

St. Clair County Board of Commissioners
Board of Commissioners' Room
County Administrative Office Building, 2nd Floor
200 Grand River Avenue
Port Huron, MI 48060

July 20, 2023 at 4:00 p.m.

Moment of Silence, Prayer or Personal Reflection

Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order

Chairman Bohm called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Agenda Item 2 - Pledge of Allegiance

Pledge of Allegiance was lead by Chairman Bohm.

Agenda Item 3 - Roll Call

Present: Beedon, Bohm, Rushing, Simasko, Torello

Absent: Baldwin, Vandenbossche

Agenda Item 4 – Additions/Deletions/Changes to the Agenda

Moved by Commissioner Beedon, supported by Commissioner Simasko, to
remove Item B – Health Advisory Board – Appointment. Discussion followed.

Carried – Roll Call Vote 3-0. Aye: Beedon, Bohm, Simasko No: Rushing, Torello

Moved by Commissioner Beedon, supported by Commissioner Simasko, to remove Item F – Veterans Affairs Board – Appointment. Discussion followed.

Carried – Roll Call Vote 3-0 Aye: Beedon, Bohm, Simasko No: Rushing, Torello

Moved by Commissioner Rushing, supported by Commissioner Beedon, to remove

Item I – Resolution 23-13 – Proposed Revisions to St. Clair County Animal

Control and Protection Ordinance. Discussion followed. Carried – Voice Vote 5-

0. Aye: Beedon, Bohm, Rushing, Simasko, Torello

Commissioner Simasko asked that the following memo be made part of the record.

MEMO TO ST CLAIR COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

FROM; Steven L. Simasko, St Clair County Commissioner District #1

TO: St Clair County Board of Commissioners

DATE: July 18th 2023

RE: POSITION STATEMENT FOR JULY 20TH 2023 FULL BOARD MEETING RE; PROPOSED REVISIONS TO ST CLAIR COUNTY ANILAL CONTROL ORDINANCE

Dear County Board Members,

This board has been asked to review proposed amendments to the county animal control ordinance. I was first aware of this on the afternoon of Friday May 30th when it appeared on a committee agenda for the June 6th committee meeting sent to us by mail. I contacted our board chair to see what he knew about the origins of this request and advised that he knew nothing about it and had no prior knowledge that this was being worked on. From what I can tell, like our board chair, no commissioner had any advance knowledge. I was interested in reviewing this and discussing both the procedural and the substantive issues surrounding the submitted ordinance revision at a public. Because of the short agenda notice (less than a week) and due to the fact that I was on vacation for the committee meeting June 6th I sent each of you a request not to send this to full board and to have it scheduled for a public workshop or other type of meeting to provide me time to thoroughly review the proposed ordinance ant to provide the

public a reasonable opportunity to address the board over and above the three minute public comment period at a committee or full board meeting under our bylaws.

I continue to be concerned that the ordinance revisions proposed by our animal control director and our administrator were the result of internal meetings and discussions by regulators both state and county only with no meaningful opportunity for public participation and provide commentary and other input for consideration by the board. In addition to lack prior notice to the commissioners and lack of public input, I decided to see if any of the other stakeholders were contacted for input prior to the creation or submission of the amendments to our animal control ordinance. I contacted personally our county prosecutor, our sheriff, Bill Deater president of the SCC Township Association, sent an e mail to each township supervisor, and communicated with our Health Department Director. It appears none of them had notice or were asked to participate in any way.

I may be a simple thinker, but it seems to me that government by the people and for the people ought to actually involve the people. This would include reasonable notice and a reasonable

opportunity to address their elected representatives so that their views can be considered in a sincere, thoughtful and meaningful way. That did not happen here.

At this time I renew my request of this board that the St Clair County Animal Control Ordinance Revisions on our agenda for this Thursday July 29th 2022, not be adopted in its present form and not without additional public notice, beyond merely posting it on our county building and county web page, and further without providing the public with a reasonable opportunity to allow for their input and discussion at a public meeting. WE could do PSA's at WPHM, something in the Times Herald and other smaller local papers, a communication to townships and municipalities perhaps.

