THE FINANCE COMMITTEE WILL MEET ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 20, 2015 AT 6:30 P.M., IN THE PERSONNEL CONFERENCE ROOM (D & E), HUMAN SERVICES BUILDING, 5303 S. CEDAR, LANSING.

Agenda

Call to Order
Approval of the May 6, 2015 Minutes
Additions to the Agenda
Limited Public Comment

1. Sheriff’s Office
   a. Resolution to Enter into a Contract with Mid Michigan Kennels to Accept a Donation of a New K-9 Dog and Training for the New K-9 Handler
   b. Resolution to Purchase 21 Body Cameras from L3 Mobile Vision, Inc. Using Homeland Security Grant Program Funds

2. Circuit Court/Family Division - Resolution to Authorize Ingham County Circuit Court to Accept Donations for the Ingham County Youth Center Programs

3. Health Department
   a. Resolution to Authorize Amendment #2 to the 2014-2015 Comprehensive Agreement with the Michigan Department of Health & Human Services
   b. Resolution to Authorize Amendment #1 to the Subcontract with the Michigan Public Health Institute (MPHI)

4. Register of Deeds - Resolution Authorizing a Continuing Contract for Microfilm and Indexing Services for the Register of Deeds

5. Innovation & Technology - Resolution Authorizing the Purchase of a 36 Month Support Service Agreement (SSA) for the New Jail Audio System

6. Fair - Resolution Authorizing Entering into a Contract with Anderson-Fischer & Associates for Excavation Services for Improvements to the “Donkey” and Dressage Arenas at the Ingham County Fairgrounds

7. Facilities Department - Resolution Authorizing a Purchase Order to JH Construction to Install a Barrier Free Sidewalk around the Perimeter of the Mason Courthouse
8. **Road Department**
   a. Resolution Authorizing a Contract for Gravel Road Dust Control Service for the Road Department
   b. Resolution Authorizing the Purchase of 2015 Seasonal Requirements of Smooth-Lined Corrugated Polyethylene Pipe & Helically Corrugated Steel Pipe for the Road Department
   c. Resolution to Approve a Second Party Agreement between the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) and the Ingham County Road Department and a Third Party Agreement between Delhi Township and the Ingham County Road Department in Relation to a Federally Funded Pathway Project along Holt Road from Kahres Road to Eifert Road

9. **Controller/Administrator’s Office**
   a. Resolution Updating Various Fees for County Services
   b. Resolution Approving Criteria for Evaluating 2016 Applications for Community Agency Funding

10. **Board Referrals**
    a. Notice of Public Hearing from the City of Lansing Regarding Brownfield Plan #38A
    b. Letter from the Charter Township of Meridian Regarding the Planned Residential Development #15-97015

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](http://www.ingham.org).
FINANCE COMMITTEE
May 6, 2015
Draft Minutes

Members Present: Anthony, Bahar-Cook, Tennis, McGrain, Naeyaert, Schafer, and Tsernoglou

Members Absent: None

Others Present: Eric Schertzing, Tim Dolehanty, Teri Morton, Jill Rhode, Andrew Seltz, Desiree Kirkland, Rick Terrill, Paul Pratt, Lance Langdon, Anne Burns, Ryan Buck, and others

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Anthony at 6:00 p.m. in the Personnel Conference Room “D & E” of the Human Services Building, 5303 S. Cedar Street, Lansing, Michigan.

Approval of the April 22, 2015 Minutes.

MOVED BY COMM. MCGRAIN, SUPPORTED BY COMM. TSERNOGLOU, TO APPROVE THE APRIL 22, 2015 FINANCE COMMITTEE MINUTES.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: None.

Additions to the Agenda

No additions to the Agenda.

Substitutes –

2. Drain Office
   a. Resolution Pledging Full Faith and Credit to Mud Creek Drain Drainage District Bonds

3. 9-1-1 Central Dispatch - Resolution to Approve the Purchase of a Reporting Server and Monitors for use with the 9-1-1 Computer Aided Dispatch Systems

12. Controller/Administrator’s Office - Resolution to Amend Business Travel and Reimbursement Policy and Procurement Card Policy

Limited Public Comment

None.

MOVED BY COMM. SCHAFER, SUPPORTED BY COMM. TENNIS, TO APPROVE A CONSENT AGENDA FOR THE FOLLOWING ACTION ITEMS:
2. **Drain Office**  
a. Resolution Pledging Full Faith and Credit to Mud Creek Drain Drainage District Bonds

3. **9-1-1 Central Dispatch** - Resolution to Approve the Purchase of a Reporting Server and Monitors for use with the 9-1-1 Computer Aided Dispatch Systems

4. **Health Department**  
a. Resolution to Amend the Collaborative Agreement with the Capital Area United Way  
b. Resolution to Enter into a Direct Billing Agreement with Equian, LLC for the Treatment of Unaccompanied Minors  
c. Resolution to Authorize the Purchase of Patient Self-Serve Kiosks for Adult Health Services  
d. Resolution to Authorize a Subcontract Agreement with Redhead Design  
e. Resolution to Authorize a Software and Service Agreement with Simbiote Development for a Patient Management System

5. **Facilities Department** - Resolution Awarding a Contract to Boynton Fire Service to Provide Fire Prevention Services at Several County Facilities

6. **Farmland and Open Space Preservation Board** - Resolution for Approval to Close on Koelling, Schwab #2, Fogle and Haynes #3 Properties

8. **Road Department**  
a. Resolution Authorizing the Purchase of 2015 Seasonal Requirement of Bituminous Surface Mixture for the Ingham County Road Department  
b. Resolution Authorizing the Extension of Authorization to Purchase the 2015/2016 Seasonal Requirement of Liquid De-Icer for the Ingham County Road Department  
c. Resolution to Approve a First Party Construction Contract with Michigan Paving & Materials, a Third Party Agreement with the Charter Township of Lansing and Another Third Party Agreement with the City of Lansing in Relation to a Road Reconstruction Project for Michigan Avenue from 1500 Feet West of Waverly Road to 1500 Feet East of Clare Street

9. **Human Resources** - Resolution Approving a Collective Bargaining Agreement with the Fraternal Order of Police Capitol City Lodge No. 141 - Corrections Unit

10. **Potter Park Zoo** - Resolution Authorizing a Transfer of Capital Improvement Funds to the Wolf Exhibit Project

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: None.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE ITEMS ON THE CONSENT AGENDA CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: None.
2. **Drain Office**  
   b. Resolution to Authorize a Reorganization within the Ingham County Drain Commissioner’s Office

MOVED BY COMM. TENNIS, SUPPORTED BY COMM. MCGRAIN, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE A REORGANIZATION WITHIN THE INGHAM COUNTY DRAIN COMMISSIONER’S OFFICE.

Commissioner McGrain asked whether both bargaining units had approved of the changes.

Paul Pratt, Deputy Drain Commissioner, answered yes.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: None.

1. **Treasurer’s Office** - Update on the Audit Regarding the Reconciliation Issue

Eric Schertzing, Treasurer, and Desiree Kirkland, Chief Deputy Treasurer, updated the Committee on the audit and reconciliation issue.

Commissioner Bahar-Cook asked whether they could provide a heads up on any issues that the audit would raise.

Ms. Kirkland stated that there would be a $160,000 shortage discrepancy that could not be reconciled.

Discussion.

Chairperson Anthony asked whether the Treasurer’s Office had sufficient support to address the issues that would be raised by the audit.

Ms. Kirkland stated that they would be in a better position to assess whether they had sufficient support once the audit was complete.

Treasurer Schertzing stated that they would be approach the Board of Commissioners in regards to additional staffing. He provided an overview of the loss of institutional knowledge in the Treasurer’s Office and its current employee makeup.

Commissioner Bahar-Cook asked whether they were concerned about any improprieties.

Treasurer Schertzing answered no.

Commissioner Schafer asked for staff’s input about the $160,000 irreconcilable issue.

Jill Rhode, Financial Services Director, provided an update on the audit.

Commissioner Schafer asked how they would recommend addressing the shortage.
Ms. Rhode stated that there would have to be an entry made.

There was a discussion about the repercussions of this audit in regards to the County’s eligibility for federal monies and grants.

Ms. Kirkland stated that the auditor, Plante Moran, was rendering services to the Treasurer’s Office in regards to the bank reconciliation issue. She further stated that Plante Moran was reassigned to review the integrity of the general ledger with Financial Services. Ms. Kirkland stated that when Plante Moran issued their findings, they did not assist the Treasurer’s Office with their process due to the reassignment.

Commissioner Tsernoglou asked whether there would be a process developed to ensure a full reconciliation after this current issue was addressed.

Ms. Rhode answered yes.

Commissioner Bahar-Cook asked why the Treasurer’s Office did not come to the Board of Commissioners for additional monies for the Plante Moran contract.

Ms. Kirkland stated that she should have asked for additional money, however it was her understanding that when Plante Moran’s assignment was changed, she did not know that Plante Moran was no longer going to work on the bank reconciliation.

Discussion.

Commissioner Tennis asked where the problem was originating.

Ms. Kirkland stated that it was a number of areas.

Discussion.

Ms. Rhode stated that the fact that we were short was surprising.

Chairperson Anthony asked for an explanation of the current relationship between the Treasurer’s Office and the Financial Services Department.

Ms. Rhode stated that this was a difficult process and the relationship needed to be worked on.

Commissioner Schafer stated that this discussion should end at this time. He further stated that this discussion was beginning to circle around personnel issues and the Committee should proceed to executive session.

Commissioner Bahar-Cook asked whether the Controller’s Office should address this issue and help mediate some solutions to address the situation.
Ms. Rhode stated that Plante Moran needed to finish their audit for May 31, 2015.

Commissioner McGrain asked that the Financial Services and Treasurer’s Office inform the Board of Commissioners on areas that they agree they can work together.

Commissioner Schafer stated that this issue should be discussed in executive session.

Teri Morton, Budget Director, reviewed the reasons why a Committee could go into executive session.

Commissioner Naeyaert stated that there should be accountability for the shortfall.

Discussion.

Treasurer Schertzing stated the Controller had been helpful in facilitating a dialogue between the Treasurer’s Office and Financial Services.

Tim Dolehanty, Administrator/Controller, stated that he would work with the Treasurer’s Office and Financial Services to develop a list by the first Committee meeting in June.

Commissioner Schafer stated that he had real concerns about accountability for the shortfall. He further stated that there should be aggressive action taken as soon as possible.

Commissioner Bahar-Cook asked Chairperson Anthony to ask staff to provide monthly updates to the commissioners on this issue.

Chairperson Anthony directed staff to provide monthly updates until this issue was resolved.

Commissioner McGrain asked how many comments would be expected on the audit’s management letter.

Ms. Rhode stated that this issue was a repeat comment. She further stated that we could expect comments in regards to the Road and Health Departments. Ms. Rhode stated that the Health Department was incredibly complex and the Road Department had issues of utilizing the correct year.

Discussion.

7. Financial Services - Resolution to Increase the Liability Self Insurance Retention to $500,000

MOVED BY COMM. MCGRAIN, SUPPORTED BY COMM. SCHAFER, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION TO INCREASE THE LIABILITY SELF INSURANCE RETENTION TO $500,000.
Ms. Rhode provided background on the financial impact of this resolution. She stated that this amount was not increased since the 1980’s.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: None.

11. **Animal Control** - Discussion: Animal Control Fee Schedules – Potential Revisions

Andrew Seltz, Animal Control Director, and Anne Burns, Deputy Animal Control Director, addressed the Committee in regards to potential revisions to fee schedules.

Commissioner Tsernoglou provided a synopsis of what had transpired on this issue at the last Law & Courts Committee meeting.

Commissioner Bahar-Cook asked whether Animal Control supported reducing fees.

Mr. Seltz answered that Animal Control supported that fees remain the same.

Discussion.

Commissioner Naeyaert stated that the redemption fees should be higher than they already were in regards to repeat offenders.

Ms. Morton stated that the statistics indicated that repeated redemptions were not common.

Ms. Morton stated that as it stood now, Animal Control and the Controller’s Office recommendations were the same.

Commissioner Tennis stated he had been a member of the Animal Control Advisory Board for a few years now. He further stated that common complaints they would receive were the high unsterilized license and redemption fees when compared to surrounding counties. Commissioner Tennis stated that Ingham County Animal Control offered more comprehensive services than surrounding counties of which justified the higher fees relative to other counties.

