# Erie County Gaming Revenue Authority

## Minutes of the Board of Directors' Meeting

September 17, 2020

This meeting is held via Zoom due to Governor Wolf's orders to stay at home during the time of this COVID-19 crisis.

*CALL TO ORDER*

The Board of Directors' Meeting of the Erie County Gaming Revenue Authority was held on September 17, 2020 via Zoom with a link that was provided to all Board members by the Executive Director. An agenda containing the Zoom link to this meeting was posted on the ECGRA website and at 5240 Knowledge Parkway, Erie, PA 16510. Legal Notice of the meeting was given through an advertisement appearing in the Erie Times-News. The meeting was called to order by the Chair.

*ROLL CALL*

Mr. Bagnoni, Mr. Barney, Mr. Cleaver, Ms. Hess, Mr. Paris, and Mr. Sample. Mr. Lee, Mr. Wachter, and Dr. Wood are also present.

*APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA*

Mr. Sample makes a motion to approve the agenda as presented. Mr. Barney seconds the motion. There is no discussion of the agenda. Motion carries 6-0.

*APPROVAL OF MINUTES* – August 2020

Mr. Cleaver makes a motion to accept the minutes. Mr. Bagnoni seconds the motion. There is no further discussion on the minutes. Motion carries 6-0.

*DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS*

There are no comments by any member of the ECGRA Board at this time.

## *COMMENTS BY THE CHAIR*

Mr. Paris has no comment at this time.

## *PUBLIC COMMENT*

There is no public on the call for comments.

## *PRESENTATIONS*

There are no presentations at this time.

## *COMMITTEE REPORTS*

a. Treasurer's Report: Mr. Bagnoni makes a motion to accept the report as presented on the Board Effect site. Mr. Cleaver seconds the motion.

   There are no questions or further discussion of the Treasurer's Report. Motion carries 6-0.

b. Strategic Planning Committee: Mr. Paris: We did hold a meeting yesterday where we spoke about the Pennsylvania Municipal Retirement System, which Mr. Wachter will have more on that later, and we talked about both the Multi-Municipal grant as well as the Arts, Culture, and Heritage grants. Hopefully, we will approve those later today.

c. Update from County Council: Mr. Horton is not on the call so there is no report from him at this time.

d. Update from County Executive's Office: Mr. Lee: Thank you, Chairman Paris. I just wanted to give some highlights of the Summer JAMS 2020 Program. The bottom line is that it was a success; we were very pleased at the County how GECAC conducted the program. As you know with the pandemic going on, we allowed it to be up to the employers whether they wanted to go forward as well as the students and I'm proud to say that we had 90 students complete the program. Typically, we have about 150 students complete the program, but it was abbreviated due to the pandemic that we are going through. Employer-wise, we typically have anywhere between 50-55 employers; this year we had 32 employers – 24 were returning and there were 8 new ones. We had 12 inside the City of Erie and 20 from outside the City of Erie; 14 were non-profits and 18 were for-profits.

   I can't say enough as far as GECAC leadership under Sylvia – she did an excellent job running the program this year. She took the baton from Ben Wilson. One of the things that the program was able to do was continue to help the students with financial literacy, but with this pandemic going on, they were able to help some of the students who were experiencing food and shelter insecurities and they were able to connect them with the right resources. We are very please with that. In addition, they were able to link up some of the students who were having some mental health issues because of everything that has been going on with the COVID-19, as well as some personal issues that were going on.

It was definitely a great move to have the program; this was the first time that we actually had more participation outside the City of Erie. The bottom line is that we were just really, really thrilled with the outcome of the program. Are there any questions about the program?

Mr. Sample: Gary, does GECAC get paid per student or do they receive a lump sum? Are they going to get the same amount they have in previous years even though the attendance was down through no fault of their own?

Mr. Lee: David, that's a great question; thanks for bringing that up. It will be prorated. In the contract there is a per-student cost, so we had to go with the per-student cost. As you know, it just wouldn't have been fair to the County had they been able to collect based on 150 students when in fact it was 90 students. It was prorated and it was reflected in the number of students they actually served.

