THE COUNTY SERVICES COMMITTEE WILL MEET ON TUESDAY, MARCH 5, 2013 AT 6:00 P.M., IN THE PERSONNEL CONFERENCE ROOM (D & E), HUMAN SERVICES BUILDING, 5303 S. CEDAR, LANSING.

Agenda

Call to Order
Approval of the February 19, 2013 Minutes
Additions to the Agenda
Limited Public Comment

1. Interviews - Parks Commission

2. Interviews - Economic Development Commission

3. Financial Services - Resolution to Increase the Cost of the Agreement with Rehmann Robson to Conduct an Audit of the Ingham County for 2012

4. Human Resources
   a. Resolution Approving a Collective Bargaining Agreement with the Fraternal Order of Police Capitol City Lodge No. 141 - Corrections Unit
   b. Resolution Authorizing the Establishment of a MERS Hybrid Plan for Newly Hired Employees Under the Fraternal Order of Police Capitol City Lodge No. 141 - Corrections Unit
   c. Resolution to Update and Affirm Compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 to Include the Administrative Requirements Under Title II of the ADA

5. Potter Park Zoo - Resolution Authorizing a Transfer of Funds and Authorization for the Potter Park Zoological Society to Provide the Management of Seasonal Workers


7. Facilities - Resolution Awarding a Contract to Pavement Consultants, Inc. to Provide Professional Asphalt Consulting and Project Management Services for the Parking Lot Replacement at the Human Services Building
8. Farmland & Open Space Preservation Board - Resolution Approving the Farmland and Open Space Preservation (FOSP) Board’s Recommended Selection Criteria (Scoring System) for the 2013 Farmland and Open Space Application Cycles and Approve the FOSP Board to Host a 2013 Application Cycle

9. Department of Transportation & Roads
   a. Resolution to Approve the Special and Routine Permits for the Ingham County Department of Transportation and Roads
   b. Resolution to Authorize a Professional Services Contract with Rowe Professional Services Company
   c. Resolution Authorizing a Contract for Supplying and Servicing Mechanics’ Uniforms, Shop Towels, Floor Mats, Mops & Related Services for the Department of Transportation & Roads
   d. Resolution Authorizing a Waiver of Ingham County’s Local Purchasing Preference Policy for the Department of Transportation & Roads Maintenance Asphalt and Local Road Program Bid Lettings & Related Purchases and/or Contracts

10. Community Development Block Grant - Resolution Authorizing an Extension to a 2009 Community Development Block Grant from the Michigan State Housing Development Authority Through June 30, 2013

11. Board of Commissioners - Resolution Recognizing April 9, 2013 as “Equal Pay” Day in Ingham County

12. Board Referral - Correspondence from Rosemary Anderson Regarding Parks Webpage (Materials to be Distributed at the Meeting)

Announcements
Public Comment
Adjournment

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES OR OTHER ELECTRONIC DEVICES OR SET TO MUTE OR VIBRATE TO AVOID DISRUPTION DURING THE MEETING

The County of Ingham will provide necessary reasonable auxiliary aids and services, such as interpreters for the hearing impaired and audio tapes of printed materials being considered at the meeting for the visually impaired, for individuals with disabilities at the meeting upon five (5) working days notice to the County of Ingham. Individuals with disabilities requiring auxiliary aids or services should contact the County of Ingham in writing or by calling the following: Ingham County Board of Commissioners, P.O. Box 319, Mason, MI 48854 Phone: (517) 676-7200. A quorum of the Board of Commissioners may be in attendance at this meeting. Meeting information is also available on line at www.ingham.org.
COUNTY SERVICES COMMITTEE
February 19, 2013
Minutes

Members Present: Debbie De Leon, Carol Koenig, Victor Celentino, Dianne Holman, Penelope Tsernoglou, and Randy Maiville

Members Absent: Deb Nolan

Others Present: Becky Bennett, Mary Lannoye, Travis Parsons, Michelle Rutkowski, Tom Boyd, Chuck Gray, Randy Marwede, Chuck Goeke, Jim Hudgins, Rick Terrill, Doug Stover, Madison Todd, Steve Dougan, Willis Bennett, Renée Branch Canady, Bill Conklin and others.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson De Leon at 6:03 p.m. in the Personnel Conference Room “D & E” of the Human Services Building, 5303 S. Cedar Street, Lansing.

Approval of the February 5, 2013 Minutes
The February 5, 2012 Minutes were approved as submitted.

Additions to the Agenda

9e. Late – Department of Transportation & Roads - Update Waverly Road Project

Limited Public Comment
Chuck Gray, UAW, stated the Union is opposed to Agenda Item #8 specifically because of Agenda Item #12. He asked the Commissioners to strongly consider not approving hiring above a Step 2.

MOVED BY COMM. MAIVILLE, SUPPORTED BY COMM. CELENTINO, TO APPROVE A CONSENT AGENDA FOR THE FOLLOWING ITEMS:

3. Drain Office
   a. Resolution Honoring Catarino Gomez
   b. Resolution Honoring George Heiler

4. 55th District Court - Resolution to Approve a Re-Organization within the 55th District Court

5. Veterans Affairs - Resolution to Authorize the Second Amendment to the 2013 Appropriations Resolution and the Establishment of a Veterans Clerk/Trust Fund Agent Position

6. Facilities - Resolution Authorizing Entering into a Contract with Wide Open West (WOW) Mid-Michigan Cable to Install New Cables and Amplifiers Throughout the Sheriff’s Office and Jail
7. **Equalization**
   a. Resolution Approving Entering into a Grant with the Michigan Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs and Appoint Douglas A. Stover as County Grant Administrator for the 2013 Remonumentation Project
   b. Resolution to Contract with Ronnie M. Lester as County Representative and Enger Surveying and Engineering for Services as Monumentation Surveyor for the Ingham County Monumentation and Remonumentation Project in 2013

9. **Department of Transportation & Roads**
   a. Resolution to Authorize Approval of the Preliminary Plat of Georgetown
   b. Resolution to Authorize the Purchase of Reflective Sign Faces and Complete Signs from Rathco Safety Supply, Inc.
   c. Resolution to Vote for Joanna Johnson, Managing Director of the Kalamazoo County Road Commission for the Three Year Term on the County Road Association’s Board of Directors Beginning April 1, 2013
   d. Resolution to Approve the Special and Routine Permits for the Ingham County Department of Transportation and Roads

10. **Fair Board**
    a. Resolution Authorizing Entering into a Contract with Jordan Roofing to Replace the Roof on the Community Hall and Office at the Ingham County Fairgrounds
    b. Resolution Authorizing Entering into a Contract with DLZ Michigan, Inc. to Provide Architectural & Engineering Services for the Main Arena Heating Project at the Ingham County Fairgrounds
    c. Resolution to Accept $9,000 in Matching Capital Improvement Funds from the Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development

11. **Parks Department** - Resolution Authorizing the Transfer of 2012 Burchfield Restroom Recreation Passport Grant Matching Funds to a 2013 Lake Lansing Park-South Recreation Passport Grant Application

12. **Human Resources**
    a. Resolution Approving a Collective Bargaining Agreement with the UAW Local 2256 - Technical, Office, Para-Professional and Service Employees
    b. Resolution Authorizing the Establishment of a MERS Hybrid Plan for Newly Hired Employees Under the UAW Local 2256 – Technical, Office, Para-Professional and Service Employees

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Comm. Nolan

MOVED BY COMM. MAIVILLE, SUPPORTED BY COMM. CELENTINO, TO APPROVE THE ITEMS ON THE CONSENT AGENDA.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Comm. Nolan
1. **Interviews** – Parks and Recreation Commission

The Committee interviewed Kevin Duffy for the Parks and Recreation Commission. Jonathan Schelke was absent from the interview. There are 3 vacancies.

2. **Interviews** – Economic Development Corporation Board of Directors

The Committee interviewed Steve Dougan and Tim Fischer for the Economic Development Corporation Board of Directors. Mark Meadows was absent from the interview. There is 1 vacancy.

8. **Health Department** - Recommendation to Start the Women, Infant, Children (WIC) Coordinator at Step 4

Dr. Branch Canady described the candidate’s qualifications and experience, in addition to, the responsibilities of the position. She stated the individual leaving held the position for approximately 30 years. Chairperson De Leon asked how many people staff this department. Comm. Celentino asked on average how long these individuals worked in the department expressing his concern that many of those employees started at a Step 1 and worked their way up the pay scale. Dr. Branch Canady informed the Commissioners of the number of staff, period of time worked and compensation within this Department. The Committee discussed specific compensation for this Department’s positions, step progression, job postings, the interview process and applicant’s qualifications obtained at their prior employment.

Comm. Maiville questioned why applicants are willing to accept a reduction from their current compensation. Dr. Branch Canady described why some applicants are willing to accept reduced pay giving the example of working directly with the clients. Chairperson De Leon asked if this applicant is retiring from their current employment. Dr. Branch Canady answered no; this applicant is mid-career and pursuing a PhD. Chairperson De Leon asked if this applicant is over qualified for this position expressing concern of the individual leaving the County. Dr. Branch Canady answered no. Dr. Branch Canady informed the Committee that there has been a good applicant pool because people want to work in the Health Department and this person is a good match to the team. Comm. Holman questioned the contradiction that in the past the Health Department has stated it is difficult to hire and now people want to work in the Health Department. Dr. Branch Canady clarified it is more difficult to hire clinicians.

Comm. Koenig asked Dr. Branch Canady what this does to morale when someone comes in at this Step level and current employees did not come in at a higher level. Dr. Branch Canady explained there are more challenges than salary decisions. There is the matter of engaging staff around the hiring process, providing a safe space and providing what is needed for the program to work. She further explained that most employees are rationale and understand the challenges in recruiting qualified individuals; it may bother some but will not significantly bother this team because they have been actively engaged in the process.
Comm. Koenig asked if applicants are often open to accepting a significant reduction of their current pay. Dr. Branch Canady explained compensation is discussed in the interview and it has been a trend for applicants to accept less than their current compensation. Chairperson De Leon noted that wages are advertised suggesting the applicants should know during the interview they will be taking a pay cut. Dr. Branch Canady acknowledged wages are advertised but is typically considered a base that can be negotiated. The Committee discussed advertising, pay scales, along with prior employment qualifications and experience.

The Committee discussed the applicant’s qualifications, experience and compensation. Dr. Branch Canady stated that no promise of specific compensation was made to the applicant. Comm. Holman suggested starting the applicant at a Step 3 and authorizing the Controller to increase to a Step 4 if necessary.

MOVED BY COMM. HOLMAN, SUPPORTED BY COMM. CELENTINO, TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATION TO START THE WOMEN, INFANT, CHILDREN (WIC) COORDINATOR AT STEP 3 GIVING THE CONTROLLER THE AUTHORIZATION TO INCREASE TO A STEP 4, IF NECESSARY.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Comm. Nolan

9. Department of Transportation & Roads
   e. Update Waverly Road Project

Comm. Holman reviewed the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) process then informed the Committee that the Waverly Road Project moved quickly through the process and is now on the TIP resulting in the Federal Government viewing Waverly Road as a project. Chairperson De Leon stated just because it on the TIP does not mean it has to be done. Comm. Holman stated that is correct plus Lansing Township still has not approved matching funds for the project. Comm. Celentino stated it is his understanding that Lansing Township’s priority is the Michigan Avenue project.

The Committee discussed Phase I and Phase II of the Waverly Road Project, matching funds, funding resources and borrowing money. Ms. Lannoye stated that the County does not borrow money to build roads. Mr. Conklin agreed, explaining building roads is a pay as you go process. Mr. Conklin also expressed his concern that there are many unanswered questions and that detailed estimates are needed because in his opinion the current estimates are low.

13. Board Referrals
   a. Onondaga Township Planning Commission Notice of Public Hearing Request for Special Land Use Permit
   b. Letter from the Catholic Diocese of Lansing Regarding the Refugee Health Services Program Agreement and Support of Saint Vincent Catholic Charities Request to Continue their Exemption from Resolution 03-168, Pertaining to Living Wage

The Board Referrals were received and placed on file.
Announcements
None.

