



## **Erie County Gaming Revenue Authority**

### **Minutes of the Board of Directors' Meeting**

October 20, 2022

Meetings for the Board of Directors of ECGRA can begin meeting in a physical location per Governor Wolf's proclamation of June 11, 2021. However, each member and ex-officio has the option to attend in person or virtually. Members of the public can now speak at the physical location of 5240 Knowledge Parkway.

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

The Board of Directors' Meeting of the Erie County Gaming Revenue Authority was held on October 20, 2022 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. Barney, Mr. Cleaver, and Mr. Oberlander are present in person, Mr. DiPaolo, Ms. Hess, and Ms. Loll are present via Zoom. Mr. Wachter is present via Zoom. Dr. Wood is present in person.

#### **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

Mr. Cleaver makes a motion to approve the agenda. Mr. DiPaolo seconds the motion. There is no discussion of the agenda. Motion carries 6-0.

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – September 2022

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

#### **DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS**

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

## COMMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Mr. Barney has no comments at this time.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

There is no public present for comments.

## PRESENTATIONS

Dr. Wood: There are no presentations scheduled for today, but the staff has been discussing the idea of having applicants for the entrepreneurship round come in. The grant binders are done for that, the staff is almost done with our internal review. As soon as we are done with that, we will provide the summaries for you. I think since these grants are bigger grants, two and a half year grants, we definitely want to have some of these folks come in and present in front of the Board and have the Board ask questions and be able to interact. We will get those summaries out to you soon.

We are also asking other funders to participate in this grant review so we are going to provide them with the summaries and see if we can get them on board with co-funding. There are \$2.7 M in requests here and we had budgeted about \$1.2 M and there are a lot of good projects here. So, we went to Erie Insurance, the Erie Community Foundation, and the DEI Commission and said that we would do the initial analysis, send it to them, and if they want to participate and figure out a way to loop their Boards in, we would involve each in the presentations. I told them that the caveat was if the ECGRA Board objects, but I thought you would be amenable to working with other funders in the region.

Mr. Barney: That sounds good to me. Are there any questions from anyone?

## COMMITTEE REPORTS

- a. Treasurer's Report: Mr. Cleaver: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I reviewed the Treasurer's Report with Dr. Wood and everything is fine. I notice that we are underspent in every line item with the exception of auditors, but that is sort of a guess in the beginning of the year; you never know what they are going to throw at you. Other than that, everything seems to be in order. If anybody has any questions, I think we can answer them.

I do want to make one comment. I noticed that County Council a week or so ago voted down a request from the County Executive regarding the ARP monies that were earmarked for ECGRA to distribute. That vote turned out 4-3 if I am aware, so we are back in the ballgame I believe. Perry, do you have any comment about that?

Dr. Wood: We continue to follow it and stay in contact with members of County government about it. I think it's important that I tell everyone this – first and foremost we are supportive of Behrend and the plastics project between Gannon and Behrend; it's a good, solid project. I also tell everyone that I think \$5 M is overkill for the project; not because it's not a big-ticket item – it's a \$30 M item, but because typically big projects like that are funded by the State and Federal governments. So, when you need to show local support, you don't put in \$5 M, you put in \$500,000 and then you show the Feds and State the tremendous amount of local buy-in

you have with \$500,000; you don't use your entire basket of eggs. That is an opinion I am giving after having been involved in these projects in the past. And, of course, there is a bit of self-interest there; ECGRA is a good administrator of these dollars.

That's part of the message when I talk to members of County government, which is we fully support the project, it's in the Playbook which we are a big supporter of, and we need to figure out a way to support them and get them to the \$30 M level. But using our local treasury for that, I think, is a strategic mistake. At the end of the day, it would fund a great project, but if we don't have those funds, we won't be able to fulfill the demand of projects that you see in our rural listening report. All of the projects that we cataloged there, there are a lot of boroughs and townships, like the City of Corry, that have given us a lot of amazing projects. These are once in a generational monies; we could do that for these rural areas. That's our government relations talking point.

Mr. Cleaver: So, it's just a matter of wait and see as it plays out.

Dr. Wood: How it's played out so far, and Tim and I have discussed this so Tim you can chime in. We know that last year there was a vote for an ordinance that basically stated where the ARPA monies were at with the 2021 money, which was the current year they had it. Then just like every new Administration, you have to rely on last year's budget and everybody knows that's County Council. That is what they did with the ARPA funds. Now the current Council is saying that they want to take a look at rejiggering those funds. They decided to start with Transformative Grants, which is the bucket that we've been administering. It went up for a vote to move the Transformative Grants from ECGRA to the plastics initiative; the vote failed 4-3. My understanding is parliamentary procedure of Administrative Code rule says that you can't bring it up again for six months. Carol and Whitey, you would know the procedure of this.

Ms. Loll: You can change the wording of it and bring it up again.

Dr. Wood: There you go. Will it be brought up again? We'll have to wait and see. But that is where we're at.

Mr. Cleaver: I just figured I would make a comment on it because it was on the news and we're sort of involved. Just wanted to keep all the Board members up to snuff with what has transpired. That's all I have as far as the Treasurer's Report.

