

**Minutes Thursday, March 6, 2025**

Mr. Schlumbohm moved the adoption of the following Resolution:

**WHEREAS**, the Ohio revised Code Section 153.64, 4931 and 4933 provides to the Board of County Commissioners, the authority to control the installation and placement of any public utilities within the dedicated public right of ways of all County maintained highways; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Board of County Commissioners believe there will be more expansion of the broadband network and new facilities and to allow for a more efficient deployment of broadband infrastructure throughout the county to authorize the Engineer to issue those permits, and

**WHEREAS**, the Ohio Revised Code Section 5589 and 5543 provides to the Board of County Commissioners, the authority to control any digging and excavating on or along a County maintained highway and for the placement of a private driveway approach to a County maintained highway; and

**WHEREAS**, The Ohio revised Code Section 4513.44 provides to the Board of County Commissioners, the authority to permit oversize and overweight vehicles using County maintained highways. And

**THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Board of Putnam County Commissioner does hereby authorize the Putnam County Engineer to develop and administer permits for the above described activities including broadband within the County road right-of-ways and to keep said permits with the permanent road records of Putnam County until December 31, 2025.

Mr. Brubaker seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Wehri yes Mr. Brubaker yes Mr. Schlumbohm yes

Comm. Jrl. 121, Page 109

Mr. Wehri moved the adoption of the following Resolution:

**WHEREAS**, Section 5101-9-6-82 of the Ohio Administrative Code (OAC) provides for the inter-county adjustment of any state or federal county family services agency allocation,

And

**WHEREAS**, Counties have requested such adjustments to best meet the needs of their constituents, due to the limited allowable uses of each fund and the nuances of the random moment sampling process on a county's funding stream;

And;

**WHEREAS**, Any unspent allocations within a county at the end of a fiscal year revert back to the state for use by the State Department of Job & Family Services;

And;

**WHEREAS**, A county family services agency must make such inter-county adjustment request to the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, and include with such request a resolution authorizing such from that county's board of county commissioners;

And

**WHEREAS**, in accordance with Ohio Administrative Code Section 5101:9-6-82(F)(2)(a), a board of county commissioners may pass a resolution assigning authority to the director of the county family service agency to serve as their designee and therefore grant that party authority to sign the inter-county adjustment agreement on behalf of the county for a specific period of time;

Now THEREFORE, BE IT

**RESOLVED**, that the Board of County Commissioners of Putnam County. Ohio hereby assigns authority to John Folk, Job and Family Services Director for one year, to serve as the Putnam County Board of Commissioners' designee, and thereby grants Mr. Folk the authority to sign inter-county agreements on behalf of Putnam County until December 31, 2025.

Mr. Schlumbohm seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Wehri yes Mr. Brubaker yes Mr. Schlumbohm yes

Comm. Jrl. 121, Page 110

### **Then/Now Purchase orders**

Mr. moved to approve the then and now purchase orders.

Mr. seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Wehri Mr. Brubaker Mr. Schlumbohm

Exceptions: Mr. Wehri Mr. Brubaker Mr. Schlumbohm

Comm. Jrl. 121, Page

### **Purchase Orders and Travel Requests**

**Office of Public Safety.....**Blanket purchase order for Other expenses for \$ 10,000.00.

Mr. Schlumbohm moved to approve the purchase orders and travel requests.

Mr. Brubaker seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Wehri yes Mr. Brubaker yes Mr. Schlumbohm yes

Exceptions: Mr. Wehri Mr. Brubaker Mr. Schlumbohm

Mr. Schlumbohm opened the meeting with leading the Pledge of Allegiance with Commissioners Wehri and Brubaker, Cindy Landwehr and Alaina Siefker.

The Commissioners had a phone call with Kyle Stechschulte from the Village of Ottawa regarding the acceptance of leachate on the weekend for pumping at the landfill. Kyle will need

to talk to the Village Council about the county getting access to get rid of our leachate. Commissioner Schlumbohm also brought up the parking ideas for Hickory Street. Kyle said the Village is still working on it. Additional handicap parking spots for the courthouse were requested also.

Commissioners Wehri, Schlumbohm and Brubaker had a discussion on the library board appointment. The Commissioners reviewed the resumes submitted by the candidates for the Library board appointment. The library did request someone with business experience. The Commissioners are favoring Kendall Schroeder of the candidates that they interviewed.