Public Comment
Chuck Gray, UAW, clarified in response to Agenda Item #8 that employee morale is not good. He pointed out that he can not negotiate higher pay levels for, say, a secretary. He expressed his concern that Agenda Item #12a freezes employee pay until the end of 2014 and managers can negotiate wages and that does not do much for morale. Mr. Gray stated many employees started from the bottom of the pay scale and worked their way up to the top of the pay scale. He asked the Commissioners to question why a candidate is willing to take a significant pay cut and further questioned if the applicants understand the change in benefits.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie Buckmaster
MARCH 5, 2013 COUNTY SERVICES MEETING
STAFF REVIEW SUMMARY

ACTION ITEMS

The Controller recommends approval of the following action items:

3. Financial Services - Resolution to Increase the Cost of the Agreement with Rehman Robson to Conduct an Audit of Ingham County for 2012.

The resolution increases the total cost of the audit by $9,690, from $71,375 to $81,065 in order to accommodate the addition of the Department of Transportation and Roads. The additional $9,690 will charged against the department’s budget.

4(a). Human Resources - Resolution Approving a Collective Bargaining with the Fraternal Order of Police Capitol City Lodge No. 141 - Corrections Unit.

The resolution authorizes a collective bargaining agreement with the FOP Corrections Unit for the time period January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2014. The agreement establishes a Hybrid Pension for new hires that include a 1.5 Defined Benefit Multiplier and a 1% employer and 2% employee defined Contribution match. The agreement also includes a 1% salary reduction. Please refer to Travis Parson’s memorandum for additional information.

4(b). Human Resources - Resolution Authorizing the Establishment of a MERS Hybrid Plan for Newly Hired Employees Under the Fraternal Order of Police Capital City Lodge NO. 141 - Corrections Unit.

The resolution establishes the new Hybrid pension plan with MERS for all employees hired after January 1, 2013.

4(c). Human Resources - Resolution to Update and Affirm Compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 to Include the Administrative Requirements Under Title II of the ADA

The resolution updates and affirms the 1992 ADA resolution for compliance recognizes the clarification of the 2008 amendment and includes the incorporation of administrative best practices. The resolution also designates the County’s Human Resources Director as the ADA Coordinator.

5. Potter Park Zoo - Resolution Authorizing a Transfer of Funds and Authorization for the Potter Park Zoological Society to Provide the Management of Seasonal Workers.

The resolution authorizes the transfer of $69,300 from the Zoo Budget to the Society in order to provide management of seasonal workers. A similar resolution was approved last year by the Board.

The resolution sets a public hearing for Tuesday March 26, 2013. Douglas J is proposing to redevelop a site at the corner of Okemos and Hamilton. The proposed development includes a salon, spa, commercial and multifamily residential users. The developer proposes the establishment of a Brownfield Redevelopment Plan with a TIF capture. The developer would pay the $329,000 in up-front costs to clean up contamination on the property and the TIF capture would reimburse the developer over a period of approximately four years. The Meridian Township Board approved the plan and the Ingham County Brownfield Redevelopment Authority recommends approval.

7. Facilities - Resolution Awarding a Contract to Pavement Consultants, Inc. to Provide Professional Asphalt Consulting and Project Management Services for the Parking Lot Replacement at the Human Services Building.

The resolution authorizes awarding a contract to Pavement Consultants, Inc. for an amount not to exceed $9,165 for the purpose of providing professional asphalt consulting and project management services for the replacement of the parking lot at the Human Services Building. Pavement Consultants, Inc., who submitted the lowest responsive and responsible bid, was chosen, after going through a competitive bidding process, and has the recommendation of both the Purchasing and Facilities Departments. Funds are available in the Capital Improvement Budget.

8. Farmland & Open Space Preservation Board - Resolution Approving the Farmland and Open Space Preservation (FOSP) Board’s Recommended Selection Criteria (Scoring System) for the 2013 Farmland & Open Space Application Cycles and Approve the FOSP Board to Host a 2013 Application Cycle.

The resolution approves the FOSP’s recommended Selection Criteria for ranking 2013 applications.

9(a). Department of Transportation & Roads - Resolution to Approve the Special and Routine Permits for the Ingham County Department of Transportation & Roads.

The resolution approves nine special permits.

9(b). Department of Transportation & Roads - Resolution to Authorize a Professional Services Contract with Rowe Professional Services Company.

The resolution authorizes a contract with Rowe to provide bridge inspection services in an amount estimated at $25,600 for the 2013 and 2014 calendar years. Rowe was the low bidder and is not a local vendor.

9(c). Department of Transportation & Roads - Resolution Authorizing a Contract for Supplying and Servicing Mechanics’ Uniforms, Shop Towels, Floor Mats, Mops & Related Services for the Department of Transportation & Roads.

The resolution authorizes a 3-year agreement, with a 2-year renewal, with UniFirst Corporation in an amount estimated at $12,722. UniFirst submitted the lowest bid and is not a local vendor.
9(d). Department of Transportation & Roads - Resolution Authorizing a Waiver of Ingham County’s Local Purchasing Preference Policy for the Department of Transportation & Roads Maintenance Asphalt and local Road Program Bid lettings.

The resolution authorizes a waiver to the County’s local purchasing preference policy for asphalt paving. There are 2 main asphalt vendors in the area. One of the vendors resides in Ingham County and the other resides just over the border in Clinton County. Their competitive bids are generally very close. If the local vendor purchasing process is not waived, the Clinton County vendor would have no incentive to bid, thereby undermining the competitive process.

10. Community Development Block Grant - Resolution to Authorizing an Extension to a 2009 Community Development Block Grant from the Michigan State Housing Development Authority Through June 30, 2013.

The resolution extends a 2009 CDBG grant through June 2013.

OTHER ACTIONS ITEMS

11. Board of Commissioners - Resolution in Support of Equal Pay Day
In 2011, the Board authorized the continuation of Rehmann Robson as the County’s auditors for 2011, 2012 and 2013 at an annual cost of $71,375. This was the same cost as of 2010 audit.

Since that time, the County has merged with the Ingham County Road Commission. Rehmann is requesting that the contract be amended by $9,690 to cover the additional work needed to include the Road and Transportation Fund under the scope of the audit. This would increase the total cost of the audit from $71,375 to $81,065.

Due to the unique accounting treatment of a construction based organization, the Road and Transportation continued to operate on the accounting software of the former Road Commission. This does increase the time needed to audit this additional fund.

I am hopeful that this increase will be for the 2012 engagement only and that we will see a reduction in future years.

After discussion with the partner responsible for our engagement, I believe this increase in fee for 2012 is reasonable and recommend that the contract amendment be approved.
RESOLUTION TO INCREASE THE COST OF THE AGREEMENT WITH REHMANN ROBSON TO CONDUCT AN AUDIT OF THE INGHAM COUNTY FOR 2012

WHEREAS, Ingham County currently uses Rehmann Robson Certified Public Accountants to conduct its annual audit; and

WHEREAS, in June 2012, the County merged with the Ingham County Road Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Rehmann Robson is requesting an additional $9,690 to include the Road and Transportation Fund in the County’s 2012 audit.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners amends the contract with Rehmann Robson to conduct the 2012 audit of Ingham County to increase the fee from $71,375 to $81,065 to include the Roads and Transportation Fund.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this additional funding will be charged to the Roads and Transportation Fund.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Controller/Administrator is authorized to make any necessary budget adjustments.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Ingham County Board of Commissioners and the County Clerk are authorized to sign any contract documents consistent with this resolution and approved as to form by the County Attorney.
February 21, 2013

To: County Services and Finance Committees

From: Travis Parsons

Subject: FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE Capitol City Lodge No. 141
Corrections Unit – Collective Bargaining Agreement

On Wednesday, February 13, 2013, the FOP put before their members for vote Ingham County’s Last Best Offer provided through the mediation process. The FOP – Corrections Unit members approved the agreement. Highlights of the agreement include the following:

- Contract Duration: through December 31, 2014

- Wages:
  - 1% salary reduction

- Steps:
  - No step progression for 2012.
  - Step progression resumes for eligible employees in 2013 on the date of ratification or on the employee anniversary date in 2013, whichever is later, to the step the employee would have progressed in 2012.

- Pension (MERS Resolutions to establish Hybrid Plan under separate Board Resolution):
  - Employees hired on or after 1/1/2013 shall participate in a MERS Hybrid pension plan: DB - 1.5% multiplier w/ a 55/25 rider and DC - 2% employee contribution with a 1% employer match.

- Retiree Health:
  - Employees hired on or after 1/1/2013 shall receive single subscriber retiree health insurance at retirement, on a sliding scale based on yrs. of service.

- Retiree Life: Effective January 1, 2013, no retirees shall receive life insurance paid by the employer.

- Sick Leave:
  - Effective 1/1/2013 the employee shall earn 3.6923 hours for each pay period (ninety-six (96) hours or 12 days per year).
  - Reduced Sick Leave Cash-Out at Separation: New Hires after January 1, 2013
  - Annual Cash-Out Option: Effective 1/1/2013 the maximum annual payout shall increase to 48 hours.

- Longevity:
  - New Hires on or after January 1, 2013 are not eligible for longevity.
  - Grandfathered employees who received longevity in 2011 are frozen at the amount received in 2011 for duration of the agreement, December 31, 2014.
  - Employees eligible for their first longevity payment 2012 will receive payment in December 2013 at the frozen rate.
RESOLUTION APPROVING A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT WITH THE FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE CAPITOL CITY LODGE NO. 141 - CORRECTIONS UNIT

WHEREAS, an agreement has been reached between representatives of Ingham County and the FOP Capitol City Lodge No. 141 for the period January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the agreement has been ratified by the employees within the bargaining agreement; and

WHEREAS, the provisions of the agreement have been approved by the County Services and Finance Committees.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby approves the contract between Ingham County and FOP Capitol City Lodge No. 141 for the period January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2014.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Board of Commissioners and the County Clerk are authorized to sign the contract on behalf of the County, subject to the approval as to form by the County Attorney.
INTRODUCED BY THE COUNTY SERVICES AND FINANCE COMMITTEE OF THE:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A MERS HYBRID PLAN FOR NEWLY HIRED EMPLOYEES UNDER THE FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE CAPITOL CITY LODGE NO. 141 - CORRECTIONS UNIT

WHEREAS, the County Board of Commissioners has recognized the escalating cost of the current MERS Defined Benefit Plan; and

WHEREAS, the FOP Capitol City Lodge No. 41 – Corrections Unit approved a new collective bargaining agreement that includes the establishment of a Hybrid pension plan for new hires.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Commissioners authorizes the attached resolutions establishing the MERS Hybrid Pension Plan for new employees in FOP Capitol City Lodge No. 41 – Corrections Unit hired on or after January 1, 2013.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chair of Board is authorized on behalf of the County to sign and execute all documents to effectuate and finalize this transaction, subject to the approval as to form, by the County Attorney.
WHEREAS, under the Municipal Employees Retirement Act of 1984, section 36(2)(a); MCL 38.1536(2)(a); Plan Document Section 36(2)(a), provides the Retirement Board (effective August 15, 1996):

[s]hall determine and establish all of the provisions of the retirement system affecting benefit eligibility, benefit programs, contribution amounts, and the election of municipalities, judicial circuit courts, judicial district courts, and judicial probate courts to be governed by the provisions of the retirement system ... [and] to establish additional programs including but not limited to defined benefit, defined contribution, ancillary benefits, health and welfare benefits, and other post employment benefit programs (as amended by 2004 PA 490).

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Board's powers, the MERS Plan Document of 1996 was adopted effective October 1, 1996, and the Plan has been amended periodically by the Board.

WHEREAS, the MERS Plan, an agent, multiple employer, public employee pension plan, has been determined by the Internal Revenue Service to be a governmental plan that is tax qualified as a trust under Code section 401(a) and exempt from taxation under section 501(a).

WHEREAS, on March 14, 2006, the Retirement Board has authorized establishment of a Hybrid Plan, with a defined benefit (DB) and defined contribution (DC) component.

WHEREAS, new Section 19B, Benefit Program H, and related plan amendments, create a new Hybrid Program that a participating municipality or court may adopt for MERS members to be administered in whole or in part under the discretion of the Municipal Employees' Retirement Board as trustee and fiduciary, directly by (or through a combination of) MERS or MERS duly-appointed third-party administrator for the DC component.

