information for Bidders, Form of Bid, Form of Contract, Plans, Specifications, and Forms of Bid Bond, Performance and Payment Bond, and other contract documents may be examined at the following:

1. The office of the Huron County Commissioners, 180 Milan Avenue, Suite 7, Norwalk, Ohio 44857.
2. Richland Engineering Limited, 29 North Park Street, Mansfield, Ohio 44902.

Copies may be obtained at the office of Richland Engineering Limited, 29 North Park Street, Mansfield, Ohio 44902 upon payment of \$10.00 for each set. Checks shall be made payable to Richland Engineering Limited and all documents become the property of the prospective bidder, with no portion of the payment being refunded.

The Huron County Commissioners will not accept and/or consider any bid as an official bid unless said bidder has picked up and paid for a complete bid package from Richland Engineering Limited. In order to bid this project you must be a plan holder of record with Richland Engineering Limited.

Each bidder must deposit with his bid, security in the amount, form and subject to the conditions provided in the Information for Bidders.

Each bidder is required to furnish with its proposal, a Bid Guaranty and Contract Bond in accordance with Section 153.54 of the Ohio Revised Code. Bid security furnished in Bond form, shall be issued by a Surety Company or Corporation licensed in the State of Ohio to provide said Surety.

Each proposal must contain the full name of the party or parties submitting the proposal and all persons interested therein. Each bidder must submit evidence of its experiences on projects of similar size and complexity. The Owner intends and requires that this project be completed within 90 days from the Notice to Proceed.

All contractors and subcontractors involved with the project will, to the extent practicable use Ohio Products, materials, services, and labor in the implementation of their project. Additionally, contractor compliance with the equal employment opportunity requirements of Ohio Administrative Code Chapter 123, the Governor's Executive Order of 1972, and Governor's Executive Order 84-9 shall be required.

Bidders must comply with the prevailing wage rates on Public Improvements within Huron County as determined by the United States Department of Labor in accordance with Federal-Aid requirements.

The Huron County Commissioners reserves the right to reject any and/or all bids, to waive any informalities in any bid, and to determine the lowest and best bidder.

No pre-bid meeting is planned for the project. It is advised that all bidders visit the project site prior to submitting any bid.

Huron County is an equal opportunity community and encourages minority and women-owned businesses to compete for all contracts offered by the Huron County Commissioners.

BY: Huron County Commissioners

Advertise: April 21, 2023
April 27, 2023

23-155

IN THE MATTER OF AUTHORIZING THE ADVERTISEMENT AND LETTING BIDS FOR THE BROADBAND EXPANSION PROJECT

Bruce Wilde moved to adopt the following resolution:

WHEREAS, on March 11, 2021, the President of the United States signed into law the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) to provide continued relief from the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic; and

WHEREAS, the ARPA program appropriates funds to provide support to State, local, Tribal and Territory governments in responding to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic; and

WHEREAS, Huron County has applied for and received ARPA funds from the U.S. Department of Treasury under the under the Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds established by American Rescue Plan Act of 2021; and

WHEREAS, all funds received from the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 shall be expended only to cover costs of the County consistent with the requirements of section 603(c)(1) of ARPA as described in H.R. 1319, and any applicable regulations and guidance only to cover expenses that:

- (1) to respond to the public health emergency with respect to the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) or its negative economic impacts, including assistance to households, small businesses, and nonprofits, or aid to impacted industries such as tourism, travel, and hospitality;
- (2) to respond to workers performing essential work during the COVID-19 public health emergency by providing premium pay to eligible workers of the county that are performing such essential work, or by providing grants to eligible employers that have eligible workers who perform essential work;
- (3) for the provision of government services to the extent of the reduction in revenue of such county due to the COVID-19 public health emergency relative to revenues collected in the most recent full fiscal year of the county prior to the emergency; or
- (4) to make necessary investments in water, sewer, or broadband infrastructure.

WHEREAS, Huron County desires to seek bids for the Broadband Expansion Project. The improvements proposed to be funded with ARPA funds include an expansion of broadband infrastructure to benefit Huron County residents, businesses, community institutions, government, and overall economic development, and to catalyze local innovation; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Huron County Commissioners has engaged McDonald Hopkins LLC for assistance in determining the eligibility of projects for the use of ARPA funding pursuant to the regulations promulgated for ARPA; and

WHEREAS, McDonald Hopkins LLC has reviewed the Broadband Expansion Project request and the relevant ARPA regulations and has determined that the use of ARPA funds received by the County may be used under the Infrastructure Category, a copy of McDonald Hopkins LLC's opinion is attached hereto and expressly incorporated by reference herein; and

WHEREAS, the notice seeking bids for the aforementioned Broadband Expansion Project must be placed in a newspaper of general circulation within Huron County for a minimum of two weeks and on the County's website pursuant to Section 307.87 of the Ohio Revised Code; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Huron County Commissioners does hereby approve of letting bids for the Broadband Expansion Project. The purchase shall be financed with funds received through ARPA; and further

BE IT RESOLVED, that notice of this will be placed in a newspaper of general circulation and posted on the County's website www.hccommissioners.com accessed by clicking on legal notices, until the bid is opened on May 15, 2023, until 10:00 a.m.; and further

BE IT RESOLVED, that the foregoing resolution was adopted and all actions and deliberations of the Board of Commissioners of the County of Huron, Ohio relating thereto were conducted in meetings open to the public, in compliance with all applicable legal requirements, including Section 121.22 of the Ohio Revised Code.

Terry Boose seconded the motion.

***Discussion:** Mr. Wilde showed a map in the bid packet and noted where the points would be located and also gave the date it must start by. He noted we are using ARPA Funds for this project and have included all of the pertinent language. This must be appropriated by 2024 and completed by 2026. This does both of those things by year in case something happens to go wrong. Mr. Riedy stated they have an estimated cost of approximately \$900,000.00

Mr. Boose asked if there were any administrative fees which could be covered in the payment of this. Ms. Ziembra was unsure what he meant. Mr. Boose thought with ARPA projects there was a lot of paperwork and he wanted to know if we could use ARPA Funds to pay for some of that. Ms. Ziembra did not think we could use it to pay for our employees' portion. Mr. Boose asked if we had an architect or engineer for this. Ms. Ziembra told him we have Mr. Riedy. Mr. Wilde asked if the items which McDonald Hopkins has worked on could be paid for with ARPA money. Ms. Ziembra told him yes.

Mr. Boose asked if we needed technical help in the future which Mr. Riedy could not provide, can we use ARPA funds to pay. Ms. Ziembra was not sure. Mr. Boose noted this is internet infrastructure and could become more complicated than we think. Mr. Wilde asked Mr. Riedy if he felt comfortable. Mr. Riedy stated he feels comfortable based on the data that FCC and Ohio Broadband have given us. It was noted they brought Ohio Broadband in on this re-bid. Mr. Boose asked if we were comfortable with the \$900,000; so we don't get bids in for \$1.3M and have to re-bid again. Ms. Ziembra stated there is cushion for that situation. We budgeted \$1M for this project and in order to allow for the 10% overages we had to put the estimate at \$900,000.

Mr. Boose stated we have \$1.3M in the bucket which is over the \$10M. Mr. Boose was wondering if we could change our document/report to use the entire \$1.3M for this project. Ms. Ziembra stated they had budgeted \$1M for the project and that would allow for change orders. Mr. Boose asked what the \$.3M was budgeted for. Ms. Ziembra told him it was budgeted for any type of change orders that may be needed for this project and the consultant fee for all the projects. Mr. Boose noted he now felt a little more comfortable and said we are getting closer to the December 2024 date when all of our monies have to be lined up. Ms. Ziembra reminded him that we have overbudgeted. Mr. Boose noted the majority of the items for which they overbudgeted were not in the \$1.3M bucket.

Mr. Boose asked Mr. Strickler if he had received an e-mail from CCAO regarding what the federal government is trying to do with ARPA money which is not appropriated. Mr. Strickler had not. Mr. Boose said one of the commissioners will need to forward the e-mail to Mr. Strickler, then said soon, the federal government wants to add an amendment to a bill which says they want to look at what has not been appropriated and re-use that money for other things. Mr. Strickler thought you had until the end of 2024 to appropriate the ARPA Funds. Mr. Brady and Mr. Boose said they do, then Mr. Boose said they are trying to change that and is why he wanted to make sure our money is appropriated. Mr. Brady noted he had discussed this with Ms. Ziembra and since the \$10M has already had a resolution appropriating it for lost revenue, that may be enough to shield it. Mr. Boose just wanted to make sure the \$1.3M is committed.

Mr. Wilde thought the county would have 95% coverage after Spectrum, North Coast Wireless and Huron County complete their projects. Ms. Ziembra noted this bid allows for both wireless or fiber and leaves it up to the bidder to look at the project and ask the questions during the pre-bid meeting to find out how they need to put together their bid packet to meet the requirements. Mr. Wilde said they are having a pre-bid meeting on May 03, 2023 and it will be available via zoom or you can attend in person.

The roll being called upon its adoption, the vote resulted as follows:

Aye – Terry Boose
Aye – Harry Brady
Aye – Bruce Wilde

Huron County Commissioners
Broadband Expansion
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

ADVERTISEMENT
NOTICE TO RESPONDENTS

Huron County Commissioners advertise that they have issued a request for proposals for the following project: Broadband Expansion. Sealed proposals may be submitted on or before May 15, 2023, until 10:00 a.m. local time, at the Huron County Commissioners, Attn.: Broadband Expansion Project, 180 Milan Avenue, Suite 7, Norwalk, Ohio 44857.

Proposal documents must be obtained from the Huron County Board of Commissioner's Office, 180 Milan Avenue, Suite 7, Norwalk, Ohio 44857, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday (holidays excluded).

Huron County will provide a 2-hour session for all potential bidders to ask questions. This date will be May 3rd at 2:30pm at 180 Milan Ave, Norwalk OH 44857. A Zoom link will also be provided to anyone that receives a bid packet.

Each proposal must contain the full name of the party or parties submitting the proposal and all persons interested therein. Each Respondent must submit evidence of its experiences on projects of similar size and complexity. Huron County intends and requires that this project be completed no later than September 2nd 2025

Respondents must comply with the prevailing wage rates on Public Improvements in Huron County, Ohio as determined by the Ohio Department of Commerce, Bureau of Wage and Hour Administration, 614.644.2239.

The Board of County Commissioners of Huron County reserves the right to waive any and all irregularities in the proposals or process and may reject any and all proposals but is not obligated to do so.

This advertisement may also be found on the Huron County Commissioners website at <http://www.hccommissioners.com> and can be accessed by clicking on Legal Notices.

Advertise: April 24, 2023 and May 1, 2023 in the Norwalk Reflector and posted on the County Website.