I attach a 5 page document I composed broken down into 5 parts that synopsise the issues I believe support my position not to approve the ordinance in present form. I will address the board on the record at the Thursday full board meeting with my concerns and ask that this document be made part of the official record as a submission by me or as a communication according to our bylaws. I give you all advance notice of my position here hoping to convince some or all of you that the proposed ordinance as submitted has legal and practical issues preventing its adoption at this time and that the process leading up to its submission to this board for consideration was insufficient for meaningful public review, discussion and input.

Resubmitted

Steven . Simasko

SCC Commissioner District#1

THE OPINIONS AND MATTERS STATED HEREIN ARE THOSE OF THE AUTHOR ALONE AND NOT THE COUNTY BOARD OR ANY ASSOCIATED DEPARTMENT. PLEASE DO NOT RESPOND BY REPLYING TO THIS E MAIL. THIS E MAIL IS INTENDED FOR THE DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ONLY AND NOT FOR DELIBERATION BY THE BOARD TOWARD A DECISION IN ANY MANNER OUTSIDE OF A LAWFUL PUBLIC MEETING. THIS E MAIL IS INTENDED TO PROVIDE RECIPIENTS WITH INFORMATION RELATING TO COUNTY AFFAIRS OR THE OPERATION OF THE COUNTY AS A GOVERNMENT AGENCY FOR CONSIDERATION AT A FUTURE LAWFUL PUBLIC MEETING.

POSITION STATEMENT FOR JULY 20TH 2032 FULL BOARD MEETING
RE; PROPOSED REVISIONS TO ST CLAIR COUNTY ANIMAL CONTROL ORDINANCE

COMMISSIONER STEVEN L. SIMASKO , DISTRICT#1

July 18th 2023

THE OPINIONS AND MATTERS STATED HEREIN ARE THOSE OF THE AUTHOR ALONE AND NOT THE COUNTY BOARD OR ANY ASSOCIATED DEPARTMENT. PLEASE DO NOT RESPOND BY RETURN E MAIL. THIS E MAIL IS INTENDED FOR THE DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ONLY AND NOT FOR DELIBERATION BY THE BOARD TOWARD A DECISION IN ANY MANNER OUTSIDE OF A LAWFUL PUBLIC MEETING. THIS E MAIL IS INTENDED TO PROVIDE RECIPIENTS WITH INFORMATION RELATING TO COUNTY AFFAIRS OR THE OPERATION OF THE COUNTY AS A GOVERNMENT AGENCY FOR CONSIDERATION AT A FUTURE LAWFUL PUBLIC MEETING.

1) BOC Authority under State Constitution and County Commission Act

We lack general police powers authority . County's' general ordinance-making power (authority to pass ordinances) is under MCL 46.11(j)

Michigan Constitution and statutory law which limits the boards authority to matters that "relate to County affairs" under existing legal precedent means only matters that relate to the "operation and functioning of the county as a governmental entity"

BOC prohibited from enacting general ordinances without specific statutory authority and in all such cases strictly limited to the very narrow authority that may be allowed by law.

Any County Ordinances passed by County BOC cannot "interfere with local ordinances", (local Township or municipal ordinance preemption)

Section 29 (a) of the Dog Law of 1919 states specifically that :

Sec. 29a. The board of county commissioners by ordinance may establish an animal control agency which shall employ at least 1 animal control officer. The board of county commissioners may assign the animal control agency to any existing county department. The animal control agency shall have jurisdiction to enforce this act in any city, village or township which does not have an animal control ordinance. The county's animal control ordinance shall provide for animal control programs, facilities, personnel and necessary expenses incurred in animal control.