WHEREAS, this Uniform Hybrid Program Resolution has been approved by the Retirement Board under the authority of MCL 38.1536(2)(a); Plan section 36(2)(a) declaring that the Retirement Board "shall determine ... and establish" all provisions of the retirement system. Under this authority, the Retirement Board authorized Section 19B, Benefit Program H, which shall not be implemented unless in strict compliance with the terms and conditions of this Resolution as provided under section 19B(2):

- In the event any alteration of any provision of this section 19B, or other sections of the Plan Document related to the provisions of Benefit Program H, is made or occurs, under section 43B of the Plan Document concerning collective bargaining or under any other plan provision or law, adoption of Benefit Program H shall not be recognized, other than in accordance with this section and other sections of the Plan Document related to the provisions of Benefit Program H.

- In the event any alteration of the terms or conditions stated in this Uniform Resolution is made or occurs, it is expressly recognized that MERS and the Retirement Board, as sole trustee and fiduciary of the MERS Plan and its trust reserves, and whose authority is nondelegable, shall have
MERS Restated Uniform Hybrid Program (Benefit Program H) Resolution

no obligation or duty: to administer (or to have administered) the Benefit Program H; to authorize the transfer of any Plan assets to the Hybrid Program; or to continue administration by MERS directly or indirectly, or by any third-party administrator.

WHEREAS, concurrent with this Resolution, and as a continuing obligation, this governing body has completed and approved, and submitted to MERS, documents necessary for adoption and implementation of MERS Benefit Program H.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the governing body adopts MERS Benefit Program H (Hybrid Program) as provided below.

I. NEW EMPLOYEES (Plan Sec 19B(4) – (12))

Effective the first day of January ____________, 2013, (to be known as the ADOPTION DATE), the County of Ingham hereby adopts Benefit Program H for (MERS municipality/court) FOP Sheriff Deputies - Division 21

first hired or rehired to the division at any time on and after the Adoption Date, and optional participation for any employee or officer of this municipality otherwise eligible to participate in MERS under Section 2B(3)(a) of the Plan Document who has previously elected to not participate in MERS. The employer shall establish the transfer rule for transferred employees in the Employer Resolution Establishing a Uniform Transfer Provision. ONLY THOSE EMPLOYEES ELIGIBLE FOR MERS MEMBERSHIP (SECTIONS 2B(3) AND 3 OF THE PLAN DOCUMENT) SHALL BE ELIGIBLE TO PARTICIPATE.

(A) HYBRID PLAN CONTRIBUTIONS

- The DB Component shall be exclusively funded by the employer, with no member contributions permitted.
- For the DC Component, employee and employer contributions shall be required as allowed and specified in Plan section 19B(8) and the MERS Uniform Hybrid DC Component Adoption Agreement (“Adoption Agreement,” Attachment 1, completed and approved and a certified copy submitted to MERS concurrent with and incorporated by reference in this Resolution). A member is immediately 100% vested in any employee contributions, and is vested in employer contributions under the employer vesting schedule.

(B) COMPENSATION AND EARNINGS

- For the DB Component, earnings shall include items of “Compensation” under Section 2A(6) of the MERS Plan Document, with the exception of the last sentence, which shall not apply.
- For the DC Component, earnings shall include items of “Compensation” under Section 2A(6) of the MERS Plan Document as provided for Benefit Program DC, which equals the Medicare taxable wages as reported by the employer on the member’s federal form W-2, wage and tax statement.
(C) HYBRID PLAN VESTING
- For the DB Component, 6 year vesting is mandatory (Plan Sec 19B(5)(b)).
- For the DC Component, employee and employer contributions shall be required as allowed and specified in Plan section 19B(8) and the Adoption Agreement (Attachment 1, completed and approved and a certified copy submitted to MERS concurrent with and incorporated by reference in this Resolution). A member is immediately 100% vested in any employee contributions, and is vested in employer contributions under the employer vesting schedule.
- As provided in Section 19B(3):
  Where a member has previously acquired in the employ of any participating municipality or participating court:
  (a) not less than 1 year of defined benefit service in force (including Hybrid Program) with any participating municipality or participating court;
  (b) eligible credited service where the participating municipality or participating court has adopted the Reciprocal Retirement Act, 1961 PA 88;
  (c) at least 12 months in which employer contributions by a participating municipality or participating court have been made on behalf of the member under Benefit Program DC; such service shall be applied toward satisfying the vesting schedule for the DB Component, and for the DC Component, for employer contributions.

(D) BENEFITS UNDER HYBRID PLAN
- For the DB component:
  (1) The Benefit Multiplier (Plan Section 19B(4)) initially selected shall be irrevocable, shall not later be changed.
  The multiplier shall be one of the following dependent upon the division’s social security coverage status:
  Social Security Coverage
  - 1.00%
  - 1.25%
  - 1.50%
  - 1.75%
  - 2.00%

  No Social Security Coverage
  - 1.00%
  - 1.25%
  - 1.50%
  - 1.75%
  - 2.00%

  (2) Final Average Compensation (FAC) shall be FAC-3 (Plan Section 19B(6)).
  (3) The Benefit shall be payable at age 60 (Plan Section 19B(5)(b)). The participating municipality or court may also allow retirement if the member or vested former member has attained age 55 years or older and has 25 or more years of credited service. Adoption of F55/25 shall be an irrevocable action and may not be subsequently changed.
  ☑ Check here to adopt F55/25
(4) Credited Service shall be comprised solely of the sum of (a) the total of the member's credited service (if any) under the previous DB program on the effective date of coverage under the Hybrid Plan (Plan Section 19B(16)(b)(ii); see II (E)(b)(ii) below); plus (b) credited service earned by the member after the effective date of coverage under the Hybrid Plan (Plan Section 19B(17)(b)).

- For the DC Component (Plan Section 19B(12)):
  
  Upon termination of membership, a vested former member or a beneficiary, as applicable, shall elect one or a combination of several of the following methods of distribution of the vested former member's or beneficiary's accumulated balance, to the extent allowed by federal law and subject to Plan Section 19B(11)(b) and procedures established by the Retirement Board:

  1. Lump sum distribution to the vested former member or beneficiary.
  2. Lump sum direct rollover to another eligible retirement plan, to the extent allowed by federal law.
  3. Annuity for the life of the vested former member or beneficiary, or optional forms of annuity as determined by the Retirement Board.
  4. No distribution, in which case the accumulated balance shall remain in the retirement system, to the extent allowed by federal law.

STOP If covering new employees only, skip II and III and go to IV on page 8. STOP
II. OPTIONAL PROVISION FOR CURRENT MERS DEFINED BENEFIT MEMBERS WHERE HYBRID PROGRAM FOR NEW EMPLOYEES ESTABLISHED (FOR TRANSFERS FROM MERS DEFINED CONTRIBUTION PROGRAM, SEE SECTION III)  
(Plan Sec 19B(13)-(16))

THIS OPTIONAL SECTION SHALL ONLY BE SELECTED WHERE THE TOTAL FUNDED PERCENT OF AGGREGATE ACCRUED LIABILITIES AND VALUATION ASSETS OF ALL RESERVES SPECIFIED IN TABLE 13 (OR SUCCESSOR TABLE) FOR THE PARTICIPATING MUNICIPALITY OR COURT, AND FOR THE AFFECTED MEMBER BENEFIT PROGRAM CLASSIFICATION(S) (DIVISION(S)) SPECIFIED IN THE MOST RECENT MERS ANNUAL ACTUARIAL VALUATION REPORT IS AT LEAST EIGHTY PERCENT (80%).

IT IS ADDITIONALLY RESOLVED, as provided in each of the following paragraphs:

(A) Effective on the Adoption Date, pursuant to Plan Section 19B(13):

all current MERS defined benefit members who are members of the same employee classification described in Section I above on the Adoption Date shall be offered the opportunity to irrevocably elect coverage under Benefit Program H. Section 19B(14) specifies an employee's written election to participate shall be filed with MERS: (a) not earlier than the last day of the third month after this Resolution is adopted and received by MERS; and (b) not later than the first day of the first calendar month that is at least six months after MERS receives this Resolution. This means each eligible employee will have about 90 days to make the decision.

After MERS receives this Resolution, this governing body's authorized official and eligible employees will be advised by MERS of the election window timelines and other information to consider in making the irrevocable decision whether to participate in Benefit Program H.

Participation for those electing coverage shall be effective the first day of the first calendar month at least six (6) months after MERS' receipt of the Resolution, here designated as being the month of ________________, 20__, (insert month and year) which shall be known as the "CONVERSION DATE."

The opportunity for current employees on the Adoption Date to participate in the Hybrid Program shall (select 1 of the following 2 choices):

☐ apply to all employees who separate from or terminate employment with this municipality after the Adoption Date and before the Conversion Date, so long as the employee does not receive a retirement allowance (including distributions from Benefit Programs DC or H) from MERS based on service for this municipality.

☐ not apply to any employee who separates from or terminates employment with this municipality after the Adoption Date.
(B) CONTRIBUTIONS shall be as provided in Section I (A) above.

(C) COMPENSATION AND EARNINGS shall be as provided in Section I (B) above.

(D) HYBRID PLAN VESTING shall be as provided in Section I (C) above.

(E) For each employee irrevocably electing to participate in Benefit Program H, then under Plan Section 19B(16), the Retirement Board shall transfer the following amounts from the reserve for employee contributions and the reserve for employer contributions and benefit payments to the reserve for defined contribution plan:

(a) The member's accumulated contributions, if any, as of 12:01 a.m. on the day the member becomes covered by Benefit Program H shall be transferred from the reserve for employee contributions to the member's credit in the reserve for Benefit Program H Defined Contribution component.

(b) The funded excess present value shall be computed as the excess, if any, of the actuarial present value of the accrued benefit associated with the member's coverage under the previous benefit program, over the actuarial present value of the accrued benefit associated with the member's coverage under the defined benefit component of Benefit Program H, after such excess is multiplied by the funded level percentage selected by the governing body in subparagraph(F)(2) below (which shall not be less than 80% nor exceed 100% funded level percentage in any case). The excess, if any, of the funded excess present value over the amount specified in sub-paragraph (a) shall be transferred from the reserve for employer contributions and benefit payments to the member's credit in the reserve for Benefit Program H Defined Contribution component. For purposes of this sub-paragraph:

(i) The actuarial present values shall be computed as of 12:01 a.m. on the day the member becomes covered by Benefit Program H and shall be based on the actuarial assumptions adopted by the Retirement Board.

(ii) On the effective date of the change of the benefit program the member's credited service under Benefit Program H shall be equal to the member's credited service under the previous benefit program.

(iii) In determining final average compensation there shall not be included any accrued annual leave.

(iv) The earliest retirement date (for an unreduced benefit) assumption under the defined benefit program in effect on the effective date of the change of the benefit program shall be utilized. Likewise the earliest retirement date assumption under Benefit Program H shall be utilized.

(v) For purposes of the actuarial present value calculation, any future benefit otherwise payable under Benefit Program E or E-1 shall be disregarded.

The transfer shall be made approximately 30 calendar days after the Conversion Date, and the transfer amount shall include pro-rated regular interest at the regular Board-established rate for crediting of interest on member's accumulated contributions in the defined benefit program, measured from the Conversion Date to the actual transfer date.
(F) Per Plan Section 19B(16)(b), the Retirement Board has established the assumptions for calculation of the actuarial present value of a member's accrued benefit that may be transferred. The assumptions are:

1. The interest rate in effect as of the Adoption Date, to determine actuarial present value, shall be the Board-established investment earnings rate assumption (currently eight percent (8.00%).)

2. The funded level for the member's specific MERS division (total funded percentage of the present value of accrued benefits which shall be determined using Termination Liability under Table 12 or successor table and valuation assets of all reserves using Table 13) as of the Adoption Date from the most recent MERS annual actuarial valuation report data provided by MERS actuary. In the APV calculation, the funded level used shall be (select one of the following):

   - Table 12 Termination Liability funded level for the division (not less than 80% nor to exceed 100% funded level).
   - If greater than the division's funded level but not more than 100% funded level, then MERS is directed to compute the funded percentage for the transfer calculation on ___% funded basis (insert number greater than the division's Table 12 Termination Liability funded level percentage but not more than 100%). Where less than 100% funded level exists, this governing body recognizes that such direction shall increase its pension funding liability. MERS shall not implement such direction unless the governing body forwards to MERS sufficient cash up to the funded level selected for all members prior to the Conversion Date; if sufficient cash is not forwarded, then the governing body expressly covenants with MERS and directs, as a condition of this selection, to MERS billing and the governing body remitting to MERS all contributions necessary to fund the unfunded liability occasioned by the aggregate transfer of the difference between the actual funded level for the division and funded level directed above over a period of four (4) years.