Discussion.

Commissioner McGrain asked why others did not charge a boarding fee for aggressive animals.

Mr. Seltz answered that he did not know. He stated that Kent County did charge a $150 quarantine fee, which was equivalent to our aggressive animal boarding fee. Mr. Seltz stated that the other counties did charge a boarding fee, but did not delineate between aggressive and non-aggressive animals.

There was a discussion about lowering the redemption fees for first offenses.

Ms. Morton stated that the Finance Committee’s intent on this would be reflected in an revised recommendation and resolution to be put forth for consideration.
12. **Controller/Administrator’s Office** - Resolution to Amend Business Travel and Reimbursement Policy and Procurement Card Policy

MOVED BY COMM. BAHAR-COOK, SUPPORTED BY COMM. SCHAFTER, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION TO AMEND BUSINESS TRAVEL AND REIMBURSEMENT POLICY AND PROCUREMENT CARD POLICY.

Mr. Dolehanty provided a synopsis of what transpired at last night’s County Services Committee meeting and the changes proposed by the substitute resolution.

Mr. Dolehanty stated that the issue of dispute resolution between an employee and Financial Services had not come up before in practice because Financial Services was good at resolving the issue.

Mr. Dolehanty stated that this policy was intended to address employee travel and did not apply to the Prosecuting Attorney’s scheduling of travel for witnesses.

Commissioner Bahar-Cook asked for Mr. Dolehanty to break down the distinctions between travel advances, reimbursement, and the procurement card.

Mr. Dolehanty provided the requested break down. He stated that this resolution was an attempt to create a consistent policy in regards to travel.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: None.

13. **Board Referral** - Notice of Public Hearing from the City of East Lansing Regarding Third Amendment to TIF Plan #4 for West Village Brownfield Plan Phase III

No action was taken on this item.

**Announcements**

Commissioner Tennis announced that Kalamazoo County charged additional fees which made up for their lower main fees.

Commissioner McGrain stated that he was happy to provide information about the Nurse In, which was occurring tomorrow, May 7 at 2:00 p.m. at the Ingham County Friend of the Court.

Commissioner Bahar-Cook announced that the Women’s Commission would be hosting a reception in the rotunda of the Mason Courthouse following the Board of Commissioners meeting on Tuesday, May 12 to honor the essay contest winners. She invited all to attend.

Commissioner Bahar-Cook stated that the Women’s Commission raised funds from corporate donors to provide the essay contest winners with cash sponsorships.
Commissioner Bahar-Cook stated that Becky Bennett, Board Coordinator, would get information to the commissioners detailing which districts the winners resided in.

Chairperson Anthony announced that the next Finance Committee meeting would begin at 6:30 p.m. instead of the regular 6:00 p.m. start time.

Public Comment

None.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:12 p.m.
RESOLUTION ACTION ITEMS:

The Controller’s Office is recommending approval of the following resolutions:

1a. **Sheriff’s Office** – Resolution to Enter into a Contract with Mid Michigan Kennels to Accept a Donation of a New K-9 Dog and Training for the New K-9 Handler

This resolution accepts the donation of a K-9 German Shepherd Police Dog named Smoke and the requisite training with the Officer assigned to Smoke. This donation to the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office from HoffenMiller Kennels of Eaton Rapids has an estimated value of $7,500.

1b. **Sheriff’s Office** – Resolution to Purchase 21 Body Cameras from L3 Mobile Vision, Inc. using Homeland Security Grant Program Funds

This resolution authorizes the purchase of the following technology equipment using surplus 2013 Homeland Security grant funding for twenty one L3 BodyVISION Camera systems to be disbursed equally to the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office (7), East Lansing Police (7), and Meridian Township Police (7) at a cost of $399 per camera system. ($399 * 21 = $8,379) This will be a multi-year project with the intent to start slow in order to fully develop the capacity for adequate data storage with respective IT Departments, field operation policies, and policies on the retention of data. (see attached memo for details)

2. **Circuit Court/Family Division** – Resolution to Authorize Ingham County Circuit Court to Accept Donations for the Ingham County Youth Center Programs

This resolution authorizes the Ingham County Circuit Court to accept monetary and/or material gifts which will assist with the Ingham County Youth Center’s current and future programs and events. Current programs include the Fresh Start Agriculture Program, the Plus Party program, as well as a Token Economy program. (see attached memo for details)

3a. **Health Department** - Resolution to Authorize Amendment #2 to the 2014-2015 Comprehensive Agreement with the Michigan Department of Health & Human Services

This resolution authorizes Amendment #2 of the 2014-2015 Comprehensive Agreement with the Michigan Department of Health & Human Services (MDHHS). This amendment will decrease the budget for Comprehensive Local Health Services from $5,201,277 to $5,147,840, a decrease of $53,437 specifically in the Essential Local Public Health Services (ELPHS) grants. The amendment makes the following specific changes in the budget:

1. Drinking Water ELPHS, decrease from $48,235 to $46,465
2. Food Service ELPHS decrease from $218,513 to $210,496
3. On Site ELPHS decrease from $97,934 to $94,341
4. HIV Prevention ELPHS decrease from $49,973 to $47,807
5. Communicable Disease Control ELPHS decrease from $580,885 to $555,712
6. Immunization ELPHS decrease from $79,010 to $75,586
7. STD Control ELPHS decrease from $214,463 to $205,169
3b. **Health Department - Resolution to Authorize Amendment #1 to the Subcontract with the Michigan Public Health Institute (MPHI)**

This resolution authorizes an amendment to the current subcontract with MPHI, adding a two-day gathering to the scope of services to be held in late summer or fall of 2015 to enable the partner agencies to plan and launch collaborative action campaigns in 2015 and 2016, extending the deadline for deliverables to November 30, 2015, and increasing the amount of the contract from $15,000 to an amount not to exceed $30,000.

4. **Register of Deeds - Resolution Authorizing a Continuing Contract for Microfilm and Indexing Services for the Register of Deeds**

The Register of Deeds seeks approval of a resolution to convert ten years of film to a digital format at a cost not to exceed $6,695.26. This project would result in conversion of 58 rolls of film representing the years from 1950 through 1960 to digital images. The project is necessary to preserve records in the best format possible in order to provide easy access to the citizens of Ingham County. Current microfilm media becomes brittle with age and tends to break when threaded into viewing machines.

5. **Innovation & Technology Department – Resolution Authorizing the Purchase of a 36 Month Support Service Agreement (SSA) for the New Jail Audio System**

The IT Department requests approval of a resolution to authorize purchase of a 36-month Support Service Agreement (SSA) with Carousel Industries to provide 24-hour support and/or managed services for all jail audio equipment. The cost of this proposal is not to exceed $8,416.84.

6. **Fair - Resolution Authorizing Entering into a Contract with Anderson-Fischer & Associates for Excavation Services for Improvements to the “Donkey” and Dressage Arenas at the Ingham County Fairgrounds**

The Ingham County Fair Board has determined that improvements to the “donkey” and dressage arenas will enhance services offered for current events and will provide an opportunity to bid for larger regional horse shows, thereby increasing participation and continue revenue stream diversification effort. The proposed resolution would allow the County to enter into a contract with Anderson-Fischer & Associates at a cost not to exceed $18,200.

7. **Facilities Department – Resolution Authorizing a Purchase Order to JH Construction to Install a Barrier Free Sidewalk around the Perimeter of the Mason Courthouse**

The resolution as proposed by the Facilities Department would authorize installation of a barrier-free sidewalk around the perimeter of the courthouse. The sidewalk will be used primarily on days security screening is present at the South entrance, as well as allowing individuals to access the building safely during the winter months. The Department recommends awarding a contract to JH Construction at a cost not to exceed $8,632.25.

8a. **Road Department – Resolution Authorizing a Contract for Gravel Road Dust Control Service for the Road Department**

The Road Department uses a service to provide, deliver and/or apply approximately 250,000 gallons of calcium chloride solution for dust control each year on the 82 miles of gravel county roads during the dry months of the year. Upon review of various proposals submitted in response to a County-issued RFP, the Road and Purchasing Departments recommend awarding a contract to Chloride Solutions at the unit price of $0.13 per gallon for calcium chloride dust control solution delivered and/or applied.
8b. **Road Department – Resolution Authorizing the Purchase of 2015 Seasonal Requirements of Smooth-Lined Corrugated Polyethylene Pipe & Helically Corrugated Steel Pipe for the Road Department**

The Road Department annually purchases approximately 3,500 lineal feet of smooth-lined corrugated polyethylene pipe and helically corrugated steel pipe—both galvanized and aluminized coated, for use as road drainage culverts and piping. Upon review of various proposals submitted in response to a County-issued RFP, the Road Department proposes a resolution to accept bids, and authorize the purchase on an as-needed, from Advanced Drainage Systems and from Contech Engineered Solutions, LLC.

8c. **Road Department – Resolution to Approve a Second Party Agreement between the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) and the Ingham County Road Department and a Third Party Agreement Between Delhi Township and the Ingham County Road Department in Relation to a Federally Funded Pathway Project along Holt Road from Kahres Road to Eifert Road**

The Road Department received federal funding to construct the RAM trail along Holt Road from Kahres Road to Eifert Road. Delhi Township desires to design, construct, and maintain the trailway for the use of the general public and satisfy all the requirements of the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), the Federal Highway Administration, and the Road Department. The Road Department seeks authorization to enter into a contract with the State of Michigan/MDOT to effect construction of RAM trail along Holt Road from Kahres Road to Eifert Road, on behalf of Delhi Charter Township, for a total estimated cost of $1,416,600 consisting of $1,159,500 in federal CMAQ funding and $257,100 in township matching funds.

9a. **Controller/Administrator - Resolution Updating Various Fees For County Services**

The Controller's Office annually prepares for the Board of Commissioners review details about adjustment of the fees for the upcoming budget process. This review has been completed and some adjustments are being presented to the Board of Commissioners for their consideration. This information was discussed at a previous round of committee meetings as a discussion item for input from the Board of Commissioners. A resolution recommending certain fee increases is now being presented at this round of meetings for adoption. The only change from the originally presented set of fee recommendations is a decrease in the Animal Control – Animal Redemption 1st Offense fee from $31.00 to $25.00 as directed by the Finance Committee at its last meeting. (see attached memo for details)

9b. **Controller/Administrator - Resolution Approving Criteria for Evaluating 2016 Applications for Community Agency Funding**

This resolution establishes the criteria by which each agency’s application will be evaluated for the 2016 Community Agency funding process. If the resolution is approved as presented, the Controller/Administrator’s Office will accept applications for Community Agency funding in July. Applications will then be evaluated by the Controller/Administrator’s Office with priority given to proposals that directly contribute to addressing the County’s long-term priority of “Meeting Basic Needs”, such as food, clothing, and shelter.

**BOARD REFERRALS:**

10a. **Notice of Public Hearing from the City of Lansing Regarding Brownfield Plan #38A**

10b. **Letter from the Charter Township of Meridian Regarding the Planned Residential Development #15-97015**
This resolution requests permission for the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office to accept a donation of a K-9 dog for our K-9 program. The donation of the K-9 also includes training for its new handler.
Agenda Item 1a

Introduced by the Law & Courts and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH MID MICHIGAN KENNELS TO ACCEPT A DONATION OF A NEW K-9 DOG AND TRAINING FOR THE NEW K-9 HANDLER

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office has had, during Sheriff Wriggelsworth’s tenure as the Sheriff, a K-9 Unit; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office K-9 Unit is considered a regional asset that is used throughout Ingham County, through mutual aid requests and calls for assistance to all Mid Michigan Police Agencies; and

WHEREAS, K-9 Rocco was retired in January, 2015 due to the promotion of K-9 Handler Andy Daenzer to Sergeant; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office wants to accept the donation of K-9 Smoke to replace K-9 Rocco; and

WHEREAS, the total donation consists of K-9 Smoke, a 3 year old, male, German Shepherd from the HoffenMiller Kennels, located at 5511 Long Highway in Eaton Rapids, Michigan, and all initial training for the new K-9 handler, Deputy Narlock; and

WHEREAS, the K-9 and training is a $7,500.00 donation in goods and services.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners approves the donation of K-9 Smoke and the requisite training to the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office from HoffenMiller Kennels.

