THE FINANCE COMMITTEE WILL MEET ON WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2017 AT 6:00 P.M., IN THE PERSONNEL CONFERENCE ROOM (D & E), HUMAN SERVICES BUILDING, 5303 S. CEDAR, LANSING.

Agenda

Call to Order
Approval of the October 18, 2017 Minutes and Closed Session Minutes
Additions to the Agenda
Limited Public Comment

1. Treasurer – Resolution to Transfer Unsold Tax Reverted Properties Rejected by Local Units to the Ingham County Land Bank Fast Track Authority

2. Drain Commissioner – Resolution Pledging Full Faith and Credit to Montgomery Drain Drainage District Notes

3. Innovation and Technology
   a. Resolution to Approve Renewal of Support from Core Technology
   b. Resolution to Approve Purchase of Crystal Reports Training from Equivant
   c. Resolution to Approve Purchase of User Training from ITProTV
   d. Resolution to Approve the Website Redesign

4. Human Resources
   a. Resolution to Approve a Letter of Understanding with Capitol City Labor Program, Inc. – 911 Non-Supervisory Unit Regarding Extension of Probation
   b. Resolution to Appoint Interim Child and Adolescent Health Center Supervisor


6. Circuit Court – Juvenile Division – Resolution to Amend Resolution #17-390 to Reflect Correct Rates for Legal Counsel

7. Circuit Court
   a. Resolution to Amend Resolution #17-370 Accepting the FY 2018 Swift and Sure Sanctions Probation Program Grant
   b. Resolution to Amend Resolution #17-371 Accepting the FY 2018 Felony Michigan Mental Health Court Grant Program Operational Grant
8. **Probate Court** – Resolution to Authorize an Agreement with TEL Systems to Upgrade Technology and Provide Maintenance Support for the Probate Court Courtrooms

9. **9-1-1 Center**
   a. Resolution to Authorize a Contract with Adams Outdoor to Provide Recruitment Advertising for the Ingham County 9-1-1 Central Dispatch Center
   b. Resolution to Authorize a Contract with PM Technologies for Maintenance of 9-1-1 Public Safety Radio Communications Tower Sites, Uninterrupted Power Supply Units, and Replacement of Batteries

10. **Law & Courts Committee** – Resolution to Accept a Consolidated Plan to Meet the Michigan Indigent Defense Commission (MIDC) Minimum Standards and to Create a New Fund within the Chart of Accounts for Purposes of Accepting Grant Funds from the MIDC

11. **Road Department**
   a. Road PASER Ratings and Current/Upcoming Roadwork (*Presentation*)
   b. Resolution to Authorize the Disposal of Road Department Surplus Property

12. **Fair Office** – Resolution to Amend the 2017 Fair Fund Budget

13. **Health Department**
   a. Resolution to Authorize an Amendment to Resolution #16–114 Authorize Certain Health Department Staff to Sign CMS Forms 855A and 855B
   b. Resolution to Authorize an Administrative Service Agreement with Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan at the Ingham County Jail
   c. Resolution to Accept FY 2018 Child and Adolescent Health Center Program Funds

14. **Veterans Affairs** – Resolution to Authorize the Ingham County Department of Veteran Affairs to Accept Four Hundred Twenty-Five Dollars Donated from the Family of Deceased Veteran, Joseph E. Merritt

15. **Controller/Administrator’s Office**
   a. Ingham County 2018 General Appropriations Resolution
   b. Resolution Authorizing 2018 Agreements for Community Agencies

16. **Board Referral** – Letter from Delhi Charter Township Regarding the Assessing Officers Report for Industrial Facility Exemption

**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.
FINANCE COMMITTEE  
October 18, 2017  
Draft Minutes

Members Present:  Anthony, Grebner, Hope, McGrain (left at 7:27 p.m.), Schafer and Naeyaert

Members Absent:  Tennis

Others Present:  Commissioner Ryan Sebolt, Clerk Barb Byrum, Treasurer Eric Schertzing, Deb Fett, Sandra Dargatz, Jill Rhode, Elisabeth Richardson, Matt Nordfjord, Rick Terrill, Becky Bennett, Michael Townsend, Liz Kane and others

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

Approval of the October 4, 2017 Minutes

WITHOUT OBJECTION, CHAIRPERSON GREBNER RECOGNIZED THAT THE OCTOBER 4, 2017 FINANCE COMMITTEE MINUTES WERE APPROVED AS PRESENTED. Absent: Commissioner Tennis

Additions to the Agenda

Substitutes –

8. Financial Services  
   b. Resolution to Waive the Public Act 152 Health Care Requirements for 2018

9. Fair Office – Resolution to Amend the 2017 Fair Fund Budget

Late –

13. Closed Session for Current Pending Litigation

Limited Public Comment

None.

MOVED BY COMM. SCHAFER, SUPPORTED BY COMM. MCGRAIN, TO APPROVE A CONSENT AGENDA CONSISTING OF THE FOLLOWING ACTION ITEMS:

1. Sheriff’s Office  
   a. Resolution to Accept the 2017 Risk Avoidance Grant (RAP) from the Michigan Municipal Risk Management Authority (MMRMA)
b. Resolution to Authorize an Interlocal Agreement with the City of Lansing and City of East Lansing for the 2017 Local JAG Grant

c. Resolution to Authorize an Agreement with the Michigan State University School of Psychiatry to Provide Psychiatric Services for Inmates at the Ingham County Jail

2. **Friend of the Court** – Resolution to Authorize an Agreement with Tel Systems to Upgrade Technology and Provide Maintenance Support for the Friend of the Court Referee Hearing Rooms

3. **55th District Court**
   a. Resolution to Accept a Grant Award from the Michigan Supreme Court State Court Administrative Office - Michigan Mental Health Court Grant Program (SCAO-MMHCGP), Continue a Probation Officer Position, and Enter into Subcontracts
   b. Resolution to Accept a Grant Award from the Michigan Supreme Court’s State Court Administrative Office - Michigan Drug Court Grant Program (SCAO-MDCGP) and Enter into Subcontracts

4. **Health Department**
   a. Resolution to Authorize an Agreement with Language Line Solutions for Interpreter Services
   b. Resolution to Authorize an Agreement with MIHP EMR, LLC
   c. Resolution to Extend Agreement with Michigan State University for Psychiatric Services
   d. Resolution to Amend NextGen/QSI Agreement
   e. Resolution to Accept 2017 AIM Funds

6. **Economic Development** – Resolution to Approve Ingham County’s Participation in the Lansing Regional Brownfield Coalition for the Purpose of Submitting an Application to the United States Environmental Protection Agency for a Brownfield Assessment Grant

7. **Innovation and Technology**
   a. Resolution to Approve Purchase of Training from ITProTV
   b. Resolution to Approve a Contract for Phone System Upgrade and E911 Addition

8. **Financial Services**
   a. Resolution to Authorize the Purchase of Services to Upgrade the MUNIS Accounting Software System to Version 11
   b. Resolution to Waive the Public Act 152 Health Care Requirements for 2018
   c. Resolution to Accept the Recommendation of the Ingham County Health Care Coalition for Employee Benefits for 2018 and to Authorize Letters of Agreement with Bargaining Units

10. **Potter Park Zoo** – Resolution to Authorize the Potter Park Zoological Society Fee Retention

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Tennis.
THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE ITEMS ON THE CONSENT AGENDA CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Tennis.

5. Facilities Department – Resolution to Award a Contract for the Removal and Replacement of Boilers

MOVED BY COMM. MCGRAIN, SUPPORTED BY COMM. SCHAFER, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION.

Commissioner Schafer stated he wanted to note that he had read Chairperson Grebner’s comments about the ethics and purchasing policies in the October 17, 2017 County Services meeting minutes. He further stated that he appreciated Chairperson Grebner’s statements, because he recalled years ago there were ethical issues related to purchasing within the County, and that was part of the reason for the County’s ethics policy.

Commissioner Hope asked what had brought on the discussion regarding the ethics policy at the County Services meeting.

Chairperson Grebner stated while there were no ethical problems with the current procurement of a contract for the boiler, it had tempted the Board of Commissioners to cross a line. He further stated that there had been several proposals to replace the boilers and none of the companies had qualified for local preference, but the argument had been made that a company should also be given more consideration for something, even when they were not the lowest bidder.

Chairperson Grebner stated he had brought up that the Board of Commissioners did not award contracts and there was a black line of how involved the Board of Commissioners could be in the contract-awarding process. He further stated that if the Board of Commissioners was allowed to make decisions on proposals outside of the purchasing policy, the vendors would not put together a good proposal, but rather lobby the Commissioners to earn their support. He further stated that while other counties were still run like that, Ingham County was not and the vendors’ attention was more on the staff than it was on the Commissioners.

Chairperson Grebner stated and staff was expected to consider the proposals and bring their recommendations to the Board of Commissioners, where they could reject the proposals and ask staff to revisit the contracts if something had been noticed in the proposals.

Commissioner Hope asked if there had been any discussion at the County Services meeting about changing the policy to address the concerns.

Chairperson Grebner stated there had been discussion about changing the purchasing policy. He further stated that the correct way to do it would be to change the policy for proposals that had not yet been received.

Chairperson Grebner stated that the Board of Commissioners should be as involved as they would like in crafting the policy to approve the policy, and after that, it was up to the staff to follow the policy and recommend the best policy.
THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Tennis.

8. Financial Services
   d. Special Fund Discussion

Jill Rhode, Financial Services Director, provided background on the Special Funds processes. She stated that it was not that her office did not know about the Special Funds accounts, but they had previously not been recorded on the general ledger because they were temporary accounts and they would only be recorded at the year-end.

Commissioner Sebolt stated that the initial question had been brought by County Clerk Barb Byrum, when it had come to light that there was an account set up to pay a contractor. He further stated that Clerk Byrum’s concerns had not been addressed in that explanation.

Ms. Rhode stated that the Treasurer had gone through all of the accounts since then and figured out which accounts should be recorded in the general ledger. She further stated that the Treasurer’s Office had used the same procedures for the account Clerk Byrum had referenced, but that one probably should have been recorded in the general ledger because it was someone else’s transaction.

Ms. Rhode stated the Treasurer had reviewed the accounts and procedures and updated them as necessary.

Discussion.

Eric Schertzing, Treasurer, stated that there was a separation between the Circuit Court and County Clerk’s Office accounts, in that the Circuit Court had a very structured, legal process, and the Clerk’s Office was not as structured but the check was still run the same way. He further stated the Circuit Court transactions would be run through Accounts Payable, and the clerk would create the vendor number and process it quickly.

Treasurer Schertzing stated that the Circuit Court had an agreement with PNC Bank to get cashier’s check out more quickly when there was a court order.

Chairperson Grebner asked how the PNC Bank checks related to the Treasurer’s Office.

Treasurer Schertzing stated that the Treasurer’s Office was in charge of setting up the bank accounts.

Discussion.

Commissioner Sebolt stated he had asked a number of questions in the email he had sent previously. He stated he had asked how many accounts there were open in the County.
Commissioner Sebolt stated that according to an appendix that had been submitted as an attachment during the budget process, there were about three of these accounts opening each week.

Ms. Rhode stated the accounts on the attachment were different types of accounts.

Commissioner Sebolt stated his question had not been answered.

Ms. Rhode stated she thought there were about eleven accounts open at year-end.

Commissioner Sebolt asked how many accounts there were, total during the year.

Ms. Rhode stated she did not know how many there were, but she expected there were a lot.

Treasurer Schertzing stated there were not a lot of accounts opened, and he estimated there were about a dozen for the 2017 so far.

Commissioner Sebolt stated he had heard that Circuit Court employees had been opening up County accounts for these funds.

Treasurer Schertzing stated the Treasurer’s Office was responsible for setting up bank accounts.

Ms. Rhode stated that only the Treasurer was allowed to set up a bank account in the County’s name. She further stated that each of the funds was treated as its own entity.

Chairperson Grebner stated those funds did not correspond to accounts anywhere, they were just bookkeeping entries the County maintained in its chart of accounts.

Treasurer Schertzing stated that there were some accounts associated drain debt accounts on the list that were both funds and accounts.

Commissioner Anthony asked if the Committee could receive a copy of the Special Fund accounts Ms. Rhode was referring to.

Ms. Rhode stated she could send the list of accounts that were open currently, the last of which she believed had been created in December of 2016. She further stated that the inmate trust account would be the largest of those accounts.

Commissioner Naeyaert stated that one of Commissioner Sebolt’s questions had been if the Treasurer’s Office had been aware of these accounts at all times.

Ms. Rhode stated she was aware they were happening, but at any given time, she could not tell how many there were. She further stated she would be able to tell with the new accounting method.
Commissioner McGrain stated he was satisfied with how the situation had been rectified and he understood the explanation that the presenters had given about the Special Funds. He asked if there was a possibility that there would ever be money leftover in an account, or if it ever was put into the Unclaimed Property fund.

Treasurer Schertzing stated the County would be transferring about 85 cents from one of the accounts, but there were no large amounts.

Ms. Rhode stated the money might gain interest, after the County paid it out.

Commissioner McGrain clarified that essentially all of the funds were moving out of the County’s possession, so the County did not gain fees or interest in any of the accounts.

Discussion.

Ms. Rhode stated this was the way things had been done for 40 years, where they did not account for them until the year-end.

Chairperson Grebner stated that there probably were more things that had always been done a certain way in the County, that were half in the accounting system and half not, and one day the Board of Commissioners would say that it should have always been done the better way once they changed the process.

Commissioner Sebolt asked if the account for the County Clerk’s Office had been lost in the shuffle.

Treasurer Schertzing stated the ballot would have been accounted for at year-end.

Commissioner Sebolt stated that Clerk Byrum had a customer come into her office asking for payment from one of these accounts, which she had never been authorized to make payment on. He further stated that the County was clearly having issues, and he believed Treasurer Schertzing and Ms. Rhode were the heads of the offices where the problems were happening.

Commissioner Sebolt stated he did not think this issue was all in the Treasurer’s Office. He further stated that there seemed to be an issue with miscommunication, as no one had the information to answer his questions and they did not get back to him, and there was no knowledge of what accounts were open until the year-end.

Ms. Rhode stated that with the exception of these accounts, that was not true.

Commissioner Sebolt stated she did not know about a temporary vendor account that had over $100,000 in it.