See reference to Attorney General Opinion No. 5341, 1977-1978, below

It is elementary that a county has only such powers as have been granted to it by the Constitution or the State Legislature. That is to say that a county possesses only those powers delegated to it. It is well settled law that a county board of commissioners has no inherent powers, but rather only those specifically and narrowly created by the constitution and statute. In other words, a county cannot adopt an ordinance unless it has been granted the authority to do so.

2) Proposed Ordinance cites 4 statutes as authority for ordinance:

Dog law of 1919: Only limited authority exists in the Dog Law of 1919, 1919 PA 339, MCL 287.261 et seq. (the Dog Law). Dog Law Statute specifically states that the scope of the State law is protecting livestock and poultry from damage by dogs; providing for the licensing of dogs; regulating the keeping of dogs, and authorizing their destruction in certain cases ... imposing powers and duties on certain state, county, city and township officers and employees....

While section 29a authorizes counties to establish animal control agencies and hire animal control officers, there is no language in the Dog Law that authorizes a county to regulate the livestock including poultry. Based on the canons of statutory construction, there is no statutory authority under the state Dog Law to pass the ordinance as proposed in its current form. See legal precedent, AG Opinions below.

Michigan Animals at Large Act PA 328 Of 1976, The Michigan Animals at Large Act contains no authority that enables a county to adopt a county ordinance regulating the care or keeping of animals. The acts' purpose is to regulate animals running at large and provide for compensation for damage done by animals;

Dangerous animal Act 1988: Dangerous animal Act contains no authority that enables the county to adopt a county ordinance regulating the care or keeping of animals. The acts' purpose is to regulate dangerous animals; provides for notification to animal control, surrender of a dangerous animal to animal control and for the confinement, identification, or destruction of dangerous animals; and provides penalties for the owners or keepers of dangerous animals that attack human beings.

Public Health Code 1978; The Public Health Code contains no authority that enables the county to adopt a county ordinance regulating the care or keeping of animals. The acts' purpose is to provide the County Health Department the authority to investigation/quarantine of suspect Rabid animals and enforcement of those procedures, which are allowable under the public health code to prevent the spread of communicable disease. Michigan's communicable disease rules are promulgated under the authority conferred on the Department of Health and Human Services by section 5 111 of Act No. 368 of the Public Acts of 1978, as amended, being 333.5111 of the Michigan Compiled Laws.

Per our County Health Director The health department works closely with Animal Control officers on cases of suspect and actual Rabies. SCCHD nursing division takes the lead on the individual report side; education and facilitation of post exposure prophylaxis (vaccine) and Animal Control takes the lead on the animal, while continually communicating outcomes between the departments.

Leader Dog Act 1970; The Leader Dog Act contains no authority that enables the county to adopt a county ordinance regulating the care or keeping of animals. The acts' purpose is to exempt certain dogs from license fees.

Legal Precedent

AG Opinion 7314 : The county's general ordinance-making power of MCL 46.11(j) does not authorize a county board of commissioners to adopt a countywide ordinance regulating the keeping of livestock and poultry on residential land.

AG Opinion 5341; A similar question regarding the scope of a county's authority under the Dog Law was addressed in OAG, 1977-1978, No. 5341, (July 31, 1978), which considered whether the Dog Law authorized a county to operate a spay and neuter clinic for dogs and cats. That opinion explained that, consistent with its title, the Dog Law provides for protection of the public from damage caused by dogs, for the licensing of dogs, for regulation of the keeping of dogs, and for destruction of dogs in certain cases And it concluded that "[n]o provision of the act specifically or impliedly authorizes a county to establish and maintain a spay and neuter clinic and cats are not mentioned in either the title or body of the act. Therefore, this law may not be used as a source of authority by a county to operate a spay and neuter clinic for dogs and cats." Which is exactly what our county Animal Control Director and our Administrator are doing by citing the State Dog Law as authority for the proposed county ordinance under review.