At 9:30 a.m. County Project Updates - Joel Riedy, Network Administrator:

- Mr. Boose asked what a PDU is. Mr. Riedy told him it is a power distribution unit and it allows them to see what each device is consuming and if we are running on battery backup power, we can configure the order in which devices shut down to keep the critical ones running.
- Clerk of Courts is on county email system. All of their e-mails have been migrated over.
- Mr. Boose stated an issue came up last week which concerned him. HCDC called a meeting and sent out e-mails. Some of the people who have our new e-mail suffix did not get the e-mail. Mr. Boose said he can forward the discussion between Ms. Minor and Mr. McCoy about this. Mr. Riedy said he can look through the logs to trace anything we know was missed and said the new filters adapt and sometimes we have to train them a little, but they learn. Discussed e-mails sent to the old address should come through as long as the content does not get flagged and the new system has tighter filters.
- Mr. Boose said CORSA gave an update about people scamming money out of other counties by changing accounts and another item noted was to keep on top of your cyber security. Mr. Boose asked if CORSA sent them information about items to look out for. Mr. Riedy said he doesn't get anything from CORSA, but EMA sends him that type of stuff. Mr. Boose told Mr. Riedy to remind Ms. Hozalski if any of this type of information is sent to her, that she forward it to you. Mr. Riedy said that less than 20% of what we receive is legitimate. Mr. Riedy said they may still have to keep tuning the filters and may have to whitelist certain individuals because the content they send may trigger the filters.
- Title Office is about ready to go on the new e-mail system, they just have to train them on how to use the level again.
- Juvenile Court requested to be put on the new e-mail system as well. IT is working on the set up for them.
- Recorder's office software has been moved to the data center. All of their data is coming from this building now. They have gotten a major increase in performance by doing this. They started this on a Friday evening and finished at about 1:00 p.m. on Saturday. Mr. Wilde noted the recorders office used to talk about people coming into work early so they could get on the server to do their work.
- Mr. Riedy said he is starting to look at Remote Management software for all of the offices because there are only 2 people in the IT department and sometimes there is no one in the office. Mr. Riedy noted it would be a lot easier for them if they had remote management agents in place which would allow them to remote in from wherever they are located. He is hoping to have some quotes put together

for that soon.

- Engineer's office has switched over to the County's antivirus software and we were able to save them a significant amount of money over what they were paying.
- Common Pleas Court asked Mr. Riedy to do some updates to the JAVS recording system. It will probably take them about a month to complete.
- Mr. Boose asked Mr. Riedy and Mr. Minor to participate in future meetings regarding the Senior Center. Mr. Boose said the Senior Enrichment IT is regional and we want to make sure everyone is on board.

Department	Project	Status	4/18/2023
IT	Electronic Information Storage center	PDU on back order until april	
	Working on room prep	Complete	
	Connecting all sites.	in progress	
	Electrical	Complete	
	Department migration	in progress	
veterans office	Router/firewall upgrade	on order	
Phone system upgrades		Complete	
Email system		Complete	
EMA	UPS replacement	complete	
JFS	Network Rack Relocation	Complete	
Prosecutor's Office	Network Migration	in progress	
IT	Backups	Complete	
Board of Elections	Printer Maintenance	Complete	
IT	Phone auto attendant	Complete	
Building department	Web page	Complete	
Sheriff	Gis Update	Complete	
Titles	UPS replacement	Complete	
JFS	children services wiring	Complete	
Board of Elections	camera live stream	Complete	
Courts	Technology Grant	Completed should know in may.	
JFS	phone relocation	waiting on quotes for wiring	
IT	EMA training	ongoing	
Clerk of courts	email migration	complete	
Clerk of courts	data center migration	currently planning tbd	
recorder	finalize data center migration	90% complete	
EMA	Dispatch Monitors	on order	
EMA	network changes	in progress	
Juvenile Court	email migration	planning phase	
Engineer	Anti-virus migrartion	Complete	
Common Pleas	Javs Updates	Needs to be scheduled	

County Project Updates – Pete Welch, Director of Operations & Steve Minor, Buildings & Grounds Supervisor. Mr. Welch handed out a spreadsheet with his updates. He explained he had divided up the projects last week and gave Mr. Minor a lot of the smaller ones. Mr. Welch noted he has been busy with the landfill because he is trying to get the plan pushed through. Mr. Welch noted the SWMD Policy Committee will need to meet by the middle of May to ratify the plan out of the committee. Also, the projects at the landfill are starting to pick-up, so he is spending a lot of time with them.

- Mr. Welch said he is continuing the process for the Administration Building roof, even though it is not in the budget. Mr. Boose noted they do have money which has not been appropriated yet and could potentially be used for that project. Mr. Welch received an engagement letter with Garmann Miller to do the design/bid process and oversee of the roof installation. They came in at 4.5%. Mr. Welch also engaged with Roof Connect and they are scheduling a service tech to come out within the next 2 weeks to do an estimate. We will then get an estimate to do the roof which includes the Roof Connect fees. Mr. Boose confirmed if we go with Roof Connect, we do not need to go through an architect. Mr. Welch said yes, but does not know if it is a better deal unless you go out to bid with the architect. Mr. Welch though there were pros and cons to each side. Garmann Miller has been good with the roofing projects, but with Roof Connect you can avoid the bidding process, which can hurt you or help you. Mr. Welch said it was definitely easier for him if we go with Roof Connect. He just has to call them and give the dimensions and ask for a cost; they will ask him what kind of material he wants. We don't care about that, we care about the warranty. He noted they warranty would drive the material we want to use.
- Mr. Wilde asked if Roof Connect actually puts the roof on. Mr. Welch said no, they have contractors who have qualified under something with the State of Ohio. Mr. Strickler and Mr. Welch thought the materials and labor have been pre-bid though the State of Ohio. Mr. Strickler commented this was similar to the Ohio Cooperative purchasing agreement, which is how we purchase our Sheriff's vehicles.
- HVAC for units 1 and 2 – Mr. Welch has the bids and would like to give them to the commissioners so the bids can be awarded. He noted this is in the budget.
- Mr. Boose asked about the Administration building elevator. Mr. Welch said Ms. Ziemba is the lead on this project. Ms. Ziemba noted this was on the agenda for Tuesday. Will go out for bid on Wednesday, April 26, 2023. It will be advertised April 26 and May 03, 2023. Prebid meeting is May

- 04 and bid opening May 12, 2023.
- Mr. Minor has started moving on the Recorder’s ceiling. He said the contractor he met with will only do the ceiling, no electric or HVAC. Mr. Minor has talked with several contractors. One of them had concerns and said that they come out to the projects and are used for soft pricing, but then are not contacted for the bid process. This has soured their willingness to come back out to give pricing. Mr. Boose asked if Mr. Minor told them we are truly looking for someone to do this. Mr. Minor said the person was going to talk to management and get back to him. Mr. Minor said he has appointments with other local contractors.
- Auditor’s carpet and paint – Mr. Minor has several appointments scheduled for carpet contractors next week and has called several painters, but has not received a return call. Mr. Boose asked if there has been a discussion with the Auditor’s office as to what they expect to get done and what hours the contractors will be allowed to work. Mr. Minor told him no. Mr. Boose felt that conversation should happen before he talks with the contractors. He noted they may only want the work to be done on weekends. Mr. Minor told him the contractor he had just discussed for the recorder’s office said they would not do work after hours or on the weekend.
- Mr. Wilde gave the name of a painter to Mr. Minor and said they were doing work for DD. He also added they worked there on weekends. The commissioners felt Mr. Minor should discuss these items with the auditor before he proceeds.
- Masonry work for buildings downtown. There is one bid. Mr. Minor is also going to have Mr. Rospert give a bid on it. Mr. Rospert is doing the work at 22 E. Main, Linwood side and will begin the 22 E Main St/Linwood Ave project on May 15.
- Public Defender door was completed yesterday.
- Mr. Minor has started calls regarding the rear steps of the Courthouse as well as the steps letting out to Benedict Ave. He will have people meet him onsite for that. Mr. Brady asked about the catwalk. Mr. Minor said nothing has been done with that. The cost to do that was brought up. Mr. Brady was concerned if we want to encourage the use of the walkway and did not want anything falling on people. Mr. Welch did not think anything has ever fallen from it and if they wanted to take the catwalk down it would add \$20,000 to \$30,000 to the cost of the project. Mr. Boose thought the catwalk should be low on the priority list. Mr. Brady said he just wanted to make sure it was structurally sound.
- Shady Lane main barn needs the roof repaired. This needs to be kept at the fore front, but will not be able to discuss it today.

PROJECTS April 20, 2023

PROJECT	Architect/Eng.	Contractor	Est. Cost	Award/ Start Date	Completion Date	Comments
Ad Building Roof	Garmin Miller					Garmin Miller submitted proposal. Waiting for RoofConnect to send estimator.
Downtown Office Complex Roof	Garmin Miller					
Ad BLDG HVAC (#1)						AF1 submitted quote for \$49,897. No second quote.
Administration Elevator	Garmin Miller		\$490,764			Vickie
UST Shady Lane	BJAAM		\$33,980	5/20/2021		No update
Shady Lane Demo						GM completed estimate (\$944,000 to 1.2 mil) on 6/30/22.
Courthouse Floor		Midstate				
Recorder’s Ceiling						Received 1 quote
Auditor’s Carpet/Paint			\$100K			Waiting to hear back from Painters and carpet installer.
Ad Bldg HVAC (#7)	In House	AF1	\$49,998	11/2/2022		Project Awarded for \$49,999
JFS Bathroom Repair						
Adult Probate HVAC			\$10,339			Completed
Office BLDG Masonary			\$50K			Tuck Point America provided cost of \$49,618. Waiting for second quote (Rospert or Ge. Restoration)
EMA Roof						
22 East Main						Hired Rospert for \$3,000 to repair. Start Date 5/15
Public Defender Door		Beck	\$8,775			Completed
Courthouse Rear Steps						Called RMH for quote
Shady Lane Main. Barn						Roof needs replaced

At 10:00 a.m. 1st Public Hearing for the Community Development Block Grant funds that the County plans to apply for.

Mr. Brady opened the public hearing.

Tiffany Shaver, Great Lakes Community Action Partnership, provided information on the CDBG grant. Ms. Shaver said the purpose of the meeting is to meet the requirements of the Community Development Block Grant. This year Huron County will be applying for the CHIP Grant. They are in the Community Housing Impact Program and it is required that 2 public hearings are held and this is the first of the 2 public hearings.

Ms. Shaver said she would review everything Huron County could potentially apply for under the CDBG Program this year. Ms. Shaver stated she would review the general information today and the CHIP specific information at the 2nd hearing.

Mr. Wilde was at a meeting with Ms. Shaver and she stated they had gone over the planning process to determine the housing needs for the county and from that they determine the activities which will be put into the CHIP application. Mr. Boose commented Firelands Forward had just paid to have a housing study completed. Mr. Wilde said he had asked them to get that study to Ms. Shaver.

Ms. Shaver said that is just one of the pieces she will be review during this process. As part of the CHIP grant the state requires they convene a housing advisory committee meeting which brings together all of the stakeholders within the community. Mr. Boose noted the only reason he mentioned this was that Firelands Forward spent a lot of money to have a professional housing study done. Mr. Shaver said she looks at that, but also other gaps beyond housing. For example, the Department of Developmental Needs are having problems with getting in home care for their clients. The state wants to know the gaps they are finding related to clients which the CHIP Program clientele may have, as well as housing needs. So, it is not just housing related. The housing study will be a very valuable resource, but there are other resources which they will evaluate during this process. Mr. Wilde noted all of the people at the meeting. Ms. Shaver said there were questionnaires which she will get back from other agencies as well. She added that was just one of the funding sources she will talk about today. She will talk about all of the funding sources which are funded by CDBG which Huron County is eligible to receive. She will give a broad overview of all the funding sources available and CHIP is one of them.

