

Randolph County Commissioners

March 15, 2021

The Randolph County Commissioners met at their regular meeting at 9:00AM in the Commissioners and Council Room in the Courthouse with the following members present: Board President Michael Wickersham, Tom Chalfant and Gary Girton. Also present was Randolph County Auditor Laura J Martin, Sheriff Art Moystner and County Attorney Meeks Cockerill.

Michael Wickersham, President presided over the meeting.

Pledge of Allegiance

Greg Beumer – Public Hearing - COVID-19 Phase 2 OCRA Grant - close out

Mike said this is where OCRA helped the local businesses with Covid-19 related expenses and loss of revenue.

Greg said this is for the phase two grant and this is the close out, that grant helped many small businesses in Randolph County retain 68 jobs and provided forgivable loans, at this point this is the close out and is simply an opportunity for the public to either ask questions or to receive comments. With that I will ask does anyone have comments or questions about the grant.

Greg said Ceann Bales, Director of Economic Development and through her office they had a lot to do with helping to get the grant and then administrating the grant once it was received.

Ceann said I want to thank the Commissioners for allowing us to do this and of course we had a volunteer revolving loan committee who met and looked over all of our applications through the whole process and we were able to award and get all of those funds out. The response of the first round and round two, people were saying if it weren't for you we would not have been able to survive Covid and get through. Again, we can't thank you enough for the support and the connections that we were able to make through our office. I have actually continued to talk to two others, they're still struggling, because we connected through this, we have built that relationship and I am working to help them find some other avenues of support. I just can't thank you enough. I know we helped 15 businesses and again, thank you and hopefully there will be more in the future.

Greg asked if anyone else had comments. He asked Commissioners do you have anything you would like to add to the minutes.

Mike said I do not have any questions or comments.

Gary said I just think it was a great program and I know I talked to two different ones that were involved and they certainly appreciated it and mentioned about how it could very well have saved their business.

Greg said seeing no other questions or comments, this technically takes care of the requirements for the public hearing for the office of Community and Rural Affairs and we can close the public hearing.

Mike called the public hearing closed.

Greg Beumer – Grantee Performance report

Mike said we need to approve the grantee performance report that has been submitted by Greg Beumer, the grant administrator. It shows our local match of \$50,000.00 and OCRA funds of \$250,000.00.

Gary made a motion to authorize Mike Wickersham to sign the grantee performance report on behalf of the Randolph County Commissioners. Tom seconded. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Mike said in addition there will be a semi-annual report due for the next two years and Greg has asked that we go ahead and authorize the signing of those reports at this point and time. I am okay doing that if you guys are okay doing that.

Tom said will we see these reports?

Mike said yes, they are not done yet. We will see them. Basically, it is a reporting of who has the money and how much they have used and how many jobs they have retained.

Greg said did we truly save their business and so on.

Mike said that is really kind of a default. If we didn't they don't have to pay the money back.

Gary made a motion to grant Mike Wickersham the authority to oversee that and sign those reports. Tom seconded. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Greg said I would also report that we did turn in the phase III application this past Thursday and as a reminder that is Covid money that is earmarked for child care. If it is awarded it would help the two YMCA daycares, Winchester and Union City.

Mike said you might explain why the third one is not involved in that.

Greg said at the time of the public hearing we did include Kidztown Academy. These grants require that they serve 51% low/moderate income families. The number of families at Kidztown are not low/moderate income was significantly high, so no matter how we worked the numbers we just couldn't keep Kidztown in the mix. It is unfortunate that, that is a requirement of the grant.

Jake Donham – Mowing bids, Asphalt bids

Jake said I got some mowing quotes for this coming season and hopefully I got them emailed to everyone for review. The first one I got is for out at the old infirmary area. Smiley has mowed it for years and as we have kind of gotten away from properties out there he has adjusted his pricing out there as well. I am not 100% sure what is ours and what is not, he takes care of everything south of the drive where the shooting area is.

Meeks said that is still ours.

Mike said and the lot between the barns and the highway is still ours.

Jake said that is what he maintained last year and that is what priced out for this year as well.

Mike said \$65 a mow?

Jake said yes. He does above and beyond out there on that and does a real good job for us. The other ones are for Courthouse, RCFFO and EMS building. We got a quote from White Oak Lawn Care and then Myers Landscaping. There was not a huge difference in pricing, Myers is a little higher but he has done it for several years and has done us a really good job and I would recommend staying with Myers.

Mike said \$20.00 a mow difference?

Jake said yes.

Mike said I saw the highway was added in there.

Jake said when Royce put his bids together he had mowed those last year so he gave pricing on that also. I just made a copy of that and gave it to Mike Haffner.

Mike said we are not approving the highway today?

Jake said correct.

Mike said you have heard the recommendation on the mowing quotes \$185.00 a mow from Myers for the EMS, RCFFO and the Courthouse and White Oak is \$165.00. Jake is recommending Myers and recommending Smiley for our area out near the old county home.

Gary made a motion to approve the recommendation for mowing. Tom seconded. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Jake said the other item is I had called American Asphalt which is the company we have used for several years on all our parking areas. Last year of course the RCFFO building we repaved everything and I knew it was going to need a seal coat and they recommended letting it sit six-months to a year before they put their seal coat on it. I contacted them to get the pricing on seal coat and I told them while they were in the area to check the two facilities as well, the Sheriff's

Department and the EMS building and if it needs anything to give me a price on them. Those three quotes are in front of us as well. I am getting all those areas cleaned up sealed up for the upcoming years.

Mike said is most of this for the RCFFO building sealing?

Jake said it is 100% seal everything.

Mike said it mentions cracks in there and there are not that many cracks.

Jake said there is a few little hairlines cracks that popped up over the winter and that's why I wanted to call Arnold and touch base with him. He said that is common on new asphalt with the freeze and thaw. He didn't see anything that was hugely a problem. He said a seal coat will more than likely will seal all that and take care of it.

Mike said sealing that building parking lot is \$8,301.18, EMS is \$880.00 and the jail is, and I presume that has cracks in it, is \$3,880.00.

Jake said yes.

Gary said will they do this later in the summer?

Jake said he said they are filling up their schedule pretty quick, the sooner they can get it, the sooner we get the quotes it to them. He didn't see anything that was super critical on doing it right away but he said it is definitely something that needed done.