Mr. Sample: Thank you.

Mr. Lee: You're welcome. Which leads me to my next point – the Request for Proposal; the Request will be going out before the end of the year. As you may be aware, the GECAC contract ends at the end of this year. Last time we did a 3-year contract with 2 years optional; we will do the same with this particular Request for Proposal. We will have Dr. Wood involved in the review process as well as the Erie Community Foundation and then the Administration from County government will be involved.

We look forward to continuing on this great program and I am happy to say that since we started the program, we have not gone up one dollar in cost to ECGRA or to the County and that is remarkable. That comes from a good partnership of watching and overseeing the finances and the administration of the program by GECAC. They have made sure that everything is checked off and the deliverables are completed. We look forward to the Request for Proposal, we look forward to whoever the successful proposer to be, and in moving the program to another level in years to come.

Mr. Barney: Gary, I have two questions. One is, what did we finally settle on as far as their rate of pay?

Mr. Lee: It was $2,274 per student, and that was applied directly into the contract for 2020.

Mr. Sample: Did we not raise the rate to $8.25 or $8.50 an hour?

Mr. Lee: Yes, we did, and we did factor that cost in which came out to an additional $16,200. We went up from $7.25 to $8.25.

Mr. Barney: My second question is you said that all the pools of money and they were going to prorate to GECAC, so we should have some money left at the end of this year?

Mr. Lee: There will be money left over. As you know, the breakdown is $150,000 from the County of Erie, $150,000 from ECGRA. The Community Foundation did not participate this year due to their commitments to so many other nonprofits and since we knew that we were going to abbreviate the program, we realized that that cost would not be necessary. The savings will be reflected equally for the County of Erie as well as for ECGRA.

Mr. Barney: And without the Foundation, it won't be as much as I thought. Thank you.

Mr. Lee: Are there any additional questions on the program? If not, then the last point I would like to cover very briefly is the Community College. As you know, it was approved and has a total of nine trustees; seven of them by each County Council member and two were selected by the County Executive. That Board is in full effect and they are hitting the ground running. Their biggest task before them is selecting a President and then that President, along with the Board, will be responsible for selecting the location and carrying out all the details according to the College Plan that was approved by the Pennsylvania State Board of Education.

The key areas that the County will remain involved in is in the finances. We are projected for the first year to be working with the State; we are hoping that the State will come through with the RACP, which is the Redevelopment Assistance Capital Program. We have it in there for $10 million, we put in for the full amount and if they are so gracious to give us the $10 million, we will be more than happy to accept that. We have to match it dollar for dollar and in our plan, we do have the match coming from the Erie Community Foundation, and the balance coming from the Gaming Funds that the County receives. If they do not give us the $10 million and they go according to plan, which is closer to $3 million, we will just work with the $3 million and go accordingly with the Gaming Funds and prorate the Erie Community Foundation money.

We are excited about the Community College; there is a lot of work ahead with the Board, but we are excited because this was a long time coming. Are there any questions about the Community College? If not, then thank you, Chairman Paris.

*REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR*

Dr. Wood: Good morning everyone. You will see in your Executive Director's packet that the majority of our time this month has been spent getting Community Assets grants through the process as well as the single Municipal Collaboration grant, which is Round 2 of that funding and we'll commence with resolution numbers 18 and 19 that we're asking you to vote on later. There is also the issue of the PMRS and taking that to the next level; and we have been dealing with this issue since before the beginning of this year. So, we're looking forward to finalizing that and wrapping it up.

If you look at my report you will see information in there from Bridgeway Capital on the funds that have been expended in both the Erie Growth Fund as well as the Response Funds that we created with them at the beginning of the COVID pandemic. What I like about their reports is they go into great detail about the companies that were funded, the entrepreneur's names, and the amount that was funded; that's why I put it in this Executive Director's Report because I want everyone to have a chance to thumb through that and ask any potential questions.