Huron County PY2023 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program

AGENDA AND MINUTES

1st Public Hearing

Hearing Date: April 20, 2023
 Hearing Time: 10:00 a.m.
 Hearing Location: Huron County Commissioners
 180 Milan Ave, Norwalk, OH
 Conducted by: Tiffaney Shaver, Great Lakes Community Action Partnership

The estimated federal resources allocated to the state from HUD are listed below. The Office of Community Development (OCD) and Ohio Housing Finance Agency (OHFA) have established a variety of programs through which these funds will be distributed.

Based on the **PY2023 Draft Ohio Consolidated Plan** for OCD Administered Programs, OCD will receive approximately \$80 million in federal funds and an amount to be determined in state funds to administer its programs. The federal funding allocations to the state are:

\$45,296,896 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program
 \$26,843,916 HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) Program
 \$6,182,721 Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Program
 \$2,649,600 Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) Program
To be determined Ohio Housing Trust Fund (OHTF)
To be determined National Housing Trust Fund (NHTF)

\$80,320,016 Total Estimated Federal PY2023 Funds

Mr. Boose thought this was not all for Huron County. Ms. Shaver said that is correct, this is the state share.

The OCD and OHFA have established several policies on how these funds can be used.

1. Huron County is eligible for the following Program Year 2023 Community Development programs administered by the State of Ohio, Development Services Agency, providing the County meets the applicable requirements:

A. Community Housing Impact & Preservation (CHIP) Program: - P. 8

Goal: Through an efficient and impactful approach, the Community Housing Impact and Preservation (CHIP) Program will partner with Ohio communities to preserve and improve the affordable housing stock for low- and moderate-income Ohioans and strengthen neighborhoods through community collaboration.

Total Funds: \$9.5 million in CDBG funds will be combined with \$14,880,000 million of HOME Investment Partnerships Program funds and SFY 2023 Ohio Housing Trust Funds (to be determined). CHIP Program funds will be distributed in one competitive funding round.

Grant Ceiling: Through a competitive application process, jurisdictions may apply for a maximum award as follows:

Maximum Award		
	Option 1	Option 2
County	\$300,000	\$400,000
City w/ a population of at least 15,000	\$250,000	\$350,000
City w/ a population between 5,000 and 14,999	\$200,000	\$300,000

Partnership Agreement: CHIP Program-eligible jurisdictions are incentivized to collaborate to form a partnership. Partnership applicant jurisdictions may apply for maximum award as detailed in Option 2. Additionally, points associated with partnership development will be awarded when scored for funding. The maximum award for each partnership cannot exceed the aggregate maximum total amount of each CHIP Program-eligible jurisdiction in the partnership as detailed in Option 2 above. Regardless of the number of communities in the partnership, the maximum grant request cannot exceed \$1.6 million.

Jurisdictions who choose to apply as a single-jurisdiction applicant, must refer to Option 1 for maximum grant award. Points associated with partnership development will not be awarded when scored for funding.

Huron County intends to partner with the Cities of Norwalk and Willard in PY23 to apply for CHIP funds. Together, the three jurisdictions are eligible for up to \$1,100,000.

Eligible Project Categories with Respective Activities: All housing activities completed with CHIP Program grant funds must be single-family homes, as defined by HUD as one to four units. Grantees will follow the OCD’s maximum per-unit limit of assistance for PY2023 and will not institute local limits of assistance. CHIP eligible activities include financing residential rehabilitation or repairs for low- and moderate-income homeowners, rehabilitation and repair loans for rental properties where tenants are low and moderated income, and tenant based rental assistance.

A second public hearing will be held to cover the details of the CHIP application. Specific activities and funding requests will be based on recommendations from the results of the Housing Needs Assessment that is in the process of gathering information from local stakeholders.

Application Timing: Submission: June 21, 2023 - Grant Award: December 1, 2023 - estimated

B. Community Development Allocation Funding Program – HURON COUNTY IS NOT ELIGIBLE FOR PY23 FUNDING

C. Neighborhood Revitalization Program – HURON COUNTY IS NOT ELIGIBLE FOR PY23 FUNDING

D. Critical Infrastructure – P. 52

The County is eligible to apply for up to \$500,000

Eligible Applicants: PY 2023 and PY 2024 Allocation Program counties and direct cities. Counties may apply on behalf of non-direct cities, villages, and unincorporated areas.

Critical Infrastructure Program Principles: The Critical Infrastructure Program was created to assist communities with funding for high priority, single-purpose, projects, such as roads, flood and drainage and other public facilities projects with high community-wide impact and that benefit primarily residential areas. Projects may include multiple activities that together contribute to a failed or failing condition.

Eligible Activities: Eligible activities include constructing, reconstructing or rehabilitating infrastructure components. Eligible infrastructure components include streets and bridges;

sidewalks; flood and drainage; water and sanitary sewer and fire protection or community facilities.

Mr. Boose asked if the Village of Greenwich wanted to apply for this, what do they need to do and how would they find out about this.

Ms. Shaver noted the County would need to make them aware these funds are available and would apply on their behalf. Mr. Boose verified this was for the whole county and if someone came to the commissioners to ask about a project. Ms. Shaver said he was correct and said the majority of these were that way and the county would need to apply on behalf of the unincorporated cities and villages. They discussed that Norwalk gets their own allocation Funding and are on the opposite year as the county.

Application Timing: Pre- Application – Round 1 Application training on April 19, 2023. Applications Due on June 14, 2023; Grant Award September 1, 2023. Rounds 2&3 To Be Determined.

Eligible Applicants: PY 2023 Community Development Program Counties and Direct Cities. **Counties may apply on behalf of non-direct cities, villages, and unincorporated areas.**

E. Economic Development Loan and Public Infrastructure Grant Program P.57

Total Funds: Approximately \$2 million in federal CDBG funds.

Program Categories: Eligible applicants may submit applications for one or more of the following categories of funding: Economic Development Public Infrastructure Program, Economic Development Loan Program and/or Residential Public Infrastructure Program.

Local Program Benefit/National Objective: Communities must qualify activities under the HUD CDBG program national objective of low- and moderate-income job creation.

Application Submission: Applicants are required to submit a pre-application to the OCD for review to apply for funds. The OCD will evaluate the proposed project's pre-application on consistency with programmatic thresholds and public benefit before determining whether to invite applicants to submit a full application.

Pre-application instructions will be available on the OCD's technical assistance website. Applications will be accepted on an open-cycle basis starting July 1, 2023, until all PY 2023 funds are awarded.

Applicants **must select either** the Economic Development Loan Program or the Economic Development Public Infrastructure Grant Program. Applications **may not** request program funds for both activities.

a. Economic Development Loan Program Pg. 57

Goal: To create and retain permanent, private-sector job opportunities, principally for low- and moderate-income persons, through expanding and retaining business and industry in Ohio communities.

Grant Ceiling: Maximum of \$500,000 for direct loans; maximum grant ceiling includes project and program administration costs. The OCD will evaluate the community's request during application review and reserves the right to reduce the award.

Eligible Jurisdictions: Non-entitlement cities and counties. Counties must apply on behalf of villages and townships; counties may also apply on behalf of cities within their jurisdiction. To limit creating new Revolving Loan Funds or in considering an applicant's administrative capacity, the OCD maintains the right to require counties to apply on behalf of cities when appropriate

Eligible Activities: Eligible activities include providing financial assistance to private for-profit entities (through eligible units of general local government) to carry out economic development projects directly and primarily related to creating, expanding or retaining a business. Financing under the state CDBG Economic Development Program may cover fixed

assets, including land, building, machinery and equipment and site preparation directly related to business or industrial development. The amount and type of financial assistance provided to a project must be deemed appropriate with respect to the financial gap and the public benefit to be derived. Financing for fixed assets must be provided in the form of a non-forgivable loan.

Application Timing: Project applications will be accepted on a continuous basis, beginning July 1, 2023.

b. Economic Development Public Infrastructure Grant Program Pg. 62

Goal: To create and retain permanent, private-sector job opportunities, principally for low- and moderate-income persons, through expanding and retaining business and industry in Ohio communities.

Grant Ceiling: Maximum of \$500,000 for off-site infrastructure projects; maximum grant ceiling includes project and program administration costs. The OCD will evaluate the community's request during application review and reserves the right to reduce the award.

Eligible Jurisdictions: Non-entitlement cities and counties. Counties must apply on behalf of villages and townships; counties may also apply on behalf of cities within their jurisdiction. In considering an applicant's administrative capacity, the OCD maintains the right to require counties to apply on behalf of cities when appropriate.

Eligible Activities: Eligible activities include providing financial assistance, through eligible units of general local government, for public improvements directly and primarily related to creating, expanding or retaining a particular business. Financing under the State CDBG Economic Development Public Infrastructure Program is designed to cover public infrastructure investment directly related to business or industrial development. The amount and type of financial assistance provided to a project must be deemed appropriate with respect to financial gap and public benefit.

In addition, job training is an eligible CDBG Economic Development Program activity. The state may provide applicants up to an additional \$50,000 in Economic Development Program funds to provide training for low- and moderate-income individuals whose positions were created or retained by the recipient business.

Application Timing: Project applications will be accepted on a continuous basis, beginning on July 1, 2023.

Mr. Boose asked how HCDC, NEDC and Huron County Chamber would become aware of these opportunities. Ms. Shaver told him we would need to make them aware of it and that is why we have the public hearings. Ms. Shaver noted that most of the time the Economic Development Departments are aware of these Funding Sources; they have been around for years. Mr. Boose said our Economic Development Director is fairly new and came from another state. Mr. Boose thought he may not be as aware and did not know how we would make him aware. The commissioners thought they could invite the HCDC Director to the next hearing. Ms. Shaver stated she would not be reviewing this at the next hearing and suggested she send Ms. Ziemba the consolidated plan and she could forward it to our director. Ms. Shaver noted the plan has all of the nuts and bolts.

c. Residential Public Infrastructure Grant Program – Pg. 66

Goal: To create a safe and sanitary living environment for Ohio citizens, by providing safe and reliable drinking water and proper sanitary waste disposal.

Grant Ceiling: Maximum of \$750,000; maximum grant ceiling includes a public water or sanitary sewer project, on-site improvements and program administration costs. On-site improvements are capped at \$200,000. Grantees will be allowed one amendment to move funds between public construction and on-site improvements as needed. The amendment will alter the pro-rata calculation for percent of CDBG participation in the construction project. A waiver is required from OCD to exceed the \$200,000 on-site cap. OCD will evaluate the community's entire request during application review and reserves the right to reduce the award.

Grant floor: Minimum of \$100,000; minimum total project cost of \$200,000. OCD will

consider waivers to the grant floor on a case-by-case basis. Projects with a grant request of less than \$500,000 and a total project cost of less than \$600,000 may also be submitted under the Community Development Critical Infrastructure Program of on-site improvements are not required. Applicants must contact OCD for guidance on program selection prior to submitting a letter of interest for water or sanitary sewer projects with a total project cost of greater than \$600,000.

