William F. Hutson called the special meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. with Stephen D. Hambley and Colleen M. Swedyk present. The meeting was held in the commissioners' hearing room and opened with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Hutson stated that the purpose of the special meeting was for the purpose of discussing the American Rescue Plan and the funds that Medina County is receiving. The plan was signed into law March 11, 2021 and provided $1.9T in economic stimulus for the country. Among other things, it extended and enhanced unemployment benefits, provided direct payments in the amount of $1,400 per person, a 15% increase to food stamp benefits, provided grants for small businesses, funds for housing/rental assistance, and provided $350B in economic aid to states, cities, villages, counties and other units of local government; included within that is $60B to counties across the U.S. Over the next couple of years, Medina County will be receiving just under $35M in funds the commissioners will be able to allocate in the county. He explained that this meeting will be to discuss the process by which the funds will be allocated, the parameters of an allowable project and what can be funded, and a couple of decisions may be made on specific projects that are smaller in nature but have some urgency to getting them accomplished, however, the primary focus will be on the process.

Amy Lyon-Galvin referenced an overview document published by the National Association of Counties noting that they did a nice job of condensing information contained in the 151 pages of the final rule. She stated that the framework is set to "turn the tide on the pandemic, address its economic fallout and lay the foundation for a strong and equitable recovery." The counties are described as having broad flexibility as long as they can demonstrate the activities support the public health response or that recipients of the recovery funds have experienced harm from the pandemic. She explained that there are five major categories identified for the allowable use of funds and noted that examples provided are not all inclusive. The categories are as follows:

1. **Support Public Health Response**
   Examples: PPE purchases, capital investments to mitigate COVID-19 in public facilities, ventilation improvements in congregate and healthcare settings, COVID-19 treatment and medical services, enhanced behavioral and mental health services, payroll support for local health/safety workforce, improve public health programs, and to address disparities in public health outcomes.

2. **Address Negative Economic Impacts**
   Examples: Assistance to households, small businesses and nonprofits, aid to impacted industries, job training to unemployed or underemployed workers, services to address individuals experiencing homelessness, support for tourism/travel/hospitality sectors, services for qualified census tract and other disproportionately impacted areas of our community.

3. **Replace Public Sector Revenue Loss**
   Permitted use of funds to support government services up to the amount of lost revenue experienced during the pandemic. This is calculated from total revenues from taxes, charges and miscellaneous general revenue which has a formula comparing pre-pandemic 2019 revenues and 4.1% annual growth is applied to it, or, what you can demonstrate in your three fiscal years prior to the COVID-19 pandemic.

4. **Premium Pay for Essential Workers**
   Additional compensation to both county employees and other essential workers in the community facing the greatest health risk due to their service. They are advising that this prioritized low and moderate income persons and the definition of essential work involves regular in-person interactions, or regular physical handling of items also handled by others.

5. **Water, Sewer and Broadband Infrastructure**
   Examples: Drinking water infrastructure projects such as building or upgrading facilities, transmission, distribution and storages systems. On the wastewater side it includes construction, improvement or repairs to treatment plants. It includes controlling non-point source pollution, flooding control, creation of green infrastructure. It also includes the provision to unserved or underserved locations new or expanded broadband access.

Ms. Lyon-Galvin noted the timelines including:

- Funds cover costs from March 3, 2021 through December 24, 2024
- Funds must be incurred and obligated by December 31, 2024
- Funds must be expended to cover obligations and all work performed and completed by December 31, 2026
- Consideration is given retroactively only to application of premium pay to January 27, 2020

She stated that Medina County is expected to receive the first half of the $34.9M ($17.45M) this week with the second half coming in twelve months; the first status report is due August 1, 2021. Mr. Hambley inquired if the individual required to register with ID.me is with the Auditor's office; Ms. Lyon-Galvin confirmed.