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

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners and Sheriff thank HoffenMiller Kennels for their generous donation.
TO: Law & Courts and Finance Committees


DATE: August 14, 2012

RE: Resolution to Purchase 21 Body Cameras from L3 Mobile Vision, Inc. using Homeland Security Grant Program Funds

The Ingham County Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Management has applied for and been approved previously for FY2013 Region 1 Homeland Security Funds. A portion of these funds will be used to purchase (21) Body Cameras from L3 Mobile Vision Inc. L3 Mobile Vision is the current vendor that In-Car Camera Systems were purchased from. This enhanced technology will be used for intelligence gathering by Law Enforcement personnel and recording day-to-day operations of Law Enforcement.

This will be the first phase of a multi-year project. The first phase will include the purchase of (21) BodyVISION systems that will be dispersed equally among the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office, East Lansing Police, and Meridian Township Police. The intent of the multi-year project is to start at a reduced level to facilitate several aspects of the project. These aspects include Data Storage with respective IT Departments, Operational Policies, and Policies on the retention of data.

This technology request has been previously submitted and approved by the Michigan State Police Emergency Management and Homeland Security Division.
What We Can Learn From the Police That Pioneered Body Cameras

Police across the country are being outfitted with body cameras, but managing all the hours of footage comes at a price and poses unintended consequences.

BY MIKE MACIAG | APRIL 13, 2015

Ever since his early days on the police force in Chesapeake, Va., Kelvin Wright has been intrigued by the idea of using cameras to fight crime. As a traffic officer in the late 1980s, he was the first cop in the department to test them on car dashboards. Chesapeake police then experimented with body-worn cameras as long ago as the late 1990s, but the technology proved impractical. By 2009, Wright was the chief. He decided to equip 90 of Chesapeake’s officers with newer-model body cameras. At the time, such recording devices were in use only in a select handful of police departments around the country.

That is quickly changing. Sparked mostly by the riots following police killings last year in Ferguson, Mo., and Staten Island, N.Y. -- and, more recently, by the shooting death of an unarmed black man in North Charleston, S.C. -- there’s been a national surge of interest in outfitting officers with body-worn cameras. Just two years ago, TASER International, a leading vendor of the devices, only supplied cameras to Chesapeake and a few hundred other agencies. Now the company reports more than 2,500 law enforcement agencies use more than 30,000 of its cameras nationwide. One national expert recently told The Wall Street Journal he estimates that 4,000 to 6,000 police departments, out of about 18,000 nationwide, use body cameras. No state mandates body-worn devices yet, but according to the National Conference of State Legislatures, lawmakers in 29 states had introduced various body camera bills as of March.

Many of the cities interested in equipping officers with body cameras have reached out to Chesapeake to see how the program has worked there. Since the unrest of Ferguson, Wright says his department has received on average a call a week about the cameras from other cities. The New York City Police Department was one of the callers. The District of Columbia Police Department sent a contingent down to Chesapeake last year to visit. Wright thinks it’s not a matter of if but when most police departments will deploy body-worn cameras of their own. “Across this country,” Wright says, “officers will wear these very much as they do their sidearm.”

Departments with body cameras are finding that there’s much more to it than merely strapping a camera on an officer’s uniform. Managing all the hours of video footage comes at a price, both in labor and data storage costs. Perhaps even more significant, body-worn cameras come with numerous unintended consequences, some of which will get worse as the technology becomes widespread.
By now, Chesapeake police officers have grown accustomed to being recorded. They begin their shifts by picking up a camera from docking stations, and they end their shifts by plugging the devices back in. All of the recorded video and audio is automatically uploaded to Evidence.com, an internal website that’s sort of a YouTube for Chesapeake police. Officers can review footage at computer terminals while writing up reports, or watch clips right away using an app on their smartphones.

Officer Krystal Holland has found that body camera videos don’t catch everything. She’s learned to describe what’s happening out loud so that it’s captured on the audio. Body cameras aren’t intimidating for younger officers like Holland, who joined the department out of the police academy about two years ago. However, there is a generational divide in the way cameras are perceived. “Typically, senior officers don’t see the value of the video or want the video unless it saves them,” Wright says. “Younger officers who are more tech savvy, they understand that this is the way of the world.”

"How we as a society deal with [body cameras] can either enhance community trust in police or adversely affect it."

Traffic officers already familiar with the benefits of in-car cameras, Wright says, played a role in securing buy-in as the department implemented body-worn devices across other units in recent years. The department also publishes regular reports tallying the number of complaints against officers that are invalidated by body camera footage, providing a clear incentive for officers uncomfortable with being recorded on the job.

All uniformed Chesapeake police officers -- about 250 total -- are required to record every encounter with citizens when performing law enforcement-related duties or responding to calls for service. The hours of footage quickly add up. Only six months after expanding the program, Chesapeake police had exceeded their initial data storage capacity that was expected to last at least a year. It’s the expense related to data storage -- not the purchase of the cameras -- that typically ends up being most costly for departments.

Police agencies are also learning that processing video footage is labor-intensive. Chesapeake officers tag videos as evidence and may spend extra time when writing reports to ensure they’re in sync with what recordings show. Police department staff respond to requests for footage, occasionally needing to redact portions of clips. Last year, police responded to more than 1,500 requests from the Commonwealth’s Attorney’s Office alone, most of which required the production of two or three videos each. The workload was so heavy that the department created a new position of video evidence coordinator to handle all the requests.

The video footage means more work for attorneys as well. Reviewing video of a typical traffic stop takes at least a half hour, and multiple videos exist when more than one officer arrives on the scene. “When they started coming in here,” says Chesapeake Commonwealth’s Attorney Nancy Parr, “it took everybody by surprise how time-consuming it was to watch the videos.” Periodic beeps can be heard throughout the day in Parr’s office from recorded noises the cameras make as videos are played. Many of the Commonwealth staff attorneys end up watching the videos in the early evening hours and on weekends.

Before the cameras are even put in place, an array of policy issues must be discussed among police, attorneys and city officials. Someone must decide which types of interactions will be recorded, how long video will be retained and what footage can be released to the public. States haven’t addressed many of these issues yet, so local departments are left to outline policies in consultation with city legal advisers. The result has been a range of different policies. Chesapeake, for example, does not require officers to notify citizens that they’re being recorded, and the city stores video not tagged as evidence for 13 months. Officers in neighboring Norfolk notify the public when they’re being recorded and retain video only 45 days if it’s not used for evidence.

*Before cameras can be put in place, police, attorneys and local officials need to decide which types of interactions will be recorded, how long video will be retained and what footage can be released to the public.*
Local elected officials in some jurisdictions have attempted to force departments to adopt the technology more quickly than they would prefer. In Baltimore, city council members passed a bill last year requiring police to wear cameras. Mayor Stephanie Rawlings-Blake vetoed the measure, arguing that the council’s powers should not extend into police department operations and that the bill failed to adequately address legal and privacy issues. The program “must be done right and should not be something that is hastily implemented without measures in place to ensure its success,” the mayor wrote. Rawlings-Blake, who supports adoption of the cameras, instead formed a city task force that later recommended a pilot program.

But even when the cameras are subjected to detailed advance scrutiny, unexpected consequences nearly always creep in. One of them is that the public may start to assume body camera footage will always be available to help their side of a legal proceeding. That’s already become an issue in Chesapeake. While Parr says it has yet to be used against prosecutors in court, some feel there isn’t a solid case without the footage. “Lay people expect the police officers to record everything in order for it to be true,” she says. In addition, when events unfold rapidly police don’t always have time to activate their cameras. One night in January, according to police, Chesapeake officers responding to a report of a suicide attempt found a man standing in the middle of the street firing multiple rounds at them. Police returned fire, and the man later died at a hospital. The shooting wasn’t captured on video, Wright says, because the officer was focused on his personal safety and didn’t think to turn the camera on. In Wright’s view, it’s an understandable instance that illustrates why not every incident will be captured. “People have come to expect video on everything,” Wright says. “To some degree, we are victims of our own success.”

The media, too, is starting to expect footage. An arrest in March by officers of the Virginia Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control attracted widespread publicity when a college student was injured. A headline in The Washington Post later that week read, “Body cameras absent in Va. arrest.”

Then there is the issue of taping citizens in private residences. Darrel Stephens, executive director of the Major Cities Chiefs Association, says some people may hesitate to call police to their homes in select circumstances, such as domestic disputes, if they believe the recordings could be opened to public consumption. “There are lots of situations police get engaged in that don’t seem appropriate to allow people to look at on YouTube,” Stephens says. Chesapeake’s policy requires officers to turn off cameras inside medical facilities or when they’re appearing before a magistrate. In Florida, all body camera video, with a few exceptions, is subject to public records requests. One state Senate bill attempts to scale back the state’s broad public records law, exempting footage shot inside private residences, schools or hospitals.

On the opposite end of the spectrum, many police departments are releasing videos entirely at their discretion or, in some cases, declining to provide any footage to the press at all. Jim Bueermann, president of the Police Foundation, a police research group, relates fears that some departments may release only those videos that cast citizens in a negative light and exonerate officers. If that’s the case, he says, the cameras will prove counterproductive: “How we as a society deal with this can either enhance community trust in police or adversely affect it.”

Early evidence suggests that, notwithstanding the potential drawbacks, the cameras yield significant benefits. A 2012 study of the Rialto, Calif., Police Department found a significant reduction in use-of-force incidents among officers randomly assigned to wear cameras, along with an 88 percent year-over-year decline in citizen complaints. A study examining a Mesa, Ariz., Police Department pilot program showed similar results over an eight-month period, with officers not wearing cameras recording nearly three times as many complaints as those who wore cameras. Many complaints against Chesapeake officers with camera footage are cleared immediately, not requiring further investigation. The department investigated 36 complaints last year, compared to more than 60 per year in 2010 and 2011, when the program had not been fully implemented.

So do cameras make police behave better, or are citizens just more cooperative when the cameras are turned on? Most in the law enforcement community contend that it’s a mix of both. “Equipping officers with body cameras does not eliminate use of force,” Bueermann says, “but it does appear to have a civilizing effect on the more routine interactions between police and the public.”
Chesapeake reports that the cameras have proved particularly useful in DUI cases. Defense attorneys find many clients’ accounts of their arrests don’t match the videos. Chesapeake prosecutor Parr says she suspects the videos have led to more guilty pleas for DUI charges, although no exact figures are available.

Body cameras can also play a pivotal role in quelling highly charged situations, as was the case early one morning in 2013 in Daytona Beach, Fla. There, two city police officers shot a well-known former high school and college football star while responding to a domestic dispute. The shooting prompted immediate outrage from residents of the low-income community. Body camera footage, however, showed the man holding a butcher knife to his girlfriend and refusing officers’ calls to release her as he appeared to start pushing the knife into her chest. To help mitigate any backlash against police, Chief Michael Chitwood reviewed the footage and invited neighborhood leaders and the news media to watch the video later that day. “What could have been a potentially serious problem was abated because of the body cameras,” Chitwood says. The State Attorney’s Office later cleared the officers of any wrongdoing.

Of course, body cameras can also spell trouble for misbehaving officers. One Daytona Beach officer claimed his camera malfunctioned during a confrontation that left a woman with busted teeth. After a similar malfunction occurred again, a forensic review of the camera revealed that the officer had intentionally switched off the power. He later resigned. Daytona Beach’s policy calls for firing anyone turning off a camera to avoid being recorded. Officers cannot, for the most part, prevent recorded video from being uploaded and only those with administrative privileges are able to edit or delete videos. “It’s going to catch the good, the bad and the ugly,” Chitwood says. “Everybody behaves better when the cameras are on.”

Every officer’s camera has an assigned docking station.

So far, body cameras have generally enjoyed strong public support. Police unions have pushed back, but their concerns are focused more on specific policies than on opposing the cameras outright. Officers, for example, want to ensure they’re still able to carry out private conversations, interview confidential informants and use the restroom without being recorded.

The top concern among law enforcement officials is that they’ll be stuck with an unfunded mandate, says Virginia state Sen. Donald McEachin, who introduced a bill requiring all departments to begin deploying body cameras by 2018. Departments in Norfolk and other places have used federal asset forfeiture funds to purchase cameras. The White House has also proposed $75 million in matching funds for states and localities to pay for equipment and storage. Any one-time grants, though, fail to cover data storage and other camera-related costs over the long term.