Eligible Jurisdictions: Non-entitlement cities and counties. Counties must apply on behalf of villages and townships; counties may also apply on behalf of cities within their jurisdiction. In considering an applicant's administrative capacity, the OCD maintains the right to require counties to apply on behalf of cities when appropriate.

Eligible Activities: The Residential Public Infrastructure Grant Program will only fund projects that provide water and/or sanitary sewer service to primarily residential users (minimum 60% of total users). Eligible on-site improvements include services laterals, septic tanks and well abandonment and CDBG-eligible related fees. A set-aside of total Residential Public Infrastructure funds will be utilized for projects where onsite improvements are the only activity. Applicants for these projects will be considered until the set-aside is depleted. Any funds remaining after March 1, 2023 will be utilized for standard Residential Public Infrastructure projects. Funding for water and/or sanitary sewer projects that benefit primary commercial or industrial users are more appropriate for the Economic Development Program.

Ms. Shaver stated this program has become more popular since the EPA has begun cracking down on the lead service lines.

F. Flexible Grant Programs – Previously known as Target of Opportunity Grant Programs – Pg. 74

Goal: To provide a means to fund worthwhile "Flexible Grant Program" projects and activities that do not fit within existing program structures, and to provide supplemental resources to resolve immediate and unforeseen needs.

Total Funds: Approximately \$2 million in PY 2023 CDBG funds, And an amount TBD in the SFY 2024 Ohio Housing Trust Funds

CDBG Flexible Grant Program: The CDBG Flexible Grant Program provides funding for "opportunity" projects. The CDBG Flexible Grant Program includes the Economic and Community Development Program, Downtown Revitalization Program and a set-aside for the New Horizons Fair Housing Program. Program requirements are outlined below.

Economic and Community Development Flexible Grant Program – Pg. 75

This program will provide funds for "Flexible Grant Program" investments in:

- Economic development projects that create and/or retain permanent job opportunities and are not eligible for Economic Development Program funding or feasible within the Economic Development Program guidelines
- Community Development projects that are not feasible in other funding categories or eligible for Community Development Program competitive set-aside or open-cycle Critical Infrastructure funds
- Housing projects benefitting severely disabled adults. Benefitting populations must meet both CDBG Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 and Section 504 of Rehabilitation Act of 1973 eligibility requirements
- Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program projects
- Imminent threat grants covered by the federal CDBG Regulation
- Initiatives of the Director of the Ohio Development Services Agency that include CDBG eligible activities.
- Planning including feasibility studies for property redevelopment, asset management, and resilience /mitigation.
- Public services – See bottom of page 75

Grant Ceiling: \$250,000

Eligible Jurisdictions: Cities, counties or villages. All applicants must be able to demonstrate

the ability to administer a Flexible Grant Program. The OCD may require a county to apply for grant funds on the behalf of a city or village within its jurisdiction if administrative capacity cannot be demonstrated by the city or village.

Eligible Activities: Any CDBG-eligible activity.

Downtown Buildings Flexible Grant Program -P.76

Total Funds: Total funds not to exceed 50% of the PY2023 CDBG Flexible Grant Program's funding

Mr. Boose asked if we could use that money to tear down a catwalk from one building to another building in downtown Norwalk. Ms. Shaver said she would need to check on that and would refer to their community development department to have them get us an answer. The commissioners said this was between the courthouse and the old jail, which is no longer in use. Ms. Shaver noted the residents in the downtown area must contain 51% LMI. Ms. Ziembra noted that a lot of the county owned buildings are not eligible for these programs. It has to be ADA. She noted we were not eligible for the elevator with the Critical Infrastructure grant. Ms. Shaver thought we could still at least look at it.

Mr. Boose suggested asking any questions now or get a contact. We cannot answer questions and will refer to Ms. Shaver.

Eligible Applicants: PY 2023 and PY 2024 Allocation Program counties and direct cities

Eligible Activities: Private rehabilitation activities only, including structural rehabilitation, façade improvements; interior and exterior building code violation corrections; historic preservation.

New Horizons Fair Housing Assistance Program – Set Aside - P.78

Goal: To provide funds to units of local government to further fair housing and eliminate impediments to fair housing. Activities funded with Hew Horizons grants must be in addition to grantee's Standard Fair Housing program which is required as part of the Allocation and CHIP program.

2. Comments/Questions:

Mr. Wilde moved to adjourn the public hearing. Mr. Boose seconded the motion.

At 10:31 a.m. the public hearing was adjourned.

At 10:33 a.m. the board recessed.

At 10:45 a.m. the board resumed regular session

OLD BUSINESS / NEW BUSINESS

Commissioner Brady updates:

- Mr. Brady attended the legislative reception in Columbus last night. Mr. Brady asked both of our Senators if they were considering the allocation of funds for the eclipse next year. Both of the Senators said they would be working on that and Senator Gavarone already has a meeting set up with the Huron County Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Boose was concerned because when he talked to Senator Manning about this and he did not know that Huron County was on the center line of the eclipse. Mr. Boose thought our EMA had been in contact with him. Mr. Wilde said he knew that Senator Manning had been invited.

Commissioner Boose updates:

- Substitute Budget bill came out this week.
 - Mr. Boose noted someone at a CCAO meeting said the Substitute Budget bill was a gut punch to county and local governments. There have been a lot of discussions with state representatives and CCAO in the past month. Based on those conversations; when the substitute bill came out on Monday, the CCAO staff was shocked. They did not see it going in the direction it is going. Mr. Boose said he felt like they don't think what the local government does is necessary.
 - Mr. Brady noted indigent defense reimbursements would go down to 78% under this proposal. The state does not want to conduct a pilot program to take over indigent defense, and let us keep those costs. They are exempting items from sales tax and are not increasing the funding for local governments. Mr. Brady thought we are getting it from all sides. The

- state believes it balances their budget and makes them look good for saving all these taxes. The costs are still there, but the local governments have to pay it.
- Mr. Boose stated we do not get any of the \$3B which is in the reserves and is one of the reasons they are saying they can cut our tax rate. The money which will be cut due to the tax rate is mainly cuts to the local governments. The money in the reserve account has no effect on local government. It is not considered part of the revenue which gets distributed for local government funds. The only thing that does is the revenue which they bring in that year. Mr. Boose noted the state said the reason the reimbursements are not back up to 100% nor would they be possibly taken over by the state is the local governments fault because they raised the amount of money which is being spent by the local Public Defenders. Mr. Wilde commented they had told us to do it. Mr. Strickler and Mr. Boose agreed, then Mr. Boose stated our Public Defender had come to them several years ago and said the state had raised our reimbursement, so we could spend more money and get more back from the state. Mr. Boose told them that is not what this is about. He then received a follow-up email from the State Public Defender saying we needed to raise the rates of our lawyers because they were increasing reimbursements. If you have any questions let them know. We called in the state Public Defender and argued that point with him because they had discussed increasing the reimbursement, but not raising the rates. Mr. Boose told him they would run out of money if they did that.
 - Mr. Boose said now the House of Representatives is blaming the commissioners for overspending that money. CCAO has been pushing to have the state take this over for 4 years. But instead the state is cutting the reimbursement.
 - Ms. Cardone asked Mr. Boose to tell the Senators not to cut MHAS funding because she noted they were set to be cut in the substitute bill.
 - There was an increase in the amount to be given out for capital improvements to jails. It will not be divided equally, you would need to submit an application like a grant.
 - Mr. Boose noted that some people are saying the amount of money they put forward will not keep up with the need, based on inflation. Mr. Brady said the interesting thing about this is that it becomes a shell game with the state. It looks like they are saving all this money, but they are just hammering everyone under them. Not just the counties, but the municipalities and others.
 - Mr. Boose noted when he told Senator Gavarone what was in this substitute bill she was mad. It will need to be passed by July 1, 2023.

11:00 a.m. Amanda Gordon, McDonald Hopkins/ Bob Morgan, Fair Board President/ Roger Hunker, Building Fundraising Committee/ Fairground's Building Project/ ARPA. Also in attendance, Dick Wiles, Fair Board; Adam Weaver, Contractors Design Engineering; Heath Feichtner; and Pete Welch, Huron County Director of Operations. Mr. Brady turned the meeting over to Mr. Boose.

Mr. Boose explained we were here to discuss the fairgrounds building. Neither the Fairgrounds, nor the committee have been involved with Federal or State regulations when constructing a \$2.5M building and everything that goes along with it. Mr. Boose was getting many questions such as: do we need an architect or can we do design build?

Mr. Boose noted the commissioners have \$1.8M of ARPA funds to use for this project and that is not the only money they are using. We will need to know by approximately June 1, whether the Fair Board wants to move forward with this project. We don't want to lose any of our ARPA money and have to turn it back in because we found out at the last minute that we can't move forward. Mr. Boose wants any and all questions to come out in this meeting. He understands they may think of more questions after this meeting, but we need to start.

Mr. Boose asked Ms. Ziemba to verify his statement that we will give the money to the Fair Board. The Fair Board will have the responsibility of everything to go along with the building. Ms. Ziemba stated that was correct and they would do draw downs. Mr. Wilde stated all of the requirements for the ARPA money made him nervous because if something does not get reported correctly we are liable.

- Mr. Brady has a list of questions to help facilitate this discussion and asked if everyone understood what that contract means or had any questions about the contract with the commissioners.
- Bob Morgan said the contract places the responsibility of the whole thing on the Fair Board. Mr. Wilde and Mr. Brady stated that is correct
- Mr. Brady asked if there were any parts of that contract they have a question about regrading ARPA and what it requires. Mr. Brady noted we have Ms. Gordon here to answer questions.
- Mr. Boose said there were 2 different things. ARPA will require things on the project and also requires an agreement with us. Mr. Boose would like to defer the ARPA questions until later and talk about just the agreement.
- Mr. Brady said he was still talking about the agreement and wants to make sure everyone understands what this agreement is going to require.
- Mr. Morgan stated everyone thought he was against this, he just does not want to do it wrong. He

deals with Federal and State moneys and knows if you do not do it right then it can cause a lot of problems and somebody will have to pay back the money. The Fair Board can't afford to pay back the money. He feels they need someone to help do the reporting. He would like to know the reporting requirements and who will do it.