Mrs. Swedyk suggested that the commissioners focus on the $17.45M and hold off until the end of the year on the balance as they don't know what could happen with some of the departments as she doesn't think it's responsible to incur all $35M right now. Mr. Hambley inquired if departments will be asked to submit any potential projects during budget hearings for additional funding, or will it be kept a totally separate process. Mr. Hutson asked if this money will go in the general fund. Scott Miller stated that it will go in a special fund and will be expended from that special fund. Mr. Hutson suggested in answer to Mr. Hambley's previous question that the requests be kept separate. Mrs. Swedyk noted that she's suggesting that some of it be reserved for later to see where we are and what we need; Mr. Hutson stated that makes sense. He suggested a formal application process as was done for the small business grants; there was a standardized approach to submitting the grant requests. Mrs. Swedyk added that the application could have the grantee list which of the five categories they believe their request falls under. Mr. Hambley stated that according to what he's heard, other counties are doing exactly that – an application and a process to review. They are all saying the same thing – they are going to take their time and try to spend responsibly. He stated that maybe as they are developing theirs, we can take a look at what they are doing in terms of process. Mr. Hutson stated that he thinks we had a very good process with the small business grants; Mrs. Swedyk noted there were three rounds of small business grants.

Mr. Hutson suggested setting deadlines for the submission of projects; Mrs. Swedyk agreed on setting deadlines at least for what will be allocated for this year. Mr. Hambley stated that some projects are going to come sooner than others; every project has its own timeline. He suggested designing the process then figuring out what to set noting that there will also need to be clarity regarding the minor civil units which he is hopeful that will be resolved fairly quickly. Mrs. Swedyk noted that she picked a number and that's what Ms. Lyon-Galvin allocated for it to look like across the townships and villages. Mr. Hambley added that all of those would need to make sure they were qualified and would also have to apply. If we're going to have to take liability for that, they likewise would have to apply because we are responsible; Mr. Hutson and Mrs. Swedyk agreed. Mrs. Swedyk stated that the first step for the townships and villages would have to set a dollar amount. Mr. Hutson added that as he understand it, some of the villages are getting their own allocation; Mr. Hambley noted there is a list as to which villages and townships are receiving this. Ms. Lyon-Galvin stated that they are still taking comments on the interim final rule through July 9, so depending on responses from townships, as that is one that has been quite in trying to get a different interpretation, they may receive their own allocations based on the fact that comments are being received through July 9. Mr. Hutson stated that townships still have the opportunity to get funding through the state as a sub-recipient; Mr. Hambley noted that is yet to be determined. He stated that since we're waiting for those interim rules to be finally adopted, maybe as part of our process we also can come to an agreement as to what few of these need to really move now. Mrs. Swedyk stated that we also need to see which of our villages are getting funding; Mr. Hambley agreed.

Mrs. Swedyk asked if there are any projects Mr. Hutson and Mr. Hambley are ready to move on. Mr. Hutson stated that he thinks one that is critical from a timing standpoint is the Fair Board; Mrs. Swedyk and Mr. Hambley agreed. Mrs. Swedyk suggested that if it's decided to do the boiler at the County Home, it might be best to get bids out in time before fall and winter. Mr. Miller stated that the original plan was to replace the boiler next year or the year after because of funding, but if it could be done this year with these monies, it would be helpful because it needs to be done; Mr. Hambley noted that he is in agreement. He explained that his attitude is remembering that all this money is borrowed money; it may not be on the county's ledger, but it's on everybody's ledger including our children's ledger and grandchildren's ledger and has to be paid back. He stated that he is emphasizing things that are permanent improvements and capital improvements. Mr. Hutson agreed adding that he thinks the money needs to be invested in the county so that the county gets a long term benefit. Mrs. Swedyk stated that the boiler is needed. Mr. Hambley agreed stating before starting this process and submitting proposals, there are a few projects we know we're going to get done regardless. Mrs. Swedyk mentioned the Fair Board's request, Mr. Hambley stated that its revenue replacement. Mr. Hutson noted that they also had some upgrades to hands-free faucets, etc. Mr. Miller explained that the total cost is $126,845; he reviewed the items in the request. Mrs. Swedyk stated that besides those expenses, considering the revenue loss from last year, those expenses are much more difficult for them.