Ms. Rhode stated she could not know about all of the accounts that were opened by the Treasurer’s Office, and that one had been set up outside of the books.
Commissioner Sebolt asked whose responsibility it was to keep track of the accounts.

Ms. Rhode stated the Treasurer was responsible for keeping track of the accounts.

Commissioner Sebolt asked why it had taken two weeks to get back to him with answers to his questions.

Ms. Rhode stated she had gone on vacation, and the account was not in the County’s books. She further stated this was not County money or an expenditure on their books, it was money set aside for a vendor that needed to be paid out.

Ms. Rhode stated the Treasurer’s Office had set it up and did not include it on the books as they thought they would treat the same way as the other similar accounts.

Commissioner Sebolt asked if there was anyone else that could cover for Ms. Rhode when she took a vacation.

Ms. Rhode stated the Controller’s Office had been working on the answers to the questions while she was away and they had gone to the Treasurer’s Office to try to figure it out, when she would have known the answer right away.

Commissioner McGrain stated that in defense of the accounting offices, if the Board of Commissioners wanted to demand more from them, it would require more manpower, and then they would have to pay for the extra staff. He further stated that at some point with the shrinking budgets, a decision probably had been made to monitor those accounts only at year-end to ease the workload.

Commissioner McGrain stated he appreciated that Ms. Rhode had taken time off, and he wanted to note if the Board of Commissioners wanted to pay for additional staff, they needed to figure out where the resources would come from.

Chairperson Grebner stated the County was simply gradually regularizing the process associated with these accounts to keep better track of them in the future.

Commissioner Anthony stated generally, it was a good best practice to have multiple people with access to all of the accounts at all times. She further stated she thought if someone in the Controller’s Office could quickly reference that information, it would help with communications issues.

Commissioner Anthony stated many of the frustrations could also be alleviated by improved communication, because even sending an email to the Commissioners to tell them they were working on the questions would help.

Treasurer Schertzing thanked Elisabeth Richardson for filling in for the Chief Deputy Treasurer’s position for the past few months. He further stated they were seeing a lot of progress,
which was why he accepted the transfer of one of his employees to the Financial Services Department, and he looked forward to the progress continuing.

Ms. Rhode stated that the County had come a long way in past the few months. She further stated that Treasurer Schertzing could not be more engaged in the process.

Chairperson Grebner stated the Board of Commissioners would know about ten months, when auditors would give their report.

Ms. Rhode stated the issue was not found until August, so there would be about 8 months where the County was still using the old system.

Chairperson Grebner stated that even if the issues from January to August were noted on the audit, things would already be put in order to show them the progress.

9. Fair Office – Resolution to Amend the 2017 Fair Fund Budget

MOVED BY COMM. NAeyaERT, SUPPORTED BY COMM. SCHAFeR, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION.

Commissioner Anthony asked Sandra Dargatz, Fair Executive Director, to explain what had happened to cause the over-expenditure in the Fair budget.

Ms. Dargatz stated the reasons the issue had come about were three-fold, the first reason being that three-quarters of the Fair’s budget came from the revenue from the 6 weather-dependent days of the Ingham County Fair and this year there were multiple days with bad weather. She further stated that the Fair had lost about $77,000 in incoming revenue over the last two years, which some say could be attributed to the loss of the grandstand.

Ms. Dargatz stated the second reason the over-expenditure happened was the Fair had taken a risk in bringing HGTV star Clint Harp, which cost them about $29,000 in lost revenue because the ticket sales were not what the company had promised. She further stated the third reason for the over-expenditure happened was there had been a maintenance employee, who was no longer employed with the County, that had damaged facilities that had to be repaired.

Commissioner Sebolt stated he still had a question that had not been answered clearly at the County Services meeting. He asked what exactly the $94,000 in over-expenditures was spent on.

Ms. Dargatz stated $29,000 of the over-expenditure was for Clint Harp.

Commissioner Sebolt asked if the Fair Board was not authorized to choose the entertainment for the Ingham County Fair.

Ms. Dargatz stated the Fair Board had a small fund for entertainment, but this was more than that fund.
Chairperson Grebner explained that the fund was an enterprise fund, which meant that expenditures could be made, with the expectation that they would make that money back with the ticket sales for entertainment.

Ms. Dargatz stated the Fair had not typically taken risks like that, and therefore only had slow, measured growth, but they took a risk this year in trying to attract a different type of audience. She further stated that some of the over-expenditure was money spent to address damage to Fairgrounds property that the maintenance staff did not know how to fix.

Ms. Dargatz stated the Fair budget typically did not go over, and if one line item did go over, the Controller would adjust that line item by pulling from another line item. She further stated that this year’s situation was attributed to a loss of revenue and a perfect storm of other circumstances.

Commissioner Sebolt asked if all of the other over-expenditures were maintenance-related.

Ms. Dargatz stated that there was also an $8,000 loss from the tractor pulls that got rained out, and $1700 for the teen dance party that did not happen.

Chairperson Grebner asked Ms. Dargatz to outline the $94,000 that was overspent.

Ms. Dargatz stated the remainder of the over-expenditures were spent on facilities repairs.

Chairperson Grebner asked Michael Townsend, Budget Director, if those estimates were correct.

Mr. Townsend stated that some of the funds allotted were projections of costs for the rest of 2017, and the difference got the figures to $94,000.

Commissioner Sebolt asked if the equipment and facilities was part of the enterprise fund.

Ms. Dargatz stated it was all part of the enterprise fund. She further stated that her peers were handed their budgets on January 1 of each year and they spent down their funds, whereas the Fair was handed zero at the beginning of the year and was expected to earn their money.

Commissioner Anthony asked what the process was if Ms. Dargatz wanted to request something that was $100,000 over-budget.

Ms. Dargatz stated if it was $100,000 over-budget, she would come before the Board of Commissioners to request the funds.

Commissioner Anthony asked what would happen if it was a lesser amount over-budget.

Ms. Dargatz stated typically, staff would just adjust line items in the Fair budget to account for the request.
Chairperson Grebner stated the County policy allowed staff to move some line items to other line items to cover the cost.

Commissioner Anthony stated that was not what happened in this case.

Chairperson Grebner stated Ms. Dargatz could have a check written up to the amount of money they had left in their fund at any point, because that was how an enterprise fund worked.

Mr. Townsend stated that the staff had looked at the Fair’s budget and projected the costs for the rest of the year, but technically the Fair was not over their budget yet, but they would be shortly.

Commissioner Anthony stated she had not understand the line in the memo that read, “Additionally, expenses for Fair week exceeded what was approved in the 2017 budget by approximately $94,000.”

Chairperson Grebner stated that referred to the budget that was approved by the Fair Board.

Ms. Dargatz stated the “approved” amount was what had been projected, or budgeted in revenue and expenses.

Commissioner Anthony asked if this situation was in violation of the Uniform Budget Act.

Mr. Townsend stated that the situation did not violate the Uniform Budget Act, but the Act did state that it was the County’s responsibility to get their budget in line. He further stated this adjustment was to help get the budget back in line, because the Fair had spent or would spend that amount of money and the revenue did not come in.

Commissioner Anthony stated she was extremely uncomfortable with an unelected board, like the Fair Board, taking these types of financial risks. She further stated that over the past few years, the County had seen the harm that advisory boards with no budgeting experience did having power over large pots of money, and there were examples of the Board of Commissioners pulling back some of that power from the advisory board, like what was done with the Potter Park Zoo Board.

Commissioner Anthony stated the Board of Commissioners should look at changing the process before it put the County at risk.

Chairperson Grebner stated the Board of Commissioners could certainly control the purse strings of a board if they wished, but the Fair Board was created by statute.

Discussion.

Chairperson Grebner suggested the Board of Commissioners could require the Fair Board submit a detailed budget, but they could not get rid of the statutory requirements of having the Fair Board and some of their power.
Commissioner Sebolt stated he thought it was problematic that adjustments to the budget were made after the money had already been spent. He further stated he was concerned about what had happened here and that the Ingham County Fair had happened in August, but this was just now being discovered.

Commissioner Sebolt stated he was concerned about the process for making the adjustments, and why it was not caught before now.

Commissioner McGrain asked what the overall budget for the Fair was.

Ms. Dargatz stated the Fair budget was $838,000 for 2017. She further stated in previous years, it had been as high as $1.2 million.

Commissioner McGrain stated this over-expenditure was about one-quarter of the Fair’s total budget. He further stated that he shared his fellow Commissioners’ concerns about where the stoppage in expenses came in after the fact.

Commissioner McGrain stated he had recalled that the Board of Commissioners had previously discussed doing away with the Fair, and he could not help but think how useful $165,000 would be in another department. He asked if part of the Fair’s budget that came from the Hotel/Motel Tax funds had been budgeted for this year.

Ms. Dargatz stated the Hotel/Motel Tax funds had been considered for the budget, but those funds were reserved for facility improvements.

Commissioner McGrain stated he thought covering the over-expenditure would be a better use of those funds. He asked Ms. Dargatz if she had the figures of how much the Hotel/Motel Tax funds amounted to each year.

Ms. Dargatz stated the Hotel/Motel Tax funds were approximately $194,000 each year.

Commissioner Naeyaert asked if all $60,000 of the facilities repairs had happened at once.
Ms. Dargatz stated the expenses had come over the course of the year in small increments and they were repairs that needed to happen to maintain the Fairgrounds.

Commissioner Naeyaert stated she understood that the weather affected the revenue from the Ingham County Fair. She further stated that it was concerning that $800-2500 repairs would accumulate to $65,000 in a year.

Ms. Dargatz stated she was working with the Controller to address that issue, and the employee had been removed that had caused financial distress.

Discussion.

Ms. Dargatz stated the Fair did purchase Zero-Turn mowers a few years ago, which they now needed to maintain.

Commissioner Hope asked if the Fair had looked into getting insurance for events that got rained out, and if the facility damage was intentional and if it would be covered by insurance.

Ms. Dargatz stated no, because if the staff was negligent and drove the forklifts into the ground, the lift mechanism needed to be fixed. She further stated they had taken steps to remove that employee from employment.

Commissioner Hope asked if insurance would cover those costs.

Chairperson Grebner stated that Ingham County was a self-insured County.

Commissioner Hope asked if the Fair had looked into event insurance.

Ms. Dargatz stated the Fair Board had discussed event insurance and they had it prior to her becoming the Executive Director, but it was very expensive and the requirements for any reimbursement were difficult to meet.

Commissioner Sebolt stated he understood the Fair was one employee down for the last quarter of the year.

Ms. Dargatz stated that was correct, and the Fair was saving $18,000 by not having a person in that position.

Mr. Townsend stated that had been taken into account when calculating the projections.

Commissioner Anthony stated she wanted to amend the resolution to require the Fair to pay back $165,000 over the next 5 years.

Commissioner Anthony stated that given the County’s budget challenges, it felt right to request those funds.
Ms. Rhode stated that if the Board of Commissioners made the adjustment a loan to the Fair, then it would not eliminate the deficit because it would add a liability.

Discussion.

Ms. Rhode stated that if it was a loan, it would be reported as a deficit and the County would have to file a deficit elimination plan.

Chairperson Grebner suggested the Board of Commissioners could direct staff to prepare the Fair budget to recover $165,000 over the next five years, by budgeting out an item each year to make up the deficit.

MOVED BY COMM. ANTHONY, SUPPORTED BY COMM. MCGRAIN, TO AMEND THE RESOLUTION AND ADD THE FOLLOWING CLAUSE BELOW THE FIRST ACTION CLAUSE:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Controller’s staff is directed to budget a recovery of these funds over the next five years.

Commissioner Schafer stated he thought it was premature to take such action, especially since the Committee was discussing the use of the Hotel/Motel Tax funds. He further stated that he understood how weather could affect the Ingham County Fair, and also that it behooved the Board of Commissioners to appoint qualified people to these advisory boards to make these decisions.

Commissioner Naeyaert stated she thought this amendment would establish a precedent, that every time the Board of Commissioners approved a budget adjustment, they would require the department to repay the funds.

Chairperson Grebner stated that the distinction was that this was supposed to be a break-even department, whereas other departments were not.

Commissioner Naeyaert asked if $165,000 in over-expenditures was the worst case scenario.

Chairperson Grebner stated it was the worst case scenario, but the funds would all be allocated to the Fair.

Commissioner Sebolt stated the Commissioners had just gone through the budget process, and he recalled that the $165,000 would have paid for two corrections officers or an Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, or even another employee in the Clerk’s office so the public could be better served. He further stated that this adjustment would be taken out of fund balance, and could affect these types of items that the Commissioners had agonized over during the budget process.

Commissioner Schafer stated he wanted the funds to be taken out of the Hotel/Motel Tax fund instead, which was why he was opposed to the amendment.
Chairperson Grebner stated that the Ingham County Fair had been held because of history, and no entity that held a fair expected to break even with it. He further stated many fairs were winking out of existence, and there was a reason there was no longer a State Fair.

Discussion.

Chairperson Grebner stated the Board of Commissioners could tell the Fair to repay the money, and the Fair would just forego repairing or painting something. He further stated at some point, the Board of Commissioners would have to decide whether they wanted to hold a general attraction fair, or just have the 4-H portion of it.

Chairperson Grebner stated that the Fairground land was valuable if the County ever wanted to sell it. He further stated that the Fair could not build enough positive cash flow in good years to make up for these types of deficits.

Discussion.

THE MOTION TO AMEND THE RESOLUTION FAILED. Yeas: Hope, Anthony and McGrain Nays: Grebner, Naeyaert, and Schafer Absent: Tennis

MOVED BY COMM. MCGRAIN, SUPPORTED BY COMM. NAEYAERT, TO TABLE THE RESOLUTION UNTIL THE NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING TO RECEIVE A LEGAL OPINION ON THE USE OF THE HOTEL/MOTEL TAX FUNDS FOR THE BUDGET ADJUSTMENT AND ADVICE FROM THE FINANCIAL SERVICES STAFF ON HOW TO PREVENT THE SITUATION IN THE FUTURE.

Chairperson Grebner asked staff to respond to the inquiries about using the Hotel/Motel Tax fund, as well as getting a legal opinion.

Discussion.