- Mr. Brady said he knows per the contract; the commissioner's will not be responsible for doing all of the reporting for the Fair Board and noted he also did not want to see the commissioners having to pay that back out of the General Fund because it didn't get done right.
- Ms. Ziemba stated when we do the reporting, she will report that the commissioners will be using the \$1.8M and will create the project. In order to pay, they will do draw downs. When they submit the draw downs they will need to submit the invoice of the contractor, prevailing wage and all of the documents that go with it to us so we have that for the audit on the ARPA side of things. Ms. Ziemba was unsure of what the reporting would be on the State Funds. She said they would need to keep accurate records of state and ARPA because they would more than likely be audited separately at the Fairgrounds as well.
- Mr. Morgan stated he knows the paperwork and testing for ODOT projects and asked if this was easier or harder.
- Ms. Gordon stated with the ARPA side of things; because we are using revenue loss money, it does decrease some of the requirements. What they are doing is standing in stead and acting as agent for the county. This is a county project, so they will need to follow the county rules for procurement and prevailing wage. She noted the Fair Board is as responsible as the county is for making sure the ARPA money is spent correctly. Ms. Gordon stated that Ms. Ziemba is the one who has to file and do the reporting in order to be able to prove and show we are using the ARPA money in accordance with all of the rules and regulations. Even though we have fewer requirements than the funds on the broadband side, the Fed's still require multiple items to be complied with under the code of federal regulations. Which is why we need to make sure we are watching the project and making sure the project is compliant with cost principles and all of those other things. To be able to prove that we are using the money for an appropriate purpose under ARPA. Ms. Gordon has not reviewed the grant monies and they may have some additional requirements or other things to be able to prove you are using the grant money accordingly. That will be separate and apart from what will need to be done for the county. Ms. Gordon told them to picture themselves as part of the county when carrying out this project because it is a county building, so they will need to follow the county procurement requirements, prevailing wage and all of those kinds of things.
- Mr. Boose asked if there is some kind of reporting which needs to be done to make sure we build the buildings. He said you could get the money and build a cheap building which would fall apart in 10 years. Then the government finds out it was not built the way it was supposed to be built. Mr. Boose wanted to know if there were some type of rules about making sure you do the project you said you were going to do.
- Ms. Gordon told him yes; basically, you follow what you would do if you were going to construct a building. She said whatever the county's requirements are to make sure the building is built correctly, that it doesn't fall down, it is not sub-standard and we haven't cut corners. This is just like we are building it ourselves, the Fair Board is just acting as our construction agent to complete the building. They would be the person assigned to watch over the project.
- Mr. Brady noted we are doing that with the Senior Center right now.
- Adam Weaver, with Contractors Design Engineering. Mr. Weaver said they are working with the Fair Board on the design of this building. Mr. Weaver noted his firm has done many commercial buildings, but the biggest difference with this building is the funding mechanism. He said any commercial building is designed and approved through state building code. They will require you to do certain things and it will be inspected at certain stages of the project and approved prior to moving forward. Mr. Weaver said they have also dealt with Federal Funds indirectly as well; when they do underground utilities and other items. With the city they go through WSOS, who sometimes administer those funds. He noted there are certain wage rates and wage surveys which they do during the projects and WSOS handles that. He asked if there was someone who would be handling the wage items.
- Ms. Gordon asked Ms. Ziemba who the Prevailing Wage Coordinator was for the county. Ms. Ziemba told her it is Ms. Stebel, but we don't know who it is for the Fair Board.
- Mr. Brady stated this will require prevailing wage and asked Mr. Morgan if they had somebody to do it; he noted the commissioners would not be tracking the prevailing wage. Mr. Brady added that Ms. Stebel does it for the commissioner's projects, but the Fair Board will need to designate someone to be the prevailing wage coordinator. They have to track this and it has to be precise.
- Mr. Morgan stated he was assuming it has to be a qualified person and asked if that statement was correct. He said they had no one to do this and this has been a question all along. Mr. Morgan said with the projects he inspects, you need to have testing done and prove it. Mr. Morgan wanted to know if we have to do all that and if so, who will do it.
- Mr. Weaver said that type of stuff is handled by the State Building Department. Mr. Boose added they don't handle prevailing wage. Mr. Weaver agreed and replied he has never had a concrete test

done on a commercial building. Mr. Brady said he had them done on every building he worked on, they came out and did slump tests and cylinder tests.

- Roger Hunker said Mr. Weaver just helped with Crawford County and they used ARPA money.
- Mr. Weaver said you could require what you want.
- Mr. Boose said we are not requiring anything.
- Mr. Weaver said an owner can require whatever they want and typically when they were dealing with Richland County Building Department they did not require that. The County or the Fair Board can require that if they want to, but it is at an additional cost and you are expected to pay for those costs. Mr. Weaver said he understands that a highway situation is very different than a building. He noted we would need to ask what we are putting in this building and decide if we want to do some tests or we can rely on our contractors and suppliers. It is up to us to decide the risk we want to take and the cost we are willing to spend.
- Mr. Brady's issue with "other counties did it this way" is that doesn't mean they did it right. Mr. Brady wants to make sure our consultant says this is done right. He noted even though another county used ARPA money and did it this way. We want to hear it from Ms. Gordon versus another county.
- Mr. Boose stated the commissioners are not requesting anything above what the Federal and State government says we have to do. We don't have any unique recommendations, but have to live with those.
- Mr. Strickler wanted to follow up on what Mr. Brady said about just because somebody else used ARPA money doesn't mean they did it right. Mr. Strickler said every situation is going to effect whether the ARPA money has been used properly or not.
- Mr. Brady is interested in what comes back.
- Mr. Strickler added we don't want to be tagged to pay that money.
- Mr. Brady agreed and said he doesn't want to look at our constituents and say we made a mistake.
- Mr. Morgan said that has been my exact question all along. What do they have to do?
- Mr. Boose asked who needs to do it, as far as an architect/prevaling wage coordinator. He noted it was easy for us to say whatever the state and federal government requires you to do and added that the Fair Board doesn't deal with that so when they discussed that the county always uses an architect to do a lot of these items. Mr. Boose thought when they where asking who is going to do that, they want more detail than just the commissioner's office or the Fair Board.
- Mr. Morgan replied what are we required to do? If you go through the architect to do all this it will be approximately 10% of the construction costs.
- Mr. Brady said you're right and noted it can vary. Mr. Brady said one question was if there is a requirement for an architect. Mr. Brady thought the answer to that is no and said you could go with a design/build. Mr. Brady asked Ms. Gordon if you go with a design/build do you need to have a project manager? If you need to have a project manager/consultant who oversees it, like a construction manager, what are the qualifications and how do you go about getting one?
- Ms. Gordon noted she is not trying to add any more costs and she knows how important this is to everyone. But we don't want the county to have to pay back \$1.8M. We want to make sure the process is followed correctly so that does not happen and need to make sure if the county were to construct this building on its own that we follow the requirements the county would otherwise do. The Fair Board is truly acting as the county in this situation. If you did a design/build and you use ARPA money for it, we need to follow the procurement requirements. Advertising and bidding to obtain the design build and the project manager. If we are not going to use ARPA funds and you are comfortable with a qualified architect or engineering firm that you would otherwise use. The commissioners need to be comfortable with who they are using because they are acting for the commissioners. If the commissioners picture doing this project for the county without the Fair Board, how would we do it. Would we use an architect? If so, then we should use an architect here. If we would use a design/build, then we would still need a project manager because Ms. Ziemba has to know when she is paying the bills that they are correct.
- Mr. Wilde asked, what if it is not correct going to Ms. Ziemba?
- Ms. Gordon said that is why you hire a professional and you rely on their license as the professional.
- Mr. Brady said except for the potential that we are investigating the process of doing the roof on the Administration Building a little differently than we have done before; it has been his understanding that most all of the projects here have been done through an architect.
- Ms. Gordon explained at the end of the day, you need to have a professional who knows what they are doing because they are going to prepare the bid specs, make sure those are done appropriately and that we are following the procurement requirements. The bidding, advertising, preparation of the notice, opening of the bids, review of the bids and all those things. The people we have used as architects previously know how to do those things.
- Mr. Brady also wants to make sure the person overseeing the project is not on the same payroll as the person doing the project because that tends to be an issue with potential conflicts down the road.
- Mr. Weaver wants to make sure we are using the term "architect" correctly and he knows what that means. Mr. Weaver said he is a professional licensed engineer and he can do these buildings. He is

not an architect. He does not want everyone here to think they are not qualified to do this. They do projects like this all the time, they are licensed, have 3 licensed engineers on staff and have done buildings for the City of Clyde, Crawford County and Attica. The difference is funding. They build the building to make sure it is built right and are not worried because the building code will cover all of that. The building code will make sure it is built right and not defective. They will inspect everything required. Mr. Weaver asked if the County has a written set of requirements and do they differentiate between the senior center, which is very different than a building the fairgrounds that will have animals in it.

- Mr. Brady did not think that ARPA differentiates between them like that.
- Mr. Weaver replied that he is not saying that ARPA does and noted that Mr. Gordon said they need to follow the rules for Huron County.
- Mr. Brady said we are following the state and federal rules.
- Ms. Gordon said that she was saying they need to follow the Huron County Procurement Policy.
- Mr. Boose said we are not following our rules we are following their rules.
- Ms. Gordon added the state rules.
- Mr. Weaver asked whose rules are they, the states or the counties.
- Mr. Brady stated that Ms. Gordon is going to try to explain.
- Mr. Weaver asked if he could get the list of requirements.
- Ms. Gordon stated we have a whole procurement policy.
- Mr. Weaver said procurement and that kind of administrative stuff. Pay applications and things like that he understands is very different than what Mr. Morgan is asking about with testing and inspections.
- Mr. Brady noted when he said architect previously he would prefer to see construction manager because that could be a PE or an architect. But either are a professional.
- Ms. Gordon explained the County is a governmental entity governed by the Ohio Revised Code. The State of Ohio revised code imposes all sorts of requirements upon them, such as the procurement requirement, prevailing wage and all sorts of things. Depending on the bucket we are using, ARPA requires and sometimes imposes different requirements in terms of reporting and things like that. Some of those the county is still under, in this particular situation ARPA says, in terms of procurement and prevailing wage, we are not going to make the county put all of these additional requirements in your contracts if you are going to use the money in this bucket. However, you still have to follow all of your requirements which come from the state and are imposed on the county by the Ohio Revised Code.
- Mr. Brady stated in essence, we do not want to add additional requirements when it comes to testing and other things. Whatever is required by the state to construct this building is what we want. If the state does not require concrete testing or other items than we do not want to add that. Mr. Brady thought Mr. Morgan wants to make sure we do what is required of us, not necessarily over that. We do not want to do less than what is required of us because he is the president of the Fair Board and will catch the criticism and it will also come to the commissioners.
- Mr. Weaver said that he is not suggesting we do anything less, he just wants to know what the requirements are.
- Mr. Boose said on the majority of our projects we hire an architect.
- Mr. Welch added that we qualify an architect first, before we hire them.
- Mr. Boose said we hire an architect who does all of that for us. We don't tell the architect everything that needs to be done.
- Mr. Weaver noted to choose an architect, you have to give them a scope of work.
- Mr. Boose said we give a very generic scope of work.
- Ms. Gordon said under request for qualifications.
- Mr. Weaver stated we have to say here is our scope of work and here is what we want you to do.
- Mr. Brady said we want to construct a building and it has to comply with the building codes for Ohio.
- Mr. Weaver asked if he is sure that is what we are doing.
- Mr. Welch noted they are making sure the contractor is following those.
- Mr. Boose stated the minimum we ask them to do is what the state requirements say. They may come to us to recommend things. The commissioners do not go out to the job site to oversee, that is what we rely on our architect to do.
- Mr. Weaver said the architect not going to do that, that is the inspector for the state of Ohio.
- Mr. Boose and Mr. Brady told him our architects are out there.
- Mr. Weaver asked if they were out there all the time.
- Mr. Boose and Mr. Brady told him they are there when the inspections happen.
- Mr. Weaver reaffirmed that when the state building inspector is there for an inspection, the architect is present.
- Mr. Brady told him yes.
- Mr. Boose said as long as they know about it. If there is a surprise inspection then they would probably not be there. Mr. Boose noted when we hire an architect, we tell them they need to do this project