Chesapeake pays roughly $1,800 per camera, which includes mounting equipment, licensing fees and maintenance plans over five years. Annual data storage for the entire department currently costs about $24,000. Expenses are exponentially higher for big-city police departments. Officials in Charlotte, N.C., recently approved spending $7 million over a five-year period to purchase and operate 1,400 police body cameras.

As more agencies line up to buy the cameras, the increased demand may not only help push down costs, but also accelerate the pace of technological innovation. The latest body cameras on city streets today pale in comparison to what’s possible in the years to come, says the Police Foundation’s Bueermann, who envisions devices activated automatically when a cop removes a gun from a holster or when certain keywords are uttered. In addition, voice recognition and facial identification capabilities may eventually make their way into the devices.

But even current technology is far ahead of the policies needed to govern use of the cameras. As police departments decide how to proceed, they’ll have to consider both where the technology is headed and what the consequences accompanying it will be. “We should move forward,” Bueermann says, “with our eyes wide open.”
Agenda Item 1b

Introduced by the Law & Courts and Finance Committees of the:

INGERHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO PURCHASE 21 BODY CAMERAS FROM L3 MOBILE VISION, INC.
USING HOMELAND SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM FUNDS

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Office of Homeland Security & Emergency Management has previously applied for and approved to receive pass through grant funds from the FY2013 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP); and

WHEREAS, the purpose of these grant funds is to purchase equipment and to provide training in the Homeland Security & Emergency Management field; and

WHEREAS, the following technology requests have been submitted and approved by the Michigan State Police Emergency Management and Homeland Security Division; and

WHEREAS, the purchase of this technology equipment (portable body cameras) would be used for intelligence gathering by law enforcement personnel, recording activities that may prevent or identify terrorist threats against the community; and

WHEREAS, the L3 Body Cameras purpose includes gathering homeland security information during routine day-to-day activities.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the purchase of the following technology equipment using Homeland Security grant funding:

- Twenty One L3 BodyVISION Camera Systems - $8,379.00

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

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

TO: Law and Courts/Finance Committees
FROM: Maureen Winslow
DATE: May 6, 2015
RE: Resolution to Accept Donations to the Ingham County Youth Center

The resolution that accompanies this memo requests authorization to accept donations, both monetary and material, for the programs and events at the Ingham County Youth Center, a 24 bed detention facility for youth petitioned to the Ingham County Circuit Court Family Division for delinquency.

As part of treatment intervention at the detention facility, the youth are involved in supervised programs, such as cognitive behavior therapy, and rewards and incentives which research shows is effective at increasing prosocial skills and reducing criminogenic behavior.

Other programs at the Youth Center include the Fresh Start Agricultural Program which will assist the youth in gaining work experience, develop leadership skills, and learn about gardening. An AmeriCorps worker has been assigned to the Youth Center to assist with the garden project.

The Plus Party and the Token Economy system in place at the facility encourage youth to meet their daily and weekly goals, while practicing prosocial activity.

The donations received will be used for incentives, rewards, as well as activities and needs surrounding the garden.
Introduced by the Law & Courts and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE INGHAM COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT TO ACCEPT DONATIONS FOR THE INGHAM COUNTY YOUTH CENTER PROGRAMS

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Youth Center is a detention facility for 24 high risk youth who have been petitioned to the Ingham County Circuit Court due to delinquent behavior; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Youth Center provides treatment intervention for youth detained in the facility with the goal of eliminating or reducing the criminogenic factors that lead to delinquent behavior; and

WHEREAS, one of the current programs is the Fresh Start Agriculture Program, designed to mentor court involved juveniles in the detention center utilizing gardening as a form of education where participating teens will learn about gardening, horticulture, science, the environment, nutrition, and art; and

WHEREAS, other programs include the Plus Party which provides incentives and rewards for youth who accomplish their daily and weekly goals as well as a Token Economy program which reinforces prosocial behaviors as a part of best practice methods to encourage and support youth in making better choices; and

WHEREAS, local individuals, businesses, and organizations often wish to support the Ingham County Youth Center’s programs and events; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Circuit Court is requesting to accept monetary and/or material donations for court operated programming at the Ingham County Youth Center.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the Ingham County Circuit Court to accept monetary and/or material gifts which will assist with the Ingham County Youth Center’s programs and events.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, accepted donated items will become the property of Ingham County and will be used, maintained, and disposed of in accordance with County policy.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby authorizes the Controller/Administrator to make necessary adjustments to the Ingham County Circuit Court Family Division’s budget to accept donations and to account for any funds received and the disbursement thereof in accordance with this resolution.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Human Services Committee
   Finance Committee

FROM: Linda S. Vail, MPA, Health Officer

DATE: May 1, 2015

RE: Resolution to Authorize Amendment #2 to the 2014-2015 Comprehensive Agreement with the Michigan Department of Health & Human Services (MDHHS)

This is a recommendation to authorize Amendment #2 of the 2014-2015 Comprehensive Agreement with the Michigan Department of Health & Human Services (MDHHS). The Comprehensive Agreement is the annual process whereby the MDHHS transmits State and Federal funds to Ingham County to support public health programs. The Comprehensive Agreement establishes the funding levels and the terms and conditions under which the funds are disbursed. The Board of Commissioners authorized the 2014-2015 Agreement in Resolution #14-451, Amendment #1 in Resolution #15-78.

The Comprehensive Agreement is regularly amended to adjust funding levels and clarify terms and conditions. This amendment will decrease the budget for Comprehensive Local Health Services from $5,201,277 to $5,147,840, a decrease of $53,437 specifically in the Essential Local Public Health Services (ELPHS) grants. The amendment makes the following specific changes in the budget:

Amendment #2

9. Food Service ELPHS decrease from $218,513 to $210,496.
10. On Site ELPHS decrease from $97,934 to $94,341.
11. HIV Prevention ELPHS decrease from $49,973 to $47,807.
12. Communicable Disease Control ELPHS decrease from $580,885 to $555,712.
13. Immunization ELPHS decrease from $79,010 to $75,586.
14. STD Control ELPHS decrease from $214,463 to $205,169.

I recommend that the Board of Commissioners adopt the attached resolution.

c: Eric Thelen w/attachment
Debbie Edokpolo w/attachment
Barb Mastin w/attachment
Introduced by the Human Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE AMENDMENT #2 TO THE 2014-2015 COMPREHENSIVE AGREEMENT WITH THE MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

WHEREAS, the responsibility for protecting the health of the public is a shared responsibility between the State and County governments in Michigan; and

WHEREAS, the Michigan Department of Health & Human Services (MDHHS) and local health departments enter into contracts to clarify the role and responsibility of each party in protecting public health; and

WHEREAS, the MDHHS and Ingham County have entered into a 2014-2015 Agreement authorized in Resolution #14-451, Amendment #1 in Resolution # 15-78; and

WHEREAS, the MDHHS has proposed Amendment #2 to the current Agreement to adjust grant funding levels and clarify Agreement procedures; and

WHEREAS, the Health Officer has recommended that the Board of Commissioners authorize the Amendment.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes Amendment #2 to the 2014-2015 Comprehensive Agreement with the Michigan Department of Health & Human Services (MDHHS).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the total amount of Comprehensive Agreement funding shall decrease from $5,201,277 to $5,147,840, a decrease of $53,437.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the decrease consists of the following specific changes to program budgets:

- Drinking Water ELPHS, decrease from $48,235 to $46,465
- Food Service ELPHS decrease from $218,513 to $210,496
- On Site ELPHS decrease from $97,934 to $94,341
- HIV Prevention ELPHS decrease from $49,973 to $47,807
- Communicable Disease Control ELPHS decrease from $580,885 to $555,712
- Immunization ELPHS decrease from $79,010 to $75,586
- STD Control ELPHS decrease from $214,463 to $205,169

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Health Officer, Linda S. Vail, MPA is authorized to submit Amendment #2 of the 2014-2015 Comprehensive Agreement electronically through the Mi-E Grants system after approval as to form by the County Attorney.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Controller/Administrator is authorized to amend the Health Department’s 2015 Budget in order to implement this resolution.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Human Services Committee
    Finance Committee

FROM: Linda S. Vail, MPA, Health Officer

DATE: May 4, 2015

RE: Recommendation to Authorize Amendment #1 to the Subcontract with Michigan Public Health Institute

Through the Ingham County Health Department’s (ICHD) Social Justice Initiative, ICHD has gained recognition at the state and national level as a leader in coordinating efforts to incorporate principles of social justice and health equity into public health practice. In 2013, ICHD entered into agreements with the National Association of City and County Health Officials (NACCHO) to coordinate the development of a network of local health departments and community organizers in Michigan (Michigan Power to Thrive). These agreements include one for $80,000, authorized by Resolution #13-285 and Resolution #14-168; and another for $62,300, authorized by Resolution #14-269.

The activities covered in the scope of work for these agreements include providing or arranging for networking/summit events to help resolve barriers that restrict or inhibit strong working relationships between community organizers and local health departments, as well as coordinating community dialogues that use the documentary series The Raising of America to develop a regional or statewide issue campaign for health equity.

In the summer of 2014, ICHD entered into a subcontract with the Michigan Public Health Institute (MPHI) to provide three half-day summit events to address emergent issues of interest to all of the partners in Michigan Power to Thrive. Two of these summit events have been delivered, and a third (focusing on the use of The Raising of America) is planned for June 25, 2015. Subsequently, ICHD negotiated with MPH to deliver an additional two-day annual gathering, to be held in late summer or fall of 2015, to enable the partner agencies to plan and launch collaborative action campaigns in 2015 and 2016.

The attached resolution authorizes an amendment to the current subcontract with MPH, adding this two-day gathering to the scope of services, extending the deadline for deliverables to November 30, 2015, and increasing the amount of the contract from $15,000 to an amount not to exceed $30,000.

I recommend that the Board of Commissioners adopt the attached resolution.

c: Eric Thelen w/attachment
    Joel Murr w/attachment
    Doak Bloss w/attachment
RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE AMENDMENT #1 TO THE SUBCONTRACT WITH THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC HEALTH INSTITUTE (MPHI)

WHEREAS, health equity – which is the elimination of the root causes of health disparity—is one of the core values for the Ingham County Health Department; and

WHEREAS, since 2011 representatives of the Health Department have been building relationships with local, state, and national organizations about promising ways to align the health equity work of public health practitioners and community organizers; and

WHEREAS, organizers and public health personnel from eight counties in Michigan (Calhoun, Genesee, Ingham, Kalamazoo, Kent, Saginaw, Washtenaw, and Wayne) have worked together to create a new network called Michigan Power to Thrive; and

WHEREAS, in Resolutions #13-285, #14-168, and #14-269, the Board of Commissioners authorized agreements between the Health Department and the National Association of County and City Health Officials (NACCHO) to coordinate the “Building Networks” activity in Michigan; and

WHEREAS, funds received through these agreements are to be used to subcontract with other organizations to carry out any of the following activities: 1) provide technical assistance to local health departments and organizers working collaboratively in Michigan; 2) educate and familiarize health department personnel with the tools, methods, and strategies used by organizers to achieve policy victories that improve health equity in communities; 3) provide networking/summit events to help resolve barriers that restrict or inhibit strong working relationships between community organizers and local health departments; and 4) coordinate community dialogues that use the documentary series The Raising of America to develop a regional or statewide issue campaign for health equity; and

WHEREAS, the Michigan Public Health Institute (MPHI) is a partner in Michigan Power to Thrive (MPTT) and has the demonstrated capacity to provide networking/summit events that strengthen and advance the work of the Michigan Power to Thrive network; and

WHEREAS, the Health Department has subcontracted with MPHI for the delivery of half-day summits for MPTT partners for planning and capacity building, and has successfully delivered half-day summits associated with this contract; and

WHEREAS, the Health Officer recommends that the Board of Commissioners authorize an amendment to the current subcontract with the Michigan Public Health Institute, extending the time frame during which activities will be completed and increasing the amount of the contract by $15,000.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Commissioners authorizes an amendment to its current $15,000 contract with Michigan Public Health Institute, increasing the amount of the contract to $30,000, and expanding its scope of services to include the delivery of a two-day annual gathering of Michigan Power to Thrive to be completed by November 30, 2015.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Controller/Administrator is authorized to make any necessary budget adjustments consistent with this resolution.

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

TO: County Service and Finance Committees
FROM: Jim Hudgins, Director, Purchasing Department
DATE: May 8, 2015
SUBJECT: Proposal Summary for Microfilm and Indexing Services.