THE MOTION TO TABLE THE RESOLUTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Tennis

11. Controller/Administrator’s Office
   a. Resolution Authorizing Adjustments to the 2017 Ingham County Budget

MOVED BY COMM. MCGRAIN, SUPPORTED BY COMM. NAEYAERT, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION.

Commissioner McGrain stated he wanted to point out that this resolution used the remainder of the County’s contingency funds.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Tennis

(14)
11. Controller/Administrator’s Office
   b. Resolution to the Amend Suspension of Operations Policy

MOVED BY COMM. MCGRAIN, SUPPORTED BY COMM. HOPE, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION.

Commissioner McGrain stated that he still felt weird about the policy change. He further stated that this put the power to suspend operations in the hands of the department heads and the Controller.

Discussion.

Chairperson Grebner stated as the policy was amended in the resolution, it only depended on the Controller’s approval.

Commissioner McGrain asked if part-time employees would be paid if they were not scheduled to work on the day the department closed.

Chairperson Grebner stated it only applied to employees who were scheduled to work that day.

Discussion.

Commissioner McGrain stated that he was concerned about sending people home, losing productivity, and the County still having to pay the employees.

Discussion.

Commissioner Anthony asked what the process was in developing and amending the policy. She asked if there had been feedback from department heads and county-wide officials.

Mr. Townsend stated there had been a conversation with the Controller’s staff, and the department heads did have some input in decision.

Discussion.

Mr. Townsend stated that the amendment to the policy was in response to the issue with the network servers, and some department heads had made the decision to send people home without consulting the Controller.

Discussion.

Chairperson Grebner stated that the Controller could now retroactively approve the department head’s decision to close.

Commissioner Anthony asked if department heads and county-wide officials had been brought in to discuss the changes being made to the policy.
Mr. Townsend stated there had been input from some department heads and county-wide officials. He further stated he could not be sure if everyone had been included in the decision.

Barb Byrum, Clerk, stated that she had not been brought into the discussion at all. She further stated that she could not speak for all of the county-wide officials, but she had not been included and it had not come up at the county-wide official quarterly meeting, so she assumed the other county-wide officials had not been included, either.

Discussion.

Clerk Byrum stated it was rare that county-wide officials were brought into a discussion.

Commissioner McGrain stated he thought county-wide officials had the authority to close their office if they deemed it necessary.

Clerk Byrum stated that there was a co-employment relationship with the County, in that the employees of county-wide offices were County employees. She further stated that her response was to the question of whether she had been included in the discussion.

Commissioner McGrain stated that this was an issue of whether the employees that worked for County-wide officials got paid when their office was closed.

Clerk Byrum stated that she had a constitutional responsibility to make sure the County’s records and elections were safe and secure, and she would fight out the payment of her employees later if it had been denied.

Discussion.

Chairperson Grebner stated that if the Controller agreed to paid employees of County-wide officials when the county-wide official decided to suspend operations, then there was no problem, otherwise the County-wide official could take the request for payment to the Board of Commissioners.

Commissioner Anthony stated she wanted to make sure the policy was clear, because she did not want it to come before the Board of Commissioners again.

Discussion.

Clerk Byrum stated that County-wide officials were not considered department heads.

Matt Nordfjord, County Attorney, stated that elected officials did not have to follow any County policy, although they would be encouraged to use the resources available to them.

Commissioner McGrain stated the only issue was the payment of those employees.
Commissioner Anthony asked if the policy needed to explicitly lay out the process for which employees of County-wide officials were paid during a suspension of operations.

Commissioner Hope asked what the interplay of the policy was in bargaining agreements, as she recalled when the policy came up previously it have been a union issue.

Mr. Nordfjord stated the collective bargaining agreement would address the County policy, or refer back to County policy.

Clerk Byrum stated that generally, County employees were hard workers, and they were constantly in fear of losing their jobs. She further stated that employees were also poached frequently to work at Jackson National Life, MSU, or other local employers.

Clerk Byrum stated that the County had valuable employees that wanted to serve the public. She further stated that in the five years that she had been Clerk, the office had only closed for a snowstorm, and because of the server issue when she could not verify the security of her data.

Clerk Byrum stated that she would welcome anyone who wanted to go to her office and see what her employees did every day.

Commissioner Sebolt stated that the policy was previously discussed in a County Services meeting. He further stated that he would caution the Committee that while they currently had reliable County-wide officials, if there was a time where one was more absent from the role and the offices did need to be closed, the Controller would not have the authority to do so.

Chairperson Grebner stated that County-wide officials should be noted in the resolution.

MOVED BY COMM. ANTHONY, SUPPORTED BY COMM. MCGRAIN, TO TABLE THE RESOLUTION AND ASK STAFF TO BRING THE POLICY BACK AFTER STAFF HAD GAINED MORE INPUT ON THE POLICY.

Commissioner Anthony stated she encouraged the Controller’s Office to bring in other voices when amending the policy.

Discussion.

THE MOTION TO TABLE THE RESOLUTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Tennis

12. Board Referral
   a. Letter from the Lansing Economic Area Partnership Announcing a Public Hearing for the City of Lansing Regarding Property Located at 629 W. Hillsdale Street
   b. Letter from the Lansing Economic Area Partnership Announcing a Public Hearing for the City of Lansing Regarding Property Located at 1800 Bassett Street
   c. 2017 Assessing Officers Report for Industrial Facility Exemption Certificates for the City of East Lansing
No action was taken on these items.

13.   Closed Session for Current Pending Litigation

MOVED BY COMM. ANTHONY, SUPPORTED BY COMM. HOPE, AT 7:27 P.M., TO
MOVE THE MEETING INTO CLOSED SESSION FOR THE PURPOSE OF DISCUSSING
CURRENT PENDING LITIGATION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY ROLL CALL VOTE. Absent: Commissioner
Tennis

Commissioner McGrain left at 7:27 p.m.

MOVED BY COMM. HOPE, SUPPORTED BY COMM. SCHAFER, AT 7:32 P.M. TO MOVE
THE MEETING BACK INTO OPEN SESSION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioners McGrain and Tennis

Announcements

None.

Public Comment

None.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:33 p.m.
RESOLUTION ACTION ITEMS:

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

1. **Treasurer** – Resolution to Transfer Unsold Tax Reverted Properties Rejected by Local Units to the Ingham County Land Bank Fast Track Authority

The County Treasurer asks for approval of a resolution that requests transfer of all unsold tax reverted properties to the Ingham County Land Bank Fast Track Authority. State and local units of government were offered an opportunity to purchase these properties and subsequently declined to exercise that right. The General Property Tax Act requires that a foreclosing governmental unit retain possession of such unsold properties (MCL 211.78m (7)). The Ingham County Land Bank Fast Track Authority was established to assist in the strategic disposition of tax-reverted property.

2. **Drain Commissioner** – Resolution Pledging Full Faith and Credit to Montgomery Drain Drainage District Notes

The Drain Commissioner has asked that the Board of Commissioners grant full faith and credit of Ingham County to Montgomery Drain Drainage District bonds. A pledge of full faith and credit helps to obtain a lower interest rate on the debt, resulting in lower costs for the municipalities and property owners of the drainage district who are liable to pay for the project. This drain project is necessary for the protection of the public health, and in order to provide funds to pay the costs of the project, the Drain Commissioner intends to issue the Drainage District’s bonds in an amount not to exceed $10.1 million. Principal and interest payments on the Bonds will be payable from assessments to be made upon public corporations and/or benefited properties in the Special Assessment District. Approval of this pledge will not exceed limits established in the Debt Policy.

3a. **Innovation and Technology Department** – Resolution to Approve Renewal of Support from Core Technology

Multibrige and Talon software from Core Technology are utilized by the Sheriff’s Office and patrol cars. This software has been in use for many years and provides critical access to LEIN data for our officers. Ongoing support for this software is critical to ensure no disruption of service occurs. The Innovation and Technology Department recommends approval of a resolution to authorize renewal of a support services agreement from Core Technology in an amount not to exceed $5,056.
3b. **Innovation and Technology Department** – *Resolution to Approve Purchase of Crystal Reports Training from Equivant*

Equivant is the vendor that supports the CourtView system for various criminal justice agencies including the Courts and Prosecuting Attorney’s office. Earlier this year the Innovation and Technology Department employee who provided support services retired and was replaced. It is important to bring that new employee current with the various aspects of her job. The Innovation and Technology Department recommends approval of a resolution to allow purchase of training programs from Equivant in an amount not to exceed $5,400.

3c. **Innovation and Technology Department** – *Resolution to Approve Purchase of User Training From ITProTV*

ITProTV provides training in easy to understand videos on various topics. In comparison to programs offered through the current training provider, Innovation and Technology (IT) Department staff determined that more users could be trained for less cost through ITProTV. Training programs relate to IT software applications as well as business, web design, and programming concepts. Training is reinforced by way of virtual labs and practice exams offered through an online subscription format. The IT Department recommends approval of a resolution to allow a one-year subscription for ITProTV user training in an amount not to exceed $9,570.

3d. **Innovation and Technology Department** – *Resolution to Approve the Website Redesign*

Proposals were recently sought to redesign the County’s website into a professional, uniform, and user-friendly destination that makes finding services and information easy for residents. Central to this website is the content management system (CMS) that allows departments to seamlessly manage their own content. The project review team met with top two finalists to determine their abilities and to answer questions. Based on the information presented, the Innovation and Technology Department recommends approval of a resolution to authorize a contract with Revize, LLC for the website redesign at a cost not to exceed $98,900.

4a. **Human Resources Department** – *Resolution to Approve a Letter of Understanding with Capitol City Labor Program, Inc. – 9-1-1 Non-Supervisory Unit Regarding Extension of Probation*

9-1-1 Administration, Human Resources, Controller’s Office, and Capitol City Labor Program, Inc. met in Special Conference to discuss staffing and training challenges that result in additional overtime. At issue, the number of holidays throughout the remainder of the 2017 makes it increasingly difficult to schedule trainers and still cover the responsibilities of the dispatch floor. The consensus recommendation of Special Conference participants is to delay the start of the Dispatcher training for recently promoted employees until January 6, 2018. The parties recommend approval of a Letter of Understanding to delay the training schedule and to extend the probationary period of impacted employees.
4b. **Human Resources Department** – Resolution to Approve a Letter of Understanding with Michigan Nurses Association Regarding Temporary Community Health Center Supervisor Assignment

The Community Health Center Supervisor for Willow, Eastern, and Sexton Clinics was recently vacated. The Health Department requests to temporarily assign that position to Charge Nurse Dianne Ankley while candidates are screened and interviewed to permanently fill the position. Ms. Ankley is qualified for and willing to accept these job duties and responsibilities on an interim basis. All seniority, economic fringe benefits, and contribution structures provided under the Michigan Nurses Association, Nurse Practitioners/Clinic Nurses Unit, Collective Bargaining Agreement will continue.


This resolution will authorize the purchase of a FLIR HS-XR Handheld Tactical Thermal Night Vision Monocular for the Office of Homeland Security & Emergency Management. The equipment will be used for intelligence gathering by law enforcement personnel and recording activities that may prevent or identify terrorist threats against the community. Funding in the amount of $8,298 will be provided from the FY2015 Region 1 Homeland Security Grant Program funds.

6. **Circuit Court – Juvenile Division** – Resolution Amending Resolution #17-390 To Reflect Correct Rates for Legal Counsel

This resolution will amend Resolution #17-390 to reflect correct rates for the two attorneys assigned delinquency cases in Judge R. George Economy’s courtroom. The rates in Resolution #17-390 should be split in half, given that each attorney receives only half of the cases. The correct amount should be $505.00 per month, not to exceed $7,575.00 per year.

7a. **Circuit Court** – Resolution to Amend Resolution #17-370 Accepting the FY 2018 Swift and Sure Sanctions Probation Program Grant

Resolution #17-370 accepted grant funds of up to $218,213.90 from the State Court Administrative Office (SCAO) to continue the Swift and Sure Sanctions Probation Program (SSSPP). The award is for the grant period of October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2018. The SCAO awarded the Court grant funds in the amount of $218,000 after Resolution #17-730 had been submitted. This resolution will amend the amount of the award to $218,000.

7b. **Circuit Court** – Resolution to Amend Resolution #17-371 Accepting the FY 2018 Felony Michigan Mental Health Court Grant Program Operational Grant

Resolution #17-371 accepted grant funds of up to $275,652.77 from the State Court Administrative Office (SCAO) to continue the Felony Mental Health Court Program (MHC). The award is for the grant period of October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2018. The SCAO awarded the Court grant funds in the amount of $275,653 after Resolution 17-731 had been submitted. This resolution will amend the amount of the award to $275,653.
8. **Probate Court** – Resolution to Authorize an Agreement with TEL Systems to Upgrade Technology and Provide Maintenance Support for the Probate Court Courtrooms

This resolution will approve entering into a contract and service agreement with TEL Systems for a turnkey solution for the design, purchase, installation, and support of a new state-of-the-art audio/video system upgrade for one of two Probate Court courtrooms in the Veterans Memorial Courthouse in 2018 at a cost not to exceed $95,225 per courtroom. Funding of $80,000 for this project has been included in the 2018 budget as recommended by the Finance Committee and scheduled for final approval by the Board of Commissioners on November 14. Funds to cover the additional cost of the project will come from the Equipment Revolving Fund.

9a. **9-1-1 Center** – Resolution to Authorize a Contract with Adams Outdoor to Provide Recruitment Advertising for the Ingham County 9-1-1 Central Dispatch Center

This resolution will authorize a contract not to exceed $31,625 with Adams Outdoor for recruitment advertising. Phase 1 is proposed for electronic billboards and an online Outdoor Extended program, and an optional Phase 2 is proposed for traditional poster billboards if needed. Funding for this project will come from the 9-1-1 fund balance. This project is proposed as part of an effort to address the all-time high number of vacant positions at the Center. It is hoped that this will give greater exposure and increase awareness of the available jobs at our 9-1-1 Center.

9b. **9-1-1 Center** – Resolution to Authorize a Contract with PM Technologies for Maintenance of 9-1-1 Public Safety Radio Communications Tower Sites, Uninterrupted Power Supply Units, and Replacement of Batteries

This resolution will authorize a contract with PM Technologies to purchase preventative maintenance and batteries/equipment for the tower sites Uninterrupted Power Supply (UPS) units. With our aging radio system, the UPS units that are at each tower site have started to fail and are in need of service. This project, at a cost not to exceed $22,186.10, will be funded from the current 9-1-1 budget.