Mike said if we approve these they can be paid out of Cum cap.

Gary made a motion to approve the quotes from American asphalt and pay the expenses out of Cum cap. Tom seconded. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Jake said I will give you a quick update. Gary and I a few weeks ago had talked and tried to get ideas just to evaluate all the buildings and see where we were at with certain projects. Some stuff that is going to be upcoming here, I am getting some pricing on. One of them being the south side of the courthouse, the basement entrance, the service entrance, the retaining wall there at the service drive is really starting to heave out and this winter was really hard on it with as wet as it was. I am getting pricing on getting that wall replaced and shored up. When I talked to Culy's over the phone, he said it sounds like there is a drainage issue possibly behind that wall and we may need to look at putting a drainage in there and backfill some gravel so maybe the water will leach away from that wall. That is going to be upcoming.

Tom said how old is that wall?

Jake said I have no idea, that particular wall has been added onto a couple different times. There is block on one section of it and then poured wall on the other.

Tom said it wasn't in the remodeling?

Jake said no, it has been there a long time. It looks like they remodeled it years ago when they put a small elevator in there for the handicap lift. That was in there I don't know how long but it is pretty old but it is definitely going to need replaced this year. It is really heaving pretty good. Some of the other smaller projects I am seeing. I want to have somebody come to the Community Corrections/Probation building and look at the roof and see where we are at with it. Let the roofing company decide, does it need a new roof or can we patch and repair. We have done that for the past few years and gotten by. Other than that, just basic maintenance stuff right now.

Gary said did you say the rest of or part of the chiller needed to be cleaned this summer or was that all done last year?

Jake said the chiller at the old hospital?

Gary said yes.

Jake said it should be good this year. I will definitely when I have a service tech over there from Salyer-Taylor for anything else, I will have him put eyes on it to just see where we are at with it. It was 100% serviced and cleaned last year.

Joe Edwards, SRI – Commissioner's Certificate sale – Resolution 2021-05

Joe said this is my annual spill about your certificate sale. I have a packet for each of you and in the packet is a proposed resolution, proposed contract, a list of the 39 properties that you all have or are the proud owners of the certificate as of last fall. I think it is about \$150,000.00 in taxes. What this proposal sets out is the same thing we have done the last multiple years certificate sale held here in this room. Last year it was held on June 25th. I did check with Danita to make sure that would still work for her office. I know it is far enough away from collections that the treasurer will be okay. I would propose that we come close to that date, it doesn't have to be same date. But some time the middle part of June to give the Auditors office and the treasure plenty of time to take off properties from this list when they certify the list for the regular tax sale on July 1st. With 39 that is not a big chore. Last year the minimum bid was \$200.00, I need you all to confirm that or change it whichever you prefer. I am not sure there would be a reason to change it necessarily, I think \$200.00 has been the standard for a while here in Randolph County. If you want to change that number, it is certainly in your bailiwick to do that. Those are basically the three things I am seeking today, is approving the resolution, assign the minimum bid and approve the contract. That is the same contract that we have used for a long time. Any questions?

Gary made a motion to accept the contract and sign it. Tom seconded. All aye votes. Motion carried.

RESOLUTION 2021-05

A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING THE INTENT TO CONDUCT A COMMISSIONERS' SALE TO SELL TAX SALE CERTIFICATES FOR PROPERTIES THAT ARE SEVERELY DELINQUENT IN PAYMENT OF PROPERTY TAXES.

WHEREAS, there are several properties in Randolph County that are severely delinquent in the payment of property taxes, having been offered for tax sales and which received no bids equal to or in excess of minimum sale price. The parcel numbers of those properties being attached to this resolution as "**Exhibit A**", and

WHEREAS, there is an assessed value associated with these properties for taxation purposes, but no taxes are being collected, therefore causing a lower than expected tax distribution to those taxing units and taxing districts within which the properties are located, and

WHEREAS, the Randolph County Commissioners desire to have these properties back on the tax rolls with taxes being collected, and

WHEREAS, IC 6-1.1-24-6, *et seq.* allows for the Randolph County Commissioners to acquire a lien on those delinquent properties and receive issuance of the tax sale certificates for those properties, without taking title to the properties, therefore limiting the liability and cost normally associated with taking title,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Randolph County Board of Commissioners that the County Executive shall acquire liens and receive tax sale certificates of the properties listed on **Exhibit A** that are severely delinquent and sell said certificates at a properly advertised Commissioner Tax Certificate sale.

Gary made a motion to approve resolution 2021-05 as presented. Tom seconded. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Joe asked do you want to stick with the \$200.00 minimum bid?

Gary made a motion that we maintain the \$200.00 minimum bid. Tom seconded. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Perry Knox and Dan Mullaney, SJCA – Bridge report

Perry introduced Dan Mullaney who is your engineer and project manager for Randolph County's county wide bridge inventory.

Dan said thank you for giving us time this morning to present our findings from the phase I bridge inspections in the fall of 2020. My name is Dan Mullaney and you all know Perry, he has made his face pretty well known around here. I believe you guys are pretty familiar with SJCA we are based out of Indianapolis, we do work all over the state, we've done bridge inspections in I think 72 of the 92 counties now and climbing. We are very committed to bridge inspection in Indiana, we are familiar with a lot of the unique challenges that you have to face. I want to thank you guys for the opportunity to do this work, for selecting us for the county wide bridge inspection contract beginning in 2020 with phase I, our 4-year contract. The way the state does these, it is a 4-year cycle, there is a phase I inspection, that is the first year and then phase II inspections are two years later, so that is inspections of all the county bridges and then the in between years, the second and fourth years of the cycle, phase 1A and 2A is all the bridges that