III. TRANSFER OF CURRENT MERS DEFINED CONTRIBUTION PROGRAM MEMBERS WHERE HYBRID PROGRAM FOR NEW EMPLOYEES ESTABLISHED Plan Sec 19B(13) – (15), (17)

IT IS ADDITIONALLY RESOLVED, as provided in each of the following paragraphs:

(A) Effective on the Adoption Date, pursuant to Plan Section 19B(13) all current MERS defined contribution members who are members of the same employee classification described in Section I above on the Adoption Date shall be offered the opportunity to irrevocably elect coverage under Benefit Program H. Section 19B(14) specifies an employee's written election to participate shall be filed with MERS: (a) not earlier than the last day of the third month after this Resolution is adopted and received by MERS; and (b) not later than the first day of the first calendar month that is at least six months after MERS receives this Resolution. This means each eligible employee will have about 90 days to make the decision.

After MERS receives this Resolution, this governing body's authorized official and eligible employees will be advised by MERS of the election window timelines and other information to consider in making the irrevocable decision whether to participate in Benefit Program H.
Participation for those electing coverage shall be effective the first day of the first calendar month at least six (6) months after MERS' receipt of the Resolution, here designated as being the month of __________, 20____, (insert month and year), which shall be known as the "CONVERSION DATE."

The opportunity for current employees on the Adoption Date to participate in the Hybrid Program shall (select 1 of the following 2 choices):

☐ apply to all employees who separate from or terminate employment with this municipality after the Adoption Date and before the Conversion Date, so long as the employee does not receive a retirement allowance (including distributions from Benefit Programs DC or H) from MERS based on service for this municipality.

☐ not apply to any employee who separates from or terminates employment with this municipality after the Adoption Date.

(B) CONTRIBUTIONS shall be as provided in Section I (A) above.

(C) COMPENSATION AND EARNINGS shall be as provided in Section I (B) above.

(D) HYBRID PLAN VESTING shall be as provided in Section I (C) above.

(E) For each employee irrevocably electing to participate in Benefit Program H, then under Plan Section 19B(17), the following shall apply:

(a) The member's accumulated balance in the reserve for defined contribution plan under Benefit Program DC, if any, as of 12:01 a.m. on the day the member becomes covered by Benefit Program H shall be transferred to the member's credit in the reserve for defined contribution plan under Benefit Program H Defined Contribution component.

(b) For purposes of calculating benefit amounts under the defined benefit component of Benefit Program H, only credited service earned after 12:01 a.m. on the day the member becomes covered by Benefit Program H shall be recognized.

IV. THIRD PARTY ADMINISTRATION

The Municipal Employees' Retirement Board retains full and unrestricted authority over the administration of MERS Benefit Program H, including but not limited to the appointment and termination of the third-party administrator, or MERS self-administration of the defined contribution program in whole or in part.
V. EFFECTIVENESS OF THIS RESOLUTION

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED: This Resolution shall have no legal effect under the MERS Plan Document until a certified copy of this adopting Resolution shall be filed with MERS, and MERS determines that all necessary requirements under Plan Document Section 19B, this Resolution, and other applicable requirements have been met. All dates for implementation of Benefit Program H under Section 19B shall be determined by MERS from the date of filing with MERS of this Resolution in proper form and content. Upon MERS determination that all necessary documents have been submitted to MERS, MERS shall record its formal approval upon this Resolution, and return a copy to the Employer's Hybrid Program Plan Coordinator identified in Section IV (D) above.

In the event an amendatory Resolution or other action by this Governing Body is required, such Resolution or action shall be deemed effective as of the date of the initial Resolution or action where concurred in by this governing body and MERS (and the third-party administrator if necessary). Section 54 of the Plan Document shall apply to this Resolution and all acts performed under its authority. The terms and conditions of this Resolution supersede and stand in place of any prior resolution, and its terms are controlling.

I hereby certify that the above is a true copy of a Resolution adopted at the official meeting held on ________________, 20___ (Signature of authorized official)

Please send MERS fully executed copy of:
- MERS 2010 Restated Uniform Hybrid Program (Benefit Program H) Resolution (this form, MD-043)
- MERS Restated Hybrid Plan (Defined Contribution Component) Adoption Agreement (form MD-044)
- Certified minutes stating governing body approval, and/or union contract language

Received and Approved by the Municipal Employees' Retirement System of Michigan

Dated: ________________, 20___ (Authorized MERS signatory)
The Employer, a participating municipality or participating court ("court") within the State of Michigan that has adopted MERS coverage, hereby establishes the following MERS Benefit Program: **Hybrid under MERS Plan Document** ("MERS Hybrid DC") as authorized by Section 19B of the Municipal Employees' Retirement System of Michigan Plan Document. All references to "Plan Document" are to sections of the MERS Plan Document; any reference to "Plan," the "MERS Plan," "Plan Participant," "Participant," or "Program," shall mean the MERS Hybrid DC Plan, unless otherwise specified.

This Adoption Agreement, together with Section 19B of the MERS Plan Document and the MERS Restated Uniform Hybrid Resolution ("Resolution"), constitute the entire MERS Benefit Program Hybrid Plan Document.

I. **EMPLOYER:** County of Ingham

II. **EFFECTIVE DATE**

1. If this is the initial Adoption Agreement relating to the MERS Defined Contribution Plan for this Division, the Effective Date of the Benefit Program here adopted shall be the first day of: January 2013

2. If this is an amendment and restatement of an existing adoption agreement relating to the MERS Hybrid DC Plan for this Division, the effective date of this amendment and restatement shall be the first day of: __________. This adoption agreement is intended to replace and serve as an amendment and restatement of the Employer's preexisting plan, which was originally effective on the first day of: __________.

III. **ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS**

Only those Employees eligible for MERS Membership (Section 3 of the MERS Plan Document) shall be eligible to participate in the MERS Hybrid DC Plan. A copy of ALL employee enrollment forms must be submitted to MERS. The following group(s) of Employees are eligible to participate in the Plan:

- FOP Sheriff Deputies - Division 21

Specify employee classification and division numbers
IV. CONTRIBUTION PROVISIONS

1. The Employer shall contribute on behalf of each Participant 1% of Earnings or $ for the calendar year (subject to the limitations of Sections 415(c) of the Internal Revenue Code).

2. Each Participant is required to contribute 2% of Earnings for the calendar year as a condition of participation in the Plan. (Write "0" if no contribution is required.) *If other contribution options are provided, please list on separate sheet of paper and attach to Adoption Agreement.

If Employee contributions are required, an Employee shall not have the right to discontinue or vary the rate of such contributions after becoming a Plan Participant.

The Employer hereby elects to "pick up" the Mandatory/Required Employee contribution. The "pick-up" provision allows the employer to direct mandatory employee contributions to be pre-tax.

[Note to Employer: Picked up contributions are excludable from the Employee's gross income under Section 414(h)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 only if they meet the requirements of Rev. Rul. 2006-43, 2006-35 I.R.B. 329. Those requirements are (1) that the Employer must specify that the contributions, although designated as Employee contributions, are being paid by the Employer in lieu of contributions by the Employee; and (2) the Employee must not have the option of receiving the contributed amounts directly instead of having them paid by the Employer to the Plan. The execution of this Adoption Agreement by the Employer shall constitute the official action required by Revenue Ruling 2006-43.]

3. Each Employee may make a voluntary (unmatched), after-tax contribution, subject to the limitations of Section 415 of the Internal Revenue Code.

4. Employer contributions and Employee contributions shall be contributed to the Trust in accordance with the following payment schedule:

☐ Weekly  ☐ Bi-weekly  ☐ Monthly

V. EARNINGS

Earnings shall be defined as "compensation" under Section 2A(6) of the MERS Plan Document, being the Medicare taxable wages reported on the Employee's W-2 statement.
MERS Restated Hybrid Plan (Defined Contribution Component)
Adoption Agreement

VI. VESTING PROVISION FOR EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS AND NORMAL RETIREMENT AGE

The Employer hereby specifies the following vesting schedule (choose one):

☐ Immediate vesting upon participation

☐ Cliff vesting: The participant is 100% vested upon a stated number of years. Stated year may not exceed maximum 5 years of service:

Stated Year:  □ 1  □ 2  □ 3  □ 4  □ 5

☐ Graded vesting percentage per year of service: Employers can select the percentage of vesting with the corresponding years of service, however the scale cannot exceed a maximum of six years of service to reach 100% vesting, nor less than the stated minimums below:

____ % after 1 year of service.
____ % after 2 years of service.
____ % (not less than 25%) after 3 years of service.
____ % (not less than 50%) after 4 years of service.
____ % (not less than 75%) after 5 years of service.
100 % (not less than 100%) after 6 years of service.

Notwithstanding the above, a member shall be vested in his/her entire employer contribution account, to the extent that the balance of such account has not previously been forfeited, if he/she is employed on or after his/her Normal Retirement Age. "Normal Retirement Age" shall be presumed to be age 60 (unless a different normal retirement age is here specified: □□)

In addition, notwithstanding the above, in the event of disability or death, a member or his/her beneficiary shall be vested in his/her entire employer contribution account, to the extent that the balance of such account has not previously been forfeited as described in Section 19A(7) of the MERS Plan Document.

VII. Loans (not more than two) are permitted under the Program. MERS recommendation is "No," not to allow loans: loans permit your employees to borrow against their retirement account.

☐ Yes  ☐ No

VIII. The Plan will accept an eligible rollover distribution from an eligible retirement plan described in Section 401(a) (including "401(k)") or 403(a) of the Code, an annuity contract described in Section 403(b) of the Code, an eligible deferred compensation plan described in Section 457(b) of the Code maintained by a state, political subdivision of a state, or any agency or instrumentality of a state or political subdivision of a state, or an individual retirement account or annuity described in Section 408(a) or 408(b) of the Code, including after-tax employee contributions, as applicable. The Plan will account separately for pre-tax and post-tax contributions and earnings thereon.
MERS Restated Hybrid Plan (Defined Contribution Component)
Adoption Agreement

IX. The Employer hereby agrees to the provisions of the MERS Uniform Defined Contribution Plan and agrees that in the event of any conflict between MERS Plan Document Section 19B and the MERS Hybrid Plan, the provisions of Section 19B shall control.

X. The Employer hereby appoints MERS as the Plan Administrator pursuant to the terms and conditions of the Plan.

XI. The Employer hereby agrees to the provisions of the Plan.

XII. The Employer hereby acknowledges it understands that failure to properly fill out this Adoption Agreement may result in the ineligibility of the Plan in the DC component of the Hybrid Plan.

In Witness Whereof, the Employer hereby causes this Agreement to be executed on this ______ day of _____________, 20__.

Employer: County of Ingham

Authorized Signature: ________________________________

Title: Chairperson, Ingham County Board of Commissioners

Witness: ________________________________
February 22, 2013

To: County Services and Finance Committees

From: Travis Parsons

Subject: Compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

The Board of Commissioners approved resolution no. 92-205 in October 1992 authorizing compliance with the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990. The County has been responsible in its actions regarding the delivery of services, programs, and activities, by making reasonable accommodations, when such accommodations will enable people with disabilities to meet essential eligibility requirements for services, programs, and activities provided by the County.

Subsequent to the Board of Commissioner’s actions in 1992, the Congress of the United States adopted the ADA Amendments Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-335) for the purpose of clarifying and reiterating who is covered by the law’s civil rights protections and revising the definition of “disability” to more broadly encompass impairments that substantially limit a major life activity.

In addition, the Department of Justice now provides ADA Best Practices for State and Local Governments, including meeting the administrative requirements under Title II of the ADA. Administrative requirements include; designating an ADA Coordinator that is responsible for coordinating the efforts of the local government entity to comply with Title II and investigating any complaints that the entity has violated Title II; providing public notice about the ADA; and developing and publishing procedures for resolving grievances arising under Title II of the ADA.