10. **Law & Courts Committee** – Resolution to Accept a Consolidated Plan to Meet the Michigan Indigent Defense Commission (MIDC) Minimum Standards and to Create a New Fund within the Chart of Accounts for Purposes of Accepting Grant Funds from the MIDC

This resolution will accept the compliance plan created by the Ingham County Indigent Defense Collaborative Committee to meet the Michigan Indigent Defense Commission (MIDC) minimum standards. The recommended plan would create a Public Defender Office to be administered by Ingham County to provide indigent defense and related services at the 30th Circuit Court, 54A District Court, 54B District Court, and the 55th District Court. The three local funding units within Ingham County (Ingham County, the City of East Lansing, and the City of Lansing) have agreed to submit this consolidated plan to the MIDC.

This resolution will also create a new fund with the county’s chart of accounts for recording all financial transactions related to the plan.
11b. **Road Department** – Resolution to Authorize the Disposal of Road Department Surplus Property

The Road Department and Purchasing Director seek approval of a resolution to authorize a public auction to dispose of certain vehicles and equipment which have been replaced or have exceeded their useful life, and therefore no longer serve Road Department needs. County policy requires the Purchasing Director to create a list of surplus items for presentation to the Controller and County Services Committee for their respective approvals. The Purchasing Director recommends approval of the proposed resolution. (Please note that, per County policy, County Commissioners are prohibited from purchasing any surplus County-owned personal property.)

12. **County Fair Office** – Resolution to Amend the 2017 Fair Fund Budget

Revenue received from the Ingham County Fair was approximately $65,000 less than budgeted, and expenses for Fair week exceeded the approved budget by approximately $100,000. Upon review of the Fair Budget in total (including non-Fair activities) it is clear that a transfer from the General Fund, Fund Balance to the Fair Fund in the amount of $165,000 is necessary to avoid a deficit.

The 2017 General Appropriations Resolution (Resolution 16-444) clearly and unambiguously states that “expenditures shall not be incurred in excess of the individual budgets adopted herein without first amending the budget pursuant to the budgetary procedures established by the Board of Commissioners.” County policy requires approval of the full Board of Commissioners, acting upon the recommendation of the Controller, Liaison and Finance Committees, is required to increase the total budget (Policy 401.F).

13a. **Health Department** - Resolution to Authorize an Amendment to Resolution #16 – 114 to Authorize Certain Health Department Staff to Sign CMS Forms 855A and 855B

This resolution authorizes the following people to sign CMS forms 855A and 855B with the following percent of management control:

- Anne Scott, Interim Deputy Health Officer/Executive Director (40%)
- Linda Vail, Health Officer (35%)
- Eric Thelen, Health Department Chief Financial Officer (25%)

13b. **Health Department** - Resolution to Authorize an Administrative Service Agreement with Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan at the Ingham County Jail

This resolution authorizes the Schedule A Addendum to the Administrative and Schedule B – BlueCard Disclosures Inter-Plan Agreement with BCBSM for paying claims for health care services provided to inmates of the Ingham County Jail. The Schedule A Addendum and Schedule B will be effective December 1, 2017 through November 30, 2018.

13c. **Health Department** - Resolution to Accept FY 2018 Child and Adolescent Health Center Program Funds

This resolution authorizes the agreement with MPCA for the acceptance of $640,000 in CAHC program funding for the period of October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2018.
14. **Veterans Affairs** - Resolution to Authorize the Ingham County Department of Veteran Affairs to Accept Four Hundred Twenty-Five Dollars Donated from the Family of Deceased Veteran, Joseph E. Merritt

This resolution accepts a donation of $425 from the family members of Joseph E. Merritt to the Ingham County Department of Veteran Affairs to be used for the purpose of serving the veterans. Specifically, Ingham County Department of Veteran Affairs will utilize these funds to honor all veterans of Ingham/Clinton County with a Veterans Day Program.

15a. **Controller’s Office** – Ingham County 2018 General Appropriations Resolution

This resolution will adopt the 2018 operating and capital budgets and millage rates as recommended by the Finance Committee at its budget meeting held on September 13, 2017.

15b. **Controller’s Office** – Resolution Authorizing 2018 Agreements for Community Agencies

This resolution approves community agency funding for FY 2018. Each application was evaluated making the “meeting basic needs” criteria a priority as approved in Board of Commissioners resolution #17-248. For 2018, twenty eight (28) applications were received; requesting a total of $268,800; and $200,000 is included in the 2018 Finance Recommended Budget for community agency funding. Each funded agency included in the recommendation is funded either at their request, or at what they received last year plus a $500 increase, totaling $200,400. If the resolution is approved as recommended, the additional $400 could be utilized from the 2018 contingency fund. Agencies receiving funding in 2017 that did not apply for 2018 include Capital Area Community Services, Edgewood Village, Tuesday Toolmen, Hosanna House, and Mid-Michigan Recovery Service. The recommendation for Advent House is $0 because the application was submitted after the deadline.

Binders containing the applications of each agency have been previously distributed to you. Please bring those with you to the meeting, as they will provide helpful information for your discussions.

**DISCUSSION ITEM:**

11a. **Road Department** - Brief Presentation on Road PASER Ratings & Current / Upcoming Roadwork

**BOARD REFERRALS:**

16. **Board Referral** – Letter from Delhi Charter Township Regarding the Assessing Officers Report for Industrial Facility Exemption
Attached for your consideration is a proposed resolution to request Ingham County transfer unsold tax reverted properties which have been rejected by local units of government to the Ingham County Land Bank Fast Track Authority.

Under Public Act 123 of 1999, MCL 211.78m (7), “If property not previously sold is not transferred to the city, village, or township in which the property is located under subsection (6), the foreclosing governmental unit shall retain possession of that property.”

The Ingham County Land Bank Fast Track Authority was established to assist in the strategic disposition of tax reverted property and local units are encouraged to object so the parcels stay with the County for disposition by the Land Bank.

Thank you for your consideration of this resolution. Please contact me if you have any questions.
Agenda Item 1

Introduced by the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO TRANSFER UNSOLD TAX REVERTED PROPERTIES REJECTED BY LOCAL UNITS TO THE INGHAM COUNTY LAND BANK FAST TRACK AUTHORITY

WHEREAS, the Land Bank Fast Track Act, 2003 PA 258, being MCL 124.751 et seq., (“the Act”) establishes the State Land Bank Fast Track Authority; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Treasurer, with the Ingham County Board of Commissioners’ approval, has entered into an intergovernmental agreement with the State Land Bank Fast Track Authority under the Act to form an Ingham County Land Bank Fast Track Authority; and

WHEREAS, tax reverted property not previously sold by the Ingham County Treasurer, acting as the foreclosing governmental unit (FGU), shall be transferred to the city, village, or township in which the property is located, except those parcels of property to which the city, village or township has objected to in accordance with 1999 PA 123, MCL 211.78m(6); and

WHEREAS, parcels rejected by a city, village or township become the property of Ingham County; and

WHEREAS, the Land Bank was established to assist in the strategic disposition of tax reverted property; and

WHEREAS, local units are encouraged to object so the parcels stay with the County for disposition by the Land Bank.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the County Board of Commissioners authorizes the Controller/Administrator to take appropriate action to transfer rejected property to the Land Bank.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Resolution shall be renewed annually.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that 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.
2017 Tax Foreclosures
Subject to Local Unit Rejection

33-01-01-03-306-191
LOT 83 BANGHART SUB NO 1
Property Address: 840 HARRIS ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-04-102-281
LOT 17 HYLEWOOD SUB
Property Address: 419 W SHERIDAN RD LANSING MI

33-01-01-04-105-071
LOT 92 FAIRFIELD GARDENS SUB
Property Address: 422 W FAIRFIELD AVE LANSING MI

33-01-01-04-155-231
LOT 37 EXC S 11 FT MAYFIELD FARMS SUB
Property Address: 2915 TURNER ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-06-326-102
LOT 28 HOWARD HEIGHTS SUB
Property Address: 309 DOUGLAS AVE LANSING MI
PART NE 1/4 SW 1/4 SEC 9 T4N R2W & LOTS 6 & 7 DELTA RIVER DRIVE ESTATES COM 20 FT W OF NE COR LOT 6, TH W ON 1/8 LINE 215 FT, S 18DEG 08MIN W 112.3 FT, S 64DEG 49MIN E 150.33 FT, N 25DEG 33MIN E 40 FT, SE'LY 30 FT TO MOST W'LY COR LOT 7, SE'LY 35 FT ON S'LY LINE LOT 7, N 25DEG 33MIN E 99.83 FT, S 64DEG 27MIN E 35.2 FT TO W'LY LINE LOT 6 AT POINT 60 FT NW'LY OF SW COR THEREOF, NE'LY 109 FT TO BEG; DELTA RIVER DRIVE ESTATES

Property Address: WESTMONT AVE LANSING MI

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

33-01-01-06-327-161

COM 125 FT S OF CEN OF SEC 6, TH E 127 FT, S 135 FT, W 127 FT, N 135 FT TO BEG; SEC 6 T4N R2W

Property Address: 2725 NORTHWEST AVE LANSING MI

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

33-01-01-08-202-271

LOT 208 NORTH HIGHLAND SUB

Property Address: 1713 N M L KING JR BLVD LANSING MI

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

33-01-01-08-256-141

LOT 164 NORTH HIGHLAND SUB

Property Address: 1311 N M L KING JR BLVD LANSING MI

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

33-01-01-08-279-055

W 30 FT OF S 22 FT LOT 28 KNOLLWOOD PARK

Property Address: KNOLLWOOD AVE LANSING MI

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------
33-01-01-08-378-101
LOT 9 ASSESSORS PLAT NO 48

Property Address: 1527 HULL CT LANSING MI

33-01-01-08-426-121
LOT 13 & S 4.7 FT OF E 135 FT LOT 11 ASSESSORS PLAT NO 13

Property Address: 1147 PRINCETON AVE LANSING MI

33-01-01-08-456-121
N 33 FT LOTS 1 & 2 BLOCK 1 DAYTONS ADD

Property Address: 710 N JENISON AVE LANSING MI

33-01-01-08-481-151
LOT 19 EXC N 45 FT ALSO S 70 FT LOT 18 ENGLEWOOD PARK ADD

Property Address: 1000 W SAGINAW ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-09-126-061
LOT 57 MAPLE PARK ADD

Property Address: 204 RUSSELL ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-09-177-003
LOTS 43 THRU 54 & LOTS 58 THRU 64, W 1/2 LOT 55, W'LY 1/2 LOT 57 & S 1/2 OF VACATED WILLIS AVE FROM E LINE N GRAND RIVER AVE TO A LINE EXT D FROM S'LY MOST COR LOT 13 TO A POINT MIDWAY ON E'LY LINE LOT 57 FRANK L DODGE SUB
Property Address: 1506 N GRAND RIVER AVE LANSING MI

33-01-01-09-276-043
E 41.25 FT OF W 82.5 FT LOTS 13 & 14 BLOCK 2 ORIG PLAT

Property Address: 403 BEAVER ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-09-306-121
S 1/2 OF E 6 R LOT 12 BLOCK 1 MOORES SUB ON BLOCK 27

Property Address: 1001 N PINE ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-09-352-001
W 40.25 FT OF N 115 FT LOT 6 BLOCK 2 MOORES SUB ON BLOCK 27

Property Address: 635 BROOK ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-09-352-211
LOT 4 BLOCK 2 MOORES SUB ON BLOCK 27

33-01-01-09-354-041
N 36 FT LOT 9 BLOCK 47 ORIG PLAT

Property Address: N CHESTNUT ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-09-354-051
S 30 FT LOT 9 & N 4 FT OF W 5 R LOT 8 BLOCK 47 ORIG PLAT

Property Address: 910 N CHESTNUT ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-09-357-141

LOT 7 ASSESSORS PLAT NO 41 REC L 11 P 47

Property Address: 707 N SYCAMORE ST 1 LANSING MI

33-01-01-09-364-121

W 27 FT OF S 40 FT OF E 6 R LOT 5 BLOCK 57 ORIG PLAT

Property Address: 406 W SAGINAW ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-09-430-311

LOT 40 ASSESSORS PLAT NO 30 OF BLOCK 19 ORIG PLAT

Property Address: 1031 N LARCH ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-10-153-011

S 1/2 LOT 15 BLOCK 3 HANDY HOME ADD

Property Address: 1556 BALLARD ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-10-153-211

LOT 1 BLOCK 3 HANDY HOME ADD

Property Address: 1501 N HIGH ST LANSING MI
33-01-01-10-157-191
N 2 R OF S 7 R LOT 1 BLOCK 2 HANDY HOME ADD
Property Address: 1213 N HIGH ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-10-157-343
E 16.5 FT LOTS 16 & 17 BLOCK 2 HANDY HOME ADD
Property Address: DRURY LANE LANSING MI

33-01-01-10-176-341
LOT 9 HIGHLAND PARK
Property Address: 1223 NEW YORK AVE LANSING MI

33-01-01-10-353-171
LOT 18 YOUNG, STABLER AND YOUNGS EAST PARK ADD
Property Address: 717 EAST PARK TERRACE LANSING MI

33-01-01-10-354-131
LOT 38 ASSESSORS PLAT NO 22
Property Address: 843 E SAGINAW ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-10-354-141
LOT 37 ASSESSORS PLAT NO 22
Property Address: 901 E SAGINAW ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-10-354-151
LOT 36 ASSESSORS PLAT NO 22

Property Address: 903 E SAGINAW ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-10-376-061
LOT 13 ASSESSORS PLAT NO 22