- according to the rules of the State or Federal entity.
- Mr. Wilde stated the architect for the Courthouse roof sent information every day, which included pictures.
 - Mr. Weaver commented we were billed for that as well.
 - Mr. Welch added at 4.5%.
 - Mr. Weaver told them he wants to make sure he understands what the scope of work is, that is his biggest concern. He added they have done a multi-million dollar building for the city of Clyde.
 - Mr. Brady stated we don't have the scope of work at this moment because it is in the design phase. We are waiting for the Fair Board to make an active decision about moving forward with this project. We need to know a timeframe because we have to commit the funding.
 - Mr. Hunker said they can't do that until the commissioners give them everything and that is why they are here. Mr. Hunker said since we started through this process the committee has been up front with the steps they are taking and now they keep being told they need more and more items.
 - Mr. Brady commented those were always there.
 - Mr. Hunker told Mr. Brady they were not told those up front. Mr. Hunker told Ms. Gordon the committee hired Mr. Weaver to work on the design. The plan was that he would get that done and the Fair Board would look at it, approve it then submit it to the building department for approval. They were then going to put it out for bid. At that point they will know where they are at and that has been their plan. Now they are told they need to have an architect.
 - Mr. Boose asked Mr. Hunker to let me finish. The questions you say weren't answered, were never asked. Also, we don't think of those things because we turn everything over to an architect. We don't know the questions you would be thinking of because we don't have to think of those. When we do a project, we hire an architect who tells us what needs to be done. Mr. Boose said it is not that we didn't answer the questions. The questions weren't asked. We assume, which was bad on our part, that if you get federal money that there are certain regulations which go along with that and we don't have a choice, that is what they tell us. These are not regulations which the county is making up. Normally, everything we have is taken care of by an architect. We are not telling you that you need to hire an architect, we are telling you that all of these things need to be done according to the rules and if you are comfortable doing it yourselves or the Fair Board is comfortable with it, then that is ok. We are not telling you that you have to, we are telling you why we hire an architect/engineer/project manager. We do that to make sure they lead us in the right direction to get it done.
 - Mr. Hunker said the rest of my question to Ms. Gordon is, if we continue down the process we are currently going and they get Mr. Weaver or someone to hire on as a project manager, then get someone to help with the prevailing wage, are they compliant?
 - Ms. Gordon stated that was a little open ended because she does not know what?
 - Mr. Welch asked if there was a process they went through to hire Mr. Weaver.
 - Ms. Gordon noted if they are using ARPA money to hire him they would need to.
 - Mr. Strickler said it is his understanding they are not going to use ARPA money.
 - Mr. Brady noted this started out as a committee to replace a barn. They were raising funds for it, which were mainly private donations. The commissioners were going to kick in \$50,000 at one point, but now we are talking about ARPA. At the beginning ARPA was not involved, so it was different.
 - Mr. Hunker said he understands.
 - Mr. Brady continued by saying it went from a \$700,000 barn to approximately \$2.7M and the scope has totally changed on the project and it went from privately funded to the commissioners kicking in \$50,000, the state capital adding \$450,000. That then automatically changed the rules before there was any mention of using ARPA. Now we are using ARPA, which can be even more stringent. This is not something which we are changing. We are trying to answer questions as they come up because the project has evolved. When you ask how much more are we going to place on them, it is an unfair question. The question is, as the project changes, the questions change because the requirements change. If you go from private to State, then State to Federal and ARPA in particular, everything changes. So, every time the funding changes, then the reporting changes. Mr. Brady thought we were here today to get those questions answered so that everybody understands this going forward. When you use ARPA money there are requirements which we have no say in. There are other things, which Mr. Weaver brought up, and we are not interested in tacking on any additional inspections which are not required by the building codes. Mr. Brady does not believe ARPA requires building inspections like that. They have requirements for the reporting of the funds and how they were expended and the details of that.
 - Ms. Gordon added internal controls.
 - Mr. Brady continued by saying there are things which are required because the commissioners have to be careful and noted Mr. Boose had said before we do something, we have to make sure if we are going to use the ARPA money, which we used for the Senior Center, that we follow the ARPA rules. We have to get certain things done before we start an ARPA project because once you start the project, you can't use the ARPA money for it if you are already in progress and you haven't done the items needed. We are here today to try to help the Fair Board and the Feichtner Memorial Committee understand what the process is and for all of us to be on the same page. That is why Ms. Gordon is

here and going forward we understand that Mr. Weaver is already involved in the design, so that will disqualify the ARPA money because you have already started that part of the project.

- Mr. Boose said that was not true.
- Mr. Strickler said only that part of the project
- Mr. Brady said he was not talking about the whole project and that is why he wants to make sure that everyone understands if you expend the private money, you can do whatever you want to do. Once you start using ARPA, you don't want to start a part of the project before it is done properly because it will disqualify the use of ARPA.
- Ms. Gordon noted you can't act first then ask for forgiveness later.
- Mr. Brady noted that is why they were here today. We want to make sure everyone understands the ARPA requirements. Mr. Brady noted when it comes to construction, that is totally different.
- Ms. Gordon had a couple of points to help this move along. She told Mr. Weaver not to take any of this as a challenge to his professionalism or abilities. She noted he has been brought on to do work and he has done other buildings. She got the sense that he feels he knows how to do this stuff, but you aren't listening.
- Mr. Weaver wanted to clarify that design professionals get interchanged all the time and people think only one can do it.
- Ms. Gordon asked Mr. Hunker who they were planning on using to prepare the bids, do the bid openings, do the advertising and those kinds of things.
- Mr. Hunker thought they would do it in conjunction with Mr. Weaver and Mr. Strickler since he would be representing the Fair Board. But maybe that is a bad assumption.
- Ms. Gordon said no.
- Mr. Strickler said he would review the bid specs for legal compliance and probably pass them on to Ms. Gordon because with ARPA funds being used she would need to make sure the proper ARPA language is in the documents. But he would not do the specs themselves.
- Ms. Gordon stated that was one of the questions through some of the conversations she had. She didn't know who was involved, what their abilities were or what they actually did, so that was an open question to her. She said the County has a procurement policy which we need to follow. Ms. Gordon asked Mr. Weaver if his firm does advertising, bid openings and that type of thing.
- Mr. Weaver stated they usually work in conjunction with the owner to do that. He noted a lot of times when they are working with a city or county, they have their own administration. So they provide the specifications and the bid documents. They can do many things, but typically the advertisement is done by the owner. He then asked who the owner is.
- Mr. Strickler said the County is the owner.
- Mr. Brady agreed and said the Fair Board is the one who will be responsible for the contract.
- Mr. Weaver said as far as advertising, they have dealt with federal money previously through WSOS and they administered it, then followed up on the requirements. Mr. Weaver's company prepared the bid package and other information to the contractors. They understood they need to have certified payrolls. His firm then turned it over to WSOS, who verified. Mr. Weaver said that is what he does not understand. Will that portion be put on him or whoever? If the County is going to be completely hands off.
- Mr. Brady told him yes, we are hands off.
- Ms. Gordon noted because their typical projects, that is why Mr. Weaver engaged as a professional.
- Mr. Weaver thought every county and city is different, including the rules.
- Mr. Brady said this contract is with the Fair Board, even though the County owns the building.
- Mr. Morgan commented that is why I am asking the questions.
- Mr. Brady has no issues with putting a barn up at the fairgrounds. We just wants to make sure the Fair Board understands what they are undertaking. This contract is going to be between the Fair Board and whatever design firm. The Fair Board will be responsible for making sure all of the reporting is done accurately. Somebody will need to oversee it. Whether they give it to Construction Engineering Design or somebody else to do as a prevailing wage coordinator. Also, a reporting person for the ARPA money. That is up to the Fair Board. So, this is between the Fair Board and whoever is performing. The reason he said something about starting into parts of the project was not to dissuade from doing it, but to make sure a part which needs to be funded by ARPA is not started before the correct ARPA procedures are followed. He doesn't want them not to get the ARPA funding because they started something and didn't follow the ARPA rules. Mr. Brady just wanted to make sure they check before they start something to decide if they will be using private or ARPA funds, because private is much less restrictive.
- Mr. Morgan said they understand that part of it. He has had the question of who will oversee it.
- Mr. Wilde said he wants to feel confident that the Fair Board is confident in what is going on.
- Mr. Boose thought one other thing we need to make clear is we didn't hire Ms. Gordon to do the details of constructing a building. He noted she is there to make sure we get the process right and are following all the rules. Then it up to whoever has the project to do all of that and make sure it all gets done. Mr. Boose thinks that may be where the confusion lies. He said what he is hearing are questions

about different items which Ms. Gordon may not be able to answer because they are construction related.

- Mr. Weaver said those are handled by the design professional and he does not think anyone is questioning that. These are administrative questions.
- Ms. Gordon told them there is the administration, the use of the funding and the reporting. We need to make sure when draws are requested from Ms. Ziembra that somebody can say it is certified and completed.
- Mr. Boose added it is more than reporting because if you say we have to do certain things to go out to bid, that is not reporting. That is following the rules to go out to bid.
- Mr. Brady noted it was all on the Fair Board. If they are using in any kind of government money then they have to make sure the correct rules are followed and the correct reporting is done. Mr. Brady said they can see copies of the procurement policy and discuss it with the rest of the Fair Board. Mr. Brady emphasized that once they make the decision to do it, then they are in it and have to follow all of the rules as they come up. This is not something we are adding, you can see it from the beginning and is it something the Fair Board wants to do. They will be responsible ultimately.
- Mr. Wilde added they needed to be confident in what they are doing.
- Mr. Morgan said the engineers he has talked to have told him they need some type of administration to do the paperwork.
- Mr. Brady said that is something the Fair Board needs to take into consideration. He does not believe the commissioners can answer that question for them. We are talking about making up to \$1.8M of ARPA funds available to the Fair Board for this project. That is all we are doing, the rest of it sits on the Fair Board. We will not put it out to bid or oversee the reporting. Ultimately it comes to Ms. Ziembra. In the long run we are responsible, but Ms. Ziembra will not be happy if this gets messed up halfway through and she has to go back to fix it all.
- Mr. Boose said we are responsible for the \$1.8M, not any of the other funding.
- Ms. Gordon suggested since we have players involved, we need to be able to better define what the players can do. If we share the procurement policy with the Fair Board and give them a few days to review it. Then we can decide whether to move forward with the person they have already or is there an additional player to help address some of your concerns about project management and other things going forward. She thought that would be the best thing to do at this point without going round and round.
- Mr. Boose said he would like to clear up one thing that was said. Do we know the architect is doing things right, they have licenses and other things. When we chose the architect for the Senior Center, we specifically looked at all of the applications and rated them based on different criteria. One item that was high on Mr. Boose's list was if they were doing any other ARPA Projects and their knowledge of the ARPA rules or is this something they have never done before. He is not telling the Fair Board what to do but when we chose for the Senior Center it was very important to us to choose someone who understood the ARPA rules. That is how we chose someone to make sure what we are getting done abides by the ARPA rules.
- Ms. Gordon added, in terms of Prevailing Wage Coordinator. Ms. Gordon noted she has worked for counties across the state and everybody has their own way of doing things. In Huron County, would the prevailing wage coordinator be able to manage the issues for this project.
- Mr. Welch thought it would be a conflict of interest.
- Mr. Hunker asked what the conflict is.
- Mr. Brady said the whole thing behind this is that this would be the Fair Board's project even though we technically own it. It would be on them because we were not going to tie up our staff to follow up and do all that. Our staff is taking care of the projects that we currently are doing.
- Ms. Gordon noted she had worked with the port authority and they had utilized a county prevailing wage coordinator and that is why she asked. Even though it is the Fair Board's project, they are carrying it out as an agent for the County, and she didn't know if that was an opportunity, if not they will need to find a Prevailing Wage Coordinator.
- Mr. Brady told her that Ms. Stebel is our Prevailing Wage coordinator, but she does a lot of other things and would not have the capacity to do it for the Fair Board as well.
- Ms. Gordon stated that is going to be one of those boxes that we will need to check and fill somebody in. Of all the things that have come out through ARPA, Prevailing Wage is a big one, no matter what we have.
- Mr. Wilde added that we have previously had issues with prevailing wages. The contractors did not want to do it right. Then they walked off the job.
- Mr. Boose said when that happened, it wasn't the Commissioners that said, no we are not paying the bill, the architect came to us and said don't pay the bill, we don't have everything we need. It wasn't like we were filing reports and decided not to pay that one.
- Ms. Gordon stated otherwise you are in trouble with the auditor.
- Mr. Brady wanted to move the questions to more project specific ones. Mr. Brady asked if anyone had a particular question about the ARPA end of things for Ms. Gordon before he moves on.