Mr. DiPaolo makes a motion to accept the Treasurer's Report as presented. Ms. Loll seconds the motion. There are no questions or discussion of the Treasurer's Report. Motion carries 6-0.

- b. Strategic Planning Committee: Dr. Wood: There is nothing to report, but I did want to let you know that I think we will have to meet twice before our next Board meeting in November. There is going to be an opportunity to review both the entrepreneurial grants through presentations and then we will have our final round of Multi-Municipal Collaboration, Renaissance Block, and Anchor Building to review. Those should be ready in November but if not, we can do it in December.
- c. Update from County Council: Mr. Shank is not present to give a report.
- d. Update from County Executive's Office: Mr. Smith is not present to give a report.

## REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Dr. Wood: The first thing you will see in the Director's Report is the staff has been busy wrapping up the rural listening tour; you'll see some advisories there of where we have been and who we have been talking to. I have to say, we do this every two to three years and it is tremendously valuable. You get out there and meet with elected officials, business leaders, civic leaders and you hear directly from them how things are going. Then if you saw that just yesterday, we were out in North East announcing funds for their Mission Main Street as well as their joint parks project. Not only do they get to see that we came, listened to them, recognized the projects that were important to them and then we show back up with a check funding their grant application. So, I think it's a good relationship building strategy.

There are also some thank you letters in the Director's Report from Octoberfest and Lake Erie Fanfare and then you will see a couple of instances where we were recognized on advertising material and then the ECGRA news clippings. These are all great things for the archives.

I already mentioned that the entrepreneur monies are in the analysis phase. Also, the facilities analysis RFP which Tom has been working on and that has come back; there were three people that bid on that. Tom, why don't you take a minute and update the Board on who the bids were and how we will decide, because we are going to bring these bids to you all for your discussion at the next Strategic Planning meeting.

Mr. Maggio: Thank you. We received four proposals – one was a bit incomplete, and one was withdrawn after they submitted it. So, we had two very solid proposals; one was Roth Marz Partnership who is very experienced in the matter, and then there was Weber, Murphy, Fox who also has impeccable credentials. The apparent low bidder is Roth Marz and was well under where I thought we would be which is good news, but there is an issue with the reimbursable schedule so we will have to go over that again and try to get an estimate of where they would be. I think that we're still in a very good position. Their bid was \$84,750.00, which is significantly lower than I thought.

This is good news for the community centers and for us. We will go over it a little more in detail and we will be able to present to the Board an opinion of who should get the contract. We are on schedule with the timing because I would like to get this completed before these community centers apply for the community centers grant since they work hand-in-glove.

I think we are in good shape, and I'm pleased with the results so far and we'll have that sorted out very soon.

Dr. Wood: Great. Thank you, Tom. Also on the horizon are Community Assets grants will be opening in December. What is the schedule on Parks, Fields, and Trails Tom?

Mr. Maggio: That is due November 17<sup>th</sup> and we already have received some early applications. Typically, we do have a lot of applications for that program; this particular round is just for capital projects and not for programming but I think that there are a lot of people that are trying to complete some projects so we will have a full number of applications to review.

Ms. Loll: Back to the bids from Roth Marz and Weber, Murphy, Fox, do they have any percentage built-in for overrun?

Mr. Maggio: No. We have a fixed cost contract.

Ms. Loll: For both of them?

Mr. Maggio: Yes. Each of them have a different schedule for reimbursables; one just has copying as a reimbursable, which would be extra. But that's not a whole lot of money. Then some have some testing which would be a reimbursable, which would be additional to the base bid. But not every

community center is going to be doing testing, for say, asbestos or lead paint or something like that. It's not too much of a concern but we have 17 community centers so I'm just trying to get a feel.

I will be talking to Bob Marz today hopefully and try to nail it down. It could be that we agree to a ceiling so that we don't exceed that amount either. That's a good question because that is very important.

Ms. Loll: That's a good way of handling that because when they did the library, they forgot part of what needed to be done and so it cost another \$70,000 more than what they bid so that was why I was wondering.

Dr. Wood: To round out the list, in November we will get a statement from the Community Foundation on where the Lead Asset Endowment is at and then we'll make a recommendation to the Board for disbursement in December. That will round out our calendar year.

Mr. Barney: Is Mr. Oberlander up to speed with how that all works?

Dr. Wood: We actually have a legal memo that we drafted at the time of establishing the endowment for perpetuity, so that guides our process. That concludes my report. Does anyone have any questions? Thank you.

#### SOLICITOR'S REPORT

Mr. Wachter: It's been a slow month which is good for you. Tom and I were just talking about coordinating on the creation of the agreement in order to have the architects do that work. We will coordinate on that and get that out in a timely fashion and if you need anything, let me know.

#### OLD BUSINESS

There is no old business to discuss at this time.

#### NEW BUSINESS

There is no new business to discuss at this time, but Dr. Wood states that there will be a lot to approve at the next meeting.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Cleaver moves to adjourn. Mr. Oberlander seconds the motion.