require more frequent inspections, 12-month frequency inspections. As I mentioned phase I was done in August and September of 2020, all the field work. Because the county, the county has 216 total bridges and that is defined by the federal highway administration as an opening of 20' or more span length, that could also be multiple barrels, culverts, if the total opening is 20' or more, that is what qualifies it to get into your bridge inventory. The county has 216 bridges and because it is over 150, the state allows two-months, two compliance months to complete those inspections. Your compliance months are in August and September. Every two years for the phases, August and September is when those inspections will take place. All of your bridges in the fall received routine inspections which is an assessment of the overall condition of all components of the bridges. In addition, we did three critical inspections on three of your steel truss bridges, that is bridge 114, 154 and 284 and those are more in-depth inspections to investigate the steel numbers attention and it is do to the nature of those bridges and their lack of redundancy, they just require more detail to make sure all the components are in good shape. In addition, in the fall we did one underwater inspection, evaluating all the in-water components that couldn't be conducted during a normal routine inspection. That was on bridge 9 on county road 1150 west. The county actually has another bridge, bridge 32 on 100 west that will require an underwater inspection and that is scheduled for later this year, in 2021. That will be done during phase 1A inspections. As far as some of the changes since 2018 phase II inspections the county has replaced three bridges since then, bridge 64 on 700 north, bridge 131 on 300 west and bridge 142 on base line road. You guys are keeping up on the needs of bridges. Those have been done since 2018 and in addition you also did a major rehabilitation of historic select bridge 305 here in Winchester, on South Street. Kind of a summary of our findings and our book, we have this big dinosaur book here but you all have copies on the flash drives that we just gave to you, there are also copies of our updated bridge map on those usb drives. We have a hard copy of the map in the book and we will also be delivering hard copies of the map, mounted maps. We have one for your office here, the Commissioners, we will give one to the Highway Department. As far as the 216 bridges, some of our findings we have 27 of those bridges are posted for a weight restriction currently. That is 12.5% of the bridges and there are a couple reasons for that. Obviously, deterioration is one of the reasons but another reason is when we do our load rating analysis on these bridges, some of the bridges that were built a long time ago for older more out dated truck wide loads. When they evaluated for loads that are in use today, required that weight restriction for that reason. You have five bridges that are currently closed on your inventory, three of those have been permanently closed. Those are truss bridges 49, 226 and 301. Those have been permanently closed for a while. The other two are bridge 21 which is on county road 500 N and bridge 304 which is right here in Winchester on Carl Street. Bridge 304 was just closed over the past several months based on our investigations, it has essentially, it had previously been posted for a 4-ton load and it had, had repairs and repairs and repairs underneath and has essentially exhausted its useful life at this point. We cannot adequately determine the potasity based on the repairs that have been done under there and its time has come for work on that one. Scour critical bridges, you are doing really well in this department, there is only one bridge that is rated as scour critical, which means that it has the potential during a large rain event to scour out the foundation and that is bridge 301, which is one of the bridges that is permanently closed. Because it is permanently closed it doesn't require monitoring during or after rain events, very good shape there. As far as our load rating analysis on all of your bridges. You may be familiar but the state issued new load rating guidance in 2018-2019 and required all bridges in the state to come up to compliance with the new legal loads that are in use

in the state. All bridges were re-evaluated, you guys were in compliance with all those load ratings. SJCA primarily updated our load ratings during phase I to evaluate some of the box beam structures that previously didn't actually have calculations done, they were just based on engineering judgement assessments of the bridges and we were able to use the old INDOT standard drawings for these types of bridges were in use at the time of construction to get an approximate capacity analysis on those bridges. As far as posting changes since 2018, we really don't have any posting changes, the only real change was the closure of bridge 304, in terms of the capacity of the bridge. As I mentioned we will be out there again later this fall for the phase 1A inspections, those are bridges that require a 12-month inspection frequency, so more frequent inspections and that is typically because they have lower condition ratings, so it is the ones where you need eyes on those bridges more often. There are 19 total bridges that require a 12-month frequency in the county. One of the things that we also prepared for you, it is in the report, its on the flash drive, but I made some copies of it as well. It is a snapshot of kind of an asset management plan that we developed based on our current findings from phase I so, obviously this list can change over time as conditions change on some of these bridges but, its our determination of what the priorities, our recommendations as to what the priorities should be for bridge work and management. This is more for major bridge work, either for replacement or rehabilitation of existing bridges and their broken down on that list by replacement and rehabilitation. We also have estimated costs for each of those bridge projects on that list, estimated construction costs. I know the county is taking an active roll in addressing some of these needs, you were just awarded federal funding on two bridge replacement projects, bridge 32 and bridge 85 so congratulations on that. We were also grateful to help you guys on those applications for federal aid for those two bridges. I know there are a couple others on the pipeline, I think 250 and there are a couple others that I think we are looking at for federal aid for the next round. Federal aid applications are generally better suited for larger bridge projects, some of the higher price tags, estimated costs, if you receive the federal aid not only does it cover construction costs but it also covers design costs which is a great mechanism to apply for. Another potential avenue for funding is the Community Crossings grants that the state has been doing for the last few years, that does not cover design costs, so the county has to put in the up-front investment of having a project designed and essentially shovel ready before they apply for those Community Crossings grants but that is another way to get funding for some of these projects. That has been a big help to a lot of counties. We are happy to help with any questions you may have on those grant applications as well. I think that is pretty much it, if you have any questions we would be happy to answer them and if you have questions after the meeting today as well, feel free to reach out. I mentioned the field work that we do is kind of in four phases over the next four years and we do it in August and September, but we're your consultant full time for these four years so don't hesitate to reach out in the meantime.

Tom said Dan you said that we were keeping up with our bridges, is that an accurate statement?

Dan said I would say that you are putting in work, it is not as if there is no work being done to improve the bridges but based on the priority schedule there is a good amount of investment needed for those bridges. One of the columns on the priority schedule is a bridge sufficiency rating which is calculated based on all of our input, it determines the sufficiency of a bridge to remain in service. A 100 is essentially a perfect bridge, brand new, pristine condition and a zero is a bridge that failed. That takes into account not only structural deterioration but also a bridge

maybe the geometry isn't accurate because it is way too narrow, it is maybe only suited for one lane of traffic, so that actually knocks that sufficiency rating down too. As you can see some of those higher priority bridges, the sufficiency rating is pretty low. There is definitely a lot of opportunity for investment to continue to address your inventory.

Tom said do you have any kind of a pier review, like all the counties you've worked in, how do we rank according to other counties with our bridge sufficiency ratings? Are we the bottom third, top third, is there any idea?

Dan said based on the counties that I have been responsible for and worked for, I don't know of a comparison tool that compares all the counties in general but based on the ones that I have seen, I'd say based on the sufficiency ratings you are probably in the middle third to maybe high bottom third in terms of sufficiency ratings.

Mike said wouldn't that relate to the number of bridges that you have and the budget you have?