A bid opening for CDBG PY 23 Allocation Put Co Historical Society ADA ramp Construction was held the bids were received as follows:

Contractor	Addendums	Bid Bond	Base Bid Amount
Schimmoller Const	X	included	\$93,999.00
Joe & Joe	X	included	\$114,629.00
E. Lee Construction	X	included	\$98,950.00
Myers Restoration	X	included	\$129,145.00

Mr. Schlumbohm moved to table the bids for further review.

Mr. Brubaker seconded the motion.

Vote: Wehri yes Brubaker yes Schlumbohm yes

A bid opening was held for the construction of the Mark Shoemaker Dt # 999. The estimate was \$21,200. The bids were received as follows:

Contractor	Bid Bond	Bid Amount
Smith Excavating	10% check	\$18,295.50
ADJ Excavating	LOC-Union Bank	\$19,252.50
Gerding Contracting	included	\$17,287.40
Sand Ridge Excavating	included	\$ 29,303.80
Kahle excavating	10% check	\$20,116.50

Mr. Schlumbohm moved to table the bids for further review.

Mr. Wehri seconded the motion.

Vote: Wehri yes Brubaker yes Schlumbohm yes

Tim Schnipke brought in the quotes received on the courtroom repairs that are needed. The Commissioners will review what was submitted. The lighting will be redone to add some uplighting to the current fixtures while the scaffolding is up and the fixtures are removed for the repairs.

The business agenda was held with Commissioners Wehri, Schlumbohm and Brubaker and Cindy Landwehr, Clerk.

The minutes from Tuesday, March 4, 2025 were reviewed and approved.

Devon Bradshaw with Enterprise Fleet met with Commissioners Wehri, Schlumbohm and Brubaker, Brian Hilvers, and Mike Lenhart, to discuss fleet management. Devon shared how they can help government entities. Do they rent any type of government vehicle? Devon shared a list of vehicles they offer, and a list of counties that they partner with for service. The services can be fitted to our needs. Sourcewell is a cooperative purchasing agent and Enterprise uses Sourcewell. This is a way for government entities to get discounted pricing. They can figure cost per mile per vehicle. Most of the other counties they service are much larger than Putnam County. If we provide a fleet list, he can compare our fleet size to a comparable entity to get an idea for pricing. Maintenance would be done through Auto Integrate and if the local shops use it, they can track the maintenance history on each vehicle. They can also set up the local shops if they do not use Auto Integrate. Devon can provide cost numbers for a perspective. When setting the budget does each department make their own decisions. Engineer is alone, the Commissioners have oversight on the EMS and Sheriff. The annual vehicle budget amount was questioned. The County has been managing costs since COVID. For EMS vehicles the swapping of chassis was explained for upgrading vehicles. The mileage on the vehicles was questioned over mileage will not be penalized but the prices will be adjusted based on mileage of the vehicle. The are management fees and backends fees on the vehicles, which is how Enterprise makes their money. The county does purchase locally as much s possible, based on availability of vehicles. The lettering services can stay the same at being done locally. Statewide in Van Wert is used for installing equipment in the vehicles. As much equipment as possible that can be switched to the new vehicles for the Sheriff's office. For fuel consumption most of the vehicles use fuel from the Engineer. On occasion the EMS squad will refuel at a gas station depending on where they are on a call in the county. The Engineer does have the capabilities to track the gas mileage for the vehicles that do refuel with them. Enterprise would take over all the current vehicles that the county owns. The frequency of trading vehicles was questioned what is it based on: age, mileage, cost? Everything would be compared to make it the most cost effective. No telematics are being used in the county vehicles other than the Sheriff and Emergency vehicles that have modems that communicate information for location. Geotab could track vehicles to monitor its travel within the county location and gas mileage. The sale of vehicles was discussed some are transferred inter-departmental; some are sold on Govdeals and there is a county auction. The age and costs of the vehicles determines the sale of the vehicles currently. Some data collection methods were shared to help determine the need for new vehicles and resale value of current vehicles. Sample fleet information was reviewed. The requirements to create a fleet account were reviewed. The timeframe to get the data collected was discussed. Devon will check back on March 27 to reschedule.

Mr. Brubaker moved to adjourn for lunch.

Mr. Wehri seconded the motion.

Vote: Wehri yes Brubaker yes Schlumbohm yes

Commissioners Wehri, Brubaker and Schlumbohm resumed session.