- Mr. Morgan asked if it is all on them and they decide we don't have to go with an architect and it gets screwed up, then the commissioners have to pay back the \$1.8M and they don't touch it.
- Mr. Brady said it has to do with the reporting end of it, so it is whoever is doing the reporting. If the building is screwed up that is on the Fair Board.
- Mr. Boose added if we owe \$1.8M, Mr. Boose won't be a commissioner at that time, but he would guess the commissioners would tell the Fair Board they need to pay it.
- Mr. Morgan said he did not know how they could.
- Mr. Brady said one of the reasons they wanted to do this in open session is to make it transparent. Mr. Brady added if they don't have all the information they need to make the decision. This will give them an opportunity to look at the reporting forms and prevailing wage forms. The Fair Board can have an adequate discussion to understand what they are going to undertake by doing this project. If you want to do it or not do it, that is the call of the Fair Board. Now is the time for questions.
- Dick Wiles asked if we have the forms that we have to submit.
- Mr. Hunker commented it would be really helpful if they could see the sample reports that the commissioners are worried about. He wanted to know why this wasn't shared with them 5 months ago when they started talking about ARPA and now they are being told they need to decide by June 01, 2023.
- Mr. Brady said that ARPA has always needed to be reported.
- Mr. Wiles asked what reports they needed.
- Mr. Hunker said they don't know what the reports are.
- Mr. Boose said if it was me, we would say that is for our architect to take care of, the commissioners don't get a list of all the reports which need to be done. Our architect takes care of that. We tell them they are responsible for getting all these reports done and to follow the rules. When they go out to bid, they will put everything they need in the bid and when the bids come in they will make sure they include everything. Mr. Boose noted there is not a packet of forms we can pull and just give it to them.
- Ms. Gordon noted it is a process and there are different levels of the process.
- Mr. Weaver said they have dealt with federal money before and they do get packets and instructions. Mr. Weaver asked if ARPA money was a different animal and said the question he is asking is not unreasonable. Do the commissioners have it? Maybe not.
- Mr. Boose stated since he has been a commissioner, in all of the capital projects we have done, no one has asked us to give them the forms.
- Mr. Weaver noted they are provided by the agency. When they deal with it, it is through the city and they deal with CDBG and WSOS. They deal with all these different mechanisms who work with the city and the government agency to provide the information which is required through the bidding process and reporting during the project.
- Mr. Wilde told him for us it is the architect.
- Mr. Hunker said as part of the committee he just wants to know what those are so he is educated and when he is talking to Mr. Weaver or whoever is going to be doing this, that he understands what it is they have to do. Mr. Hunker added that we are just telling them they have to do reports. He gets that, but what are the reports.
- Mr. Boose said we are not telling you that you just have to do reports, we are saying there is a process which has to be followed and that is a whole lot different than filling out reports. If there is a specific way you have to pick your architect, then you need to do that or if there is a specific item you need to have in your bid documents, you need to do that. It is not necessarily filling out a form. That is preparing the bid documents according to what ARPA and the Federal Government says. Mr. Boose noted they are asking us to give them the forms and told them we have a much larger project than this and have hired an architect, who has not asked us any of those questions.
- Mr. Brady asked how many times has ARPA changed the rules since it first started. Now there is an amendment in the US Senate to change it again. We just know we need somebody to do this. Mr. Brady told Mr. Weaver he probably could do this, but we chose Garmann Miller for our project. We gave them the project and they do all of the stuff.
- Mr. Boose added we don't pay Ms. Gordon and her firm or the architect just because the federal government says you have to have it and we don't expect anything from them. We pay them to do the type of stuff the Fair Board is asking right now. He noted they are asking the commissioners for a form.
- Ms. Ziemba stated when they signed the contract we prepared for the architect, the Procurement Policy was included in it and there was language in it saying they agree to follow ARPA.
- Ms. Gordon noted there are certain things you have to make sure are in every contract and every bid.
- Ms. Ziemba said she will give Mr. Weaver a copy of the contract with the Fair Board which they just signed. It has the Procurement Policy and project description.
- Mr. Boose commented that every contract the commissioners approve, they do not know exactly what every line in it means. So, if you get a contract from Mr. Strickler to sign with us. We think that you are trusting legal counsel and us to do that best we can to have everything in it we can. Mr. Boose

said some of the information they are asking for sounds like you already have because it was in the contract.

- Ms. Ziemba handed out the contracts and said the procurement policy was attached. She noted the update added was that the project description is a 24,000-foot building.
- Mr. Boose wanted to get back to roles. He feels there is some frustration and maybe not everyone is getting the total communication they want or need. Mr. Boose thinks to move forward; the commissioner's contract is with the Fair Board. As far as the details of how they are moving forward, if it were him, he thinks they should work with the committee and the Fair Board. We don't want to mix up the communication by having 2 different groups come to us and that is why they had the meeting 2 weeks ago. So everyone can understand. After that meeting Mr. Boose did not think everyone was on the same page and that is the reason for this meeting. Mr. Boose said he had a misconception when he told Mr. Hunker to call Ms. Gordon. Mr. Strickler told him that can't happen. Mr. Boose said it is the Fair Board's Project and if they decide to move forward, we have a signed contract from them, but we have not signed it because we were not sure if everybody is clear about how they were moving forward and not because we don't want the project. The commissioners want to see a new barn and love the barn which was designed and the ideas behind it. The Fair Board just needs to abide by the rules and go through the proper channels of communication so that one person isn't saying one thing and another. Also, so that everyone understands what their role is. Mr. Boose told them we are not saying they have to be ready to start building by June 01. That is a date Mr. Boose threw out and has not discussed it with the other commissioners.
- Mr. Brady said he is good with that because we need to know where we are going with ARPA.
- Mr. Boose noted we can't spend \$1.5M just like that. If it gets to be 2024 and we have that money left to spend and don't spend it, we will lose it. We don't want that to happen, we want to make sure everybody agrees and is moving in the right direction. Everybody thinks this project can get done the way it needs to get done. Mr. Boose noted if they came to the commissioners and said they need another month, he did not think the commissioners would refuse them. We are just trying to set some parameters. If you came to the commissioners and said you need 6 months, then we would start to worry that if you don't do what you say you are going to do, how we will spend the money. Mr. Boose asked if they understood and if that was what they were talking about concerning roles.
- Ms. Gordon said at the higher level yes, but she would like to go up one more level to be able to define. Once they read the procurement policy they can understand how much Mr. Weaver is going to do and what other roles are out there. Prevailing Wage has already been defined, and there are other things. We already know as a group and are all comfortable that they are going to be able to prove they followed all of the requirements; procurement, etc. and the building requirements. In the end they will have a beautiful building and the expenditure of the ARPA funds has been done correctly.
- Ms. Ziemba confirmed the contract which Contractor Design Engineering signed is with the Fair Board. Ms. Ziemba asked if Mr. Weaver's firm was putting together the bid packet for the Fair Board. Mr. Weaver stated they could. Ms. Ziemba then said if they did it, then it would go to the Fair Board and asked Mr. Strickler if he was representing the Fair Board. Mr. Strickler told her that was correct. She told Mr. Morgan he would then give the bid documents to Mr. Strickler to add any county language, then give them to Ms. Gordon to have the ARPA language added. After Ms. Gordon is done she would give it back to Mr. Strickler or the Fair Board. Then it can go out to bid.
- Ms. Gordon stated there is another line to fill in. Who is going to manage the bidding, advertise the bids and open the bids.
- Mr. Welch thought Mr. Weaver could do that.
- Mr. Boose asked Ms. Stebel what she did for our jobs which required prevailing wage.
- Ms. Stebel stated if she is the prevailing wage coordinator for a project, she oversees whether the contractor hired to do the job is paying the prevailing wage properly. If they are not then it goes back to them and they either have to fix it or she has to go to the State of Ohio. Prevailing Wage can change on a daily basis, so she has to keep up with it. She also has to make sure that the employees know they are being paid prevailing wage.
- Mr. Boose stated he knows if a subcontractor finds out they have to pay prevailing wage, they get a list of what those wages are. Mr. Boose asked if Ms. Stebel is the one who provides that.
- Ms. Stebel said she provides it to the contractor, who has to provide it to the subcontractor.
- Mr. Weaver commented a lot of times they are in the bid packet.
- Ms. Stebel explained that if it changes, she would send them to the contractor, who is required to give them to the subcontractor.
- Mr. Brady stated ultimately the general contractor is on the hook for that.
- Mr. Boose said he is trying to understand her job, so if they need to hire someone to do her job, they know what kind of things they are looking for.
- Ms. Stebel told him they also have to submit the payroll to her, then she verifies the payroll with the prevailing wages to make sure they are paying the correct wage rate and fringe benefits.
- Mr. Boose stated if we have an architect involved, what is their role in what you do.
- Ms. Stebel said the architect does all that. They send out all of the change notices and review the payroll. The payroll still comes to her and she has to verify it before she pays.