The resolution before you updates and affirms the 1992 resolution for compliance, recognizes the clarification of the 2008 amendment and includes the incorporation of administrative best practices.
RESOLUTION TO UPDATE AND AFFIRM COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990 TO INCLUDE THE ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS UNDER TITLE II OF THE ADA

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners approved Resolution #92-205, authorizing compliance with the Americans With Disabilities Act in the delivery of services, programs and activities by making reasonable accommodations, when such accommodations will enable people with disabilities to meet essential eligibility requirements for services, programs, and activities provided by the County of Ingham; and

WHEREAS, Resolution #92-205 included the requirement that the County of Ingham shall make information concerning the Act and its application to services, programs, and activities available to applicants, participants, beneficiaries and other interested persons; and

WHEREAS, subsequent to this resolution the Congress of the United States adopted the ADA Amendments Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-335) for the purpose of clarifying and reiterating who is covered by the law’s civil rights protections and revising the definition of “disability” to more broadly encompass impairments that substantially limit a major life activity; and

WHEREAS, there are administrative requirements under Title II of the ADA regarding designating an ADA Coordinator, providing public notice about ADA, and establishing and publishing a grievance procedure; and

WHEREAS, Ingham County desires to comply with these ADA administrative best practices.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby updates and affirms Resolution #92-205 for compliance, recognizes the clarification of the 2008 Amendment and includes the incorporation of administrative best practice.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Human Resources Director is designated as the ADA Coordinator.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the ADA Coordinator is responsible for coordinating the efforts of Ingham County to comply with Title II of the ADA, including notice requirements and the establishment and publishing of a grievance procedure.
TO: Finance and County Services Liaison Committees  
FROM: Sherrie Graham, Director  
DATE: February 14, 2013  
RE: Resolution Recommending a Transfer of Funds and Authorization for the Potter Park Zoo Society to provide the Management of Seasonal Workers

Please see the attached proposed resolution authorizing the transfer of $69,300 for seasonal wages and security. These funds will assist the society to streamline and improve the functioning of those services.

Thank you for your consideration. Please feel free to contact me at any time, if you have any questions.
Introduced by the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A TRANSFER OF FUNDS AND AUTHORIZATION FOR THE POTTER PARK ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY TO PROVIDE THE MANAGEMENT OF SEASONAL WORKERS

WHEREAS, it is the desire of the Potter Park Zoo Board and the Zoo Management Team to work towards a successful Private/Public relationship with the Potter Park Zoological Society; and

WHEREAS, the Zoo Management Team wishes to continue to provide excellent customer service and be able to improve upon existing standards and proceed in a financially prudent manner; and

WHEREAS, the Zoo Management Team recommends that combining resources in the key customer service areas, by having all seasonal staff be hired, trained, supervised and paid by the Potter Park Zoological Society, will allow the Zoo to provide the most effective and consistent customer service; and

WHEREAS, the Zoo Management Team has identified funding within the 2013 approved Potter Park Zoo budget, which will provide for adequate staff as determined by the Zoo Director, as well as additional funds that can be transferred to other line items within the budget; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners Resolution #12-66 was approved for the transfer of funds to the Potter Park Zoo Society for the year of 2012.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the Potter Park Zoological Society to provide the management of the seasonal employees at the Potter Park Zoo.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners approves the transfer of funds for the year 2013 in the amount of $69,300 from the Potter Park Zoo Millage to the Potter Park Zoo Society from the following line items:

- $35,874 from admissions seasonal wages, line item #258-69200-705000-32000
- $11,876 from parking seasonal, line item #258-69300-705000-35000
- $21,000 from equipment seasonal, line #258-69300-705000-34600
- $550 from shelter/wages temporary #258-69300-70500-32000

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Controller/Administrator and the Chair of the Board of Commissioners be authorized to make the necessary transfer of funds.
TO: Ingham County Board of Commissioners County Services Committee

FROM: Sandra Gower, Economic Development Coordinator

SUBJECT: Public Hearing, Douglas J Redevelopment Brownfield Plan
Meridian Charter Township

DATE: February 21, 2013

Douglas J Housing-Okemos, LLC is proposing to redevelop a site in Meridian Charter Township at the corners of Hamilton Street and Okemos Road (2138 and 2148 Hamilton Road; 4695 Okemos Road). The proposed development includes a salon, spa, commercial and multi-family residential uses.

The Developer approached the Ingham County Brownfield Redevelopment Authority (ICBRA) in December to 2012 to discuss a Brownfield Plan with a TIF Capture to address the clean-up of some contamination on the property. The estimated eligible expenses are $328,900. Based on the estimated taxable value of the completed project it will take four years of tax capture to recoup those costs. A plan was presented to the ICBRA at its meeting of January 11, 2013. The ICBRA approved the plan and recommended the Board of Commissioners approve the plan.

Per PA 381 of 1996 as amended, the Board of Commissioners must hold a public hearing prior to adopting the plan. It also requires that Meridian Charter Township concur with the plan. Meridian Charter Township held a public hearing on February 5, 2013. On February 19, 2013 the Meridian Charter Township Board approved the plan.

The resolution before you is to set the public hearing for Tuesday March 26, 2013 at 6:30 PM.
INTRODUCED BY THE COUNTY SERVICES COMMITTEE OF THE:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION SETTING A PUBLIC HEARING FOR A BROWNFIELD PLAN FOR THE DOUGLAS J REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AT 2138 AND 2148 HAMILTON ROAD AND 4695 OKEMOS ROAD IN MERIDIAN CHARTER TOWNSHIP

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners created the Ingham County Brownfield Redevelopment Authority (ICBRA) in September 2001 (resolution #01-279) pursuant to PA 381 of 1996, as amended (the Act) in order to promote the redevelopment of environmentally distressed, functionally obsolete, and/or blighted areas of the County; and

WHEREAS, the ICBRA recommends approval a Brownfield Plan to redevelop deteriorating, contaminated properties in Meridian Charter Township, Michigan identified with tax ID Numbers 33-02-02-21-405-010, 33-02-02-21-405-005, and 33-02-02-21-405-009 (the “Property”) containing 1.5 acres into a combination of commercial, retail and multi-unit residential development which will increase the Township’s tax base while creating new jobs; and

WHEREAS, the description of the Property along with any maps and Brownfield (finance) Plan are available for public inspection at the office of the ICBRA, Hilliard Building 121 E Maple Street, Room 104, Mason, MI 48854; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Act, the Board of Commissioners is required to hold a public hearing on the approval and adoption of the Brownfield Plan and to publish that notice in accordance with the Act.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, a public hearing shall be set for March 26, 2013 at 7:30 PM in the Board of Commissioners’ Room, Ingham County Courthouse, Mason, MI to hear any interested persons on the adoption of a resolution approving the Brownfield Plan called Douglas J Redevelopment for redevelopment of property in Meridian Charter Township.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that pursuant to the Act, the Clerk shall provide notice of the public hearing to taxing jurisdictions that levy taxes subject to capture under the Act and shall give notice to the public by causing notice to be published in a newspaper of general circulation in the County before the date set for the public hearing.
MEMORANDUM

TO: County Services and Finance Committees
FROM: Rick Terrill, Facilities Director
DATE: February 20, 2013
SUBJECT: RESOLUTION AWARDING A CONTRACT TO PAVEMENT CONSULTANTS, INC. TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL ASPHALT CONSULTING AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT SERVICES TO REPLACE THE PARKING LOT AT THE HUMAN SERVICES BUILDING

The resolution before you authorizes awarding a contract to Pavement Consultants, Inc. for an amount not to exceed $9,165.00, for the purpose of providing professional asphalt consulting and project management services for the replacement of the parking lot at the Human Services Building.

Pavement Consultants, Inc., who submitted the lowest responsive and responsible bid, was chosen, after going through a competitive bidding process, and has the recommendation of both the Purchasing and Facilities Departments. We are confident that Pavement Consultants Inc. will provide us with the quality service we need to complete this project successfully.

The funds for this project are available in the Approved CIP Line Item 631-23304-931000-2FC16 which has a balance of $232,700.00.

I recommend approval of this resolution.
TO: County Service and Finance Committees
FROM: Jim Hudgins, Director of Purchasing
DATE: February 20, 2013
SUBJECT: Proposal Summary for Asphalt Consulting Services

Project Description:
Proposals were solicited from qualified and experienced professional firms for the purpose of entering into a contract to provide for professional engineering and project management services for the replacement of approximately 50,000 square feet of the parking lot at the Human Service Facility.

The scope of work will include, but is not limited to, developing design and construction specifications including quality control measures, attending pre/post-bid meetings, assisting in the review and evaluation process of construction bids, conducting overall project management, conducting project close-out and field quality assurance, and ensuring that all contract specifications are met.

Proposal Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Consultant, Inc.</td>
<td>$9,165</td>
<td>No – Eaton Rapids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzgerald Henne &amp; Associates</td>
<td>$22,150</td>
<td>Yes – Lansing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure Tec</td>
<td>$29,675</td>
<td>N – Kalamazoo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation:
The Evaluation Committee recommends awarding a contract to Pavement Consulting Inc. in an amount not to exceed $9,165. In addition to submitting the lowest responsive proposal, PCI specializes in pavement design and management and has prior experience working with the County.
INTRODUCED BY THE COUNTY SERVICES AND FINANCE COMMITTEES OF THE:

INGERHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AWARDING A CONTRACT TO PAVEMENT CONSULTANTS, INC. TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL ASPHALT CONSULTING AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT SERVICES FOR THE PARKING LOT REPLACEMENT AT THE HUMAN SERVICES BUILDING

WHEREAS, the Human Services Building parking lot is in need of replacement due to deterioration over the years; and

WHEREAS, after careful review of bids, the Purchasing and Facilities Departments both agree that a contract be awarded to Pavement Consultants, Inc. who submitted the lowest responsive and responsible bid in the amount of $9,165.00; and

WHEREAS, funds for this project are available within the approved CIP Line Item 631-23304-931000-2FC16 which has a balance of $232,700.00.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby authorizes entering into a contract with Pavement Consultants, Inc., 840 South Smith Road, Eaton Rapids, MI 48827, to provide professional asphalt consulting and project management services, for the parking lot replacement at the Human Services Building, for an amount not to exceed $9,165.00.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the Board Chairperson and the County Clerk to sign any necessary documents that are consistent with this resolution and approved as to form by the County Attorney.
MEMO

February 21, 2013

To: County Services Committee

From: Stacy Byers, Director FOSP Board

RE: Resolution Approving the Farmland and Open Space Preservation (FOSP) Board’s Recommended Selection Criteria (Scoring System) for the 2012 Farmland and Open Space Application Cycles and Approve the FOSP Board to Host a 2013 Application Cycle.

Summary of Proposed Action:
This resolution approves the 2013 Farmland and Open Space Selection Criteria (Scoring System) for ranking landowner applications. The Ingham County Farmland and Open Space Preservation Board recommends the County Board of Commissioners adopt the 2013 Selection Criteria’s for both the Farmland and Open Space Preservation programs and approve the FOSP Board to host a 2013 Farmland and Open Space Preservation application cycle.