Project Description:
Quotes were sought in 2014 for Microfilm Conversion and Indexing Services. The project would allow for the scanning, conversion and indexing of 86 rolls of microfilm representing documents (105,600± images) recorded from 1950 through 1960 and publishing online for the public and title companies to view.

Proposal Summary:
Vendors contacted: 5 Local: 1
Vendors responding: 2 Local: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Office Solutions, 345 W. Lake Lansing Rd, East Lansing MI 48823</td>
<td>$6,794.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Sciences Inc., 1551 E. Lincoln Avenue, Madison Heights MI 48073</td>
<td>$10,517.76</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not Responding:
Fidlar Technologies, 350 Research Parkway, Davenport, IA 52806
Manatron/Thomas Reuters, 510 E. Milham Avenue, Portage MI 49002
Iron Mountain, PO Box 27128, New York, NY 10087-7131

Recommendation:
It is recommended to extend the contract to convert 15 rolls of film representing deeds, and 43 rolls representing mortgages recorded between 1950 through 1960 for a cost not to exceed $6,695.00, which is consistent with the same unit rate as quoted in 2014. Inclusive of an offsite scanning charge of $700.00.
Agenda Item 4

Introduced by the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A CONTINUING CONTRACT FOR
MICROFILM AND INDEXING SERVICES FOR THE REGISTER OF DEEDS

WHEREAS, Ingham County is committed to providing its citizens convenient access to images of recorded documents and their preservation; and

WHEREAS, these images are handled on a regular basis by the public and have become worn and brittle; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners passed Resolution #14-209 to convert and index 86 rolls of film to digital images, and make the images available to the public without further damage to the existing film; and

WHEREAS, the Register of Deeds has identified an additional 58 rolls to be converted to digital images; and

WHEREAS, inserting these images into the public online system will enable the public to view the images and also make them available to customers in the Register of Deeds’ public vault; and

WHEREAS, after completing 86 rolls of imaging with Michigan Office Solutions the Register of Deeds would like the extend the contract to Michigan Office Solutions who submitted a responsible bid in 2014, and has agreed to convert 15 rolls of film representing deeds and 43 rolls representing mortgages recorded between 1950 through 1960 for a cost not to exceed $6,695.26; and

WHEREAS, funds for this project are available within the Register of Deeds Technology line item #10123600 818000.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the Register of Deeds Office to extend the contract with Michigan Office Solutions for the conversion and indexing of 58 rolls of microfilm representing documents recorded from 1950 through 1960 for a cost not to exceed $6,695.26.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Board of Commissioners is hereby authorized to sign any necessary documents after approval as to form by the County Attorney.
TO: Board of Commissioners
FROM: Frank Chain – IT Project Manager
RE: Support Service Agreement for New Jail Audio System
DATE: April 21, 2015

Dear Commissioners,

This resolution authorizes the purchase of a 36 month Support Service Agreement (SSA) with Carousel Industries for the continued support for the new jail audio system. The cost is not to exceed $8,416.84 for the 36 month SSA.

In return for the payment of the fees, Carousel Industries will provide 24/7 support and/or managed services for all of the installed jail audio equipment, to include but not limited to Biamp mixer’s, JBL Speakers, Omnidirectional Microphones, UPS, and wiring.

The new jail audio system was replaced by Carousel Industries. The new jail audio system replaced the failed/failing audio system installed by Grand Valley. The new audio system was installed in three phases at the jail. The first phase was Post 5 installed in June, 2014. The second phase was done from resolution 14-338. With the final phase being completed from resolution 14-400. All three phases will be covered under this agreement.

Thank you for your consideration and feel free to contact me if you have any questions at 676-7369 or fchain@ingham.org.
Agenda Item 5

Introduced by the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE PURCHASE OF A 36 MONTH SUPPORT SERVICE AGREEMENT (SSA) FOR THE NEW JAIL AUDIO SYSTEM

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Jail has a new jail audio system; and

WHEREAS, the Innovation and Technology Department worked with Carousel Industries to replace the failed/failing Grand Valley audio system; and

WHEREAS, the new jail audio system was completed in three phases; and

WHEREAS, the first phase was completed on Post 5 in June, the second phase was completed from Resolution #14-338, and the third and final phase was completed from Resolution #14-400; and

WHEREAS, all three phases will be covered under this agreement.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Commissioners authorizes the purchase of the Support Service Agreement (SSA) for the new jail audio system from Carousel Industries.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the cost of the SSA, in an amount not to exceed $8,416.84, will be paid from the 63625810-932030 IT Maintenance account.

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

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Ingham County Board of Commissioners is authorized to sign any contract/purchase order documents with Carousel Industries consistent with this resolution and approved as to form by the County Attorney.
Memorandum

To: County Services & Finance Committees

From: Sandra Dargatz, Executive Director, Ingham County Fair

Date: May 4, 2015

RE: Authorization to Enter into a Contract with Anderson-Fischer & Associates of Mason, Michigan for excavation services for improvement to the “Donkey” and Dressage Arenas at the Ingham County Fairgrounds

The existing condition of the footing in the “donkey” and dressage horse arenas on the north end of the fairgrounds has become deficient for usage by the thirty plus horse shows occurring annually.

In support of the 2015 Budget & Activity Priorities set by the Ingham County Board of Commissioners in resolution #14-177, the Ingham County Fair Board, by way of the proposed improvements to the two horse arenas, will enhance services offered to current events and will provide an opportunity to bid for larger regional horse shows, thus increasing the current participation and continuing to diversify the Ingham County Fair Board revenue stream.

The Purchasing and Fair Board both concur that a contract be awarded to Anderson-Fischer & Associates who submitted the lowest responsive and responsible bid in the amount not to exceed $18,200.00.

The Hotel/Motel reserve fund for Fairgrounds capital improvements has a current fund balance of $62,359.69. The Fair Board requests the transfer of $18,200.00, from the Hotel/Motel reserve funds to the 2015 Ingham County Fair CIP account # 56176900-976000, to assist with the completion of this capital project.

The improvements on the two arenas will begin upon execution of the contracts and is currently slated for the second week of June 2015, which will allow for the completion in conjunction with the start of the 2015 horse show season.

Sincerely,

Sandra Dargatz
Executive Director, Ingham County Fair
(517) 676-2857
MEMORANDUM

TO: County Services and Finance Committees
FROM: Jim Hudgins, Director of Purchasing
DATE: April 8, 2015
SUBJECT: Excavation Services for the Ingham County Fairgrounds

Project Description:
Bids were sought from experienced and qualified excavators for the purpose of making improvements to the Donkey and Dressage Arenas located at the Ingham County Fairgrounds.

Scope of work:
Donkey Arena: Remove existing footing and base and excavate to enlarge arena from current footprint to 100’ x 200’, place a new base of clay, compact, lay down 3 inches of 2ns sand and grade out for a finished arena surface. Clay base (370 yards) 2ns sand (185 yards).

Dressage Arena: Remove existing footing and base, place new clay base, compact, lay down 3 inches of 2ns sandy on top, and grade out for finished arena surface. Clay base (315 yards) 2ns sandy (160 yards).

Proposal Summary:
Vendors contacted: 29  Local: 12
Pre-Bid attendance 14  Local: 05
Vendors responding: 07  Local: 04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Local Pref</th>
<th>Bid Bond</th>
<th>Addendum</th>
<th>Total Bid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson-Fischer &amp; Associates, Mason MI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$18,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jule Swartz &amp; Sons Excavating, Jackson MI</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$19,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVR Incorporated, Okemos MI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$20,789.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI Demolition &amp; Excavation, Okemos MI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Check in lieu</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$28,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rieth Riley Construction Co., Lansing MI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$31,577.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike &amp; Sons Asphalt, Bath MI</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$34,407.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared Beduhn Excavating</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation:
The Evaluation Committee recommends awarding the contract to Anderson-Fischer & Associates in an amount not to exceed $18,200.

Anderson-Fischer & Associates, a local vendor, submitted the lowest responsive proposal. The vendor is licensed, bonded and insured. The company has experience working on projects of similar size and scope.

Advertisement:
The RFP was advertised in the Lansing State Journal, City Pulse and posted on the Purchasing Department Web Page.
Agenda Item 6

Introduced by the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ENTERING INTO A CONTRACT WITH ANDERSON-FISCHER & ASSOCIATES FOR EXCAVATION SERVICES FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE “DONKEY” AND DRESSAGE ARENAS AT THE INGHAM COUNTY FAIRGROUNDS

WHEREAS, the existing condition of the footing in the “donkey” and dressage horse arenas on the north end of the fairgrounds has become deficient for usage by the thirty plus horse shows occurring annually; and

WHEREAS, in support of the 2015 Budget & Activity Priorities set by the Ingham County Board of Commissioners in resolution #14-177, the Ingham County Fair Board, by way of the improvements to the two horse arenas, will enhance services offered to current events and will provide an opportunity to bid for larger regional horse shows, thus increasing the current participation and continuing to diversify the Ingham County Fair Board revenue stream; and

WHEREAS, the Hotel/Motel reserve fund for Fairgrounds capital improvements is currently at $62,359.69; and

WHEREAS, after careful review of bids, the Purchasing and Fair Board both concur that a contract be awarded to Anderson-Fischer & Associates who submitted the lowest responsive and responsible bid in the amount not to exceed $18,200.00.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby authorizes awarding a contract to Anderson-Fischer & Associates, 225 E. Kipp Rd., Mason, Michigan 48854, to make improvements to the “donkey” and dressage arenas for a not to exceed cost of $18,200.00.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Ingham County Controller/Administrator is authorized to transfer funds from the Hotel/Motel reserve funds to the 2015 Ingham County Fair CIP account #56176900-976000.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Ingham County Board of Commissioners is authorized to sign any necessary contract documents consistent with this resolution upon approval as to form by the County Attorney.
MEMORANDUM

TO: County Services and Finance Committees

FROM: Rick Terrill, Facilities Director

DATE: May 5, 2015

SUBJECT: RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A PURCHASE ORDER TO JH CONSTRUCTION TO INSTALL A BARRIER FREE SIDEWALK AROUND THE PERIMETER OF THE MASON COURTHOUSE

The resolution before you authorizes a Purchase Order for JH Construction to install a barrier free sidewalk around the perimeter of the courthouse that will connect all four entrances. The sidewalk will be used primarily on days security screening is present at the South entrance, for court proceedings, as well as allowing individuals to access the building safely during the winter months.

The Facilities Department collected estimates from three qualified vendors and request that a Purchase Order be issued to JH Construction who submitted the lowest, not to exceed estimate of $8,632.25.

Funds for said services are available within Line Item 245-23399-976000-5FC08 which has a balance of $15,000.00 for a courthouse barrier free sidewalk.

I recommend approval of this resolution.
MEMORANDUM

TO: County Services and Finance Committees

FROM: Jim Hudgins, Director of Purchasing

DATE: May 6, 2015

SUBJECT: Courthouse Sidewalk Installation

Project Description:
Three (3) estimates were sought to install a barrier-free concrete sidewalk around the perimeter of the Mason Courthouse that will connect the four entrances.

Proposal Summary:
Vendors contacted: 03 Local: 03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Local Preference</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JH Construction</td>
<td>1167 S. Aurelius Road, Mason MI 48854</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$8,632.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montague Concrete Construction</td>
<td>4675 Wilcox Road, Holt MI 48842</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$8,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able Concrete</td>
<td>1305 S. Cedar, Ste 105, Lansing MI 48910</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$13,332.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation:
JH Construction, a local vendor, submitted the lowest estimate. The recommendation is to issue a purchase order to JH Construction in an amount not to exceed $8,632.25.
Agenda Item 7

Introduced by the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A PURCHASE ORDER TO JH CONSTRUCTION TO INSTALL A BARRIER FREE SIDEWALK AROUND THE PERIMETER OF THE MASON COURTHOUSE

WHEREAS, the Mason Courthouse is in need of a barrier free sidewalk around the perimeter of the courthouse that will connect all four entrances; and

WHEREAS, the barrier free sidewalk will be used primarily on days security screening is present at the South entrance for court proceedings; and

WHEREAS, the barrier free sidewalk will also allow individuals to access the building safely during the winter months; and

WHEREAS, the Facilities Department collected estimates from three qualified vendors and request that a Purchase Order be issued to JH Construction who submitted the lowest not to exceed estimate of $8,632.25; and

WHEREAS, funds for said services are available within Line Item 245-23399-976000-5FC08 which has a balance of $15,000.00 for a courthouse barrier free sidewalk.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby authorizes a Purchase Order to JH Construction, 1167 South Aurelius Road, Mason, Michigan 48854 to install a barrier free sidewalk around the perimeter of the courthouse that will connect all four entrances, for a not to exceed cost of $8,632.25.