There was discussion regarding a scoring matrix for the submitted requests. Mr. Miller stated that the Fair is the most time pressing project. Other than that, he suggested taking our time because it is much more restrictive than the prior CARES funding. He stated we need to make sure we're getting the biggest bang for the buck. He suggested the commissioners rank the current list according to priority. Mrs. Swedyk added that it should be made clear that the county departments are prioritized. Mr. Hutson noted that technically even nonprofits could make a request and potentially be funded. Mrs. Swedyk added that some of the county's capital improvements should be prioritized. There was discussion regarding what constitutes a county department. Mr. Miller stated that the list contains county departments including the Health Department and the Park Districts. He noted that we have $65M in requests, so the requests are already at $30M more than what the county is getting. Mr. Hambley suggested that an evaluation list be put together for scoring. After discussion, the commissioners agreed that the following criteria be included in the matrix for independent scoring by the commissioners which will be brought together for discussion *(score ranges to be from 1-5 with 5 being the highest)*:

- Permanency of improvement (greater than 5 years)
- Project fits into allowable parameters
- County Department vs. other department/agency
- Are other funds available to that department/project
- Impact to the community

Mr. Miller inquired if the "impact to the community" means number of residents it's benefitting; Mr. Hutson confirmed. Mr. Hambley stated that whoever receives this money is going to have to meet the same criteria that the county would. How would that apply to a business in verifying that the funds have been spent appropriately? Businesses and individuals aren't audited and public entities are. Ms. Lyon-Galvin explained that in following the example of the prior CARES funding, any sub-grant that was allocated had a strict list of requirements they had to adhere to and an acknowledgement that they would comply with those allowable uses, and there was a follow up component where they had to demonstrate that they had spent those monies appropriately.

Mr. Miller suggested that if the commissioners are okay with the request from the Fair Board, he would like to get that approved so they can begin the process of getting what they need; the commissioners agreed and Mr. Miller will prepare a resolution. Mrs. Swedyk inquired about also doing a resolution moving forward with the boiler for the County Home; Mr. Hambley and Mr. Hutson agreed. Mr. Miller stated that can put each project on a scoring sheet so the commissioners can begin scoring; scores can be added to the spreadsheet to assist in making some final determinations on projects. Mr. Hambley asked if this would be closing the door on any other projects. Mr. Hutson suggested having an open period for submission of applications to continue until July 9, then from July 9 until the middle of August can be used for evaluation and scoring, then late August/beginning of September, some decisions can be made on the projects they want to fund. Mrs. Swedyk asked for clarification on who applications will be accepted from. Mr. Hutson stated that at this point, he is not in favor of opening it up to wide, but there are some other housing projects they may want to consider, and we are still waiting on some guidance as to what the definition and possible use of a public safety employee, and whether we can use funds to fund those kinds of programs. Mrs. Swedyk stated that there are some entities that have made several requests or sub-requests; she inquired how those will be scored and suggested those entities be required to submit their projects individually so they can be scored individually. Mr. Miller stated that to eliminate those things, he and Amy can go through and make a note beside the projects they don't think can be justified. Mrs. Swedyk explained that the Park District submitted two completely separate projects, and she thinks they should be scored individually. Mr. Hutson asked if Ms. Lyon-Galvin can put those in the spreadsheet as separate components; Ms. Lyon-Galvin confirmed. Mr. Miller and Ms. Lyon-Galvin will create a scoresheet for the commissioners' review and comments. Once it is finalized, the individual projects will be inserted into the scoresheets. They will also request any additional applications from departments who may not have submitted in this first round. The commissioners agreed to keep the application submissions open until July 9.

Mr. Hambley stated that Economic Development Corporation published a list of all the aid that is coming down to assist small businesses and tourism noting that those have separate funding available which is why he suggested holding back and not expanding; even the state expanded theirs to include bars, restaurants, hotels, etc. Mrs. Swedyk noted that one of the scoring categories is access to other funding.

The commissioners thanked Ms. Lyon-Galvin for preparing the spreadsheet and binders noting that she did a very nice job. These items will be discussed during future regular commissioners' meetings. The commissioners agreed that the addition of scoring categories may be reserved until the decision to fund or not fund is made. Mr. Hambley mentioned that he is looking forward to seeing how some of the other counties are doing this.

Adjournment
Mr. Hambley moved to adjourn the meeting; Mrs. Swedyk seconded the motion. Roll call showed all commissioners voting AYE; the motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 6:41 p.m.

All deliberations concerning official business and formal actions by this Board of Commissioners were conducted in an open public meeting this twenty-fifth day of May, 2021.

COMMISSIONERS

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen D. Hambley

OF

Colleen M. Swedyk

Rhonda J. Beck
Clerk to the Commissioners

MEDINA COUNTY

William F. Hutson