Property Address: 804 N PENNSYLVANIA AVE LANSING MI

33-01-01-10-376-231
LOTS 1 & 2 THE METLIN ADD

Property Address: 1026 E OAKLAND AVE LANSING MI

33-01-01-14-362-071
LOT 60 ULLRICH'S SUB REC L 4 P 28

Property Address: S CLEMENS AVE LANSING MI

33-01-01-14-380-171
LOT 48 BROWNS SUB OF A PART OF OUTLOTS A AND B OF SNYDERS ADD

Property Address: 630 S FRANCIS AVE LANSING MI
33-01-01-15-154-091
E 34.5 FT LOT 3 BLOCK 3 JEROMES ADD
Property Address: 917 JEROME ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-15-305-131
S 38 FT OF E 95 FT LOT 11 BLOCK 7 GREEN OAK ADD
Property Address: 230 S EIGHTH ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-15-381-081
LOT 18 BLOCK 8 LANSING IMPROVEMENT COMPANYS ADD
Property Address: LARNED ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-15-427-131
N 35 FT LOT 14 BLOCK 1 HALLS ADD
Property Address: 215 ALLEN ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-15-483-121
S 26 FT LOT 135 & N 14 FT LOT 136 BREITEN PARK SUB REC L S P 48
Property Address: 622 ALLEN ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-15-485-111
LOT 41 PAUL PARK ADD
Property Address: 622 LESLIE ST LANSING MI
33-01-01-16-428-201
LOT 5 BLOCK 1 BARNARDS SUB REC L 1 P 32
Property Address: BARNARD ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-16-428-211
LOT 4 BLOCK 1 BARNARDS SUB REC L 1 P 32
Property Address: 625 BARNARD ST 1 LANSING MI

33-01-01-17-258-082
E 26.5 FT LOT 15 & W 1 R LOT 16 BLOCK 2 FRENCHS SUB
Property Address: 1222 W OTTAWA ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-17-258-091
E 2 R OF W 3 R LOT 16 BLOCK 2 FRENCHS SUB
Property Address: 1220 W OTTAWA ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-17-451-502
LOT 95 & E 16.5 FT LOT 96 ASSESSORS PLAT NO 9
Property Address: 1207 W KALAMAZOO ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-20-135-131
LOT 23 RIVERVIEW HEIGHTS SUB REC L 4 P 44

Property Address: 914 MIDDLE ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-20-407-041

LOT 86 OLDSDALE SUB

Property Address: 1517 PATTENGILL AVE LANSING MI

33-01-01-21-253-020

LOT 5 CLEARS SUB OF BLOCK 204

Property Address: 1017 S GRAND AVE LANSING MI

33-01-01-21-380-171

E 1/2 LOT 3 BLOCK 16 PARK PLACE

Property Address: 213 W BARNES AVE LANSING MI

33-01-01-21-427-062

W 30 FT OF E 4 R LOTS 10 & 11 ROLLIN H PERSON ADD

Property Address: 511 BAKER ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-21-428-001

N 50 FT LOTS 21 & 22 ROLLIN H PERSON ADD

Property Address: 1417 LINVAL ST LANSING MI
33-01-01-21-428-035
S 82.5 FT LOT 26 ROLLIN H PERSON ADD

Property Address: 621 BAKER ST 1 LANSING MI

33-01-01-21-428-045
N 40 FT LOTS 25, 26 & 27 EXC E 17 FT THEREOF ROLLIN H PERSON ADD

Property Address: 1418 BAILEY ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-21-429-065
W 41 FT OF N 53.06 FT LOTS 1 & 2 BLOCK 1 AMENDED PLAT OF HALLS SOUTH SIDE ADD

Property Address: 414 BAKER ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-21-484-035
N 28 FT LOT 133 & N 28 FT OF W 30 FT LOT 134 TORRANCE FARM ADD

Property Address: 1823 LINVAL ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-22-129-321
LOT 15 BLOCK 5 MANUFACTURERS ADD NO 1

Property Address: 1126 E MALCOLM X ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-22-176-341
LOT 85 HUNTINGTON HEIGHTS SUB
Property Address: 1238 PARK VIEW AVE LANSING MI

33-01-01-22-206-011
LOTS 158 & 159 EXCELSIOR LAND COMPANYS SUB

Property Address: 1005 BENSCH ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-22-206-161
LOT 234 EXCELSIOR LAND COMPANYS SUB

Property Address: 1036 DAKIN ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-22-226-331
LOT 396 EXCELSIOR LAND COMPANYS SUB

Property Address: 943 MCCULLOUGH ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-22-255-061
LOT 74 EXCELSIOR LAND COMPANYS SUB

Property Address: 1223 S HOLMES ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-22-279-191
LOT 16 CITY PARK SUB

Property Address: 1107 REGENT ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-22-301-071
LOT 45 CLARKS SUB

Property Address: 725 BEULAH ST LANSING MI

-----------------------------------------------

33-01-01-22-303-011

LOTS 19 & 21 CLARKS SUB

Property Address: 710 BEULAH ST LANSING MI

-----------------------------------------------

33-01-01-22-305-101

LOT 19 BLOCK 1 ASSESSORS PLAT NO 20

Property Address: 1441 BAILEY ST LANSING MI

-----------------------------------------------

33-01-01-22-351-061

LOT 12 BLOCK 1 ASSESSORS PLAT NO 28 REC L 10 P 33

Property Address: 1531 BAILEY ST LANSING MI

-----------------------------------------------

33-01-01-22-351-271

LOT 33 BLOCK 1 ASSESSORS PLAT NO 28 REC L 10 P 33

Property Address: 1530 LYONS AVE LANSING MI

-----------------------------------------------

33-01-01-22-351-281

LOT 34 BLOCK 1 ASSESSORS PLAT NO 28 REC L 10 P 33

Property Address: 1524 LYONS AVE LANSING MI
33-01-01-22-352-121
LOT 16 BLOCK 4 ASSESSORS PLAT NO 28 REC L 10 P 33
Property Address: 1613 LYONS AVE LANSING MI

33-01-01-22-354-041
LOT 8 BLOCK 2 ASSESSORS PLAT NO 28 REC L 10 P 33
Property Address: 1711 BAILEY ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-22-354-141
LOT 17 & N 10 FT LOT 16 BLOCK 2 ASSESSORS PLAT NO 28 REC L 10 P 33
Property Address: 1720 LYONS AVE LANSING MI

33-01-01-27-107-001
LOT 82 HOLLYWOOD SUB
Property Address: MCKIM AVE LANSING MI

33-01-01-27-426-042
LOT 7, N 120 FT LOT 8, ALSO N 120 FT LOT 9 EXC W 22 FT GOODHOME SUB
Property Address: 1813 E WILLARD AVE LANSING MI

33-01-01-28-403-011
LOT 14 REOLA PARK SUB
Property Address: 2609 MAPLEWOOD AVE LANSING MI

33-01-01-28-430-001
LOT 108 SOUTH PARKWOOD SUB

Property Address: 602 S PARK BLVD LANSING MI

33-01-01-28-432-051
LOT 71 SOUTH PARKWOOD SUB

Property Address: 629 DENVER AVE LANSING MI

33-01-01-29-278-011
LOT 11 BLOCK 3 RESUB OF BLOCKS 17, 21, 22 AND LOTS 35 TO 72 INCL, BLOCK 30 ELMHURST SUB

Property Address: 2505 S M L KING JR BLVD LANSING MI

33-01-01-29-305-122
COM SW COR SEC 29. TH E 283 FT, N 214.5 FT, E 267 FT, N 247.5 FT, W 550 FT TO W SEC LINE, S 462 FT TO BEG; SEC 29 T4N R2W

Property Address: 2130 W HOLMES RD LANSING MI

33-01-01-30-453-141
LOT 465 PLEASANT GROVE SUB NO 1

Property Address: 3210 VIKING RD LANSING MI
33-01-01-31-205-171
LOT 43 SHERATON PARK
Property Address: 3728 DEERFIELD AVE LANSING MI

33-01-01-31-253-161
LOT 79 PLEASANT SUB
Property Address: 4020 INGHAM ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-31-276-001
LOT 205 EXC E 60 FT PLEASANT SUB NO 3
Property Address: 3907 INGHAM ST LANSING MI

33-01-01-31-276-111
LOT 87 PLEASANT SUB
Property Address: 2514 GREENBELT DR LANSING MI

33-01-01-31-276-121
LOT 88 PLEASANT SUB
Property Address: 2510 GREENBELT DR LANSING MI

33-01-01-31-479-301
LOT 107 EXC N 88 FT OF W 121 FT & S 16 FT ECO FARMS
Property Address: 4722 PLEASANT GROVE RD LANSING MI

33-01-01-32-126-152

COM 24 R E OF NW COR OF NE 1/4 OF NW 1/4 SEC 32, S 300 FT, E 66 FT, N 300 FT, W 66 FT TO BEG; SEC 32 T4N R2W

Property Address: 1733 W HOLMES RD LANSING MI

33-01-01-32-353-283

LOTS 208, 209 & 210 PLEASANT GROVE SUB EXC S 8 FT OF LOT 210

Property Address: 5014 CHRISTIANSEN RD LANSING MI

33-01-01-32-401-121

W 80 FT LOTS 2 & 3 SUPERVISORS PLAT OF PROSPERITY FARMS NO 1

Property Address: 1118 PIERCE RD LANSING MI

33-01-01-33-402-102

COM SE COR LOT 30, TH W 30 FT, N TO N LINE SAID LOT, W TO SE COR LOT 37, N TO NE COR LOT 38, E 50 FT , N TO N LINE ASSESSORS PLAT NO 56, E ON SAID LINE 99.02 FT, S 103.06 FT, S 45DEG 11MIN 51SCD E 28.36 FT TO NW COR LOT 26, E 79.24 FT TO E LINE LOT 30 EXTD N, S 200 FT TO BEG; ASSESSORS PLAT NO 56

Property Address: E EVERETTDALE AVE LANSING MI

33-01-01-33-404-201

LOT 66 SUPERVISORS PLAT OF EVERETT-DALE NO 2 SUB
Property Address: 124 E EVERETTDALE AVE LANSING MI

33-01-01-33-427-221

LOT 27 ORCHARD GARDENS SUB

Property Address: 612 E CAVANAUGH RD LANSING MI

33-01-01-35-351-111

LOT 44 & E 14.5 FT LOT 43 SUPERVISORS PLAT OF CULVER-DALE SUB

Property Address: 2107 IRENE ST LANSING MI

33-01-05-04-151-081

COM ON W SEC LINE 284 FT N OF W 1/4 POST SEC 4, TH E 610 FT TO CL COUNTY DRAIN, N'LY ALONG SAID CL TO PT E OF A PT 70 FT N OF BEG, W TO W SEC LINE, S 70 FT TO BEG; SEC 4 T3N R2W

Property Address: 5507 S WASHINGTON AVE LANSING MI

33-01-05-05-202-022

LOT 20 SUPERVISORS PLAT OF BALZER SUB, EXCEPT COM AT THE NW CORNER LOT 20 SUPERVISORS PLAT OF BALZER SUB FOR POB, TH S 87.74 FT, THE E 137.23 FT, THE N 87.74 FT, TH W 137.23 TO POB

Property Address: BALZER ST LANSING MI

33-01-05-05-252-001

LOT 149 EXC E 5 FT VILLAGE GREEN SUB NO 2

Property Address: W NORTHROP ST LANSING MI
33-01-05-05-276-021

COM SE COR LOT 20, TH N ON E LOT LINE 30 FT, N 51DEG 0MIN W 194.3 FT TO E'LY R/W LINE M-99, S 33DEG 30MIN W 75 FT, S 56DEG 30MIN E 98.5 FT, S 34.9 FT TO SW COR LOT 20, E 110 FT TO BEG; SUPERVISORS PLAT OF PROSPERITY FARMS

Property Address: 5317 S M L KING JR BLVD LANSING MI

33-01-05-05-376-141

LOT 12 VALLEAU CITY

Property Address: 5822 VALENCIA BLVD LANSING MI

33-01-05-05-376-201

LOT 6 VALLEAU CITY

Property Address: 5861 S M L KING JR BLVD LANSING MI

33-01-05-06-378-001

LOT 79 COACHLIGHT ESTATES SUB

Property Address: 3305 INDEPENDENCE LANE LANSING MI

33-01-05-06-429-023

LOT 167 EXC W 65 FT WEBSTER FARM SUB NO 3

Property Address: 5712 PICARDY ST LANSING MI
33-01-05-06-430-121

N 100 FT LOT 208 WEBSTER FARM SUB NO 3

Property Address: 2427 POLLARD RD LANSING MI

33-01-05-07-227-061

LOTS 44 & 45 KENBROOK

Property Address: S M L KING JR BLVD LANSING MI

33-01-05-08-226-281

LOT 60 MARYWOOD

Property Address: 6218 MARYWOOD AVE LANSING MI
INTRODUCED BY THE COUNTY SERVICES AND FINANCE COMMITTEES OF THE:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION PLEDGING FULL FAITH AND CREDIT
TO MONTGOMERY DRAIN DRAINAGE DISTRICT NOTES

RESOLUTION # ________

Minutes of a regular meeting of the Board of Commissioners of Ingham County, Michigan, held in the Ingham County Courthouse, Mason, Michigan, on __________, 2017, at ____ p.m., local time.

PRESENT: Commissioners ____________________________________________________________

ABSENT: Commissioners ___________________________________________________________

The following resolution was offered by Commissioner ____________ and supported by Commissioner: ____________

WHEREAS, pursuant to a petition filed with the Drain Commissioner of the County of Ingham, State of Michigan (the “Drain Commissioner”), proceedings have been taken under the provisions of Act 40, Public Acts of Michigan, 1956, as amended (the “Act”), for the making of certain intra-county drain improvements to the Montgomery Drain (the “Project”), which is being undertaken by the Montgomery Drain Drainage District (the “Drainage District”); and

WHEREAS, the Project is necessary for the protection of the public health, and in order to provide funds to pay preliminary costs of the Project, the Drainage District intends to issue its note or notes, in addition to notes it has previously issued, in a total aggregate amount not to exceed $10,100,000 pursuant to the Section 434 of the Act (the “Notes”); and

WHEREAS, the principal of and interest on the Notes will be payable from bonds to be issued by the Drainage District to provide permanent financing for the Project (the “Bonds”); and

WHEREAS, the preliminary costs of the Project have been financed by a combination of notes issued to banks and advances from the Drain Revolving Fund (Fund 802); and

WHEREAS, the County Board of Commissioners has requested relinquishment of $5,000,000 of the amounts advanced by the County of Ingham (the “County”) to Fund 802 in order to designate them for other uses; and

WHEREAS, the Drain Commissioner deems it advisable and necessary to request that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners (the “Board”) adopt a resolution consenting to the pledge of the limited tax full faith and credit of the County on the Notes; and

WHEREAS, the Board may, by resolution adopted by a majority vote of two-thirds of the members of the Board, pledge the full faith and credit of the County for the prompt payment of the principal of and interest on the Notes pursuant to Section 434 of the Act; and

WHEREAS, the pledge of the full faith and credit of the County to the Notes will reduce the cost of financing the Project and will be a benefit to the people of the County.
NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS RESOLVED as follows:

1. The County pledges its full faith and credit for the prompt payment of the principal of and interest on the Notes and any Notes issued to refinance the Notes, and the County agrees that in the event that the Bonds are not issued prior to the date on which the principal of and interest on the Notes (or any Note issued to refinance the Notes) are due and that moneys are not otherwise available to the Drainage District on such date to pay such principal and interest, the County will immediately make such advancement from general funds of the County to the extent necessary to pay the principal of and interest on the Notes when due. The ability of the County to levy taxes to pay the principal of and interest on the Notes shall be subject to constitutional and statutory limitations on the taxing power of the County.