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

TO: County Service and Finance Committees
FROM: Jim Hudgins, Director of Purchasing
DATE: May 6, 2015
SUBJECT: Liquid Calcium Chloride Solution

Project Description:
Sealed bids were sought from qualified and experienced companies for the purpose of furnishing the Road Department’s 2015 seasonal requirements (approximately 250,000 gallons) of liquid calcium chloride solution for dust control on gravel roads.

Proposal Summary:
Vendors contacted: 07  Local: 01  
Vendors responding: 05  Local: 01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great lakes Chloride Inc.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>.44/gal</td>
<td>.482/gal</td>
<td>.58/gal</td>
<td>.47/gal</td>
<td>.515/gal</td>
<td>.61/gal</td>
<td>.52/gal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloride Solutions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>.1395/gal</td>
<td>.1395/gal</td>
<td>.1395/gal</td>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>No bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI Chloride Sales</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>.173/gal</td>
<td>.29/gal</td>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>No bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI Mineral Resources</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>.13/gal</td>
<td>.13/gal</td>
<td>.13/gal</td>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>No bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid Calcuim</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>No bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1322/gal</td>
<td>362/gal</td>
<td>647/gal</td>
<td>.61/gal</td>
<td>.65/gal</td>
<td>735/gal</td>
<td>735/gal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation:
It is the recommendation of the Evaluation Committee, in accordance with the Local Purchasing Preference Policy, to award the contract to Chloride Solutions, a local vendor who is willing to match Michigan Mineral Resources’ unit prices quoted in their 2015 response and summarized above at $0.13/gallon.

Advertisement:
The RFP was advertised in the Lansing State Journal, City Pulse and posted on the Purchasing Department Web Page.
Introducetd by the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A CONTRACT FOR GRAVEL ROAD DUST CONTROL SERVICE FOR THE ROAD DEPARTMENT

WHEREAS, the Road Department uses a service to provide, deliver and/or apply approximately 250,000 gallons of calcium chloride solution for dust control each year on the 82 miles of gravel county roads during the dry months of the year; and

WHEREAS, the Road Department’s adopted 2015 budget includes funds for this expense in controllable expenditures; and

WHEREAS, bids for the Road Department’s 2015 supply of liquid calcium chloride dust control solution were solicited by the Purchasing Department in RFP #48-15; and

WHEREAS, Michigan Mineral Resources of Albion Michigan was the low bidder on this service with a bid of $0.13 per gallon; and

WHEREAS, Chloride Solutions of Webberville Michigan, a local vendor, has offered to match the low bid from Michigan Mineral Resources; and

WHEREAS, it is therefore the recommendation of the Road and Purchasing Departments to enter into a contract with Chloride Solutions at the unit price of 13 cents per gallon for calcium chloride dust control solution delivered and/or applied.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Board of Commissioners authorizes a contract with Chloride Solutions of Webberville, Michigan at the unit price of 13 cents per gallon for calcium chloride dust control solution delivered and/or applied.

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

TO: County Services and Finance Committees
FROM: Jim Hudgins, Director of Purchasing
DATE: May 4, 2015
SUBJECT: Smooth-Lined Corrugated Polyethylene Pipe and Helically Corrugated Steel Pipe

Project Description:
Competitive sealed bids were sought from qualified and experienced companies for the purpose of furnishing the Road Department’s 2015 season’s requirements of smooth-lined corrugated polyethylene pipe and helically corrugated steel pipe.

Proposal Summary:
Vendors contacted: 14 Local: 01
Vendors responding: 04 Local: 01

Cost grids are located on the next page.

Recommendation:
The Evaluation Committee recommends awarding the Steel Pipe contract to Contech Engineered Solutions (a local vendor) and the Plastic Pipe to Advanced Drainage Systems, Inc. at the unit prices quoted in their responses and listed on the following pages.

Advertisement:
The RFP was advertised in the Lansing State Journal, El Central Hispanic News, and posted on the Purchasing Department Web Page.
**Item 1: Smooth-lined Corrugated Polyethylene Pipe and Couplers**

*To furnish Ingham County Road Department with their annual requirements of smooth-lined corrugated polyethylene pipe and couplers of various sizes and lengths as outlined below.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pipe Diameter</th>
<th>Contech Engineered Solutions</th>
<th>St. Regis Culvert Inc</th>
<th>Jensen Bridge &amp; Supply Company</th>
<th>Advanced Drainage Systems (ADS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Inch</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Inch</td>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Inch</td>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Inch Self Coupling</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$5.40</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Inch Self Coupling</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$6.90</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Inch Self Coupling</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$9.10</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$7.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Inch Self Coupling</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$15.50</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$13.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Inch Self Coupling</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$21.50</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$20.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Inch Self Coupling</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$30.95</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$26.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solid Sleeve Couplers</th>
<th>Contech Engineered Solutions</th>
<th>St. Regis Culvert Inc</th>
<th>Jensen Bridge &amp; Supply Company</th>
<th>Advanced Drainage Systems (ADS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Inch</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Inch</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$11.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Inch</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$15.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Inch</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$40.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Inch</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$59.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Inch</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$104.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Inch</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$159.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Inch</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$354.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Inch</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$487.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To furnish the Ingham County Road Department with their annual requirement of Helically Corrugated Galvanized Type 1 Coated Steel Pipe and Couplers of various sizes and construction lengths as outlined below.

### Galvanized Pipe Diameter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diameter</th>
<th>Gage</th>
<th>Contech Engineered Solutions</th>
<th>St. Regis Culvert Inc</th>
<th>Jensen Bridge &amp; Supply Company</th>
<th>Advanced Drainage Systems (ADS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$7.60</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$9.50</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$6.91</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>$6.91</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$10.20</td>
<td>$7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$10.20</td>
<td>$7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$7.20</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$5.41</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>$12.77</td>
<td>$11.05</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$10.80</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$13.41</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>$11.25</td>
<td>$10.18</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$10.40</td>
<td>$16.95</td>
<td>$13.14</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$14.40</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$18.04</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>$11.25</td>
<td>$10.18</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>$17.72</td>
<td>$13.20</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>$13.20</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$11.50</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$16.82</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$11.50</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$16.82</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$11.50</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$22.10</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$11.50</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$26.82</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$13.50</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$16.82</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$13.50</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$26.26</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$13.50</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$36.08</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$13.50</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$16.82</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$13.50</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$26.26</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$98.00</td>
<td>$137.00</td>
<td>$97.43</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Aluminized Type 2 Pipe Diameter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diameter</th>
<th>Gage</th>
<th>Price Each</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 Inch Spiral Aluminized Type 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Inch Spiral Aluminized Type 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$8.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Inch Spiral Aluminized Type 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Inch Spiral Aluminized Type 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$12.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Inch Spiral Aluminized Type 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$17.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Inch Spiral Aluminized Type 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$23.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Inch Spiral Aluminized Type 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$26.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Inch Spiral Aluminized Type 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Inch Spiral Aluminized Type 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Inch Spiral Aluminized Type 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$78.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Connecting Bands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connecting Bands</th>
<th>Gage</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Price Each</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$11.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$11.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$11.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Inch Aluminized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$13.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Inch Aluminized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$13.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Inch Aluminized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Inch Aluminized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Inch Aluminized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Inch Galuminized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Inch Galuminized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Inch Galuminized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$64.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Inch Galuminized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$64.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Inch Galuminized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$94.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Inch Galuminized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$94.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Inch Galuminized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$130.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Inch Galuminized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$130.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Inch Galuminized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Inch Galuminized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Inch Aluminized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$186.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Inch Aluminized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$186.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Price per Linear ft.**

- **Contech Engineered Solutions**
- **St. Regis Culvert Inc**
- **Jensen Bridge & Supply Company**
- **Advanced Drainage Systems (ADS)**

**Price Each**

- **Contech Engineered Solutions**
- **St. Regis Culvert Inc**
- **Jensen Bridge & Supply Company**
- **Advanced Drainage Systems (ADS)**
Introducing the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE PURCHASE OF 2015 SEASONAL REQUIREMENTS OF SMOOTH-LINED CORRUGATED POLYETHYLENE PIPE & HELICALLY CORRUGATED STEEL PIPE FOR THE ROAD DEPARTMENT

WHEREAS, the Road Department annually purchases approximately 3500 lineal feet of various sizes of both smooth lined corrugated polyethylene pipe and helically corrugated steel pipe—both galvanized and aluminized coated, for use as road drainage culverts and piping; and

WHEREAS, the Road Department’s adopted 2015 budget includes in controllable expenditures, funds for this and other maintenance material purchases; and

WHEREAS, bids for both smooth lined corrugated polyethylene pipe and helically corrugated steel pipe—both galvanized and aluminized coated, were solicited and evaluated by the Ingham County Purchasing Department per Request for Proposals (RFP) #53-15, and it is their recommendation, with the concurrence of Road Department staff, to award this bid and purchase on an as-needed, unit price basis smooth lined corrugated polyethylene pipe from Advanced Drainage Systems, and helically corrugated steel pipe—both galvanized and aluminized coated, from Contech Engineered Solutions, LLC.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Board of Commissioners accepts the bids, and authorizes the purchase on an as-needed, unit price basis of smooth lined corrugated polyethylene pipe from Advanced Drainage Systems, and helically corrugated steel pipe, both galvanized and aluminized coated, from Contech Engineered Solutions, LLC.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Road Department and Purchasing Department are hereby authorized to execute purchase orders with Advanced Drainage Systems for smooth lined corrugated polyethylene pipe, and Contech Engineered Solutions, LLC, for helically corrugated steel pipe—both galvanized and aluminized coated, as needed and budgeted.
TO: County Services and Finance Committees
FROM: Robert Peterson, Director of Engineering, Road Department
DATE: May 6, 2015
SUBJECT: Delhi Township RAM Trail

The federal government makes available Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ) funding to build transportation projects or programs that will contribute to the attainment or maintenance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone, carbon monoxide, or particulate matter. CMAQ funds must benefit the non-attainment area or maintenance area by reducing mobile source emissions. Pathways are projects that are eligible for CMAQ funding.

Only certain agencies are eligible to make application for, and received CMAQ funding. The Michigan Department of Transportation, incorporated cities, some villages, and road commissions are all eligible agencies. Townships wishing to utilize CMAQ funding to build pathways must find an eligible agency to sponsor their applications for funding. The County Road Advisory Board voted to sponsor Delhi Township’s CMAQ funding application for the RAM Trail Project from Kahres Road to Eifert Road. The project was awarded the grant in 2013. The estimated costs for the project are as follows:

Federal CMAQ Funding: $1,159,500
Delhi Township Match: $257,100
$1,416,600

We are to the point where the funds have been obligated for construction and contracts can be executed. The contractual responsibilities are as follows: The Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) will enter into a first party contract with the contractor, which basically ensures that all the federal construction requirements and responsibilities are defined. A second party agreement between MDOT and Ingham County is required to define the Road Department’s responsibilities and to administer the construction contract on MDOT’s behalf. Lastly, a third party agreement between Ingham County and Delhi Township is required to transfer much of ICRD’s construction oversight, maintenance, and local match responsibilities to the township and secure a construction administration fee.

The reason for this memo and resolution is to execute the MDOT and Ingham County second party agreement and the Ingham County and Delhi Township third party agreement.

Approval of the attached resolution is recommended.
WHEREAS, the Ingham County Road Department received Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ), on behalf of Delhi Charter Township, to construct the RAM trail along Holt Road from Kahres Road to Eifert Road; and

WHEREAS, Delhi Township desires to design, construct, and maintain the trailway for the use of the general public and satisfy all the requirements of the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), the Federal Highway Administration, and the Road Department; and

WHEREAS, the PROJECT will be undertaken pursuant to a contract between the State of Michigan/MDOT and the contractor; and

WHEREAS, the County on behalf of the Road Department, in turn, must therefore enter into an associated second party agreement with the State of Michigan/MDOT consistent with the requirement for state and federal funding requirements; and

WHEREAS, the Road Department and Delhi Township agree that the township will administer construction of the project, and will pay any and all local match costs incurred by the project, plus $4,000.00 for project administration and oversight provided by the Road Department; and

WHEREAS, the estimated costs for the project are as follows:

Federal CMAQ Funding: $1,159,500
Delhi Township Match: $257,100
$1,416,600

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes entering into a contract with the State of Michigan/MDOT to effect construction of RAM trail along Holt Road from Kahres Road to Eifert Road, on behalf of Delhi Charter Township, for a total estimated cost of $1,416,600 consisting of $1,159,500 in federal CMAQ funding and $257,100 in township matching funds.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes entering into a third party agreement with Delhi Charter Township to also effect construction of RAM trail along Holt Road from Kahres Road to Eifert Road.