There is a Masonic Temple designation in here for a National Historic Designation that we helped them receive. There are some pictures in here of the progress being made by the Erie Center for Arts & Technology and they wanted to make sure that we saw that there was some recognition of ECGRA in the media that they had done. The report is rounded out with the thank you letters and the media which we capture in here for historical purposes. There have been several articles lately that didn't even make this report celebrating projects that were partially funded by ECGRA.

Focusing on the grants, we will wait until we get to the resolutions to go into detail on that. Does anyone have any questions for me? Hearing none, that concludes my report.

*SOLICITOR'S REPORT*

Mr. Wachter: Last month Perry asked that I take a look at the contract and various documents that were provided to us by the Pennsylvania Municipal Retirement System and put them in a form that could be adopted by the Board and also be able to explain to the Board how the program is going to work. This is not a traditional pension; this is a cash balance plan where the money that is being put into the system will be built up over a period of time in order for a single life annuity to be paid out at the time of retirement. We cannot think of it as a traditional pension, because that is not what this is.

There is one of two ways that we can go about this because there are a lot of items to discuss and I will note that the elections that were made in the document – that was the version of the document that we had received from the Pennsylvania Municipal Retirement System – so we have made no administrative elections in this document. We want to explain it to you so you know what you're voting on and we can change anything. We can either move to Page 152 of the document provided to the Board on Board Effect; it's a 22-page contract, however, don't let that dissuade you from going through it because it won't take that long because only those items that have been selected need to be discussed and the majority of the document actually excludes things so we don't need to get into much detail about those, or I can give you a high-level overview. Which way would you like me to go?

Mr. Lee: I would suggest the high-level overview.

The Board is in agreement with that suggestion.

Mr. Wachter: This plan is effective April 1, 2020; we needed to select that as a plan year start date and we wanted to align that with our fiscal year. The fact that it is now September does not matter, so if you were to adopt it, it would just move forward with the next pay cycle in which it would start. The benefit is available to full-time employees who work 40 hours/week. You are able to have that benefit upon six months completion of service. Actually, let me correct the record and say that this would not start with the next pay period, but it would start after six months. You are fully vested after one year. So, we would wait six months from approval and then we would be fully vested in one year. The employer contribution is 15% of compensation; that was the number provided by PMRS.

Dr. Wood: Tim, if I can interject. That number was provided by PMRS, but I think we can all agree that that number is too high.

Mr. Wachter: That's great. I just wanted to call it out, so we will just need to get to a number. Let me tell you how the rest of the program works and then maybe we can figure out what the right number is.

Dr. Wood: Great.

Mr. Wachter: Employer compensation only includes pay – nothing else; no reimbursements, no vacations, paid out sick time, whatever that is, none of that gets calculated into what the employer contribution is. So, there's no opportunity to perform some of the administrative moves that other plans allow you to do to unnaturally goose your retirement; that is not available here. The employee is not required to make contributions; however, the employee is permitted to if they wanted, but that would only be after tax contributions. The employees are not permitted to purchase service or other credits. This is clearly a pay-as-you-go plan. If you leave the Authority and come back and you have already received a distribution, you would be allowed to buy back your time that you previously earned and you would have up to five years to do so.

Benefits are payable to an employee after attaining age 65 or attaining age 55 with ten years of service once you have separated from service; there is no distribution while you are employed. You cannot take an early check. If someone's account is less than $5,000, a payment is distributed in a lump sum, otherwise the normal form of benefit is the single life annuity. The plan does allow the employee to select optional forms of payment to convert the value of the employee's account to a joint and survivor annuity options or a lump sum of the account balance; so, there is a couple different options for payout.

That is about all the main issues that I think you would be concerned about on how to understand how the plan works. I do think that the number of 15% is a bit high and that is something you should figure out what you want that to be. Perry, I know that you have some comparables as to what some other entities are using in the area and I didn't know if you wanted to speak to those.