Dan said it does, 216 bridges is a lot of bridges. You see the priority list is fairly substantial, it's also not a list that is supposed to indicate that you need to take on all these projects right now, we try to lay out a plan on that list for maybe when some of that work is needed based on our assessment. We want you to have that upfront, so you can prepare and potentially apply for necessary funding, anything of that nature that you can be ahead of it. It's a tool for maybe the next 15 or 20 years to look at long term and plan those projects.

Meeks said I have asked this question more than once about the Carl Street bridge, there is a sanitary sewer system underneath that one also, I don't know if you know that or not but there is a sewer down there. What is the plan, because I sit through the City Council meetings too and I know that is a concern? What do you think it is going to take to get that bridge back?

Mike said \$910,000.00.

Dan said that is our estimate based on our recommendation for a full replacement of the bridge, that cost would not include any utility relocation costs, so as far as if we were to relocate the sanitary sewer that would be additional costs.

Meeks said I don't know how you would relocate it.

Dan said the other option would be to pursue, if you were trying to get it back open, we could potentially do a super structure replacement. I know the beams under there are pretty much sagging, we would definitely need to replace the beams under the deck, that is something we could investigate, it was recommended for a full replacement based on the condition of the substructure, your end supports. We feel it would be in the best interest to completely replace those and get a brand new 75 year/80-year design life bridge. If you were to replace the super structure, your substructure which is everything underneath the supports would be your controlling factor, so that would limit how long your new super structure would last but that would get the bridge opened if the county is interested in getting the bridge opened more quickly and for a little less cost.

Gary said if we are saying some of the issues underneath, any and all that they are, we can't correct them. What option do we have?

Dan said for the sewer?

Gary said yes.

Dan said we could investigate options to avoid relocation of the sewer.

Mike said we didn't have a lot of issue with the sewer.

Perry said if you put that bridge on federal aid funding, you can apply in your initial application for a reimbursable utility, which in that case it would potentially qualify, I can't say it definitely does because you never know when they grant the money. Similar to what we did on bridge 85, we applied for a reimbursable utility as part of that federal grant because there is a lift station. You are looking at the earliest possible application for that project would be this December, you would get that bridge replaced in 2027. We are looking at Community Crossing matching grant for that structure, Shirley and Dan have been working on a solution for that and again full replacement is recommended to get the full value. Community Crossing matching grant, if we've got it under contract in the next 60-days, one year for permits, it'll go in second call next year, you are looking at earliest possible construction 2023. However, utility reimbursements are not a qualifying expense for Community Crossings. That would have to be funded outside of, because Community Crossings only function, only pays for construction, that's it.

Meeks said I would assume the City would have to pick up the sewer.

Mike said we did Franklin Street, I'm not sure we paid for any sewer when we did that. I guess I'm not sure why were talking about the sewer. We did 32 we did Franklin Street, we did South street, Carl is the next one south, I think for me, I think we should replace it. I don't think we should try to fix it.

Dan said that is why we have it in our replacement list, we feel that would be the best value.

Meeks said you are saying 2023 is the quickest you would be thinking and 2027 if they replace it.

Perry said yes, the delay is the permits because they are typically one year and you are going to need them all because you are in town. You are going to need a significant amount of permitting on that project. That's the states turnaround time.

Mike said do we have any other questions of Perry or Dan?

Gary said when you give the priority rating, is that based solely on the structural ability of the bridge?

Dan said primarily structural deterioration, structural condition. I will say that it is more focused on structural condition for the replacement list. I'd say it's a little more, we take other factors into consideration as far as the rehabilitations and repairs but that definitely is a consideration. You will notice bridge 85 is one that we actually had on there as a rehabilitation but the county got the replacement funds for it which is excellent. That is not number one on the list but that's the highest traveled bridge in the county, so that is obviously a very high priority for you. If you have questions about this list or maybe have additional input we'd be happy take that into account as well. We got input from Mike Haffner as well during the process. That is a great question and I would say it is mostly structural rating, sufficiency rating but we have a little wiggle room in there for some bridges that you would prioritize over others.

Mike Haffner said let's go back to 304 with the Community Crossing, basically if that would get awarded, the second the second stage of 2023, at the time it would be actually buildable would be 2024.

Perry said we would get awarded in 2022. We would push for an application in July of 2022 and it would be awarded in August, September, right in that range in 22 and you put it out for bids by that fall, then it could go 2023. It is 18 months, so it could even go spring of 24.

Mike Haffner said if you are not going to be able to do it until the fall of 2022, that means I can't put anything in there for the spring session of 2022 because this is going to be a million dollar. You are giving up the opportunity for roads.

Perry said right now our preliminary construction cost estimate for 304 with the structure that Shirley proposed is right at \$600,000.00 and you would be eligible for \$1 million. Assuming that the final construction costs come in close to that \$600,000.00. You would have about \$400,000.00 to utilize for other things.

Mike said your point is if we ask for a million in the fall for this bridge, you can't ask for anything in the spring because you are limited to \$1 million a year.

Mike Haffner said yes.

Perry said we certainly want to maximize that, again we are not going to apply until next year, so we are going to have a very accurate number for that application, so that you will be able to maximize your million whether it is another road project or whatever it is you want. But he is right, it takes away from your road funding if you put a bridge in. Somewhere what we did this year with 110, it is only \$1 million that you are eligible for.

Mike Haffner said my second question is on bridge 32, is there any way we can, since we are getting the federal aid, we are even trying to step this up a year on federal aid. Can we ask for a variance from the state on underwater? I don't see a need to do an underwater inspection on a bridge we are going to be tearing down. That would save the county money if we don't have to do an underwater report.

Dan said it is something we can have the discussion about, I think if the bridge is in its parent condition in the fall of 21 and it will be since nothing will have happened by then, then I think right now we are required to inspect those in water elements, that are scheduled for 2021 which is part of our contract. But it is certainly something we could ask INDOT about. That would be a consideration for the new structure, is getting a design that avoids the need for an underwater inspection. Right now, there is a pier right in the middle of the water.

Mike said what does an underwater inspection cost, roughly?

Dan said roughly, I'd say probably \$6 to \$7 thousand.

Perry said 80% of that is reimbursed on federal aid.

Gary said it is good to have this information, at least based on the figures that you are putting into your formula, the priority of some of these bridges.