Financial Implications:
There will be future costs associated with proceeding with a 2013 Farmland and Open Space Application Cycle, including, but not limited to, postage and mailings, newspaper announcement costs and staff time to score and rank applications. Once all Applications, both new and old, are scored and ranked the FOSP Board will recommend approval of the top ranked applicants by the Board of Commissioners and will seek matching funds from the Federal Farm and Ranch Land Protection Program. Those costs are included in the 2013 budget.
WHEREAS, Ingham County desires to provide for the effective long-term protection and preservation of farmland in Ingham County from the pressure of increasing residential and commercial development; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners adopted the Ingham County Farmland and Open Space Preservation Ordinance in July 2004 and amended it in 2010 (10-99); and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Farmland and Open Space Preservation Ordinance authorized the establishment of the Ingham County Farmland and Open Space Preservation Board to oversee the Farmland and Open Space Preservation Program; and

WHEREAS, Ingham County voters passed a millage of .14 mils in 2008 to fund purchases of agricultural conservation easements through the Ingham County Farmland and Open Space Preservation Program; and

WHEREAS, in the course of implementing the Ordinance, the Ingham County Farmland and Open Space Preservation Board has established Selection Criteria for ranking landowner applications to the Ingham County Farmland and Open Space Preservation Program; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Ordinance requires that the Farmland and Open Space Selection Criteria be approved by the Ingham County Board of Commissioners.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners approves the attached 2013 Farmland and Open Space Selection Criteria developed by the Ingham County Farmland and Open Space Preservation Board as set forth in the Farmland and Open Space Preservation Ordinance passed July 27, 2004.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners approves The Ingham County Farmland and Open Space Preservation Board hosting a 2013 farmland and open space preservation application cycle.
Selection Criteria for Open Space Land Preservation Program
2013 Application Cycle

Tier I Criteria Sections
Ecological, scenic, geological criteria  56 points
Property size and location criteria  45 points
Total Points  101 points

A. Potential Conservation Area(s) (from the Greening Mid-Michigan Project)  maximum points: 10
   1. High Potential  10 points
   2. Medium Potential  8 points
   3. Low Potential  6 points

Example: parcel falls within a Medium Potential Conservation Area = 8 points

B. Water quality values
   1. Riparian land  maximum points: 5
      Property with a water frontage of 200 linear feet or greater receives 5 points. Points for a property with water
      frontage of less than 200 linear feet are:  5 x linear feet of water frontage/200 = points.
      Example: parcel has 75 feet of water frontage on the Red Cedar River: 5 x 75 = 375/200 = 1.875 points
   2. Land in the 100-year flood plain  maximum points: 8
      Property that is 100% in the flood plain receives 8 points. Points for a property with less than 100% in the flood
      plain are:  8 x percent in flood plain = points.
      Example: 20 acres of an 80 acre parcel is in the 100-year flood plain: 8 x 25/100 (20/80 = 0.25) = 200/100 = 2 points
   3. Wetlands, including buffer area  maximum points: 4
      Property that is 100% wetland receives 4 points. Points for a property with less than 100% wetland are:  4 x
      percent in wetland = points.
      Example: 5 acres of an 40 acre parcel is wetland: 4 x 12.5/100 (5/40 = 0.125) = 50/100 = 0.50 points
   4. Aquifer recharge land  maximum points: 8
      Property that is 100% aquifer recharge land receives 8 points. Points for a property with less than 100% aquifer
      recharge land are:  8 x percent aquifer recharge land = points.
      Example: 10 acres of a 20 acre parcel is aquifer recharge land: 8 x 50/100 (10/20 = 0.50) = 400/100 = 4 points

C. Habitats
   1. Forestland  maximum points: 5
      Property that is 100% forest land receives 5 points. Points for a property with less than 100% forest land are:
      5 x percent in forest land = points.
      Example: 15 acres of a 20 acres parcel is wooded: 5 x 75/100 (15/20 = 0.75) = 375/100 = 3.75 points
   2. Others – grassland, shrub land, etc.  maximum points: 3
      Property that is 100% in other types of natural habitat receives 3 points. Points for a property with less than
      100% in other types of habitat are:  3 x percent in other types of habitat = points.
      Example: 10 acres of a 15 acre parcel is grassland: 3 x 66/100 (10/15 = 0.66) = 198/100 = 1.98 points

D. Rare species  maximum points: 10
   1. State and federal threatened and endangered species on the property
      Up to 10 points may be given depending on rarity category; the higher the rarity category the more points given.
      Example: Parcel has a Copperbelly water snake on the property: =10 points

E. Physically (geologically) significant features  maximum points: 3
   Up to 3 points may be given. Example: property has a terminal marine.
PROPERTY SIZE and LOCATION CRITERIA (45 points)

F. Parcel size
Parcels of 100 acres or greater receive 25 points. Points for a property of less than 100 acres are: 25 x acreage of parcel/100 = points.
Example: Parcel is 40 acres in size: 25 x 40 = 1000/100 = 10 points

G. Proximity to Designated Population Center in Ingham County (As Defined in “Regional Growth: Choices For Our Future”, Summary Report, Tri-County Regional Planning Commission, Sept. 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance from Population Center</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 mile or less</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 miles</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3 miles</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4 miles</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 5 miles</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 miles</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example: Parcel is located 2 miles from “designated population center”. Total points = 4 points

H. Location with respect to other protected property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location to Protected Land</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adjacent but within 1/2 mile</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adjacent but within 1 mile</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adjacent but within 2 miles</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example: Parcel is within 1 mile of an already protected property = 6 points

I. Road frontage (paved or gravel)
Road frontage of 1320 feet (1/4 mile) or greater receives 2 points. Points for road frontage of less than 1320 feet are: 2 x feet of road frontage/1320 = points.
Example: Parcel has 500 feet of road frontage: 2 x 500 = 1000/1320 = 0.76 points

J. Block applications
Properties applying in a block application must be contiguous (they may be separated by a road). Each applicant in the block application will receive the stated points.
Two or more landowners applying together and submitting 300 or more contiguous acres each receives 3 points. Points for two or more landowners submitting less than 300 acres are: 3 x number of contiguous acres submitted/300 = points.
Example: Parcel is applying with three other landowners to make a 450 acre block of land: 3 x 450 = 1350/300 = 4.5 therefore the points received are 3, the maximum.
Note: If only one property in a block application is preserved, the remaining landowners will continue to receive full points for this section of the scoring criteria in future cycles, provided the remaining landowners still wish to participate in the block application.

TOTAL TIER I POINTS POSSIBLE – 101

Applicants note: Landowners who accept federal, state or local matching funds to protect their open space land may be selected for the program before landowners who do not accept such funds, regardless of their relative ranking based on the above “Selection Criteria for Protection of Open Space Land”.

Tier I Criteria

Agricultural Characteristics 57 points
Development Pressure 48 points
Additional Ag Protection Efforts 38 points
Other Criteria 10 points

Tier I Total Points 153 points

AGRICULTURAL CHARACTERISTICS (57 POINTS)

1) Agricultural Productivity – Prime and Unique Soils

Prime and Unique Soils
Prime under all circumstances 20 points
Prime if adequately drained 15 points
Not prime or unique 0 points

Example: 70% of parcel is prime under all circumstances (0.70 x 20 pts) = 14 points
30% of parcel is prime if adequately drained (0.30 x15 pts) = 4.5 points
Total points = 18.5 points

2) Size of Parcel(s)

Maximum Points: 20

Points for parcels between 15 and 200 acres are calculated by multiplying 0.1 times the parcel size. Any parcel above 200 acres receives 20 points. Parcels between 15 and 39.99 acres must be in specialty crop production. Parcels that are 0-14.99 acres receive 0 points.

Example: Parcel size is 150 acres: 150 x 0.1 = 15
Example: Parcel is 85 acres: 85 x 0.1 = 8.5
Example: Parcel is 350 acres: 350 x0.1 = 35; 20 points, the maximum possible
Example: Parcel is 13 acres: (0 points for parcel less than 14.99 acres)

3) Additional Agricultural Income

Maximum Points: 5

Points will be awarded to operations that have “value-added” agriculture either through animal related production or through production of a specialty crop (crops other than corn, wheat, soybeans), or both, with total sales over $10,000.00 annually.

Example: Parcel is integral to farm operation that produces a specialty crop, which grosses over $15,000 annually. Total points = 5 points

4) Proximity to Existing Livestock Farms

Maximum Points: 5

A livestock operation for this purpose means a farm with more than 50 animal units (EPA definition: 1000 lbs = 1 unit)

Parcel is contiguous to an existing livestock operation 5 points
Parcel is located between 0.5 miles and 1 mile of an existing livestock operation 3 points
Parcel is located further than 1 mile from an existing livestock operation 0 points

*Contiguous for this section means no other parcel is located between the parcels. Parcels separated only by a road are considered contiguous.
5) **Amount of Undeveloped* Land in the Surrounding Area**

A circle with a 1 mile radius and with a centroid (center point) generated by computer is used to calculate the points in this section.

- 75% or more of the surrounding area is undeveloped land    7 points
- 50% or more but less than 75% of the surrounding area is undeveloped land  5 points
- 25% or more but less than 50% of the surrounding area is undeveloped land  2 points
- Less than 25% of the surrounding area is undeveloped land      0 points

*For the purposes of this section, “undeveloped” means no permanent buildings, residential, commercial, industrial or otherwise.

**DEVELOPMENT PRESSURE (48 POINTS)**

6) **Proximity to Existing Public Sanitary Sewer or Water, or Both**

Linear (straight line) distance to existing, usable public sanitary sewer, or water services, or both, will result in the following scoring options:

- Less than one-half (1/2) mile from sewer or water       5 points
- One-half (1/2) mile or more but less than 1 mile       7 points
- One (1) mile or more but less than 2 miles       10 points
- Two (2) miles or more but less than 5 miles       5 points
- More than 5 miles            0 points

*Example: Parcel is located 3 miles from existing sewer lines. Total points = 5 points.

7) **Proximity to Designated Population Center in Ingham County (As Defined in “Regional Growth: Choices For Our Future”, Summary Report, Tri-County Regional Planning Commission, September 2005)**

Farm boundary is 1 mile from, or within the population center      30 points
Farm boundary is within 1 to 2 miles from population center       28 points
Farm boundary is within 2 to 3 miles from population center       26 points
Farm boundary is within 3 to 4 miles from population center       24 points
Farm boundary is within 4 to 5 miles from population center       22 points
Farm boundary is more than 5 miles from population center          0 points

*Example: Farm is located 2 miles from “designated population center”. Total points= 28 points

8) **Road Frontage (paved or gravel)**

Emphasis is placed on parcels with greater linear distance of road frontage, placing the farmland under a greater threat of fragmented development. Frontage can be gravel, paved, or both and must be adjacent to the subject parcel.

- Road frontage of 5280 feet (1 mile) or more          8 points
- Road frontage of 2640 feet (1/2 mile) to 5279 (just under 1 mile)  6 points
- Road frontage of 1320 feet (1/4 mile) to 2639 (just under ½ mile)  4 points
- Road frontage less than ¼ mile                  0 point

*Example: Parcel has 1 mile of road frontage. Total points = 8 points

**ADDITIONAL AGRICULTURAL PROTECTION EFFORTS (38 POINTS)**

9) **Location to Protected Property**

Parcel is near other private land which has been permanently protected from development through a conservation easement or deed restriction (development rights may have been purchased, transferred or donated). Linear distance is used from nearest farm boundary.
Parcel is adjacent to protected land  20 points
Parcel is not adjacent but within 1/2 mile of protected land  15 points
Parcel is not adjacent but within 1 mile of protected land  10 points
Parcel is not adjacent but within 2 miles of protected land  5 points

Example: Parcel is adjacent to property under a permanent conservation easement = 20 points

10) Agricultural District Zoning  Maximum Points: 3
Additional points are given to a parcel that is in a designated agricultural district.
Exclusive Agricultural District A-1: (Restricts residential development)  3 points
General Agricultural District A-2: (Rural residential zoning)  1 point
Non-Agricultural District  0 points

Example: Parcel has been designated as an exclusive agricultural district, A-1 (maximum density 1 unit per 20 acres) under current zoning. Total Points = 3 points

11) Block Applications  Maximum Points: 15
Emphasis is placed on applications which consist of one or more landowners who create a 50-acre or more block of contiguous farmland. Contiguous blocks of farmland have a greater potential for creating a long-term business environment for agriculture. Parcels included in a block application must be contiguous (touching but may be separated by a road). Each applicant in the block application will receive points for this section.
One or more landowners apply together to create 1000 or more contiguous acres  15 points
One or more landowners apply together to create 750 to 999 contiguous acres  10 points
One or more landowners apply together to create 500 to 749 contiguous acres  8 points
One or more landowners apply together to create 300 to 499 contiguous acres  6 points
Contiguous acreage of 299 acres or less  0 points

Example: Four landowners, with varying parcel acreage, submit a block-application of about 800 contiguous acres. (Each of the four landowners would receive 10 points for this section).

Note: If a parcel in a block application is preserved, the remaining landowners will continue to receive full points for this section of the scoring criteria in future cycles, provided they still wish to participate in the block application.