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

TO: Finance and Liaison Committees

FROM: Timothy J. Dolehanty, Controller/Administrator

DATE: May 8, 2015

SUBJECT: Resolution Updating Various Fees for County Services

This resolution will authorize the adjustment of various fees for county services to be effective for the Health Department and the Friend of the Court on October 1, 2015, for the Park and Zoo winter seasonal fees on November 1, 2015, and for all other departments on January 1, 2016. These adjustments are based on an update of the “Cost of Services Analysis” completed by Maximus in 2002. In subsequent years, the cost has been determined by multiplying the previous year’s cost by a cost increase factor for each department. Utilizing this method again, the 2016 cost was calculated by multiplying the 2015 cost by the 2016 cost increase factor. Updated costs were then multiplied by the target percent of cost to be recovered by the fee for services as identified by the Board of Commissioners. Input was solicited from county departments and offices as part of the process of making these recommended adjustments. A full analysis of each fee was presented to all committees at previous rounds of meetings.

If the fee adjustments are passed as proposed, additional annual revenue would total approximately $82,000. Any additional revenue will be recognized in the 2016 Controller Recommended Budget.

As directed by the Board of Commissioners, the Controller’s Office has incorporated the update of county fees into the annual budget process. This will allow the county to annually and incrementally adjust fees based on changing costs, rather than to make large adjustments at one time.

Please contact me if you have any questions regarding this information.

Attachments
WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners set various fees for county services in Resolution #02-155 based on information and recommendations of the *Maximus Cost of Services Analysis* completed in 2002; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners also established the percent of the cost of providing the services which should be recovered by such fees, referred to in this process as a “target percent”; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners has directed the Controller’s Office to establish a process for the annual review of these fees and target percents; and

WHEREAS, the annual average United States’ consumer price index was used as the cost increase factor; and

WHEREAS, this cost increase factor is applied to the previous year’s calculated cost and multiplied by the target percent and in most cases rounded to the lower full dollar amount in order to arrive at a preliminary recommended fee for the upcoming year; and

WHEREAS, in cases where the calculated cost multiplied by target percent is much higher than the current fee, the fee will be recommended to increase gradually each year until the full cost multiplied by target percent is reached, in order to avoid any drastic increases in fees; and

WHEREAS, in cases where the calculated cost multiplied by target percent is lower than the current fee, no fee increase will be recommended for that year; and

WHEREAS, after initial recommendations are made by the Controller, these recommendations are distributed to the affected offices and departments, in order to receive their input; and

WHEREAS, after reviewing the input from the affected offices and departments, the Controller makes final recommendations to the Board of Commissioners; and

WHEREAS, the Controller’s Office has finished its annual review of these fees and recommended increases where appropriate based on increased costs of providing services supported by these fees and the percent of the cost of providing the services which should be covered by such fees as established by the Board of Commissioners; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners has reviewed the Controller’s recommendations including the target percentages, along with recommendations of the various county offices, departments, and staff.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Commissioners authorizes or encourages the following fee increases, decreases and new fees in the Attachments at the rates established effective January 1, 2016 with the exception of the Health Department and Friend of the Court, where new rates will be effective October 1, 2015 and the Park and Zoo winter seasonal fees which will be effective starting November 1, 2015.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the fees struck out in the Attachments are to be eliminated.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the fees within major Health Department services are not included on the attachments and were not set by the policy above, but rather through policy established in Resolutions #05-166 and #05-242.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Service</th>
<th>Fee Description</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Target Fee</th>
<th>2015 Fee</th>
<th>2016 Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drain Comm.</td>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$275.00</td>
<td>$280.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Comm.</td>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$555.00</td>
<td>$565.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Comm.</td>
<td>Preliminary Comm. Site Plan Review</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>$680.00</td>
<td>$690.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Comm.</td>
<td>Preliminary Plat Review</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>$680.00</td>
<td>$690.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Comm.</td>
<td>Plat and Commercial Drainage Review - First acre</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$680.00</td>
<td>$690.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Comm.</td>
<td>Additional acre</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$76.00</td>
<td>$77.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Comm.</td>
<td>Re-submission Admin fee</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$220.00</td>
<td>$225.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Comm.</td>
<td>Plat Drain Administration Fee</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>$2,400.00</td>
<td>$2,450.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Comm.</td>
<td>Drain Crossing Permit- (Residential)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td>$130.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Comm.</td>
<td>Tap in Permit - Residential</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$105.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Comm.</td>
<td>Tap-in Permit - Commercial</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$410.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Comm.</td>
<td>Soil Erosion Permit - Commercial-12 mo. Duration - 1/2 acre or less</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$590.00</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Comm.</td>
<td>Soil Erosion (12 mo.) - Commercial- each additional acre</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$59.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Comm.</td>
<td>Soil Erosion Permit - Commercial -9 mo. Duration - 1/2 acre or less</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$520.00</td>
<td>$525.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Comm.</td>
<td>Soil Erosion Permit - Commercial - 6 mo. Duration - 1/2 acre or less</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$440.00</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Comm.</td>
<td>Soil Erosion Permit Transfer</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$95.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Comm.</td>
<td>Escrow account-1/2 acre or less</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$555.00</td>
<td>$565.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Comm.</td>
<td>Escrow account - 1/2 to 1 acre</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$1,675.00</td>
<td>$1,685.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Comm.</td>
<td>Escrow account - 1 to 5 acres</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$3,350.00</td>
<td>$3,375.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Comm.</td>
<td>Escrow account - 5 to 10 acres</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$5,590.00</td>
<td>$5,600.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Comm.</td>
<td>Escrow account - each add'l 10 acres</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$2,795.00</td>
<td>$2,800.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Comm.</td>
<td>Soil Erosion Permit-Residential-12 mo.</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$235.00</td>
<td>$260.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Comm.</td>
<td>Soil Erosion Permit - 9 month duration</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>$245.00</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Comm.</td>
<td>Commercial Minor Disturbance Soil Erosion - Permit/Review/Inspection</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>$310.00</td>
<td>$320.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Comm.</td>
<td>Residential Minor Disturbance Soil Erosion - Permit/Review/Inspection</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$46.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equalization</td>
<td>17&quot; x 22&quot;</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$19.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equalization</td>
<td>34&quot; x 44&quot;</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$37.00</td>
<td>$38.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equalization</td>
<td>17&quot; x 22&quot;</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$37.00</td>
<td>$38.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equalization</td>
<td>28&quot; x 40&quot;</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$62.00</td>
<td>$63.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equalization</td>
<td>34&quot; x 44&quot;</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$76.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equalization</td>
<td>Custom Maps</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
<td>$71.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Service</td>
<td>Fee Description</td>
<td>Target Percent</td>
<td>2015 Fee</td>
<td>2016 Fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>NEW - Winter Sports Building - reservation fee/non operational hrs</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Pedal Boat - per 1/2 hour (Weekday)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Pedal Boat - per 1/2 hr (Weekend)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Pedal Boat - Senior (+60) - per 1/2 hr.</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Pedal Boat - 1/2 hour - NEW</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>1st hour</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Each additional hour.</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Cross Country Skiing Adults: Wknds &amp; Holidays (Burchfield)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Each additional hour.</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>X-Country Skiing Children (12 &amp; under): Wkds &amp; Holidays (Burchfield)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Each additional hour.</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>NEW - Cross Country Ski Rental - adult per hour</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>NEW - Cross Country Ski Rental - child per hour</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Adult Pass - Snow Tubing (2 hours) Mon-Fri</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Child Pass - Snow Tubing (12 &amp; under 2 hours) Mon-Fri</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Family Pass - Snow Tubing (2 adults &amp; 2 children 2hrs) Mon-Fri</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Adult Pass - Snow Tubing (2 hours) Sat, Sun and Holidays</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Child Pass - Snow Tubing (12 &amp; under 2 hours) S, S and hol</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Family Pass - Snow Tubing (2 adults &amp; 2 children 2hrs) S, S, hol</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Group Rate (30-100 people, 2 hours) /per person</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Each add’l child for Snow Tubing.</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Adult Pass - Snowboarding (open to close) Mon-Fri</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Adult Pass - Snowboarding - SS, Holidays</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Child Pass - Snowboarding - all day (12 &amp; under) Mon-Fri</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Child Pass - Snowboarding - (12 &amp; under) SS, holiday</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Season Pass for Adults ** Resident</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$149.00</td>
<td>$149.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Season Pass-Children 12 &amp; under **</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$99.00</td>
<td>$99.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Season Pass for Adults ** Non-Resident</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$159.00</td>
<td>$159.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Season Pass-Children 12 &amp; under ** Non-Resident</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$109.00</td>
<td>$109.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>NEW - Per person (adults and children) (2 hours)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>NEW - Group Rate - (4 + people) (per person) (2 hours)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>NEW - Non-operational hour reservation (2hours) + pp group rate of $8.00</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Snowtubing - Group Rate (1-50 people) 2 hours (normal fee pp + $50)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$299.00</td>
<td>$299.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Snowtubing - Group Rate (50+ people) 2 hours (normal fee pp + $100)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$299.00</td>
<td>$299.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Snowtubing - Per additional adult</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Snowtubing - Per additional child</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Snow Board &amp; Boot rental</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Board or Boot rental</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Helmet rental</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ATTACHMENT A: FEES WHICH ARE ADJUSTED

### County Services Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Service</th>
<th>Fee Description</th>
<th>Target Percent</th>
<th>2015 Fee</th>
<th>2016 Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Test rental</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoo</td>
<td>Admission- Children (age 3-12) (April - October)</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoo</td>
<td>Admission- All Adults(October-March); Res, Non-Res, or Senior</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoo</td>
<td>Admission- Children (November-March)</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoo</td>
<td>Potter Park Penquin Cove Shelter</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$79.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoo</td>
<td>Potter Park Eagle Landing Shelter</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$105.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoo</td>
<td>Potter Park 1/2 of Tiger Den Shelter</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$105.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoo</td>
<td>Potter Park - Tiger Den Shelter</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$175.00</td>
<td>$180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoD</td>
<td>Laredo product,0-250 minutes,chrg/month</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$53.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoD</td>
<td>Laredo Min. Overage for 0-250 min. plan</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoD</td>
<td>Laredo product, 250-1000 mins.-chrg/mo.</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$105.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoD</td>
<td>Laredo Min. Ovrg for 250-1000 min. plan</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
<td>$0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoD</td>
<td>Laredo product,1001-3000 mins-chrg/mo.</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoD</td>
<td>Laredo Min. Ovrg for 1000-3000 min. plan</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$0.12</td>
<td>$0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>NSF Che cks</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$31.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Human Services Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Service</th>
<th>Fee Description</th>
<th>Target Percent</th>
<th>2015 Fee</th>
<th>2016 Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Health</td>
<td>INS Vaccination Verif Form I-693</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$37.00</td>
<td>$38.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Health</td>
<td>MIHP Tran. Bus/Van</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$35.04</td>
<td>$35.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Health</td>
<td>MIHP - Trans Taxi</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$32.04</td>
<td>$32.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Health</td>
<td>Compreh Envir Investigation</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Health</td>
<td>Immigration Physical Exams</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$195.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imm. Clinic</td>
<td>Intemat'l Travel Consult</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$61.00</td>
<td>$62.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Examiner</td>
<td>Autopsy Report Copies (family)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Examiner</td>
<td>Autopsy Report Copies (others)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OYC</td>
<td>Agency Training Request- Base, 1.5 hr.</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$212.00</td>
<td>$215.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OYC</td>
<td>Agency Training Request- Base, 2.5 hr.</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$352.00</td>
<td>$355.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OYC</td>
<td>Agency Training Request- Base, 5.0 hr.</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$687.00</td>
<td>$688.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OYC</td>
<td>OYC-Advertised Train.- 1-2 hr./per person (min. 15 attending)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$27.00</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OYC</td>
<td>OYC-Advertised Train.- 2.5-4.5 hr./per person (min. 15 attending)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OYC</td>
<td>OYC-Advertised Train.- 5-7 hrs./per person (min. 15 attending).</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
<td>$71.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OYC</td>
<td>OYC-Agency Request Head Start CPR &amp; 1st Aide</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Service</td>
<td>Fee Description</td>
<td>Target Percent</td>
<td>2015 Fee</td>
<td>2016 Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>Adoption Fee- Dogs(under six years of age)</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>$72.00</td>
<td>$73.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>Adoption Fee - Dogs(six years or older)</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>Adoption Fee - Cats(under six years of age)</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>$62.00</td>
<td>$63.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>Animal Redemption - 1st offense</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>$31.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>Euthanasia Fee</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>Ten Dog Kennel Inspection Fee</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$155.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>Over Ten Dog Kennel Inspection Fee</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$175.00</td>
<td>$180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>Owner Surrender</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$44.00</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>Owner Pick-up Fee</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$46.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>Tranq. At-Large Fee</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$46.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pros Atty</td>
<td>Diversion - Initial Interview</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>$34.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pros Atty</td>
<td>Diversion - Misdemeanor Offender</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>$445.00</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pros Atty</td>
<td>Diversion - Felony Offender</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>$795.00</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pros Atty</td>
<td>Costs-eligible convictions - Guilty Plea</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>$106.00</td>
<td>$110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pros Atty</td>
<td>Costs for eligible convictions - Trial</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>$225.00</td>
<td>$230.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>Costs for Command per hour</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$63.80</td>
<td>$64.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>Costs for Deputy per hour</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$57.22</td>
<td>$58.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>False Alarm Fee- third offense</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$43.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ATTACHMENT B: FEES WHICH ADJUSTMENT IS RECOMMENDED