Since no provision of the Dog Law specifically or impliedly authorizes a county board of commissioners to adopt an animal control ordinance to regulate anything other than dogs subject to the narrow purpose of the state statute and likewise in the manner set forth in the state law itself, the Dog Law may not be used as a source of such authority.

3) Michigan Right to Farm Act Preempts local regulation of animal care and Agricultural Practices

Certain provisions within the proposed ordinance impact farming/agriculture practices preempted by and contrary to clear legislative intent of the Michigan Right to Farm Act and the Generally Accepted Agricultural and Management Practices for the Care of Farm Animals (GAAMP's). The GAMMS are promulgated under the MRTFA by The Michigan Commission of Agriculture and Rural Development, a 15-member board appointed by the Governor, who meet regularly to review and promulgate the standards for animal care and other agricultural issues to be enforced statewide. The MRTFA pre-empts and prohibits the adoption or enforcement of any local ordinance, regulation, or resolution that purports to extend or revise in any manner the provisions of this MRTFA.

The Michigan Right to Farm Act (MCL286.474 (6)) states:

"it is the express legislative intent that this act preempt any local ordinance, regulation, or resolution that purports to extend or revise in any manner the provisions of this act or generally accepted agricultural and management practices developed under this act. Except as otherwise provided in this section, a local unit of government shall not enact, maintain, or enforce an ordinance, regulation, or resolution that conflicts in any manner with this act or generally accepted agricultural and management practices developed under this act."

4) & 5) Some of the SCC Animal Control ordinance revisions are over broad and unnecessary.

4) The SCC Animal Control ordinance revisions as proposed are over broad as some of the provisions exceed this board's authority to adopt parts of the ordinance as submitted. That is to say that some aspects of the proposed county ordinance are not allowable under current law as a county ordinance under this boards limited authority.

5) The SCC Animal Control ordinance revisions as proposed are unnecessary as the state legislature has already passed state laws and administrative rules sufficient to regulate the care and treatment of animals including dogs most specifically. A good example is the Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Developments Generally Accepted Agricultural and Management Practices (GAAMP's) provisions for the care of animals and the MDARD Regulation 129 that regulates kennel operations.

Some of the state laws on the regulation, treatment and care of animals are :

The Dog Law of 1919

The Michigan Penal Code

The Michigan Animal at Large Act

The Michigan large Carnivore Act

The Michigan Wolf Dog Act

The Generally Accepted Agricultural and Management Practices under the RTFA

Administrative Rules of the various state Departments

In my opinion it is unnecessary and therefore inappropriate to expand or otherwise adopt a county ordinance on matters already regulated by state law. Aside from the lack of necessity for such county regulation, as pointed out above, the county is not permitted to do so in many instances due to preemption by state and local regulations and also due to the very limited authority the county has to pass ordinances in general. In the various state regulations noted above one can see that there is no need for a county ordinance that replicates or exceeds those regulations already in place that are presently enforceable by any law enforcement agency. We already have ample state regulation that regulates the care and treatment of animals.

Agenda Item 5 – Approval of the Agenda

Moved by Commissioner Simasko, supported by Commissioner Beedon, to approve the agenda as amended. Carried – Voice Vote 5-0. Aye: Beedon, Bohm, Rushing, Simasko, Torello

Agenda Item 6– Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting:

Moved by Commissioner Beedon, supported by Commissioner Rushing, to approve and file the minutes of the 06/15/23 Commission meeting and the 07/06/23 Standing Committee meetings. Carried - Voice Vote 5-0. Aye: Beedon, Bohm, Rushing, Simasko, Torello

Agenda Item 7 - Proclamations

Moved by Commissioner Torello, supported by Commissioner Rushing, to approve the proclamation recognizing Raymond Martin's years of service. Carried – Voice Vote 5-0. Aye: Beedon, Bohm, Rushing, Simasko, Torello

Agenda Item 8– Consent Agenda:

Moved by Commissioner Simasko, supported by Commissioner Beedon, to approve items 8A through 8J on the Consent Agenda. Carried- Voice Vote 5-0. Aye: Beedon, Bohm, Rushing, Simasko, Torello