Perry said we had a recent conversation, Mike's got some of these bridges on there way to replacement. Bridge 173, you're in process on that one. Some of them he is already on in addition to the ones were working on. Mike has been pretty good at getting the smaller structures that he can do with his forces and letting us work on the larger structures and figuring out funding. It has been a good relationship so far.

Dan said part of what is in the report is a maintenance summary, these are items that the highway department can take care of. Some preventative maintenance items that can potentially extend the life for some of the other structures too. That is part of it as well, it is not just major work.

Gary said I agree, those types of things to me are important because that is going to lengthen the life.

Perry said I had sent over a, I had Shirley look at three bridges that were over the Whiteriver over here in Windsor.

Mike said what numbers where those again?

Perry said 162, 174 and 175. I think they are 152, 154, one of them is 212'. These are big bridges that need. And Commissioner Girton, to your question, I will let Dan explain that at this point those bridges were built in the 70's, I think the early 70's and we are looking at a deck overlay and some rehabilitation work. I think we came up with slightly over \$1 million in construction to do the rehabilitation on all three bridges and they are closely located together. There is about \$215,000.00 in design fees and preparing the plan sheets for the contractors and the bid contracts. Dan how do you think that would affect the life of those big bridges and when you get big bridges over big rivers those are big money bridges, extending their life and not having to replace them is something.

Dan said those overlays will, basically getting rid of that deteriorating surface layer of the bridge deck and then putting an overlay on it preventing more of that salt water from getting into the

deck and then eventually into the beams, that is going to extend the life, you are probably getting an extra 20-25 years out of that bridge by doing that overlay. That kind of work is just as important as you said as replacing.

Gary said I agree, particularly over there where we have traffic but we don't have extreme traffic. To have to outlay three major bridges in that area, that just takes up all the funds we have for several years. My opinion, anything we can do and I know Mike has talked about bridge tech people and getting out and doing all this and prioritizing. I think that is absolutely a necessity.

Perry said these bridges, I have been out there and looked at them and two of the bridges have precast concrete beams, the beams are actually under the deck. The seals are gone and actually deteriorated and all that salt is getting onto the actual concrete beams which is structure and now their starting to deteriorate and then further it is running down onto the piers and those pier caps are not starting to spall. The rehabilitation that we are proposing would be rehabilitation repair on all of those elements to stabilize that bridge, it is not just the deck itself, like he said we are trying to extend the life of that big bridge. A 200' bridge over Whiteriver got to be a several million-dollar project by itself if you had to replace it. I know we kind of jumped ahead there to 10, 11, 12 on our list but the fact that those are large bridges and trying to get ahead of that worst first mentality that you talked about, you can get ahead of those big bridges and kind of put them ahead then you have taken them off your radar, we can stay concentrated on these bridges that workable within your budget. The fact that they are all three located within the same area, you may get favorable bidding from a contractor. Mike and I were looking at some bridges in the north/east part of the county, there are about 3 or 4 of them up there that all have similar needs, that we will be looking at next. If you can package them up and get their life extended, that can certainly cut into that list pretty significantly. To go back to what Mike was saying about Community Crossings, I will add that we were looking at those three projects for Community Crossings, with a million dollars on those plus or minus and then \$600,000.00 on 304, I am going to use up this Community Crossings road money now for two years. So, he will not have as much money available for his road projects, which I know will be a balancing act for the county. I think those three big bridges out there is a good project, to get them off your radar and not worry about those 150' or 200' bridges over Whiteriver.

Gary said if we delay that for three or four years and they deteriorate to the point where we may not be able to do anything. Then what option do we have but replace them.

Perry said there is one particular bridge out there that Shirley has some concerns about, they will use a hydro-demolition to make sure they get all of the bad out of that bridge and if it's bad and we really can't tell until we get down in it, but if it's bad, you might be looking at an emergency deck replacement. I have asked her how many of those she's had over her history, she's had one and she has been at this about 20 plus years. There is that possibility that it is worse than we think.

Mike Haffner said what I was talking to Perry about, in reality if we are doing a Community Crossing, I would think those three bridges would have to come first on a Community Crossings and 304, it is not going to hurt it anymore as far as deterioration. Yes, I'm sure everybody wants

it opened as soon as possible but it is not going to get any worse. My thinking, if we are going to use Community Crossings, I would be thinking that those three would have to come before 304.

Mike said how soon could those be done?

Perry said do to permitting, same thing, second round next year.

Dan said it could potentially be accelerated though if we are only doing work to the surface. If we are just sealing the joints and sealing the deck with an overlay. Those things can be streamlined.

Perry said I had sent over an email with the proposal, I don't expect you to act on it today. It is something we can talk about later. I just wanted to get that information out to you and we can present a formal proposal on those three bridges at another Commissioner meeting.

Mike said I appreciate your report.

Dan said the reason it is so big, we took a lot of pictures, we feel pictures can tell a lot, especially for you guys reviewing it. You obviously have the electronic copy. All of our additional photos of the bridges are independent after the each of the report and it is all in order of the bridges.

Mike said how many pages is that.

Dan said this is all double sided, almost 1800 pages total.

Perry said we will leave one book here and then he has the same book that he will deliver to the highway department.

Dan said one thing we are looking into is utilizing some technology in those pdf copies we have given you, we are looking into being able to make that interactive, so not only do you have the electronic copy but you have an electronic table of contents where you can use the map and click on a bridge and it will take you right to that report.

Missy Williams – Request use of Courthouse lawn May 7th and June 26, 2021

Missy said Scottie and I are working in tandem on this event, two years ago we had the third-grade students from all six Randolph County Schools, remember Randolph Central has two elementary schools. I am seeking your approval to use the Courthouse Bi-centennial plaza and we ask individual office within the Courthouse if the students can visit. This is one of the rooms that they come into and we have a guide who tells them a little bit about what the Commissioner's and the Council do and a little bit about county government. We have a grant from Indiana Humanities to do this.

Gary made a motion to approve the request to use the Courthouse Bi-centennial plaza and the courthouse lawn for the third-grade student tours. Tom seconded. All aye votes.