2. In the event that, pursuant to said pledge of full faith and credit, the County advances out of County funds sums to pay any part of the principal of and interest due on the Notes, the County shall take all actions and proceedings and pursue all remedies permitted or authorized by law for the reimbursement of such sums so paid.

3. The Chairperson of the Board, the County Administrator, the County Clerk, the County Treasurer, and any other official of the County, or any one or more of them, are authorized and directed to take all actions necessary or desirable for the issuance of the Notes, and to execute any documents or certificates necessary to complete the issuance of the Notes, including, but not limited to, any applications including applications to the Michigan Department of Treasury, any waivers, certificates, receipts, orders, agreements, instruments, and any certificates relating to federal or state securities laws, rules or regulations.

4. All resolutions and parts of resolutions are, to the extent of any conflict with this resolution, rescinded to the extent of the conflict.

YEAS: Commissioners

NAYS: Commissioners

ABSTAIN: Commissioners

COUNTY SERVICES:

Yeas: 

Nays: Absent: Approved: 

FINANCE:

Yeas: 

Nays: Absent: Approved: 

RESOLUTION DECLARED ADOPTED.

Barb Byrum, Clerk
County of Ingham
CERTIFICATION

I, Barb Byrum, the duly qualified and acting Clerk of Ingham County, Michigan (the “County”) do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and complete copy of a resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners at a meeting held on __________, 2017, the original of which is on file in my office. Public notice of said meeting was given pursuant to and in compliance with Act 267, Public Acts of Michigan, 1976, as amended.

____________________________________________________

Barb Byrum, Clerk

Date: __________, 2017

County of Ingham
TO: Board of Commissioners, County Services Committee, and Finance Committee

FROM: Deb Fett, CIO

DATE: 10/19/2017

SUBJECT: Core Technology Multibridge/Talon Renewal

BACKGROUND
Ingham County currently uses Multibridge and Talon software from Core Technology in our Sheriff’s Office and patrol cars. This software has been in use for many years and provides critical access to LEIN data for our officers.

In order to ensure the system has no downtime or other issues which would hinder law enforcement, IT renews support on the software each year. This year the support expires on 11/30/17.

ALTERNATIVES
None.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
The funding for the $5,056.00 total will come from the County’s Innovation and Technology Department’s LOFT Fund #636-25820-932050.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
None.

RECOMMENDATION
Based on the information presented, I respectfully recommend approval of the attached short contract for Core Technology to renew support of the Multibridge/Talon software in the amount of $5,056.00.
**Invoice No.** MN300206  
**Date** 10/31/2017  
**Due Date** 11/30/2017  
**Customer No.** ING30009  
**Page** 1 of 1

---

**Bill To**  
Ingham Co Mi Sheriff Office  
Accts Payable / Sarah Rickets  
121 East Maple, 3rd Floor  
Mason, Mi 48854  
US

**Ship To**  
Ingham County  
121 East Maple, 3rd Floor  
Mason, MI 48854  
US

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract/Project Number</th>
<th>Purchase Order</th>
<th>Payment Terms</th>
<th>Currency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Start of Maint Period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Unit Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE</td>
<td>Annual CORE Technology Maintenance; DEC/2017 - NOV/2018</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE-MAINT</td>
<td>Support - MultiBridge Enterprise LEIN</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2,278.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE-MAINT</td>
<td>Support - Talon Desktop</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>138.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE</td>
<td><strong>Payment Due 12/1/17</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

***IMPORTANT***  
Email notice is REQUIRED for any changes and/or cancellations and will take effect 30 days after the notice is received.

We appreciate your business!

Thank you,  
Kim Bays  
kbays@harriscomputer.com

---

**Remit To:**  
Core Technology Corporation  
62133 Collections Center Drive  
Chicago, IL 60693-0521

---

Subtotal:  5,056.00  
Misc:  0.00  
Taxes:  0.00  
Freight:  0.00  
Total:  5,056.00

---

Invoice Questions? Please call Kim Bays at 613-226-5511 ext 2017 OR e-mail kbays@harriscomputer.com

Tax Exempt? Please send your exemption certificate to the address above or email it to kbays@harriscomputer.com

Thank you for your business!
Introduced by County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE RENEWAL OF SUPPORT FROM CORE TECHNOLOGY

WHEREAS, Core Technology is the company that provides support for the MultiBridge and Talon software used by our Sheriff’s Office and patrol cars; and

WHEREAS, ongoing support is critical to ensuring that we have no disruption of service to our law enforcement personnel; and

WHEREAS, the current contract expires on 11/30/2017; and

WHEREAS, the funds are available in the current budgeted year.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Commissioners do hereby authorize the renewal of support from Core Technology in the amount not to exceed $5,056.00.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the total cost will be paid out of the County’s Innovation and Technology Department’s LOFT Fund #636-25820-932050.

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

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Ingham County Board of Commissioners is authorized to sign any contract documents consistent with this resolution and approved as to form by the County Attorney.
TO: Board of Commissioners, County Services Committee, and Finance Committee
FROM: Deb Fett, CIO
DATE: 10/19/2017
SUBJECT: Crystal Reports Training

BACKGROUND
Equivant is the company that supports the CourtView system in our various criminal justice areas including our Courts and Prosecuting Attorneys’ office. Earlier this year, our in house support person retired and has been replaced. In order to better support our users, it is important to bring that new person up to speed with the various aspects of her job. This quote is to train her in Crystal Reports as it pertains to CourtView in particular.

ALTERNATIVES
As this training is particular to a specific software in use there are no alternative vendors.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
The funding for the $5,400.00 total will come from the County’s Innovation and Technology Department’s Staff Development and Training Fund #636-95800-960000.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
Although we can probably take care of small fixes, without proper training we will need to contract with the vendor to support any major report writing needs for CourtView.

RECOMMENDATION
Based on the information presented, I respectfully recommend approval of the attached resolution for Equivant for Crystal Reports training in the amount of $5,400.00.
# Quote

**To:** Lon Miles  
Ingham County Court  
PO Box 319  
Mason, MI 48854  
inalles@ingham.gov  
Contact: Lon Miles (517) 676.7381

**Quote:** INGM120171017  
**Date:** October 16, 2017  
**Valid through:** December 15, 2017

## Project: CourtView Crystal Report Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Training (Includes training preparation and delivery of training, includes up to three training days)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$4,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Professional Services Discount</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Professional Services | $3,900 |
| Estimated Travel Cost | $1,500 |

**Estimated Baseline Project Total, excluding applicable taxes**  
**$5,400**

---

**Scope of Work**

Onsite Training Services to include topics such as:  
Crystal Report Writer Software

**Notes**

1. Quotation must be signed and returned with a purchase order to schedule project.
2. Professional Services quoted are at a firm fixed price, but extent of services is limited to the number of training days specified in Item 1.2. For those items that are limited, actual effort, costs and expenses may be less than or greater than those estimated. Customer shall have no obligation to pay CJS more than the estimated price. CJS shall have no obligation to provide labor or incur costs or expenses having a combined value more than the quoted price, even if the services have not been completed or the deliverables delivered, or the results expected by the customer have not been achieved. The parties may by mutual written agreement, increase the quoted price. Changes in scope will require a change order to increase the firm fixed price based upon the additional level of services.
3. Delays caused by Customer site or configuration issues may require rescheduling and/or Change Order for additional services and related travel costs.
4. If project is cancelled prior to completion, all effort and travel-related costs expended through the date of cancellation will be due and payable.
5. CJS will invoice for professional services as follows:
   - Project Management services will be invoiced at the end of the first month in which Project management services are provided.
   - Training Services will be invoiced at the end of the first month in which a training day is provided.
6. Travel costs are estimated and actual cost incurred by CJS will be charged.
7. For tips of less than four consecutive days, Travel time will be invoiced at $75 per hour, not to exceed nine (9) hours per round trip.
8. CJS will invoice for travel costs at the end of the month in which the travel cost is incurred.
9. Training will be scheduled for the first available date at which CJS and Customer resources are jointly available. Should rescheduling be necessitated for any reason, the next available date at which CJS and Customer resources are both available will be scheduled.
10. For the purposes of quotation CJS has assumed that training will be provided on consecutive days. Should Customer request that training be provided on non-consecutive days, the Estimated Travel Cost for labor and travel expenses may exceed the estimate provided.
11. A training day is eight (8) hours or less training provided on a single day. Unless expressly stated all training will be provided during normal business hours (9 a.m. to 5 p.m. local time).
12. CJS will provide training utilizing the CourtView Release installed in the Customer’s training environment.
13. Training sessions are limited to a maximum of ten (10) students per training session.
14. Customer will prioritize the training topics and provide the prioritized list to CJS prior to the start of training preparation. CJS will cover the topics in the prioritized order. CJS will cover as many of the topics as can be accommodated within the quoted training hours. Should all topics not be covered, or additional training required, a change order to expand the level of effort will be required.
15. Customer is responsible for all required licenses, hardware, network and third-party software components and configuration.
16. Customer is responsible for providing a suitable training environment that includes a personal computer for each student.
17. Customer will make available all resources requested by CJS for assistance.

---

**Accepted:**

**Print Name / Signature**

**Date:**

---

5399 Lauby Road, NW | NORTH CANTON, OHIO 44720 | 330.470.4280 | 330.484.2483 FAX
Introduced by County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE PURCHASE OF CRYSTAL REPORTS TRAINING FROM EQUIVANT

WHEREAS, Equivant is the company that supports the CourtView system in our various criminal justice areas; and

WHEREAS, a new person is supporting said system and requires training to best serve our users; and

WHEREAS, the funds are available in the current budgeted year.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Commissioners do hereby authorize the purchase of training from Equivant in the amount not to exceed $5,400.00.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the total cost will be paid out of the Innovation and Technology’s Staff Development and Training Fund #63695800-960000.

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

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Ingham County Board of Commissioners is authorized to sign any contract documents consistent with this resolution and approved as to form by the County Attorney.
TO: Board of Commissioners, County Services Committee, and Finance Committee

FROM: Deb Fett, CIO

DATE: 10/19/2017

SUBJECT: User Training Subscription

BACKGROUND
ITProTV is a company that provides training in easy to understand videos on various topics. In comparing the offerings they have versus our current training provider, we have discovered that we can train more users for less per user than our current training vendor. The training we are interested in pertains to IT software applications as well as business, web design, and programming concepts. The training is reinforced by virtual labs and practice exams. This training is an online subscription format that is purchased in yearly increments.

ALTERNATIVES
The portion of the training relating only to Office and Business is not currently on the GSA contract so quotes were obtained.

ITProTV $87.00 per user per year
GoSkills $149.50 per user per year
Lynda.com $150.00 per user per year

FINANCIAL IMPACT
The funding for the $9,570.00 total will come from the County’s Innovation and Technology Department’s Employee Development and Training Fund #636-95800-960080.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
Ongoing training is an important part of ensuring our County staff are best able to serve our citizens.

RECOMMENDATION
Based on the information presented, I respectfully recommend approval of the attached resolution for ITProTV user training in the amount of $9,570.00.
## Quote

**Quote #**

**0045**

| BILLED TO: B. JEFFREY | INGHAM COUNTY | UNITED STATES |

### PRODUCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Pro</td>
<td>Unlimited access to all OfficePro TV content for 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biz Pro</td>
<td>Unlimited access to all BizPro TV content for 12 months. Quote valid for 30 days.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discount**

$3,270.00

**Total**

$3,570.00

---

**Terms and Conditions**

Amounts shown in USD. Final payment must be received by ITProTV within 30 days of invoice date unless otherwise agreed upon. ITProTV reserves the right to suspend access in those cases where timely payment is not made.
Introduced by County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE PURCHASE OF USER TRAINING FROM ITPROTV

WHEREAS, ITProTV is a company that provides user training in easy to understand videos; and

WHEREAS, ongoing training is an important part of ensuring our County staff are best able to serve our citizens; and

WHEREAS, the funds are available in the current budgeted year.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Commissioners do hereby authorize the purchase of training from ITProTV in the amount not to exceed $9,600.00.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the total cost will be paid out of the Innovation and Technology’s Staff Development and Training Fund #63695800-960080.

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

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Ingham County Board of Commissioners is authorized to sign any contract documents consistent with this resolution and approved as to form by the County Attorney.
TO: Board of Commissioners, County Services Committee, and Finance Committee

FROM: Deb Fett, CIO

DATE: 10/19/2017

SUBJECT: Resolution – Website Redesign

BACKGROUND
Ingham County currently has a website that is inconsistent and difficult to use or maintain. This sad state is a result of previous attempts to update it with small budgets and wishes that soon outstripped reality. Since our website can be the first impression of our County, we need it to better represent what Ingham County has to offer.

In order to bring our website to the desired positive state, ITD worked with a key team of our internal website content editors to develop a comprehensive RFP outlining our needs. Now that the bids from the RFP have been received and opened, the team met again to determine top finalists based on the criteria outlined in the RFP. The top two finalists – CivicPlus and Revize – were asked to meet with the team to show their abilities and to answer questions. This resolution is the culmination of those meetings.