Agenda Item 9 - Reports of Standing and Special Committees

Commissioner Beedon– Board of Health – Oral

National Accreditation - Oral

Commissioner Rushing – Riley Township Board Meeting – Oral

Agenda Item 10 - Citizens Wishing to Address the Board

Kevin Lindke – PO Box 44, St. Clair MI 48079
RE: Bohm

Libby Prill – 6177 Tripp, China MI 48054
RE: Brownfield, Planning, 26 Mile Rd

Vicki Blackburn – 3437 Stone St., Port Huron MI 48060
RE: Support Liz King

Agenda Item 11 – Unfinished Business

Broadband Consultant - Tabled

Agenda Item 12A: Approval of County Disbursements – June 2023

Moved by Commissioner Simasko, supported by Commissioner Torello, to approve the June 2023 County Disbursements in the amount of \$18,326,048.19. Carried – Roll Call Vote 5-0 Aye: Baldwin, Beedon, Bohm, Rushing, Simasko, Vandenbossche

Agenda Item 12C: Library Consultant Services for Bookmobile Contract

Approval – Specialty Vehicle Services, LLC

Moved by Commissioner Simasko, supported by Commissioner Beedon, to approve the Professional Service Contract with Specialty Vehicle Services, LLC for bookmobile consultant services for the Library in an amount not to exceed \$21,300.

Carried – Roll Call Vote 5-0 Aye: Beedon, Bohm, Rushing, Simasko, Torello

Agenda Item 12D: Resolution 23-15 Approving Area Agency on Aging 1-B – FY 2024 Annual Implementation Plan

Moved by Commissioner Torello, supported by Commissioner Rushing, to adopt Resolution 23-15 approving the Area Agency on Aging 1-B FY 2024 Annual Implementation Plan. Carried – Voice Vote 5-0 Aye: Beedon, Bohm, Rushing, Simasko, Torello

Agenda Item 12E: St. Clair County Health Department – St. Clair County Community College (SC4) – Nursing Agreement Extension Approval

Moved by Commissioner Beedon, supported by Commissioner Rushing, to approve the Health Department nursing agreement extension with SC4 for a term of 07/01/23 through 06/30/24 in the amount of \$109,374. Carried – Roll Call Vote 5-0 Aye: Beedon, Bohm, Rushing, Simasko, Torello

Agenda Item 12G: FY 2024 Residential Substance Abuse Treatment Grant Application Approval

Moved by Commissioner Rushing, supported by Commissioner Torello, to approve the FY 2024 Residential Substance Abuse Treatment grant application in the amount of \$242,953. Carried – Voice Vote 5-0. Aye: Beedon, Bohm Rushing, Simasko, Torello

Agenda Item 12H: Office of Public Guardian – Contract Approval Request for Thomas Reuters CLEAR Programming

Moved by Commissioner Torello, supported by Commissioner Rushing, to approve the agreement with Westlaw for the Clear Proflex subscription for the Public Guardian's Office for a 3-year term in the total amount of \$21,639.12. Carried – Roll Call Vote 5-0 Ayes: Beedon, Bohm, Rushing, Simasko, Torello

Agenda Item 12J: Sheriff's Office Contract Approval Request – Motorola Solutions

Moved by Commissioner Simasko, supported by Commissioner Rushing, to approve the agreement with Motorola Solutions for the replacement of the Sheriff Department's radios and 3-year warranty in an amount not to exceed \$634,897.30. Discussion followed. Carried – Roll Call Vote 5-0. Aye: Beedon, Bohm, Rushing, Simasko, Torello

Agenda Item 12K: Sheriff's Office Contract Approval Request – Tek84 for Jail Intercept Body Scanner