Missy said we are bringing forward our second date, which is June 26th. We are not sure on that date but we are moving forward with trying to come up with a date and time and a place for the Randolph United appreciation dinner. Right now, we don't know if that will be 100 people, 150 people but we are looking to do that in the downtown area as an outside event, that evening, using the Bicentennial plaza for possibly a jazz band or some kind of band. We would actually have a company come in and set up tables, so I want you to keep that date and consider that for future when we have more details.

Gary made a motion to reserve June 26th for the Randolph United appreciation dinner. Tom seconded. All aye voted. Motion carried.

Missy said the last thing is we invite you to the Randolph County third grade day, because Indiana Humanities is the one that granted us the funding, Indiana landmarks will be here and we always invite some other people from Indianapolis. Please plan on attending.

Dianne and Duane, EMS – Ambulance repair

Duane said our 2016 Ford with 88,000 miles blew a spark plug out of the head, its an aluminum head, the Ford dealer said to replace the head it is \$3,694.00 and that is if they don't find any damage once the tear into it. A rebuilt motor with a 36-month warranty is \$8,765.00.

Mike asked Duane did Gary Friend get in touch with you?

Duane said yes.

Mike said what was his opinion on this?

Duane said to replace the motor.

Mike said he is willing to pay for that?

Duane said I guess so.

Mike said he told me out of Cum cap.

Gary said I think that is a better deal than replacing the head.

Tom said is that a full warranty?

Duane said yes, the Ford dealer said he doesn't recommend going with a new motor because it's only 1-year/12000 mile and on this rebuilt it's 3-years and if a water pump goes out at 34-months, warranty covers the water pump and on the new motor it doesn't cover anything.

Mike said I think we should go ahead and do it.

Gary made a motion to approve purchasing the rebuilt motor out of Cum cap. Tom seconded. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Ertel April Checkup agreement

Mike said the Ertel April checkup agreement and we decided not to go with the Covid testing?

Duane said yes.

Mike said if I were to go to the bus, could I request Covid testing at my own expense or do they just not bring it?

Duane said they could do that and that is why I want to talk to them because my understanding on the registration, that is one of the questions, if they want Covid. With the paperwork we send out about this whole thing, nobody ever reads it so, I want the Covid taken off all together because people won't read it and if they say they want the Covid then they get hit for the \$45.00. It will be a mess all the way around.

Mike said it is on here as an optional testing. The flyer that goes out or notice goes out will not have Covid testing on it?

Duane said right, I want to talk to Ertel and have them take it off the registration all together, so it is not an option at all. Like I said if we give it to them and let them pay it themselves it will be a mess.

Mike said do we want to approve the Ertel bus as we have done in the past?

Tom made a motion to approve the Ertel bus. Gary seconded. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Ambulance Purchase

Mike said I would be in favor of the first or second meeting in April, you come back with your ambulance proposal for the new ambulance which we put on the back burner last year. I presume we still need that.

Duane said yes.

Mike said we probably should start talking about it again.

Duane said do you want a bid then or just start the process.

Mike said I would confirm back to see what the two we looked at last year, whether their pricing has changed. Would that be okay to do.

Meeks said you are still going to have to bid it.

Gary said we can still bid it but that is going to give us a dollar figure to work with.

Mike said do that and then we can decide if we are going to bid it. Just come to the first meeting in April.

Resolution 2021-06

Mike said I have received an email saying Blackford County has signed the resolution. They are willing to buy our steel for \$134,436.00 which is what we have in it.

Gary Bates said yes sir.

Mike said we have pretty much determined that we don't need them. I would recommend that we sell them.

RESOLUTION NUMBER 2021-10 (BLACKFORD COUNTY)

RESOLUTION NUMBER 2021-06 (RANDOLPH COUNTY)

**RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE TRANSFER OF PERSONAL PROPERTY
BETWEEN
BLACKFORD COUNTY, INDIANA AND RANDOLPH COUNTY, INDIANA**

WHEREAS, Blackford County, Indiana and Randolph County, Indiana are political subdivisions and governmental entities (may also be referred to as Parties within this resolution) which are authorized by Indiana Code § 36-1-7 to enter into agreements to jointly exercise power; and

WHEREAS, Randolph County owns Four (4) 180' Lattice Towers. The towers are the personal property to be exchanged. These units are not being utilized by Randolph County and will be beneficial for Blackford County usage;

WHEREAS, Randolph County desires to transfer said property to Blackford County;

WHEREAS, Indiana Code § 36-1-11-8 allows Blackford County to accept exchange of personal property listed from Randolph County for \$134,436.00;

WHEREAS, Notwithstanding anything herein to the contrary, this resolution shall not be effective until all parties hereto have executed this resolution and each political subdivision has approved or ratified this resolution at a public meeting.;

WHEREAS, Neither Party is responsible for the other Party's property once the physical exchange of the personal property has occurred;

WHEREAS, the exchange of personal property will occur within thirty (30) days of the executed agreement by both Parties;

WHEREAS, Except as otherwise expressly provided herein, this resolution supersedes all prior agreements, negotiations and discussions relative to the subject matter hereof and is a full integration of the agreement of the parties.

Tom made a motion to approve the joint resolution with Blackford County, our Resolution 2021-06 to sell our steel for what was to be the broadband towers for \$134,436.00. Gary seconded. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Gary Bates said if you need it for the Resolution, there resolution number is 2021-10. I will get you a copy of their signed resolution.

Gary Bates - Logging recorder

Gary said on the logging recorder, in late January we came up and opened up some bids for the new logging recorder for the 911 and radio. Our committee met and did the scoring of the projects. The committee has unanimously voted to go with the highest score which is Nelson Systems. We are asking for approval to move forward with that pending final funding. Chris and Terry are working on the final funding for that. We would like to notify the winner and the losers and let them know. Of course, we will then get the contract between Nelson Systems and the County together and present to you once the final funding is done. We certainly appreciate everyone's help on this, it was a very close RFP process.

Mike said it looks like they rated highest with all reviewers, except for one category and one reviewer three. You heard the recommendation, any questions of Gary or Chris?