ALTERNATIVES
Following due process requirements, an RFP was released and bids were received for the website redesign requested. The bidders were:

- CivicPlus, Inc. $165,368.00
- Vision Technology Solutions, LLC. $66,560.00 Annual Fee $14,000.00 with 5% annual increase
- Real Time Solutions / Stephen Kaufman Shroeder $112,000.00
- Good Method, LLC. $57,263.00
- Revize, LLC. $98,900.00
- CivicLive/West Interactive Services Corporation $148,000.00

FINANCIAL IMPACT
The funding for the not to exceed $99,000.00 will come from the County’s Innovation and Technology Department’s Network Consulting Fund #636-25810-802000.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
Revize, LLC was chosen as they are not only have the lower cost and had a better score on our criteria, but were more in tune with finding a solution that fit our needs rather than fitting us into their solution, are a Michigan vendor, and have been used by other Michigan counties who have given them a good reference.

RECOMMENDATION
Based on the information presented, I respectfully recommend approval of the contract with Revize, LLC for the website redesign.
TO: Deb Fett, IT Director
FROM: James Hudgins, Director of Purchasing
DATE: August 10, 2017
RE: Memorandum of performance for RFP No. 140-17: Website Redesign and Content Management System

Per your request, the Purchasing Department sought proposals to redesign the County’s website into a professional, uniform, and user-friendly destination that makes finding services and information easy for residents. Central to this website is the content management system (CMS) that allows departments to seamlessly manage their own content.

The RFP was advertised in the Lansing State Journal, City Pulse and posted on the Ingham County Purchasing Department’s website.

The Purchasing Department can confirm the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Overall Number of Vendors</th>
<th>Number of Local Vendors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vendors invited to propose</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendors responding</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following grid is a summary of the vendors’ costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VENDOR NAME</th>
<th>LOCAL PREF</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good Method LLC</td>
<td>Traverse City, MI</td>
<td>$57,263.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision Technology Solutions LLC</td>
<td>El Segundo, CA</td>
<td>$66,560.00 Annual Fee $14,000 with 5% annual increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revize LLC</td>
<td>Troy, MI</td>
<td>$98,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Time Solutions / Stephen Kauffman Schroeder</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM</td>
<td>$112,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation</td>
<td>Scotts Valley, CA</td>
<td>$148,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CivicPlus, Inc.</td>
<td>Manhattan, KS</td>
<td>$165,368.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You are now ready to complete the final steps in the process: 1) Evaluate the submissions based on the criteria established in the RFP; 2) confirm funds are available; 3) submit your recommendation of award along with your evaluation to the Purchasing Department; 4) write a memo of explanation; and, 5) prepare a resolution for Board approval.

This Memorandum is to be included with your memo and resolution submission to the Resolutions Group as acknowledgement of the Purchasing Department’s participation in the purchasing process.

If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me by e-mail at jhudgins@ingham.org or by phone at 676-7309.
INTRODUCED BY COUNTY SERVICES AND FINANCE COMMITTEES OF THE:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE WEBSITE REDESIGN

WHEREAS, the Ingham County website is currently inconsistent and difficult to use or maintain; and

WHEREAS, said website provides first impression of our County so should better represent what Ingham County has to offer; and

WHEREAS, ITD and a team of web content editors utilized the RFP process to obtain and evaluate bids from multiple vendors for redesigning the website; and

WHEREAS, the contract amount is in the ITD 2017 budget.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Commissioners do hereby authorize the contracting with Revize, LLC for the website redesign in the amount not to exceed $99,000.00.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the total cost will be paid out of the county’s Network Fund #63625810-802000.

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

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Ingham County Board of Commissioners is authorized to sign any contract documents consistent with this resolution and approved as to form by the County Attorney.
TO: Board of Commissioners County Services Committee  
FROM: Travis Parsons, Human Resources Director  
DATE: October 30, 2017  
SUBJECT: LOU – Capitol City Labor Program, Inc. – 911 Non-Supervisory Unit  
County Services November 7th

BACKGROUND
The 911 Center continues to experience significant staffing shortages that require current employees to work a tremendous amount of overtime. In response, 911 Administration, Human Resources, Controller’s Office and Capitol City Labor Program, Inc. met in Special Conference to discuss staffing and training challenges that result in additional overtime.

Most recently we discussed meeting the training responsibilities for several newly promoted Call Takers to Dispatcher positions. The number of holidays throughout the remainder of the 2017 makes it increasingly difficult to arrange trainers and still cover the responsibilities of the dispatch floor.

The joint solution from the Special Conference is to delay the start of the Dispatcher training for these recently promoted employees until the first rotation in 2018 (January 6, 2018). Without the proposed modification, the training time would be cut short and the probationary period for these employees would be impacted. The parties agreed that it is necessary to modify the probationary period for this group. The Letter of Understanding captures this unique scenario and provides a solution for the delayed training schedule and corresponding extension of the probationary period.

ALTERNATIVES
To make no change to the current language.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
There is no financial impact.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
Through the meet and confer process, all parties agreed to the arrangement and captured the agreement in the proposed Letter of Understanding.

RECOMMENDATION
Based on the information presented, the Director – 911 and I respectfully recommend approval of the attached resolution authorizing the Letter of Understanding between the Employer and the CCLP – 911 Non-Supervisory Unit regarding the extension of probation.
WHEREAS, an agreement was reached between representatives of Ingham County and the Capitol City labor Program, Inc. – 911 Non-Supervisory Unit (CCLP) for the period January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2017; and

WHEREAS, the Human Resources Department, 911 Center, and Capitol City Labor Program, Inc. met and discussed the extenuating circumstances regarding the staffing level in the 911 Center and the need to delay the training of a newly promoted group Call Takers to Dispatchers until January 6, 2017; and

WHEREAS, the Human Resources Department, 911 Center, and Capitol City Labor Program, Inc. identified the impact of the suspension on the probationary period served by this group of employees; and

WHEREAS, the Employer and Union recognize the unique circumstances of this promotion process and the impact to the work schedule through January 6, 2018; and

WHEREAS, the parties desire to amend the language through the attached Letter of Understanding; and

WHEREAS, the provisions of the Letter of Understanding has been approved by the County Services.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby approves the attached Letter of Understanding.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Board of Commissioners is authorized to sign the Letter of Understanding on behalf of the County, subject to the approval as to form by the County Attorney.
LETTER OF UNDERSTANDING  
BETWEEN  
COUNTY OF INGHAM  
AND  
CAPITOL CITY LABOR PROGRAM, INC.-  
911 NON-SUPERVISORY UNIT  

PROBATIONARY PERIOD

WHEREAS, the current collective bargaining agreement between the parties provides in Article 17, PROBATIONARY PERIOD, specifically 17.3 that Employees who are promoted within the bargaining unit are subject to an additional probationary period as specified in 17.3.1; and

WHEREAS, the promotion from Call Taker to Dispatcher requires significant additional training and the opportunity to evaluate performance during probation; and

WHEREAS, due to extenuating circumstances regarding the staffing level in the 911 Center, the parties determined a need to delay training for the newly promoted Dispatchers; and

WHEREAS, the parties have come to agreement that the delay in training and evaluation would delay the probationary period.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY AGREED between the parties as follows:

1. The recently promoted Call Takers to Dispatchers will have their training paused and they will not begin training in the Dispatcher position until January 6, 2018.

2. Employees recently promoted to Dispatcher would serve the full probationary period in accordance with contract, with the beginning date of new probationary period to correspond with the start date of their Dispatcher training. The probationary extension is not to exceed an additional 90 days.

3. It is expressly understood and agreed by the parties that because of the unique set of circumstances for these impacted newly promoted employees, this LOU is without prejudice as to any other cases.

4. All other terms and conditions specified in the parties’ collective bargaining agreement shall remain in full force and effect.
COUNTY OF INGHAM  CAPITOL CITY LABOR PROGRAM, INC

_______________________________  _______________________________
Sarah Anthony, Chairperson     Date          Tom Krug, Executive Director     Date

________________________________
Sherry Larner                          Date

APPROVED AS TO FORM FOR INGHAM COUNTY COHL, STOKER & TOSKEY, PC.

By_______________________________________
Mattis Nordfjord                          Date
TO: Board of Commissioners Human Services, County Services, and Finance Committee
FROM: Linda S. Vail, MPA
DATE: October 30, 2017
SUBJECT: Appoint Interim Child and Adolescent Health Center Supervisor
For the meeting agenda of November 14th, 2017

BACKGROUND
The Health Center Supervisor position that oversees the Child and Adolescent Health Centers (School-Based/School-Linked Health Centers), Willow, Eastern and Sexton, is vacant. During the time the search for a qualified candidate to permanently fill the position is found, and interim Health Center Supervisor is needed to continue to oversee the day-to-day operations of the clinics, to assure compliance and quality service provision. It is the desire of the Health Department to establish Dianne Ankley, R.N., who currently serves as Charge Nurse for these Health Centers, as interim Health Center Supervisor until a candidate is hired to permanently fill the position.

ALTERNATIVES
There are no alternatives.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
Dianne Ankley is currently a Charge Nurse, MNA, NP&CN, Grade 03, Step 5 ($68,264.25) and will be paid out of class as a MCF 10, Step 5 ($73,957.55) for the duration she serves as Interim Health Center Supervisor. This will not impose additional costs beyond what is budgeted for FY 2018.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
There are no other considerations.

RECOMMENDATION
Based on the information presented, I respectfully recommend that Dianne Ankley, R.N., be appointed interim Health Center Supervisor for the Child and Adolescent Health Centers, and for the duration of her service in this interim role, be paid out of class as a MCF 10, Step 5 ($73,957.55).
Introducing by the Human Services, County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO APPOINT INTERIM CHILD AND ADOLESCENT HEALTH CENTER SUPERVISOR

WHEREAS, the Health Center Supervisor position that oversees the Child and Adolescent Health Centers (School-Based/School-Linked Health Centers), Willow, Eastern, and Sexton, is vacant; and

WHEREAS, during the time the search for a qualified candidate to permanently fill the position is found, an interim Health Center Supervisor is needed to continue to oversee the day-to-day operations of the clinics, to assure compliance and quality service provision; and

WHEREAS, it is the desire of the Health Department to establish Dianne Ankley, R.N., who currently serves as Charge Nurse for these Health Centers, as interim Health Center Supervisor until a candidate is hired to permanently fill the position; and

WHEREAS, Dianne Ankley is currently a Charge Nurse, MNA, NP&CN, Grade 03, Step 5 ($68,264.25) and will be paid out of class as an MCF 10, Step 5 ($73,957.55) for the duration she serves as Interim Health Center Supervisor; and

WHEREAS, this will not impose additional costs beyond what is budgeted for FY 2018; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham Community Health Center Board and Health Officer supports the appointment of Dianne Ankley as Interim Health Center Supervisor.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes Dianne Ankley, R.N., to be appointed interim Health Center Supervisor for the Child and Adolescent Health Centers.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Dianne Ankley be paid out of class for the duration of her service in this interim role as an MCF 10, Step 5 ($73,957.55).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the County Controller/Administrator is authorized to make any necessary budget adjustments and amendments to the position allocation list consistent with this resolution.

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.
LETTER OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN
COUNTY OF INGHAM (Employer)
AND
MICHIGAN NURSES ASSOCIATION (Union)

WHEREAS, the Employer and the Union have entered a collective bargaining agreement with a term running January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2017; and

WHEREAS, due to the recent vacancy of the Community Health Center Supervisor for Willow, Eastern and Sexton Clinics, the Employer seeks to temporarily assign that position on an interim basis to Dianne Ankley, Charge Nurse, while the County seeks to permanently fill the Community Health Center Supervisor position; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Dianne Ankley is qualified for and willing to temporarily assume these job duties and responsibilities on an interim basis; and

WHEREAS, the Employer has recognized that adjusting the salary for temporarily assuming the assigned duties and responsibilities during this period is justified; and

WHEREAS, the Employer and the Union are agreeable to this temporary staffing arrangement and the temporary salary increase.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY AGREED between the parties as follows:

1. The parties agree that the Community Health Center Supervisor job duties and responsibilities shall be temporarily assigned to Dianne Ankley, Charge Nurse, effective from November 14, 2017, until a successor has been hired.

2. The parties agree that while Ms. Dianne Ankley is serving as the Interim Community Health Center Supervisor, Ms. Ankley’s annual salary level shall be adjusted from her current MNA Grade 3, Step 5 ($68,264.25) to the MCF Pay Grade 10, Step 5 level ($73,957.61). Upon Ms. Ankley ceasing to be assigned the Community Health Center Supervisor job duties and responsibilities, her salary shall be returned to the appropriate step under the MNA Pay Grade.

3. The parties agree that all seniority, economic fringe benefits and contribution structures provided under the Michigan Nurses Association, Nurse Practitioners/Clinic Nurses Unit, Collective Bargaining Agreement, will continue.

4. The parties agree that this Letter of Understanding is intended to be temporary in duration, to be effective from November 14, 2017, through no later than December 31, 2017, unless extended in writing by mutual agreement of the parties.

5. The balance of the Agreement between the parties will remain in full force and effect for the duration of the Agreement's term.
COUNTY OF INGHAM

Sarah Anthony, Chairperson  Date
Ingham County Board of Commissioners

Linda Vail, Date
Health Officer

TEAMSTERS, LOCAL 243

Julia Smith-Heck, Date
Labor Relations Representative

Kathy Kacynski, Date
President

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
COHL, STOKER & TOSKEY, P.C.

Mattis Nordfjord
TO:        Law & Courts Committee
          Finance Committee

FROM:  Sergeant Mary Hull, Ingham County Office of Homeland Security and
        Emergency Management

DATE:    October 11, 2017

RE:      RESOLUTION TO PURCHASE A HANDHELD NIGHT/THERMAL
         IMAGING CAMERA (FLIR) FOR THE INGHAM COUNTY OFFICE OF
         HOMELAND SECURITY & EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT.

The Ingham County Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Management has applied for and been approved for FY2015 Region 1 Homeland Security Grant Program funds. A portion of these funds will be used to purchase one FLIR HS-XR Handheld Tactical Thermal Night Vision Monocular for the Office of Homeland Security & Emergency Management. This handheld FLIR would help protect residents and businesses of the county from homeland security and terrorist threats.
Introducing the Law & Courts and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO PURCHASE A HANDHELD NIGHT/THERMAL IMAGING CAMERA (FLIR) FOR THE INGHAM COUNTY OFFICE OF HOMELAND SECURITY & EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Office of Homeland Security & Emergency Management has previously applied for and been approved to receive pass through grant funds from the FY2015 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 night vision) would be used for intelligence gathering by law enforcement personnel and recording activities that may prevent or identify terrorist threats against the community.