Dr. Wood: Let me start out by giving a quick refresher on PMRS. It is a State-affiliated agency whose specific mission as created by the Commonwealth to create retirement plans for local governments, municipal authorities like ours, school districts and counties. They have over 1,100 clients in the State of Pennsylvania, some of them right here in Erie County. An example I can mention is the City of Corry's Redevelopment Authority.

Mr. Wachter: If I could jump in on that, Perry? They are an affiliate of the Department of Community and Economic Development at the State level, so if you were to email them their email address is @pa.gov. They are not technically government employees, but they are an affiliate of the Commonwealth.

Dr. Wood: Great point. They are an incredibly affordable option because they charge $20/person; they will cost the Authority $60/year to administer this program. What we currently have at ECGRA is a matching Simple IRA concept and that is currently at 3%; where ECGRA matches 3% of what the employee earns. What we are talking about doing is moving to a cash balance plan more comparable to what other entities like ours in the region have. So as for comparables, you can't really compare what PMRS is offering to the County. I know sometimes we bounce back and forth as to whether we should compare ourselves to the County or not. The County has a pension and 403B matching concept. That is clearly not the direction we're going; we're not going in the pension direction.

Mr. Wachter: Perry, that's because the pension is significantly more expensive.

Dr. Wood: Correct. A traditional pension plan would be extremely expensive for us to do. We are more in line with the Convention Center Authority which offers a percentage of around 10% to their employees, although that can vary. We are trying to be more comparable to an Authority like that and what they offer. They have the same thing; they have a minimal percentage for optional employee participation.

The number that the staff is recommending is not 15%, we think that's too high. Based on our current budgeting, if you look at our budget, we have two line items one being called Retirement, which is the Simple IRA, and the second is the funds that we have scheduled for PMRS. If we were to combine those two line items, we would have enough to do a 10% contribution for the next six months like Tim suggested which would be September through the end of March which is the end of our fiscal year.

Mr. Lee: I have a couple of questions here for clarification purposes. Right now, we're talking strictly about the employer contribution of being 10%? I'm asking for clarification.

Dr. Wood: Yes.

Mr. Lee: So, the employee has the option of whether they want to participate or not?

Mr. Wachter: Correct.

Mr. Lee: And is there a cut-off as far as a percentage that the employee is permitted to go up to?

Mr. Wachter: Currently it is 15%, which matches the 15% employer contribution. Those numbers are in line; we can change one or we can change both, however it is you want to do it.

Mr. Lee: Right. You are absolutely right when you say you can't compare it to the County because it is apples compared to oranges for all the reasons that were stated by Mr. Wachter and Dr. Wood. The only thing I would share with the Board as far as from the employee contribution, I would suggest that whatever percentage you land on, and this is just my personal thoughts, you don't really want to be going back-and-forth. So, if you land on 10%, 5%, or somewhere in between like 7%, I would recommend keeping it at that particular level.

The other part that I would just share with you is that we should take this into context and think about the crisis that is happening with the COVID-19 and as we continue to work through this, but you just have to be aware – and I think everyone is – of the high unemployment nationally, which depending on which report you read could be 30 million people, with the State over 820,000, and with the County it is close to 18,000 and these percentages are really, really high. The only reason I say that is that any type of move that you do with our organization, it will be looked at very closely. So, in saying that, I think that the Board should take all of that into context as far as what you decide and keep it there going forward, put it in context as far as COVID-19 and what's going on with the rest of the country right now – and it's going to be going on for a little while, and just kind of look at some of the other individuals. And this is a very unique kind of plan but try to take into account maybe some of the other Authorities that are around the County and what percentage they have. In fact, Perry, do have some of those numbers for the other Authorities and what they are contributing?

Dr. Wood: The Convention Center Authority is at 8% match and that is the one that we were gearing toward being more comparable with.

Mr. Lee: Thank you. I will stop there because I think I have said enough. Thank you for the research, Attorney Wachter, and thanks for the information.