County Engineer Mike Lenhart met with Commissioners Wehri, Schlumbohm and Brubaker to review bridge rating quotes for M-6 Bridge. Information was given last week for review. People wouldn't be sitting at a dead-end road. A cul-du-sac was proposed to prevent people parking and causing trouble and help with plows, deliveries and the like. The Engineer stated emergency personnel will have the same distance and time to travel to cities as they do now and the county would be under more liability since it was closed for safety. The Engineer's concerns are still an issue with the safety of the bridge. The historical factor is also an issue. Local traffic was the main violator of this bridge and if it is reopened that will be a violator again. The decision belongs to the Commissioners since everything is under their name and it is ultimately their responsibility. The engineer will provide any recommendations he can on any road and bridge to maintain public safety. The original bridge closing was based on the recommendation of the Engineer, he did not say to close the bridge he recommended it. Who pays for the studies if the Engineer does not agree with them being needed. The Commissioners recall that the Engineer did agree to initially pay for the bridge rating since it was a bridge and it falls under his duties. Something may not happen now it may happen 10 years or beyond but if the bridge would fail it will fall back on the current Commissioners and the decisions they have made. The quote he is presented from DLZ is out of Columbus, they have offices all over the state Cleveland, Akron, Columbus. If the bridge is reopened the county Engineer will no longer do the annual inspections. As of now this and one other bridge within the county would need the specific load rating inspection. The historic bridges within the county were closed and made pedestrian bridges and the load inspections were not needed. The M-6 bridge can handle 5 ton of less. The weight of Amazon vans was discussed. The engineer stated the semi-trucks will not back up if they don't fit, they will push through to get through and damage the guardrail cement barriers whatever is in their way. All bridges need to be inspected every 12 months. Fracture critical bridges are inspected every 24 months unless something is found then it is pushed to 12 months. The cost will not be just \$13,000, some years it could be \$5,000. The Engineer does not agree with reopening the bridge but if the Commissioners decide to reopen it, he will do what they ask. He may not like it but he will do it. The local residents wanted to reopen the bridge and set height limits until the Prosecutor said there may be liability to the residents with that. The residents seem to be ok with the County being responsible for the liability but not themselves. Mr. Lenhart did not agree with the restoring of the bridge instead of rehabbing it to make more usable for heavier traffic and vehicles. It is just personal opinion of the local residents for this bridge to be reopened. The cul-de-sac before the bridge would have been big enough to accommodate a semi needing to turn around. The bridge was safe after the restoration but the integrity of the materials was not measured. The wrought iron material of the bridge was concerning to the restoration company but its integrity was not tested. Since this is a historic bridge, it is different money was spent on it to restore and preserve it for its historical value. Mr. Lenhart himself does not like that the bridge is closed. Since it has been restored, people were treating it as if it were a new bridge and it was not a new bridge. There were many reasons that this bridge was closed. Some of the landowners that attended the meetings did understand both sides of why the bridge was closed. The trustees weren't necessarily opposed, nor were they for the closing of the bridge, they wanted people to have access for golf carts for Ted Fest. The Commissioners would like to see an inspection of the bridge so they would have an argument for those that call them about the reopening of the bridge. The Commissioners asked about splitting the cost of the inspection. The Engineer wants that in writing for posterity's sake. The bridge report from liability insurance was brought up. Not all the county bridges are insured, only the ones that are listed. The list was reviewed. If

someone would drive over the bridge and it collapses insurance would not replace it. If the M-6 bridge would go down it, it would not be replaced. The Engineer wants to keep the Commissioners informed to make the best decisions. This historical bridge restoration was documented with the State Historical Society. If the bridge is not heavily traveled it is not economical to replace the bridge. Currently the bridge is being preserved and people can use it, with walking, bicycling and golfcart traffic. The quotes were reviewed. The Commissioners will review the quotes. The Engineer explained that the galvanizing of some of the pieces do not go well due to some pieces disintegrating during the galvanizing. Some of them were just epoxied instead of galvanized due to the condition of the materials which was form 1876. The Commissioner should think about their decision before the results come back to see if they need to spend more money on this bridge. Lenhart took this project over in the middle from previous engineer Recker, it was up to the bidding when he took over. Every bridge restoration comes down to this.

Mr. Schlumbohm moved to adjourn for the day.

Mr. Brubaker seconded the motion.

Vote: Wehri yes Brubaker yes Schlumbohm yes

Mr. Schlumbohm moved to approve the minutes as read from Thursday, March 6, 2025.

Mr. Wehri seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Wehri yes Mr. Brubaker yes Mr. Schlumbohm yes