- Mr. Welch stated the architect or engineer collects the payroll of the subcontractor and interviews the employees to make sure they are getting paid correctly and they report it to us. We look at it, approve it and send it off or pay the bill.
- Mr. Brady noted you also have to verify the people doing the job are in the classifications to do the job.
- Mr. Welch said that is the interview part.
- Mr. Boose asked Ms. Stebel if she gets involved at all, as I understand prevailing wage it includes all benefits and is not just this person is getting paid \$7 and prevailing wage says you have to pay \$8. He thought it includes most benefits.
- Ms. Stebel said it includes all benefits.
- Mr. Welch commented that is why it is beneficial to hire someone who has done it before instead of trying to teach someone to do it. He said it can get complex sometimes depending on the size of the contract.
- Mr. Boose wanted to make sure, since Mr. Morgan has never worked with prevailing wage before, that he needs someone to do it. It is not just to make sure they are making the correct amount per hour. There is more to it.
- Ms. Ziemba added that Ms. Stebel kind of has a buffer, because we always have an architect. They do an overall review, then send it to Ms. Stebel and she checks it and can let them know if she finds a mathematical error, then the architect will doublecheck and confirm or reject the error.
- Mr. Brady noted because Mr. Weaver mentioned wage surveys, that most people think prevailing wage is union scale, but it is not necessarily union scale. It is not as easy as calling a union to ask. This is dependent on wage surveys which include all of the benefits and is sent out to all the registered contractors in an area and they fill out a survey. Then they average out all of the surveys to come up with prevailing wage.
- Ms. Ziemba thought the project has to be filed with the state prevailing wage.
- Ms. Gordon said it does.
- Mr. Weaver said there is a difference between state and federal as well.
- Mr. Brady said there is Davis Bacon at the Federal level.
- Ms. Gordon said they do not need to follow Davis Bacon.
- Ms. Gordon asked if we wanted to set a time to meet, after they have reviewed the procurement policy. We could include a couple of representatives and Mr. Strickler to go through it and try to determine what roles we can fill in at this point.
- Mr. Wilde asked if this should be a public meeting.
- Ms. Gordon felt it should be with the commissioners.
- Mr. Strickler said as long as he is available it is fine.
- Ms. Gordon said we would need Mr. Weavers information and maybe the for four of us could get together next week sometime. They decided on a conference call on Wednesday, April 26 at 11:00 a.m. Ms. Gordon said she just wanted to have Mr. Morgan, Mr. Weaver, Mr. Strickler and herself so they could fill in the blanks.
- Mr. Boose recommended Mr. Weaver or Mr. Morgan be in contact with the Committee in case they have any questions.
- Ms. Gordon agreed and thought for the call, since they were reviewing the procurement policy, its steps and requirements, this group would be the best.
- Mr. Brady wants the Fair Board to have a clear understanding of what is expected.
- Mr. Morgan thought they have two choices. They can hire an architect/engineer, or go with CDE and piecemeal it together.
- Mr. Brady said they would not piecemeal it together.
- Mr. Morgan said he was referring to the prevailing wage.
- Mr. Weaver noted it would depend on what the Fair Board wants them to do.
- Mr. Morgan asked if they could do all that stuff.
- Mr. Weaver said they could do it up to through the bid. The rest of it he needs to understand what is required.
- Mr. Brady told him the meeting should help him to understand better.
- Mr. Weaver said that is what he needs to know for sure. Then he will let them know whether he is able or capable of doing it.
- Ms. Gordon stated he was not going to put his license on the line to say he can do it if he can't.
- Mr. Brady thought after that meeting they should have a clearer understanding of what Mr. Weaver is willing to do, can do, or wants to do. Then the Fair Board can make a better decision.
- Mr. Morgan commented they will need to have a Fair Board meeting, but will need to wait until they are done with this.
- Ms. Gordon asked them to review the procurement policy so they could discuss it next Wednesday. She said she would send them the call-in information. She also told them she would review the steps and other items such as going out for bid. Then they can decide who will do what. They can then figure out what is left and what other professionals, if needed, do they need to fill those spots in with.

Ms. Gordon felt since they had already started down the road of design, they should utilize that as much as they can and the services which they can do.

- Mr. Weaver said there are companies out there who are just Project Managers who do that. They don't have design, just project management. Mr. Weaver noted the size of his firm is not large, so it would take a lot of resources to tackle something like that.
- Heath Feichtner asked how long a process this would be once they got into the ARPA.
- Mr. Brady asked if he meant before it goes out to bid and was told yes.
- Ms. Gordon stated it would be more of the planning and design and how long it would take to put the bid specs together.
- Mr. Weaver said once they had the package to Mr. Strickler and Ms. Gordon. To insert the information.
- Ms. Gordon added it would be about a week for each person.
- Mr. Strickler thought he may be able to get it done quicker, it just depends on his schedule and work load.
- Ms. Gordon said the timing for the publication for the bids would be about a 2 to 3-week process before opening. So, you could figure about a month there, once you get through everything.
- Mr. Strickler said you have to advertise for 2 weeks in a row, then the review.
- Ms. Gordon added you have to make sure you have the responsible bidder.
- Mr. Boose said if you want to compare it to the timeframe for the senior project. They signed the contract with the architect in February or March. Their last meeting was yesterday and they are in the middle of tying down some details. They have a very good idea of the building and where stuff is going to be laid out and where the building will be. Their goal is to start construction this fall.
- Mr. Brady had a question this may pertain to the committee, or it may pertain to the Fair Board –
 - Questions for the committee
 - How much money have they raised so far?
 - Are they continuing to try to get donations?
 - Will they continue the effort to get more donations?
- Mr. Hunker stated, as they said back in December, they are continuing to raise money. They have a grant writer who is continuing to write grants. They currently have \$226,000. There were a couple of other little things that have come in and with the money that is at the fair and the state money, there is \$550,700.00; also, there are some pledges, so they are past \$2.5M.
- Mr. Brady confirmed they are going to continue to try to find grants.
- Mr. Hunker noted the grant writer has continued to try, but a lot of it has been held up because they can't give her a timeline. Mr. Hunker said they have lost a few due to not having a timeline.
- Mr. Brady had a question for the Fair Board and noted the maintenance on another building would add to their expenses. He then asked about rentals and if they saw a market for the rental of the new building.
- Mr. Boose commented before you answer that question, as I understand the building is not just going to be rented. There will be projects and other uses. Mr. Boose thought the uses for the building could lead to different revenue. Not necessarily how many people will rent it for weddings.
- Mr. Brady said that is why he asked the question about revenue streams. He does not care what the revenue is from, but is curious. The money to construct the building may not come out of the Fair Board's pockets, but does the Fair Board feel comfortable with being able to establish enough of a revenue stream to do maintenance for it.
- Mr. Morgan said they hope to have it rented out as much as we can, then the money will go into a separate account. They keep a separate account for the Expo Building which is used for maintenance.
- Mr. Hunker told Mr. Brady that is kind of a loaded question. As he has traveled the state and seen counties who have done similar projects. It also comes into play what hotels and restaurants are available; which can determine what events can come in to a facility like that. If it is a weekend event, we need to have the infrastructure to handle it.
- Mr. Brady said you are right and stated he was not trying to give a loaded question.
- Mr. Boose thought it is a very important point and said the ARPA money they are giving is for tourism and we are not using it for 4-H only.
- Mr. Brady said he appreciates what Mr. Hunker said and agrees with it and with what Mr. Boose just said. We are doing what we can through the various economic development groups in the area and hopes there is an opportunity to partner up with some of those organizations to help promote some of these things. If this building gets built, he wants to see it be successful. But does not want to see the Fair Board have issues due to maintaining the building. Mr. Brady added that he would be happy to work with the Fair Board to promote the events.
- Mr. Morgan said being bigger will open it up to bigger things, not just weddings. With the size, it will open it up to a whole new setting.
- Mr. Brady added that nobody has a crystal ball and said they do a lot with online auctions and cattle. Mr. Brady knew someone who took their show cows to other states and asked if they could see the potential for those type of events.

- Mr. Hunker commented those events are huge. Just the livestock shows alone, in the State of Ohio, have exploded in the last 8 years.
- Mr. Boose said he hates to rely on social media, but has some social media friends who go to animal shows every weekend just for cows. He doesn't know if it has grown a lot because he doesn't know what it was doing before, but these people are busy showing their animals all winter long in Ohio.
- Mr. Hunker noted that until this last year he was on the Ohio Cattleman's Best Committee for 7 or 8 years. When he started they probably averaged 400 participants at a show and last year they were at around 800. He added they can't find room for everybody.
- Mr. Brady said that's the kind of thing the commissioners are looking to do for economic development in the county.
- Mr. Hunker noted the committee has always been of the standpoint that they are livestock people, but it can be so much more and that is why the ARPA money is so helpful because it can really make the building better. They were just going to make the building a shell, but now they can make it an event center. The question is do you wait until other infrastructure is there or build this and hope that some of that comes.
- Mr. Brady said there have already been e-mails from people in the county and people who have asked him why we are spending so much money on a hog barn at the fairgrounds. That is the reason he is asking these questions. He just wants to be able to give answers to people in the county as to why this is a good investment. Mr. Brady thought what Mr. Hunker and Mr. Boose said about people coming to those shows is doing that. If this gives Huron County an opportunity to bring people in and the Fair Board an opportunity to make some money off of this venture through rental income, they will have money for maintenance and possibly to do other things at the fairgrounds.
- Mr. Brady hoped the committee and the Fair Board would be able to get the information they need from the meeting next week, then go back to the Fair Board to decide.

At 12:52 p.m. Terry Boose moved to enter into Executive Session ORC 121.22 (G)(3) a conference with an attorney for the public body concerning disputes involving the public body that are the subject of pending or imminent court action; ORC 121.22 (G) (5) Matters required to be kept confidential by federal law or rules or state statutes; and ORC 121.22 (G) (6) Specialized details relative to the security arrangements and emergency response protocols for a public body or a public office, if disclosure of the matters discussed could reasonably be expected to jeopardize the security of the public body or public office. Bruce Wilde seconded the motion. The roll being called upon its adoption, the vote resulted as follows:

*Aye – Terry Boose
Aye – Harry Brady
Aye – Bruce Wilde*

At 2:00 p.m. Bruce Wilde moved to end Executive Sessions ORC 121.22 (G)(3) (5) & (6). Terry Boose seconded the motion. The roll being called upon its adoption, the vote resulted as follows:

*Aye – Terry Boose
Aye – Harry Brady
Aye – Bruce Wilde*

***Action taken**

Bruce Wilde moved to notify the architect that the chosen location of the Senior Center is the one behind the License/Title Bureau and is site option b on the map. Terry Boose seconded the motion. The roll being called upon its adoption, the vote resulted as follows:

*Aye – Terry Boose
Aye – Harry Brady
Aye – Bruce Wilde*

They would like Ms. Ziemba to notify the architect of the location so they can proceed with soil borings.

At 2:10 p.m. Bruce Wilde moved to adjourn. Terry Boose seconded the motion. The meeting stood adjourned.

IN THE MATTER OF CERTIFICATION

The Clerk to the Board does hereby attest that the foregoing is a true and correct record of all actions taken by the Board of Huron County Commissioners on April 20, 2023.

REGULAR SESSION

THURSDAY

APRIL 20, 2023

IN THE MATTER OF ADJOURNING

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. With no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 2:10 p.m.

Signatures on File