Mr. Cleaver: Do the employees presently have a pension plan?

Mr. Wachter: No. There is a Simple IRA employer match.

Mr. Cleaver: Do we roll that over into this plan if it's approved?

Mr. Wachter: The Simple IRA will not be able to be rolled over into this plan, I don't believe. Perry, is that correct?

Dr. Wood: That is correct. The way in which PMRS was established, they cannot administer a Defined Contribution Plan.

Mr. Cleaver: So, what happens then?

Mr. Wachter: The employee can take that and roll it over into a personal IRA so it will continue to accrue to their benefit, it will just no longer be managed, nor matched, by the Authority system.

Mr. Cleaver: So, it's dormant; whatever that amount is, that's theirs?

Mr. Wachter: That's theirs.

Mr. Cleaver: Are there any borrowing powers in this pension plan?

Mr. Wachter: No.

Mr. Cleaver: Down the road, there's none whatsoever?

Mr. Wachter: No, because it's not a pension plan.

Mr. Cleaver: Alright.

Dr. Wood: I think we have to be careful using the word pension because it's not.

Mr. Wachter: There is an election for that, I believe, that could have been chosen but it has been selected that there would be no borrowing.

Mr. Cleaver: Thank you.

Mr. Sample: Corry has the PMRS plan, a fixed benefit, and they also have a 457B which is like a 401K. The two points are that we would no longer be putting the 3% match on the 401K and any employee match would be after tax, not pre-tax. Is that correct?

Mr. Wachter: That is correct. And we don't currently have a 401K; it's a Simple IRA. But yes, that is correct. Any employee contribution, if they would want to do that, is after tax. The reason you do it after tax is so that you pay the tax on those dollars once and when there is a distribution, then those dollars are not taxed at the time of distribution.

Mr. Sample: Correct. Now, I got a little confused when you said that our contribution would be based solely on salary, not on benefits.

Mr. Wachter: Correct. If someone was to buy out their sick time or get paid out on sick time or get paid out on vacation time that was unused – and I don't even know if we can do that – but, if they were able to do that, that would not then incur a larger contribution requirement for the Authority. You can't goose your retirement by doing those things.

Mr. Sample: In our particular case, we do have one or two people who received compensation instead of insurance, but that is in fact compensation. If their spouse already had insurance, we weren't going to replicate it.

Mr. Wachter: We would have to look at how that is being accounted for, if that's being included on the W-2 as straight compensation. That is a very good point; that may account for that.

Mr. Sample: I believe it's just deemed as compensation. It was more justification on our part.

Mr. Wachter: Yes, that would incur the employer match.

Mr. Sample: I just know that when we did the numbers in Corry, the numbers were higher than the 8 or 10%, what we were willing to put in because we didn't have to commit to the other things.

Mr. Wachter: Dave, did you say Corry had a Defined Benefit Plan?

Mr. Sample: What they had, and I reached out to Novotny this morning, they have a PMRS Fixed Plan, Fixed Benefit, and the 457B like a 401K. They've got a hybrid; they're still getting both carts.

Mr. Wachter: Right. And I would think a Fixed Benefit Plan would be more lucrative for the employee. This is a Cash Balance Plan, so we're not committing to making any particular level of payout for the life of the individual upon retirement. Rather, it's only the money that we have committed on a pay period – the 15% - that would be paid out. That would be on the Cash Balance that is available.

Mr. Sample: And that was my point. These other plans are more lucrative.

Mr. Wachter: Correct. A 5% match on a Fixed Benefit Plan has costs after retirement that the Authority has to pay out, which would be more expensive.

Mr. Sample: I have only looked at this a little bit, but it does not look like a bad arrangement to me at all.

Ms. Hess: I was wondering if you had any other comparables. This is new to me and I don't know if 8% is high or low, is 10% high or low? I'm trying to understand what a good baseline is. Do you have any other comparables that would be similar?