Moved by Commissioner Rushing, supported by Commissioner Beedon, to approve the purchase of a whole-body security scanner and 5-year warranty from TEK84 in an amount not to exceed \$202,500. Carried – Roll Call Vote 5-0. Aye: Beedon, Bohm, Rushing, Simasko, Torello

Agenda Item 12L: Blue Water Conservation District Funding Request

Moved by Commissioner Torello, supported by Commissioner Rushing, to approve \$30,000 in funding for the Blue Water Conservation District for FY 2024 through FY 2026. Carried – Roll Call Vote 5-0 Aye: Beedon, Bohm, Rushing, Simasko, Torello

Agenda Item 12M: Parks and Recreation Proposed Fee Revision

Moved by Commissioner Beedon, supported by Commissioner Torello, to approve the Parks and Recreation proposed fee scheduled revisions. Carried – Voice Vote 5-0 Aye: Beedon, Bohm, Rushing, Simasko, Torello

Agenda Item 12N: Resolution 23-14 Airport Sponsor Contract Approval – Environmental Assessment Phase 2

Moved by Commissioner Torello, supported by Commissioner Rushing, to adopt Resolution 23-14 approving the sponsor contract for funding of the Environmental Assessment Phase 2 for the Airport. Carried – Voice Vote 5-0 Aye: Beedon, Bohm, Rushing, Simasko, Torello

Agenda Item 12O: AT & T Contract for Telephone Services

Moved by Commissioner Simasko, supported by Commissioner Beedon, to approve the contract with AT&T for telephone services for a 3-year term.

Carried – Roll Call Vote 5-0 Aye: Beedon, Bohm, Rushing, Simasko, Torello

Agenda Item 12P: Commissioner Vandenbossche – District 7 American Rescue Plan Project – Clay Township

Moved by Commissioner Rushing, supported by Commissioner Torello, to approve the District 7 American Rescue Plan project for Clay Township for the upgrade for a contact point for the warning siren project in the amount of \$10,115.

Carried – Roll Call Vote 5-0 Aye: Beedon, Bohm, Rushing, Simasko, Torello

Agenda Item 12Q: Medical Director Employment Agreement – Dr Remington Nevin

Dr. Nevin introduced himself and said a few words. “Good evening Commissioners, Dr. Remington Nevin, it is a pleasure to be here. I suppose you are all familiar with my CV and you heard the reports of the committee that interviewed me so I will just say a few words, briefly. I, I have family in the area. My father, my late father is from Buffalo. My mother is from a small town just across the river in Ontario and I was raised in Toronto. Went to the University of Toronto before joining the US Army, where I served 14 years as a public health officer. I volunteered for a number of overseas deployment to combat areas including Afghanistan so I am use to taking incoming heat rounds. I do understand some of the controversies in the county. That’s fine, I am happy to discuss that more in the due course. I’m very interested in relocating here, I may have mentioned, to be, to be closer to my family that is in the area. So, when I saw this opportunity, my partner and I, we thought this was a great opportunity for us. So, thank you very much for considering my application, favorably. I will address the, I suppose the gorilla in the room, I am familiar with the

controversy surrounding COVID, COVID interventions and let me just say I, I share many of those concerns that have been expressed here. I am on record, this is no secret, I was on record very early in the pandemic as expressing some concerns with some of the decisions that were made, very high levels, not everyone in the public health profession necessarily agrees with every decision that has been made. For many years, it was impossible for us to even debate these issues openly. Now that we can, I think we will get a much more nuance of understanding of events of recent years. My philosophy in public health is that there are very rarely perfect solutions in public health there is almost always tradeoffs, and when deciding on a course of action to pursue, I think the decision makers need to consider both the pros and potential cons of any potential intervention and use the values and priorities of the communities to guide them in whatever decision is made. The decision that is right for one community may not be the right decision for another community. That is not wrong, it's a reflection that public health serves the public and the purpose of public health is not just to protect health and save lives, it is to protect health and save lives in a matter that is consistent with the priorities and values of the population. That's my public health philosophy and I am looking forward to helping the county make potential difficult decisions in that regard in the future. Happy to take any questions."