OTHER CRITERIA (10 POINTS)

12) Additional Agricultural Characteristics  Maximum Points: 5
Additional agricultural characteristics are USDA certified organic farm or Centennial farm.
Parcel has one or more additional agricultural features  5 points
Parcel does not have an additional agricultural feature  0 points

13) Michigan Agricultural Environmental Assurance Program (MAEAP)  Maximum Points: 5
Participation in the MAEAP demonstrates a commitment to environmental stewardship above and beyond a conservation plan. The State Agriculture Preservation Board has identified the MAEAP as a priority to providing matching funds. Farms verified under the MAEAP must show verification to receive points.
Farm is MAEAP verified  5 points
Farm is not MAEAP verified  0 points

TIER I: TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE IS 153
WHEREAS, as of June 1, 2012, the Ingham County Road Commission becomes the Ingham County Department of Transportation and Roads per Resolution #12-123; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Road Commission periodically approved Special and Routine permits as part of their roles and responsibilities; and

WHEREAS, this will now be the responsibility of the Board of Commissioners to approve these permits as necessary.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners approves the attached list of Special and Routine Permits dated February 21, 2013 as submitted.
### INGHAM COUNTY
**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND ROADS**

**DATE:** February 21, 2013

**LIST OF CURRENT PERMITS ISSUED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R/W PERMIT#</th>
<th>R/W APPLICANT / CONTRACTOR</th>
<th>R/W WORK</th>
<th>R/W LOCATION</th>
<th>R/W CITY/TWP.</th>
<th>R/W SECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-032</td>
<td>CONSUMERS ENERGY</td>
<td>ELECTRIC / OH</td>
<td>CURTICE RD BET EDGAR RD AND AURELIUS RD</td>
<td>AURELIUS</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-033</td>
<td>AARON GRAF</td>
<td>TREE REMOVAL</td>
<td>CARTER RD, SWAN RD, GRAF RD</td>
<td>WHITE OAK</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-034</td>
<td>MICHIGAN LOGOS INC</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS</td>
<td>WILLIAMSTON RD &amp; HASLETT RD</td>
<td>WILLIAMSTOWN</td>
<td>10 &amp; 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-036</td>
<td>COMCAST</td>
<td>CABLE / UG</td>
<td>HOLT RD AND COLLEGE RD</td>
<td>ALAIEDON</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-038</td>
<td>TRAVER MILK HAULING</td>
<td>HAUL ROUTE / MILK</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-040</td>
<td>LANSING CHARTER TOWNSHIP</td>
<td>WATER MAIN</td>
<td>DEERFIELD AVE BET SAGINAW ST AND GENESEE ST</td>
<td>LANSING</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-041</td>
<td>LANSING CHARTER TOWNSHIP</td>
<td>WATER MAIN</td>
<td>EASTFIELD RD BET HARTWICK DR AND TIMBER DR</td>
<td>LANSING</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-042</td>
<td>MAXSON MILK TRANSPORT INC</td>
<td>HAUL ROUTE / MILK</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>LEROY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-045</td>
<td>J &amp; J HARDWOODS, INC</td>
<td>TREE REMOVAL</td>
<td>OKEMOS RD AND MT HOPE ROAD</td>
<td>MERIDIAN</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERMIT SUPERVISOR:** ______________________________  
**MANAGING DIRECTOR:** ______________________________
MEMORANDUM

TO: County Services and Finance Committees

FROM: Robert Peterson, Director of Engineering
       Department of Transportation & Roads

DATE: February 21, 2013

SUBJECT: 2013 Biennial Bridge Inspection Contract

The Ingham County Department of Transportation and Roads (ICDTR) is required by federal law to inspect all aspects of its bridges every two years and report the results to the Michigan State Department of Transportation (MDOT). MDOT uses biennial bridge inspection reports from all over the Michigan (state, county, city, and village) to compile a report that is submitted to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Ultimately, the federal government uses the inspection data to guide decisions about federal transportation funding levels and program requirements.

In general, only structures that span 20 feet or more (abutment to abutment) are considered bridges. There are 67 structures that fit that description within the confines of ICDTR jurisdiction. Structures spanning less than 20 feet are categorized as culverts and do not require biennial bridge inspections reported to MDOT and FHWA. However, ICDTR staff and our consultants inspect culverts periodically and as necessary.

Bridge inspections are a rigorous exercise that must follow National Bridge Inspection (NBI) and MDOT standards. ICDTR only solicited proposals from MDOT pre-qualified consultants that have the required training and expertise. Even though all respondents are MDOT pre-qualified, qualification statements are solicited to expand upon the consultant’s pre-qualified status, inspection expertise, and the individual team member’s level of experience.

Due to the nature of the normal inspections and the fact that the initial inspection could lead to more detailed inspections and/or load analyses, the Request for Proposals was drafted as a unit price contract. The unit price contract format has served ICDTR well for the last four inspection cycles, insures that we only pay for the services we need or want, and allows us to order additional work without having to negotiate a cost after-the-fact.

The Purchasing Department advertised for biennial bridge inspection services and received seven (7) proposals. ICDTR and Purchasing Department staff reviewed the proposals and agreed to recommend that Rowe Professional Services Company, Flint, Michigan, be retained to provide the requested bridge inspections. Based on the mandated inspections the basic service fee totals $15,650.00. With the estimate of additional services needed to fulfill our bridge inspection obligation, their fee is estimated to total $25,600.00. The estimated total fee from next closest proposer was $34,290.00.

I respectfully recommend that the Board of Commissioners adopt the attached resolution and accept the unit price proposal from Rowe Professional Services Company.
MEMORANDUM

TO: County Services and Finance Committees
FROM: Jim Hudgins, Director, Purchasing Department
DATE: February 21, 2013
SUBJECT: Proposal Summary – 2013 and 2014 Biennial Bridge Inspection Program for the Ingham County Department of Transportation and Roads

Project Description:
Proposals were sought from Michigan Department of Transportation prequalified and experienced engineering firms for the purpose of entering into a contract to provide professional engineering services for the 2013 and 2014 Biennial Bridge Inspection Program for the Ingham County Department of Transportation and Roads. All work shall be completed within the 24-month anniversary of the bridge’s previous inspection or within a timeframe acceptable, in writing, from the Michigan Department of Transportation.

Proposal Summary:
Vendors contacted: 28  Local: 8
Vendors responding: 7  Local: 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Basic Service Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rowe Professional Services Company</td>
<td>No - Flint</td>
<td>$25,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes Engineering Group LLC</td>
<td>Yes - Lansing</td>
<td>$34,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH Engineering Ltd</td>
<td>No - Detroit</td>
<td>$35,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLZ Michigan, Inc.</td>
<td>Yes - Lansing</td>
<td>$41,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishbeck, Thompson, Carr &amp; Huber, Inc.</td>
<td>Yes - Lansing</td>
<td>$53,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spalding DeDecker Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>No - Rochester Hills</td>
<td>$73,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergmann Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>Yes - East Lansing</td>
<td>$76,630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Vendors Not Responding:
C2AE, Lansing – No bid submitted due to their work load.

Other Vendors Not Responding:
Wade Trim, Taylor; Scott Civil Engineering Company, Grand Rapids; Anderson, Eckstein & Westrick, Inc., Shelby Township – No bid submitted due to their work load.

OHM Advisors, Livonia – No bid submitted due to the location of these bridges relative to OHM Advisors and the competitive nature of this work.

Hubbell, Roth & Clark, Inc., Bloomfield Hills – No bid submitted due to the location of these bridges relative to Hubbell, Roth & Clark, Inc. and the competitive nature of this work.

Recommendation:
It is the recommendation of the Evaluation Committee to award a contract to Rowe Professional Services Company based on its proposal dated February 5, 2013. Rowe Professional Services Company submitted the lowest responsive and responsible bid, and has the experience and references required for this project.

Advertisement:
The RFP was advertised in the City Pulse, The Chronicle, and posted on the Purchasing Department Web Page.
INTRODUCED BY THE COUNTY SERVICES AND FINANCE COMMITTEES OF THE:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT WITH ROWE PROFESSIONAL SERVICES COMPANY

WHEREAS, the former Road Commission, now Ingham County Department of Transportation and Roads (ROAD DEPARTMENT) is required by federal law to inspect all aspects of its bridges every two years and report the results to the Michigan State Department of Transportation; and

WHEREAS, the ROAD DEPARTMENT bridge inspection data is incorporated into a report that is submitted to the Federal Highway Administration, which ultimately is used to guide decisions about federal transportation funding levels and program requirements; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Purchasing Department advertised for biennial bridge inspection services and received seven (7) proposals; and

WHEREAS, the ROAD DEPARTMENT and Purchasing Department staff evaluated the submitted proposals and recommend that the Board of Commissioners authorize a professional services contract with Rowe Professional Services Company, Flint, Michigan.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes entering into a contract with Rowe Professional Services Company, 540 S. Saginaw Street, Suite 200, Flint, Michigan, based on its unit price proposal dated February 5, 2013, for 2013 & 2014 biennial bridge inspections and as-needed services.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Ingham County Board of Commissioners and the County Clerk are authorized to sign any contract documents consistent with this resolution and approved as to form by the County Attorney.
TO:        County Services and Finance Committees  
FROM:     Jim Hudgins, Director of Purchasing  
DATE:     February 20, 2013  
SUBJECT:  Proposal Summary for Uniform Rental and Cleaning Services for the Ingham County Department of Transportation & Roads  

Project Description:  
Proposals were sought from qualified and experienced firms for the purpose of furnishing rental uniforms, cleaning of such uniforms, rental and cleaning of area protection mats, dust mops, and towels for the Ingham County Department of Transportation & Roads for a period of three years with an option for a two-year extension. Prices will remain constant with no yearly price increases for the initial 3-year term of the contract. 

Proposal Summary:  
Vendors contacted: 10  Local: 2  
Vendors responding: 4  Local: 1  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Weekly Delivery Cost</th>
<th>Total Weekly Cost of all Uniforms</th>
<th>Total Weekly Cost of all Floor Mats</th>
<th>Total Weekly Cost of Shop Towels</th>
<th>Total Weekly Cost of Shop Towels</th>
<th>Total Weekly Cost of Dust Mops</th>
<th>Total Weekly Cost of Soiled Locker Storage</th>
<th>Grand Total Weekly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UniFirst Corporation</td>
<td>N - Pontiac</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$32.60</td>
<td>$23.25</td>
<td>$20.70</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$81.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrow Uniform LLC</td>
<td>N - Jackson</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$35.20</td>
<td>$31.68</td>
<td>$20.25</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$92.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallagher Uniform</td>
<td>N - Battle Creek</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$18.24</td>
<td>$40.20</td>
<td>$26.50</td>
<td>$5.40</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$94.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurer's Textile Rental Services</td>
<td>Y - Lansing</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$42.68</td>
<td>$29.05</td>
<td>$19.50</td>
<td>$3.80</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$98.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Vendors Not Responding:  
Sohn Linen Service, Lansing - No bid submitted since vendor is not interested in furnishing or cleaning these types of uniforms. 

Recommendation:  
The Evaluation Committee recommends awarding a 3-year contract with an option for a 2-year renewal to UniFirst Corporation based on its proposal dated January 29, 2013. Total value of 3-year contract is estimated to be $12,722. 

Advertisement:  
The RFP was advertised in the City Pulse, El Central and posted on the Purchasing Department Web Page.
Agenda Item 9c

Introduced by the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A CONTRACT FOR SUPPLYING AND SERVICING MECHANICS’ UNIFORMS, SHOP TOWELS, FLOOR MATS, MOPS & RELATED SERVICES FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION & ROADS

WHEREAS, the Department of Transportation and Roads provides uniforms for its mechanics and fleet supervisor per their respective labor agreements, and needs services to supply mechanics’ shop towels, floor mat and mop cleaning and related services for all Road Department facilities; and

WHEREAS, the Purchasing Department recently released bid packet #3-13 and received sealed, competitive bid proposals for these services for the next 3 year period beginning from date of service contract execution; and

WHEREAS, UniFirst Corporation of Pontiac, MI, submitted the lowest qualified and responsive bid for total weekly costs of $81.55 per week for all of the services required per bid packet 3-13, as shown on the attached Proposal Summary; and

WHEREAS, both the Road Department and the Purchasing Department have reviewed all of the bid proposals received for bid packet 3-13 and recommend accepting that from UniFirst Corporation.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners accepts the bid, and authorizes entering into a contract with UniFirst Corporation, Pontiac, MI, for supplying and servicing mechanics’ uniforms, shop towels, floor mats, mops, and related services for the Department of Transportation & Roads per bid packet 3-13 for total weekly costs of $81.55 per week for the three year period beginning from date of service contract execution, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board Chairperson and County Clerk are hereby authorized to sign any necessary related documents on behalf of the County after approval as to form by the County Attorney.
MEMORANDUM

TO: County Services & Finance Committees

FROM: William M. Conklin, Managing Director
Department of Transportation & Roads

DATE: February 21, 2013

RE: Request & Recommendation for
Waiver to Local Purchasing Preference Policy
For the Department of Transportation & Road’s
Annual Purchase of Maintenance Asphalt &
Local Road Program Contracted Paving

Ingham County’s Local Purchasing Preference Policy, Resolution 05-044 updated by Resolution 10-359, provides that in a competitive bid letting, a registered local vendor (RLV), being a vendor located within Ingham County, may match and be awarded a low bid otherwise submitted by a non-local vendor (non-RLV) if the RLV’s bid is within 10% of the non-RLV’s low bid, assuming all other all other bid criteria are satisfied. This policy aims to increase economic activity in Ingham County by fostering more local jobs, tax revenue, business expenditure, and business relocations to the County.