Dr. Wood: Short answer is no, unless Mr. Cleaver remembers what the retirement plan looked like at the Parking Authority. What I have found is the municipal plans are extremely generous and so are the school district plans and the County plans. It's only when you get to the Authority plans where you have more of a concept like this where it is non-pension based and there isn't a mix of the two things. The exception is what Dave just said where the Authority in Corry has both the Fixed Plan and the 457B. As far as comparables goes, it varies; it really depends upon what the individual Boards of Directors decide to do. I wish there was a nice, neat place where I could find this information. I called a lot of people to try to get more information about this and I . . .

Mr. Sample: I remember when we went through this initially. There is a lot of Authorities that are like they are tribal; they wouldn't give information out.

Dr. Wood: I was shocked at the number of people who told me no.

Mr. Sample: Right. It's like they felt like we had no need for that.

Mr. Lee: Let me ask you something, Dr. Wood. Could the Pennsylvania Municipal Retirement System provide what the average is from the employer? I would think that that would be something that perhaps would be public information. Not asking about individual Authorities, but asking what the average is around the State.

Dr. Wood: I did have conversations with them about what the average plan looks like but not what the average percentage looks like. Did you have that conversation by chance, Tim?

Mr. Wachter: I did not.

Dr. Wood: Our plan is based upon what the average plan looks like for municipal authorities.

Mr. Lee: Sure. But I would think they could provide some feedback as far as what the average percentage is from the employer standpoint, and I think that would be very helpful.

Mr. Bagnoni: How can the Authorities say that they don't want to give you the information? Aren't they public authorities?

Mr. Wachter: We stopped short of making a Right-to-Know Request.

Mr. Sample: You could submit a Right-to-Know, but that would just create an adversarial situation.

Mr. Bagnoni: That's stupid.

Mr. Wachter: I have emailed the attorney for the Municipal Retirement System and asked the question about the average. I'll let you know if I get an answer in a timely fashion.

Mr. Bagnoni: What is driving this change?

Mr. Wachter: My understanding is that in conversations that the Board have had is that we need to put the Authority's compensation system to make it more competitive and put it more in line with what is expected in the event that we have to start replacing employees. What we currently offer is what everyone has kind of grown up with, but more would be expected from new employees if they were to be at the level that we wanted them to be.

Mr. Sample: And every time we have a compensation discussion, this comes up. We had decided to ask Dr. Wood and Tammi to go in and do this because at some point we've got to look like a real entity.

Mr. Wachter: If I could just interject, the Counsel from PMRS just responded and he believes the average is 8%.

Mr. Lee: Thank you, Tim. To your point, Dave, you are absolutely right. I think that this a good move to have this infrastructure in place. I think our infrastructure is behind the times in a lot of areas, but when you talk about retirement, you should definitely have a solid system set up. I think this is a very good move to make to establish this system, I really do. And Tim, thank you for the information of the 8%. I would just add this and then I'm going to be quiet. I think whatever you land on, whether it's the 8% or the 10%, I think that you should allow the employee to put in more - up to 15% - if they choose to; that's from the employee standpoint. I don't think you should cut it off for the employee, but whatever you land on for the employer, I think it just ought to be consistent at whatever you decide to move forward with. Thank you.

Mr. Bagnoni: So, now what?

Mr. Wachter: We have a Resolution and a Plan that states a 15% contribution and I would need somebody to tell me what number you would like to put in there and if there is a motion at the time that we get into that resolution we could do it with that employer contribution number. The employee contribution number is still at 15%, so if we wanted to follow Gary's advice and leave that where it is, we don't have to change it.

Mr. Sample: I would make the motion that we should go with 8%.

Mr. Cleaver: I second that motion.

Mr. Wachter: We have a motion and a second for 8%. There is an existing resolution on the agenda now and we will amend that document such that it is 8% if this moves forward.

Mr. Paris: Thank you, Tim.