Gary made a motion to approve Nelson Systems. Tom seconded. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Veteran's Service Officer

Mike said Mike Kennedy and Cathy Shull is here this morning. I did meet with Cathy last week and I also talked with Tim Dyke at the Indiana Veterans Association. A couple things after my meeting and discussion, one of the issues before us is the offer from the Delaware County Veteran Affairs officer Nate Jones and as good as this sounds him sharing between us and Delaware County, I really don't think it is necessary. Nate I am sure is doing a good job for Delaware County and I think he does a good job for any Randolph County residents that go over there for one reason or another but I think that is his job to help veterans regardless of where they live or where they are from. I don't think he is getting bombarded by Randolph County residents because I think our office is servicing those veterans as they come in. I talked to Tim Dyke and he is still working on getting Cathy accredited and evidently there is different levels of accreditation or different accrediting bodies that can offer accreditation and he believes that he can get her accredited, I think through the Indiana Veterans affairs, I believe is what he said and if she is then she can pretty much represent or get access to what our veterans need when they come into our office. At this point in time I would recommend that we continue to allow the process to continue. I think Cathy is doing a good job for us in interim. I've not received any concerns from veterans about lack of service. Tim Dyke and Mike Kennedy both have full faith in Cathy's ability. One of the things the region is missing from talking to Cathy is a Regional Veteran's Affairs officer. Which that Regional Veteran's Affairs Officer could assist not only Cathy but other County Veteran's Affairs Officers to any assistance or help they might need and probably would relieve Tim Dyke of a lot of calls. Bottom line is I think right now, I would recommend that we continue to go with Cathy and just would add that we do have three new applicants that we have not interviewed and if we want to go ahead and interview these three applicants we can do that. I think it would be worth talking to them but as I've excluded myself from the previous interview process, I would exclude myself from this process as well. Cathy or Mike Kennedy do you have anything to share?

Mike Kennedy said I agree with not having Delaware county come over. If you are going to pay somebody to tutor Cathy, I'm right here, I still remember the job and she is getting good recommendations from Tim Dyke and other Veteran's Service Officers that she corresponds with. She would get her initial training and certification would come from the National Association of Veteran's Service Officers and they got an accreditation program with the American Legion and VFW, the Disabled American Veterans, the Purple Heart Association to get accreditations through them, so if they start her off with the National Association of Veteran's Service Officers which is where my initial accreditation came from and when you guys sent me to Illinois for training. What they do now is the training that they have in June or July, whenever they schedule it, they have the National Association there to accredit new Service Officer's every year. It would just be a matter of getting that done, Tim making sure that happens for Cathy.

Gary asked Cathy, do you have other people sign off on your paperwork?

Cathy said there is not really anything that I have to sign, there is only a couple forms that I have to sign that I have not at this time. One of the forms that Mr. Wickersham and I spoke about is for property tax deductions and when somebody comes in for that it doesn't actually apply for this year. So, unless it is some type of emergency, I have had to where I can email it, they sign off on it and email it directly back to me. It can be handled right then and there. There is that little hesitation in that process.

Mike said there is still the issue that the main office out of St Louis is still not at full capacity because of Covid. So, if there is a complaint that things aren't getting done as quickly as possible, it may not be Cathy's fault.

Cathy said if somebody needs record of their discharge papers or in-service papers, we can't get those at this time, nobody can. There are other things out of my control.

Gary said the other question is do we need a part-time secretary to assist you?

Cathy said right now because I am not as fast as what Mike was, it does take me some time to process things and so, I am able to do it as I go. It is up to you guys what you want to do.

Gary said it is up to you, what you need.

Mike said it doesn't sound like at this point in time a part-time secretary is necessary.

Cathy said I don't think I need one.

Mike said do we want to interview these three applicants or do we want to tell them that we don't want to interview them and we are no longer seeking a Veteran's Service Officer?

Gary said I don't think we need to spend the time interviewing someone, based on the information we have at the present time, has a slim chance of moving into that position.

Mike Kennedy said it depends on if Cathy can get her accreditation. If she can't get her accreditation then you might need one of those three people that are a veteran to get them in there. In my opinion, I think you should go ahead and interview them and at least you would have that back up if we can't get Cathy accredited.

Gary said would you be willing to assist in that interview process?

Mike Kennedy said yes, I would sit in on that process.

Laura said do you want the job posting left up or taken down?

Gary said take it down.

Randolph Central request for connection on the tower

Mike said Roland Abrams was here, but has left. Chris can you share some information on what he sent us a letter requesting?

Chris said our agreement does specifically state that the school corporation can have access to the tower or put things on the tower. So, that is why he drafted the letter. I don't know that I see a reason to, update or modify the MOU if the letter is attached to it and we agreed to it. That they be able to put equipment on the north and the central towers.

Mike said it goes up 100 feet and it is just opposite existing equipment or equipment that is going to be on there, I think is what that letter said. The real question for us is do we want to give Randolph Central permission to do that.

Chris said they were actually the easiest Corporation to deal with.

Gary said what else would be at the 100-foot level, you said would be close to interfering?

Mike said let me pull up his letter to make sure of what it said. Mike said you should forward the microwave 4.9 gigahertz issue that we have with the FCC and the request to reach out to our elected officials to help us with the FCC and giving us a temporary license because they have frozen those licenses. When I received that, I thought you'd sent that to everybody and you just sent it to me. I would ask that you forward that to the other two Commissioner's and all the Council. I think if we all did that we would be in a better position, there is strength in numbers.

Gary Bates asked Chris if he had forwarded the letter from the school to J & K to make sure the load bearing is good. They are the ones doing the load assessments on the towers.

Mike said the letter from Randolph Central says on the tower located at the highway garage we would install a side antenna support near 100 feet above ground level with a 20 foot tall antenna on the north side of the tower, this antenna would be connected to equipment at the shelter and then at Deerfield we request to install a side antenna support at 60 feet above ground level on the south side of the tower support antenna 10 feet tall. So, it's 100' and 60'. Someone want to move approval of that request?

Gary made a motion to approve the Randolph Central request to subject to it being authorized by J & K. Tom seconded. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Gary said do we know ordinarily if these 300' towers would possibly be available for broadband, what range?

Gary Bates said not off hand, they have given me already the antenna placements, so I can send that to you or sent it to somebody.

Gary said I think we were told we could go up with broadband to 299'. So, I didn't know what range would be available.

Gary Bates said I'm not sure where the 800 and the VHF antenna's would be and then your antenna.

Gary said that is what I told Mike that he needed to get his position so if they needed a stand out to get it on before they erected the towers.