Moved by Commissioner Beedon, supported by Commissioner Rushing, to approve the Medical Director employment agreement with Dr. Remington Nevin for a term of 07/24/23 through 06/23/26 at a rate of \$123 per hour. Carried – Roll Call Vote 5-0
Aye: Beedon, Bohm, Rushing, Simasko, Torello

Agenda Item 12R: State of Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS) Lease

Moved by Commissioner Simasko, supported by Commissioner Rushing, to approve the lease agreement with the Michigan Department of Health and Human services for a term of 06/01/23 through 05/31/24 in the total amount of \$559,992.

Carried – Roll Call 5-0 Aye: Beedon, Bohm, Rushing, Simasko, Torello

Agenda Item 12S: FY 2024 Traffic Enforcement Program Grant Application Approval

Moved by Commissioner Torello, supported by Commissioner Rushing, to approve the FY 2024 Traffic Enforcement Program grant application in the amount of \$62,206.

Carried – Voice Vote 5-0 Aye: Beedon, Bohm, Rushing, Simasko, Torello

Agenda Item 12T: FY2020 National Criminal History Improvement Program Grant Agreement Approval

Moved by Commissioner Rushing, supported by Commissioner Simasko, to approve the FY 2020 National Criminal History Improvement Program Grant Agreement in the

amount of \$10,278. Carried – Voice Vote 5-0 Aye: Beedon, Bohm, Rushing, Simasko, Torello

Agenda Item 13 – Administrator’s Report

1. The retirement board met earlier in the week and today we met to discuss the retirement health care trust. Both funds returned 7.4% this year. As you recall, we had about a 14% loss last year for each fund so we are starting to make those dollars up. At the retirement board meeting, they set the date for the actuary meeting, which will take place on August 15 @ 9 a.m. That is where the board will get the results of the 2022 actuarial evaluations.
2. We currently have multiple RPF’s out for many of the ARPA projects. The library roof, those RPF’s results are due tomorrow along with the architect for the health department design. The lobbyist RPF, those interviews have been complete and there will be a recommendation for that coming to the Board in August. You will see more RFP’s, not just because of the ARPA projects, but many of our contracts are coming in asking for very significant increases, sometimes upward of 40%. Due to that we will be bidding out more things.
3. Another RFP you will see coming is for chillers for the administration building. The chillers are the original with the building and are starting to experience some failures. This item was not on the ARPA list so we are reevaluating the list.
4. I am working with the City of Port Huron on leasing the parking lot located at Merchant and Quay Street for public city parking.
5. Results for CIP came in last week. There were 25 projects totaling \$36 million. There are a few more to come in so you will have a better update next month.

Moved by Commissioner Simasko, supported by Commissioner Beedon, to accept the Administrator’s Report. Carried – Voice Vote 5-0 Aye: Beedon, Bohm, Rushing, Simasko, Torello

Agenda Item 14A – Miscellaneous Business

Commissioner Rushing brought up the Road Commission budget and process.

Commissioner Simasko questioned the process of the Brownfield Development.

Suggested reaching out to corporation counsel for clarification.

Commissioner Simasko addressed the preferred paper ballot process when voting as the County Board.

Commissioner Bohm mentioned the power boat race that is coming to St. Clair next weekend.

Agenda Item 15 – Receive and File

Moved by Commissioner Beedon, supported by Commissioner Simasko, to receive and file packets that were sent to Commissioners, packets at their places and any other information presented. Carried – Voice Vote 5-0 Aye: Beedon, Bohm, Rushing, Simasko, Torello

Agenda Item 16 – Adjournment

Moved by Commissioner Simasko, supported by Commissioner Torello, to adjourn at 4:49 p.m. Carried – Voice Vote 5-0 Aye: Beedon, Bohm, Rushing, Simasko, Torello

Angie Waters, County Clerk/Register of Deeds