*OLD BUSINESS*

Dr. Wood: Mr. Barney, are you still in the meeting? I know I talked to Mr. Cleaver about this yesterday, about potentially making a motion to extend the funding contract for the UECDC's food program based on the current need they are seeing in the community. In discussions with various Board members, it seems it makes sense to take a look at the UECDC's existing grant through the COVID-19 Response Fund and extend it so that they can continue to serve the food needs of the pantries, churches, and community centers that they are working with and provide them with $20,000 total.

Mr. Cleaver: Perry, you and I had discussed this the other day and I have no problems with extending that. In fact, I would be more than glad to put that on the table for a vote.

Mr. Sample seconds the motion to extend the UECDC food program by $20,000.

Mr. Barney: Gentlemen, I appreciate the two of you supporting this request.

Mr. Paris: Thank you. Is there anyone who would like more information on exactly what we're doing?

Dr. Wood: Let me just clarify the motion being made. I know this is kind of unprecedented but let me word it in a way that I think makes the most sense. Mr. Cleaver wants to make a motion to extend the existing grant agreement with the UECDC for a period of one month to cover two weeks' programmatic costs for a total of $20,000. I'm sorry to put the words in your mouth but I just think it would be easier to make sure we check all the boxes. Are you okay with that motion, Mr. Cleaver?

Mr. Cleaver: Yes, definitely.

Dr. Wood: I would just want to add to this that in talks with the CEO of the UECDC, our main goal is to give him a two week runway to continue this valuable program that is serving a need in the community but this two week runway is intended to give him the time to communicate with the Second Harvest Food Bank food system so that they can get more connected with him and integrate the data they have about who they're serving to the overall food pantries. That is the overall goal here and it will probably not go beyond these two weeks here for that reason.

The longer-term goal is to get the UECDC operation more connected with the food insecurity system which exists here in Erie County in northwest PA. In discussions with you, it clearly makes sense for elected officials, like the County Executive for example, to take the role on leading those discussions because the food insecurity system is receiving millions of dollars from the State and Federal government. I look forward to handing the football off there.

There is no further discussion of this motion. Motion carries 6-0.

*NEW BUSINESS*

a. Resolution Number 18, 2020 – Resolution to enter into agreements with fourteen (14) Erie County community organizations and municipalities engaged in Arts, Culture, and Heritage

Dr. Wood reads the resolution.

Mr. Bagnoni makes a motion to approve the resolution. Mr. Barney seconds the motion. Mr. Sample reminds the Board that he is on the Board for Impact Corry and must abstain from voting. There is no further discussion of the resolution. Motion carries 5-0-1, with Mr. Sample abstaining.

b. Resolution Number 19, 2020 – Resolution to enter into agreement with one (1) entity as the sole recipient of the 2020 Multi-Municipal Collaboration Grant, Round 2

Dr. Wood reads the resolution.

Mr. Barney makes a motion to approve the resolution. Mr. Sample seconds the motion. There is no further discussion of the resolution. Motion carries 6-0.

c. Resolution Number 20, 2020 – Resolution of Erie County Gaming Revenue Authority, Erie County, electing to establish a non-uniform retirement plan to be administered by the Pennsylvania Municipal Retirement System (PMRS) pursuant to Article IV of the Pennsylvania Municipal Retirement Law

Dr. Wood reads the beginning of the resolution but chooses not to read the eight sections in their entirety since all Board members have a copy in front of them. Dr. Wood states that this resolution was provided to the Erie County Gaming Revenue Authority by the legal counsel of the PMRS group and asks Mr. Wachter to confirm that.

Mr. Wachter: Yes, this resolution was provided by the PMRS Legal counsel and I have just received word that they will send us a revised agreement within the next couple of days to reflect an 8% employer contribution. The intent of this resolution then is to approve the agreement with an 8% employer contribution.

Mr. Barney makes a motion to accept the resolution. Mr. Bagnoni seconds the motion. There is no further discussion of the resolution. Motion carries 6-0.

Mr. Cleaver moves to adjourn.