For most bid lettings, this policy works as intended, especially if there is more than one RLV bidder and the cost saving advantages of competitive bidding are not impacted. In such cases the County benefits from both getting the lowest bid and doing business with local vendors.

In lettings having no RLV bidders, the policy obviously has no effect.

However for large purchase bid lettings having only one RLV bidder, the unintended consequence of imperfect competition and thus potentially paying substantially more for the low bid may result. The single RLV may bid up to 10% higher than it otherwise would, knowing it can match and take any lower bid if within 10%. In such a case, if the RLV’s bid is the low bid as opened, the purchase could end up costing up to 10% more than it would have with more competitive bidding.

The Road Department annually lets at least two large scale asphalt purchases, the annual maintenance asphalt for pick-up and placement by road department crews for road surface maintenance, and one or more lettings of local road program paving contracts. Federal aid projects are let by MDOT per federal requirements. Both road department asphalt lettings involve supplying large enough quantities of asphalt, that typically the only bidders are only the two manufacturers of hot asphalt in the area, Rieth-Riley (RR) located in Mason, an RLV, and Michigan Paving & Materials Corp., (MPMC) located just north of the County Line in Clinton County. Paving contractors who do not manufacture their own asphalt, which is most paving contractors other than the two mentioned above, typically cannot bid against these two as they must purchase asphalt at retail prices from one of the two suppliers. A third supplier, Lansing Asphalt is constructing an asphalt plant, also located outside the County in Eaton County. Thus RR is and will be the only RLV in these bid lettings.

The first asphalt letting under the Local Purchasing Preference Policy was the road department’s 2012 Local Road Program-contracted paving, bid #1639, in August, 2012. RR was the only bidder, as MPMC submitted a “no-bid”. If this trend continues, there would be no competitive pressure on RR’s pricing, which, without implying any negative connotations about RR whatsoever, could result in higher asphalt pricing. This issue was discussed at the August 21, 2012 County Services Committee meeting, at which the Committee requested me to research this issue and bring back a recommendation prior to the next asphalt bid letting. Thus this memo and attached resolution are submitted for consideration of the benefits and costs of adhering to the policy for asphalt purchases as the Road Department is close to bidding the various asphalt purchases for 2013.
The Road Department’s annual maintenance asphalt purchase is typically 12,000 to 14,000 tons. 2012’s prices were RR-$50.00/ton and MPMC-$48.90/ton. With pricing this close, we buy from both, depending on which is closer to the work being done, to save on trucking time and expense. If MPMC were to decide not to bid, and RR were to bid up to 10% higher, or more with no competition, this could add $70,000 to our asphalt costs assuming a 10% increase on 14,000 tons of asphalt currently priced at $50.00 per ton. With only one supplier, trucking cost would also be higher and less efficient for work in the north end of the County.

Similarly, the Local Road Program (LRP) typically lets up to approximately 8,000 tons of asphalt paving. With current pricing at about $55.00 to $70 per ton depending on mix type, a 10% increase would cost at least $44,000 based on the $55.00/ton current price.

According to a recent search of publically available tax records shown on the Ingham County Equalization Department’s Tax Mapping website, Rieth-Riley, and/or an associated business unit known as Capex Land Inc., paid a total of $48,670.52 in property taxes on a number of land parcels to all local taxing units located within the County, including the County and state education fund in the 2011 property tax year, the most recent year shown on this website. MPMC does not own any property in Ingham County.

Although employment in the asphalt industry varies considerably with work volume, and project time and location, examination of certified payrolls on recent Road Dept Local Road Program paving projects as required per both federal and county policy indicated that at the time of these weekly payrolls, 33% of RR’s, (2012 Local Road Program, week 3) and 30% of MPMC’s (2011 LRP, Meridian Twp, only week) crews on these projects lived in Ingham County.

Given the close proximity of both RR and MPMC to the greater Lansing area, we assume their business expenditures in the Lansing area economy are also similar. However, we have no publically accessible way of verifying this information.

Therefore, given the total potential asphalt cost increases due to possibly uncompetitive bidding exceeding property tax collections from the one RLV, generally similar percentage of each bidders’ workforces living within Ingham County, and presumably similar business expenditures in the area economy, Road Department staff finds that the potential additional costs of adhering to the Local Purchasing Policy may outweigh its benefit and thus recommends waiving the policy for Road Department asphalt bid lettings.

Furthermore, maintenance asphalt is also used by road department crews doing work on the Local Road Program, whose cost is shared by Townships as required under Sec 12, subsection 15, of Act 51. As both the maintenance and LRP asphalt lettings directly affect the LRP cost and Township cost sharing, the Township members of the County Road Advisory Board discussed this issue and passed a motion at the Advisory Board’s February 20, 2013, meeting recommending the Board of Commissioners waive the Local Purchasing Preference Policy on both the maintenance and LRP asphalt lettings.

As both Road Department staff and the County Road Advisory Board recommend, the Board of Commissioners is advised to waive the Local Purchasing Preference Policy for the Road Department’s maintenance and LRP asphalt lettings. A proposed resolution to this effect is attached for consideration.
Agenda Item 9d

Introduced by the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A WAIVER
OF INGHAM COUNTY’S LOCAL PURCHASING PREFERENCE POLICY
FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION & ROADS
MAINTENANCE ASPHALT AND LOCAL ROAD PROGRAM
BID LETTINGS & RELATED PURCHASES AND/OR CONTRACTS

WHEREAS, to increase economic activity in Ingham County by fostering more local jobs, tax revenue, business expenditure, and business relocations to Ingham County, the County’s Local Purchasing Preference Policy, Resolution 05-044 updated by Resolution 10-359, provides that in a competitive bid letting, a registered local vendor (RLV), being a vendor located within Ingham County, may match and be awarded a low bid otherwise proposed by a non-local vendor (non-RLV) if the RLV’s bid is within 10% of the non-RLV’s low bid, assuming all other bid criteria are satisfied; and

WHEREAS, for large purchase bid lettings having only one RLV bidder, the unintended consequence of imperfect competition and thus potentially paying substantially more for the low bid may result; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Transportation and Roads annually lets at least two large scale asphalt purchases, the annual maintenance asphalt for pick-up and placement by road department crews for road surface maintenance, and one or more lettings of local road program paving contracts, and both lettings involve supplying such large quantities of asphalt, that typically the only bidders are only the two manufacturers of hot asphalt in the greater Ingham County area, one being an RLV, and the other not; and

WHEREAS, the Road Department’s annual maintenance asphalt purchase is typically up to 14,000 tons at a typical cost of approximately 50.00/ton, such that if the low bid is up to 10% higher, or more with no competition, this could add up to $70,000 to the Road Department’s asphalt costs; and

WHEREAS, with only one asphalt supplier, the Road Department’s trucking cost would also be higher and less efficient for work in certain areas of the County; and

WHEREAS, the Local Road Program (LRP) typically lets up to approximately 8,000 tons of asphalt paving at current pricing of $55.00 to $70 per ton depending on mix type, such that a 10% increase would add at least $44,000 based on the $55.00/ton current price; and

WHEREAS, per resolution 12-187, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners established a County Road Advisory Board consisting of the Supervisor of each Township or their designee to advise the Road Department and the Board of Commissioners on county road issues; and

WHEREAS, both Road Department staff and the County Road Advisory Board advise that Ingham County’s Local Purchasing Preference Policy, Resolution 05-044 updated by Resolution 10-359, be waived due to the above cited potential cost increases outweighing the benefits of this policy in relation to the Road Department’s annual maintenance asphalt and local road program bid lettings and related purchases.
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners, approves waiving Ingham County’s Local Purchasing Preference Policy, Resolution 05-044 updated by Resolution 10-359, in relation to the Road Department’s annual maintenance asphalt and local road program bid lettings and related purchases.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes Road and Purchasing Department staff to post bid letting documents for the Road Department’s annual maintenance asphalt and local road program bid lettings that do not include the County’s Local Purchasing Preference Policy.
February 26, 2013

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Commissioners
FROM: Glen Rockey, Ingham County CDBG
RE: MSHDA Grant Amendment Request - Grant #MSC-2009-0552-HOA

The Board of Commissioners approved Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds in the amount of $50,000 from the Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA) on April 14, 2009 (Resolution #09-092), and approved additional grant funding in the amount of $325,000 on October 13, 2009 (Resolution #09-330).

These funds are utilized to provide Homeowner Rehabilitation to residents of Ingham County, excluding those living in the cities of Lansing and East Lansing.

MSHDA has authorized an extension of the grant term through June 30, 2013 in order to complete one project currently in process.

Please be advised that all other aspects of the grant agreement remain the same. I respectfully request that the term extension be approved.
Introduced by the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AN EXTENSION TO A 2009 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT FROM THE MICHIGAN STATE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY THROUGH JUNE 30, 2013

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Housing Commission applied for Community Development Block Grant funding on behalf of Ingham County from the Michigan State Housing Development Authority; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorized acceptance of Michigan State Housing Development Authority grant funds in the amount of $50,000 (Resolution #09-092) on April 14, 2009; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorized acceptance of additional Michigan State Housing Development Authority grant funds in the amount of $325,000 (Resolution #09-330) on October 13, 2009; and

WHEREAS, the Michigan State Housing Development Authority has seen fit to extend the grant term through June 30, 2013; and

WHEREAS, all other aspects of the grant agreement remain the same.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners accepts the grant term extension through June 30, 2013 for the Community Development Block Grant totaling $375,000 from the Michigan State Housing Development Authority, on behalf of Ingham County, to utilize the funds as designated in the grant agreement.
INGHAM COUNTY WOMEN’S COMMISSION

Resolution in Support of Equal Pay Day

Tuesday, April 9, 2013

WHEREAS, Equal Pay Day was originated in Michigan by the Pay Equity Network and adopted by the National Committee on Pay Equity (NCPE) in 1996 as a public awareness event to illustrate the gap between men’s and women’s wages

WHEREAS, Michigan has several laws requiring equal pay for equal work, they are weak and need strengthening

WHEREAS, Michigan women earn 72 cents for every dollar earned by Michigan men

WHEREAS, eight measures to promote pay equity introduced in the Michigan Senate and House died in committee when the two-year legislative session ended December 31, 2012

WHEREAS, Equal Pay Day symbolizes how far into 2013 women must work to earn what men earned in 2012, on Tuesday, April 9, 2013 an event is scheduled at the Rotunda in the State Capitol Building in Lansing from noon to 1:00 pm to mark that day

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Women’s Commission support efforts to educate the public about the need for legislation addressing the sex- and race-based pay disparities.
Introduced by the County Services Committee of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING APRIL 9, 2013 AS “EQUAL PAY” DAY IN INGHAM COUNTY

WHEREAS, fifty-one years after the passage of the Equal Pay Act and title VII of the Civil Rights Act, women continue to suffer the consequences of unequal pay; and

WHEREAS, Michigan women earn 72 cents for every dollar earned by Michigan men, over a working lifetime, this wage disparity costs the average American woman and her family $700,000 to $2 million in lost wages, impacting Social Security benefits and pensions; and

WHEREAS, fair pay policies can be implemented simply and without undue costs or hardships in both the public and private sectors; and

WHEREAS, fair pay policies would raise family income and strengthen the security of working families while amplifying our economy; and

WHEREAS, Michigan has several laws requiring equal pay for equal work, they are weak and need strengthening; and

WHEREAS, eight measures to promote pay equity introduced in the Michigan Senate and House died in committee when the two-year legislative session ended December 31, 2012; and

WHEREAS, April 9, 2013, symbolizes the time in the new year in which the wages paid to women catch up to the wages paid to men from the previous year; and

WHEREAS, Equal Pay Day symbolizes how far into 2013 women must work to earn what men earned in 2012, on Tuesday, April 9, 2013 an event is scheduled at the Rotunda in the State Capitol Building in Lansing from noon to 1:00 pm to mark that day.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners joins the Ingham County Women’s Commission in supporting efforts to educate the public about the need for legislation addressing the sex- and race-based pay disparities.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby recognizes April 9, 2013 as “Equal Pay” Day in Ingham County.