Other Business:

Art Moystner, Randolph County Sheriff

Art said I don't recall whether I emailed you guys or not, we have acquired a decommissioned military ambulance that we are going to use to replace the 1990 Ford that we have now that we have been putting money into. There is somebody that is going to donate time and materials to put shelving in that for us and once we get it painted we will put it into service to respond out to any tactical situations that we might have in the county.

Regular Claims \$1,006,074.21

Gary made a motion to approve the regular claims as presented. Tom seconded. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Payroll Claims \$ 229,059.64

Tom made a motion to approve the payroll claims as presented. Gary seconded. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Randolph County United February claim \$18467.67

Randolph County United February Tourism Claim \$2,365.67

Randolph County United March claim \$18,467.67

Randolph County United March Tourism claim \$2,365.67

Gary made a motion to approve all four of these claims as presented. Tom seconded. All aye votes. Motion carried.

MPX Solutions Claim \$54,373.05

Gary said do you want to do them both or individual?

Mike said I am not seeing a contractor's signature on the MPX claim. Let's do the Pyramid.

Pyramid Claim \$16,658.50

Gary made a motion to approve the Pyramid Claim as presented. Tom seconded. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Mike said shouldn't this MPX application be certified.

Laura said I didn't look at it.

Gary Bates said the contractor didn't sign it?

Mike said no, the Architect signed it but not the vendor. What about the other two?

MPX Solutions Claim \$6721.80

MPX Solutions Claim \$6443.60

Mike said these two are for materials and they have not signed those either. I think we really need to have them sign them before we pay them. I suppose we could go ahead and approve payment and trust that they are going to sign them later.

Laura said I can call and ask them to come in and sign them.

Mike said one of them is for installation of the towers, the labor for installation, the bigger one is for work to date. The question is if they were signed, I wouldn't have a problem approving the payment, since the applications are not signed.

Gary Bates said if you could make a motion to pay upon signature, I will contact him and have him come in and sign.

Gary made a motion to approve the payment of all three MPX claims upon signature of the pay applications by the contractor. Tom seconded. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Perpetual Hwy Easement claim \$4,500.00

Perpetual Hwy Easement claim \$7,300.00

Mike said these claims are for the perpetual highway easements that we purchased in the southwest portion of the county.

Tom said haven't we already approved those once?

Laura said no, remember you wanted the farmers to be able to pick up their checks when they come in to sign. So, we need the claims approved and signed by the Commissioners before we can cut those checks.

Mike said again, we can approve the claim, we can write the checks and we will hold the checks until they sign these perpetual easements that we have already signed. One claim is for \$4,500.00 and one claim is for \$7,300.00.

Tom said this is coming out of windfarm?

Mike said this has already been approved by us and council to be paid out of windfarm.

Tom made a motion to approve payment of these two Perpetual Highway Easement claims upon signature of the farmers. Gary seconded. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Minutes of February 1, 16, March 1, 2021

Mike said we received a copy of these minutes via email. Are there any additions, corrections or deletions to these three sets of minutes?

Tom made a motion to approve the three sets of minutes as presented. Gary seconded. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Taylor Systems Change Order \$1,970.32

Taylor Systems Change Order \$1,078.59

Laura said one of the change orders are for extra cabling in the EOC training room in the basement of the Sheriff's department, that was added and they wanted different phones for the dispatch center than what we decided on, so they are taking off three and adding three and there were a couple extra ports.

Mike said these are for the Sheriff's Department and these change orders need to be authorized by the Commissioner's. If we are willing to accept the change orders, we need to authorize one of us to sign these change orders.

Tom made a motion to approve these change orders and allow the president of the Commissioner's to sign on behalf of the Commissioner's. Gary seconded. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Cobalt Civil Contract Exhibit G

MPX Contract Exhibit G

Laura said when you signed the contracts for Cobalt and MPX, the exhibit G's were left blank and not signed by the contractors. Cobalt completed and signed theirs, MPX completed but did not sign theirs, so if you want to sign Cobalt's, I can have MPX sign theirs and bring it back next meeting for your signature.

Mike signed Cobalt Civils contract exhibit G.

Rex Collins Electric Contract

Mike said this is the bid that we awarded at our last meeting and this is the contract that goes with that bid. This is part of the communications project.

Gary said can you tell me what it was, I could not open that file for some reason?

Mike said \$235,977.00 and there is \$15,000.00 of allowances within that contract sum.

Gary made a motion to approve this contract and allow Mike Wickersham to sign. Tom seconded. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Whitewater Valley Rural Electric Right of Way Easement

Whitewater Valley Home Owner Electric Agreement

Mike said this is for as Gary indicated, the south tower. It is in Whitewater Valley Rural Electric service area. It looks like we have a cost of \$13,519.00 to bring service to that tower. Is that correct Gary?

Gary Bates said I believe so.

Laura said I emailed Chris Shaneyfelt about that and he told me that amount of money was included in the electrical bid.

Mike said that is good news. So, we are entering an agreement with Whitewater Valley REMC to install electric service at our south tower and an application for service and membership and we have an underground electric service agreement and we have a right of way easement. We are granting them an easement to go across our property to bring electricity to the tower and then we become a Whitewater REMC member and pay for our electric service to them at the south tower.

Tom made a motion to approve.

Gary said did Country view give them an easement? The only thing we can give an easement to is across our property which is just a few feet.

Mike said I would think that they would need an easement from Country view as well.

Tom said that wouldn't come to us.

Mike said in order to bring it back to our lane, they are going to have to do that.

Gary said we can sign these but that just gives them authority to cross our property.

Mike said I have a motion to approve the right of way easement, which has been pointed out that is only part of the easement they need, our homeowner's electric agreement which cost of \$13,519.00 for installation but that is included in the contract and our service agreement with REMC. Gary seconded. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Gary Bates asked do I need to contact them and tell them they will need another easement?

Gary said I would think so. They may have already done it, I don't know.

Treasurer's Report

Gary made a motion to approve the treasurer's report. Tom seconded. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Meeks Cockerill

Meeks said I just wanted to make sure that it gets in the permanent minutes that it is Art's birthday.

Citizen Comments

None


Adjournment

Tom made a motion to adjourn. Gary seconded. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Reviewed and signed this 5 day of April, 2021.

RANDOLPH COUNTY COMMISSIONERS







ATTEST: 

Laura J Martin, Auditor of Randolph County