#### Law and Courts Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Service</th>
<th>Fee Description</th>
<th>Target Percent</th>
<th>2015 Fee</th>
<th>2016 Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circuit Court</td>
<td>Copies</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit Court</td>
<td>Criminal Histories</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit Court</td>
<td>Felony Case Costs</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$650.00</td>
<td>$1,470.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit Court</td>
<td>Show Cause - Probation</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit Court</td>
<td>GTD Bench Warrants NEW</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Division</td>
<td>Delinquency Court Costs</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Division</td>
<td>Tether</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$31.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Human Services and Finance Committees
FROM: Jared Cypher, Deputy Controller
DATE: May 6, 2015
RE: 2016 Community Agency Funding Process

This resolution establishes the criteria by which each agency’s application will be evaluated for the 2016 Community Agency funding process.

If the resolution is approved as presented, the Controller/Administrator’s Office will accept applications for Community Agency funding in July. Applications will then be evaluated by the Controller/Administrator’s Office with priority given to proposals that directly contribute to addressing the County’s long-term priority of “Meeting Basic Needs”, such as food, clothing, and shelter.

The recommendations made by the Controller/Administrator’s Office on funding levels for each applicant agency will then be presented to the Board of Commissioners for consideration and approval in November.

In FY 2015, $200,000 was made available for community agencies, and 28 agencies were awarded funding.
Introduced by the Human Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION APPROVING CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING 2016 APPLICATIONS FOR COMMUNITY AGENCY FUNDING

WHEREAS, since 1978, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners has provided financial support to various non-profit community organizations that provide a broad range of services for the purpose of advancing the County’s adopted long-range objectives; and

WHEREAS, over the years the community agency process has grown to 32 applicants requesting funding, with total requests of approximately $250,000 annually; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners desires to make the process of awarding community agency funding efficient and effective; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners desires to continue the Community Agency application process, focusing on the long term goal of assisting Ingham County residents in meeting basic needs.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the 2016 community agency funding process, with priority given to those proposals that directly contribute to addressing the County’s long-term priority of “Meeting Basic Needs”, such as food, clothing, and shelter.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Controller/Administrator is authorized to evaluate and determine funding levels for each applicant as a recommendation for approval by the Human Services Committee.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, no agency shall receive more than 10% of the total available funding for community agencies in FY 2016.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Board of Commissioners wishes for applicants to understand that solicitation of proposals is not a commitment to fund those proposals in fiscal year 2016.
The Lansing City Council will hold a public hearing on May 11, 2015 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers, 10th Floor, Lansing City Hall, Lansing, MI, for the purpose stated below:

To afford an opportunity for all residents, taxpayers of the City of Lansing, other interested persons and ad valorem taxing units to appear and be heard on the approval of Brownfield Plan #38A – Ottawa Block Brownfield Redevelopment Plan pursuant to and in accordance with the provisions of the Brownfield Redevelopment Financing Act, Public Act 381 of 1996, as amended, for property commonly referred to as 810 West Ottawa Street located in the City of Lansing, but more particularly described as:

A PARCEL OF LAND IN BLOCK #4 OF CLAYPOOL'S SUBDIVISION AND BLOCK #90 OF THE ORIGINAL PLAT OF THE CITY OF LANSING, CITY OF LANSING, INGHAM COUNTY, MICHIGAN, CONTAINING PART OF LOTS #1 AND 2, AND ALL OF LOTS #3 AND 4 OF SAID CLAYPOOL'S SUBDIVISION AND ALL OF LOTS #1, 3, 5 AND 6 OF SAID BLOCK #90 OF THE ORIGINAL PLAT OF THE CITY OF LANSING, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS BEGINNING AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID BLOCK #4, CLAYPOOL'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID BLOCK 344.33 FEET; THENCE SOUTHERLY PARALLEL TO THE WEST LINE OF SAID BLOCK 198.00 FEET; THENCE EASTERLY PARALLEL TO THE NORTH LINE OF SAID BLOCK 92.26 FEET; THENCE NORTHERLY PARALLEL TO THE WEST LINE OF SAID BLOCK 198.00 FEET TO THE NORTH LINE OF SAID BLOCK; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG SAID NORTH LINE 140.92 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID BLOCK #90 OF THE ORIGINAL PLAT; THENCE CONTINUING EASTERLY ON THE NORTH LINE OF SAID BLOCK 161.21 FEET TO THE EAST LINE OF SAID BLOCK; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID EAST LINE 65.79 FEET TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 1 OF SAID BLOCK; THENCE WESTERLY 160.56 FEET ON THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID LOT 1 TO THE WEST LINE OF SAID BLOCK; THENCE SOUTHERLY 66.60 FEET ON SAID WEST LINE TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 3 OF SAID BLOCK; THENCE EASTERLY 159.91 FEET ON THE NORTH LINE OF SAID LOT 3 TO THE EAST LINE OF SAID BLOCK; THENCE SOUTHERLY ON SAID EAST LINE 65.78 FEET TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 4, THENCE WESTERLY 159.26 FEET ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF LOT 4, THENCE SOUTHERLY 65.42 FEET ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID BLOCK TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 5, THENCE EASTERLY 158.84 FEET ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF LOT 5 TO THE EAST LINE OF SAID BLOCK, THENCE SOUTHERLY 132.44 FEET ALONG SAID EAST LINE TO THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID BLOCK; THENCE WESTERLY ON SAID SOUTH LINE 157.33 FEET TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 2, BLOCK #4 OF CLAYPOOL'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE CONTINUING WESTERLY 178.75 FEET ON THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID BLOCK; THENCE NORTHERLY PARALLEL TO THE WEST LINE OF SAID BLOCK 148.50 FEET; THENCE WESTERLY PARALLEL TO THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID BLOCK 55.00 FEET; THENCE SOUTHERLY PARALLEL TO THE WEST LINE OF SAID BLOCK 148.50 FEET TO
THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID BLOCK; THENCE WESTERLY ON SAID SOUTH LINE 348.74 FEET TO THE WEST LINE OF SAID BLOCK; THENCE NORTHERLY ON SAID WEST LINE 396.00 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING, CONTAINING 5.63 ACRES. EXCEPT: A PARCEL OF LAND IN LOT 1, BLOCK # 4 OF CLAYPOOL'S SUBDIVISION CITY OF LANSING, INGHAM COUNTY, MICHIGAN, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS: COMMENCING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID BLOCK # 4 CLAYPOOL'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID BLOCK 348.74 FEET TO THE WEST LINE OF PARCEL # 33-01-01-17-279-131 FOR A PLACE OF BEGINNING; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID PARCEL 136.00 FEET, PARALLEL WITH SAID BLOCK # 4 OF CLAYPOOL'S SUBDIVISION CITY OF LANSING, INGHAM COUNTY, MICHIGAN; THENCE WESTERLY 56.99 FEET PARALLEL WITH THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID BLOCK; THENCE SOUTHERLY 136.00 FEET, PARALLEL WITH THE WEST LINE OF SAID BLOCK; THENCE EASTERLY 56.99 FEET, ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID BLOCK TO THE PLACE OF BEGINNING. CONTAINING 7,751 SQUARE FEET (0.18 ACRE'S) MORE OR LESS. EXCEPT: A PARCEL OF LAND IN LOT 1, BLOCK # 4 OF CLAYPOOL'S SUBDIVISION CITY OF LANSING, INGHAM COUNTY, MICHIGAN, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS COMMENCING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID BLOCK # 4 CLAYPOOL'S SUBDIVISION; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID BLOCK 235.75 FEET TO THE WEST LINE OF 804 OTTAWA STREET PARCEL # 33-01-01-17-279-802 FOR A PLACE OF BEGINNING; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID PARCEL 112.00 FEET, PARALLEL WITH SAID BLOCK # 4 OF CLAYPOOL'S SUBDIVISION CITY OF LANSING, INGHAM COUNTY, MICHIGAN; THENCE EASTERLY 56.00 FEET PARALLEL WITH THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID BLOCK; THENCE SOUTHERLY 112.00 FEET, PARALLEL WITH THE WEST LINE OF SAID BLOCK; THENCE EASTERLY 56.00 FEET, ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID BLOCK TO THE PLACE OF BEGINNING, CONTAINING 6,272 SQUARE FEET (0.14 ACRE'S) MORE OR LESS 33-01-01-17-279-003, and, LOTS 2 BLOCK 90 ORIG PLAT, 33-01-01-16-155-013.

Approval of this Brownfield Plan will enable the Lansing Brownfield Redevelopment Authority to capture incremental tax increases which result from the redevelopment of the property to pay for costs associated therewith. Further information regarding this issue, including maps, plats, and a description of the brownfield plan will be available for public inspection and may be obtained from Karl Dorshimer – Director of Business Development, Lansing Economic Area Partnership, 1000 S. Washington Ave., Suite 201, Lansing, MI 48910, (517) 702-3387.

Chris Swope, City Clerk
City of Lansing
RE: Planned Residential Development #15-97015 (SP Investments Limited Partnership)

Dear Property Owner/Occupant:

This is to notify you that the Planning Commission of the Charter Township of Meridian will hold a public hearing regarding a request from SP Investments Limited Partnership to amend the Planned Residential Development (PRD #97015) sketch plan for the remaining 161.88 undeveloped acres of the Ember Oaks Preliminary Plat. The site is zoned RR (Rural Residential) with a Planned Residential Overlay. It is located on the north side of Jolly Road, approximately 3,400 feet east of Dobie Road.

The public hearing will be held during the Planning Commission’s May 18, 2015 regular meeting. The meeting will begin at 7:00 p.m. and will be held in the Town Hall Room of the Meridian Municipal Building, 5151 Marsh Road, Okemos, Michigan 48864 (517-853-4560).

The purpose of the public hearing is to give the Planning Commission an opportunity to hear all persons interested or involved in the request. Your comments may be made in writing addressed to Gail Oranchak, Principal Planner, 5151 Marsh Road, Okemos, Michigan, 48864, by email to oranchak@meridian.mi.us or at the meeting.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact me at (517) 853-4564 or e-mail oranchak@meridian.mi.us.

Sincerely,

Gail Oranchak, AICP
Principal Planner
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Charter Township of Meridian

PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (PRD)
#15-97015 (SP INVESTMENTS LIMITED PARTNERSHIP)

A REQUEST TO AMEND THE PRD SKETCH PLAN
FOR THE REMAINING 161.88 ACRES OF THE
EMBER OAKS PRELIMINARY PLAT