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

Total cost - $8,298.00.

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.
TO: Law and Courts Committee
Finance Committee

FROM: Scott Leroy, Deputy Court Administrator

DATE: October 23, 2017

RE: RESOLUTION TO AMEND RESOLUTION #17-390 TO REFLECT CORRECT RATES FOR LEGAL COUNSEL

The attached Resolution is asking to amend resolution #17-390 to reflect correct rates for the two attorneys assigned delinquency cases in Judge R. George Economy’s courtroom. The rates in resolution #17-390 should be split in half, given the attorneys are only receiving half of the cases. The correct amount should be $505.00 a month, not to exceed $7,575.00 a year.
WHEREAS, Attorney Steven Feigelson and Attorney Robert Ochodnicky provide legal representation on one-half of the juvenile delinquency cases, respectively, assigned to Judge R. George Economy; and

WHEREAS, Resolution #17-390 was passed on October 10, 2017, approving legal counsel paid at specific rates; and

WHEREAS, there was an error in Resolution #17-390 in the monthly payment amounts allocated for Attorney Steven Feigelson and Attorney Robert Ochodnicky; and

WHEREAS, the correct amount each attorney should receive is $505.00 monthly, not to exceed $7,575.00 a year.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Resolution #17-390 is amended to reflect legal counsel for Judge R. George Economy’s delinquency cases paid at the following rates:
- Attorney Steven Feigelson is paid in the amount of $505.00 monthly, not to exceed $7,575.00 a year.
- Attorney Robert Ochodnicky is paid in the amount of $505.00 monthly, not to exceed $7,575.00 a year.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Ingham County Board of Commissioners is authorized to sign any necessary contractual documents consistent with this Resolution and approved to form by the County Attorney.
To: Law & Courts and Finance Committees

From: Rhonda K. Swayze

Date: October 24, 2017

Re: Swift and Sure Sanctions Probation Program
2017 - 2018 Operational Grant Award

The 30th Circuit Court submitted a Memo and Resolution in September to accept grant funds up to an amount of $218,213.90 from the State Court Administrative Office (SCAO) to continue the Swift and Sure Sanctions Probation Program (SSSPP). The award is for the grant period of October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2018.

The Board resolved in Resolution 17-370 to accept an amount of up to $218,231.90 once awarded, make any necessary adjustments to the 2017 and 2018 budget and position allocation lists, and sign any necessary contract/subcontracts consistent with the Resolution. The SCAO awarded the Court grant funds in the amount of $218,000 after Resolution 17-730 had been submitted.

Through the enclosed Resolution, we are requesting that the Board amend Resolution 17-370 as to the amount of the award, only.

cc: Hon. Clinton Canady
Hon. Joyce Draganchuk
Shauna Dunnings
Hon. Janelle A. Lawless
Lisa McCormick
Carol Siemon
Agenda Item 7a

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

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO AMEND RESOLUTION 17-370 ACCEPTING THE FY 2018 SWIFT AND SURE SANCTIONS PROBATION PROGRAM GRANT

WHEREAS, the 30th Circuit Court applied for grant funds in the amount of $218,231.90 from the State Court Administrative Office (SCAO) for the fiscal year of October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2018 to continue the Swift and Sure Sanctions Probation Program grant; and

WHEREAS, the SCAO hadn’t notified the Court of the amount of the award prior to the last round of Committee meetings preceding the closure of the 2017 fiscal year; and

WHEREAS, the Court, wishing to continue services in the 2018 fiscal year, submitted Resolution 17-370 to accept funds up to the amount of $218,231.90 once awarded; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners resolved to accept an amount of up to $218,231.90, once awarded, make any necessary adjustments to the 2017 and 2018 budget and position allocation lists, and sign any necessary contract/subcontracts consistent with the Resolution; and

WHEREAS, the SCAO awarded the Court grant funds in the amount of $218,000 after Resolution 17-370 had been submitted.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners amends Resolution 17-370 by accepting an amount of $218,000 awarded by the SCAO for the Felony Michigan Mental Health Court Grant which begins on October 1, 2017 and ends on September 30, 2018.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that all other terms of Resolution 17-370 remain the same as approved.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board Chairperson is authorized to sign any amended agreements consistent with this resolution subject to approval as to form by the County Attorney.
The 30th Circuit Court submitted a Memo and Resolution in September to accept grant funds up to an amount of $275,652.77 from the State Court Administrative Office (SCAO) to continue the Felony Mental Health Court (MHC) Program. The award is for the grant period of October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2018.

The Board resolved in Resolution 17-371 to accept an amount of up to $275,652.77 once awarded, make any necessary adjustments to the 2017 and 2018 budget and position allocation lists, and sign any necessary contract/subcontracts consistent with the Resolution. The SCAO awarded the Court grant funds in the amount of $275,653 after Resolution 17-731 had been submitted.

Through the enclosed Resolution, we are requesting that the Board amend Resolution 17-371 as to the amount of the award, only.

cc: Hon. Joyce Draganchuk
Shauna Dunnings
Hon. James S. Jamo
Hon. Janelle A. Lawless
Lisa McCormick
Carol Siemon
Agenda Item 7b

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

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO AMEND RESOLUTION 17-371 ACCEPTING THE FY 2018 FELONY MICHIGAN MENTAL HEALTH COURT GRANT PROGRAM OPERATIONAL GRANT

WHEREAS, the 30th Circuit Court applied for grant funds in the amount of $275,652.77 from the State Court Administrative Office (SCAO) for the fiscal year of October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2018 to continue the Felony Michigan Mental Health Court (MHC) Grant; and

WHEREAS, the SCAO hadn’t notified the Court of the amount of the award prior to the last round of Committee meetings preceding the closure of the 2017 fiscal year; and

WHEREAS, the Court, wishing to continue services in the 2018 fiscal year, submitted Resolution 17-371 to accept funds up to the amount of $275,652.77 once awarded; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners resolved to accept an amount of up to $275,652.77, once awarded, make any necessary adjustments to the 2017 and 2018 budget and position allocation lists, and sign any necessary contract/subcontracts consistent with the Resolution; and

WHEREAS, the SCAO awarded the Court grant funds in the amount of $275,653 after Resolution 17-731 had been submitted.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners amends Resolution 17-370 by accepting an amount of $275,653 awarded by the SCAO for the Felony Michigan Mental Health Court Grant which begins on October 1, 2017 and ends on September 30, 2018.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that all other terms of Resolution 17-371 remain the same as approved.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board Chairperson is authorized to sign any amended agreements consistent with this resolution subject to approval as to form by the County Attorney.
Agenda Item 8

TO: Law and Courts Committee
    Finance Committee
    Board of Commissioners

FROM: George M. Strander
      Probate Court Administrator & Probate Register

DATE: October 24, 2017

RE: Resolution in relation to courtroom upgrades

Please find attached a draft resolution to enter into a contract with TEL to provide upgrades to one of our two courtrooms. The resolution is essentially identical to one already passed by the Board of Commissioners in relation to Circuit Court courtroom upgrades.
Per your request, the Purchasing Department sought proposals from qualified and experienced vendors for a turnkey solution for the design, purchase, installation, and support of new state-of-the-art audio/video systems in eight (8) courtrooms for the Ingham County 30th Judicial Circuit Court and the Ingham County Probate Court in Lansing, Michigan. Minimum Proposer Requirements: 1) The proposer must be a direct advanced certified partner for the proposed product/solution(s). 2) The proposer shall maintain a staff of bench and field service technicians in the mid-Michigan area.

The RFP was advertised in the Lansing State Journal and The Chronicle in addition to posting on the Ingham County Purchasing Department’s website.

The Purchasing Department can confirm the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Overall Number of Vendors</th>
<th>Number of Local Vendors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vendor invited to propose</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor attending pre-bid/proposal meeting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendors responding</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposal summary grid of the vendors’ costs is on the last page.

You are now ready to complete the final steps in the process: 1) Evaluate the submissions based on the criteria established in the RFP; 2) confirm funds are available; 3) submit evaluation to the Purchasing Department with your recommendation; 4) write a memo of explanation; and, 5) prepare a resolution for Board approval. If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me by e-mail at jhudgins@ingham.org or by phone at 676-7309.

For construction projects over $10,000 preconstruction meetings are required. Please make sure the Purchasing Department is invited and is able to attend such meetings to ensure all contractors are in compliance with prevailing wages and proper bonding.

This Memorandum is to be included with your memo and resolution submission to the “Resolutions group” as acknowledgement of the Purchasing Department’s participation in the proposal purchasing process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VENDOR NAME</th>
<th>LOCAL PREF</th>
<th>COURTROOM 1</th>
<th>COURTROOM 2</th>
<th>COURTROOM 3</th>
<th>COURTROOM 4</th>
<th>COURTROOM 5</th>
<th>COURTROOM 6</th>
<th>COURTROOM 7</th>
<th>COURTROOM 8</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEL Systems (Thalner Electronics Inc.)</td>
<td>No, Ann Arbor</td>
<td>$95,225.00</td>
<td>$95,225.00</td>
<td>$95,225.00</td>
<td>$95,225.00</td>
<td>$95,225.00</td>
<td>$95,225.00</td>
<td>$95,225.00</td>
<td>$95,225.00</td>
<td>$761,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Information Systems, Inc.</td>
<td>No, FL</td>
<td>$102,063.53</td>
<td>$103,156.51</td>
<td>$103,156.51</td>
<td>$103,703.00</td>
<td>$102,063.53</td>
<td>$102,063.53</td>
<td>$102,063.53</td>
<td>$102,063.53</td>
<td>$820,333.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoundCom Michigan Corp; DBA: I.COMM</td>
<td>Yes, Lansing</td>
<td>$123,251.00</td>
<td>$123,251.00</td>
<td>$123,251.00</td>
<td>$123,251.00</td>
<td>$123,251.00</td>
<td>$123,251.00</td>
<td>$123,251.00</td>
<td>$123,251.00</td>
<td>$986,008.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDW Government LLC</td>
<td>No, IL</td>
<td>$154,872.77</td>
<td>$154,872.77</td>
<td>$153,032.22</td>
<td>$153,032.22</td>
<td>$153,032.22</td>
<td>$153,032.22</td>
<td>$154,872.77</td>
<td>$153,032.22</td>
<td>$1,229,779.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Jim Hudgins, Director of Purchasing

From: Rhonda K. Swayze, Deputy Court Administrator/General Trial Division

Date: April 25, 2017

Re: RFP No. 10-17; Courtroom Technology Upgrades for Ingham County 30th Judicial Circuit Court

Having identified the need to update courtroom technology in the courtrooms located in the Veterans Memorial Courthouse from analog to digital technology, the 30th Circuit Court sought CIP funding in the 2016 and 2017 budget cycles. Funding in the amount of $80,000 per courtroom was approved for two courtrooms in the 2016 budget cycle and two courtrooms in the 2017 budget cycle. Funding for the last two courtrooms located in the Veterans Memorials Courthouse will be sought through the CIP process in the 2018 budget cycle.

A RFP was issued by the Purchasing Department in January, 2017. The RFP described a request for a turnkey solution for the design, purchase, installation, and support of new state-of-the-art audio/video systems in the courtrooms.

The 30th Judicial Circuit Court evaluation team, which consisted of Court Administrator, Shauna Dunnings; Deputy Court Administrator, Rhonda Swayze; Circuit Court Technology Liaison, Mike Brandt; Probate Court Administrator, George Strander; IT Director, Deb Fett; and Application Programmer, Mike Nolen, reviewed and evaluated the four RFPs submitted and made a recommendation that TEL Systems (Thalner Electronics, Inc.) be awarded with the right to proceed with the project. The evaluation was submitted to the Purchasing Department. The evaluation team requested a meeting with TEL Systems so team members had an opportunity to ask additional questions and thoroughly review the products and installation plan that TEL had proposed. That meeting took place on March 29, 2017.

The recommendation to proceed with TEL Systems is based on the following:

- At $95,225, TEL was the lowest bid per courtroom before particular components were identified for elimination from the proposal. After those components were identified for elimination, TEL came in under our budgeted amount of $80,000 per courtroom.

- TEL’s price per courtroom includes maintenance for three years rather than one year like the other three vendors.

- Vendors CDW-G and ICOMM could not be recommended due to their proposed costs of the project. CDW-G’s proposed costs were approximately twice as high as TEL’s. ICOMM’s costs were approximately $30,000 higher than TEL’s.

- BIS Digital uses proprietary software for audio and video courtroom recording and does not provide the details as to whether proprietary hardware is needed to operate their software. The court currently uses FTR for audio and video courtroom recording and the hardware cited in TEL’s proposal supports the continued use of FTR.
• The documentation in TEL’s proposal was exactly what we asked for and more. It explained in detail how the proposed system will work and included specific brand and model information for the proposed equipment.

• TEL also proposed ideas to save the court money.

• TEL has experience with installing courtroom technology along with positive references from past customers to support their qualifications.

• TEL has been the provider of the court’s courtroom technology maintenance for at least 14 years. During that time, they have provided the court with timely and effective service.

If this memo of explanation is satisfactory to the Purchasing Department, the 30th Circuit Court will move ahead by preparing a resolution for Board approval.

Your assistance and support in this important project have been invaluable.

Thank you.

cc: Mike Brandt  
Shauna Dunnings  
Deb Fett  
Hon. Janelle Lawless  
Mike Nolen
INTRODUCED BY THE LAW & COURTS AND FINANCE COMMITTEES OF THE:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE AN AGREEMENT WITH TEL SYSTEMS TO UPGRADE TECHNOLOGY AND PROVIDE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT FOR THE PROBATE COURT COURTROOMS

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Probate Court and Ingham County IT Department identified the need to replace equipment that has surpassed its life expectancy and to update courtroom technology in the Veterans Memorial Courthouse from analog to digital technology; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Probate Court has secured funding of $80,000 for one of its two courtrooms in the 2018 budget cycle, pending final approval by the Board of Commissioners; and

WHEREAS, a Request for Proposal (RFP 10-17) for a turnkey solution for the design, purchase, installation, and support of new state-of-the-art audio/video system in the courtrooms was issued by the Purchasing Department in January, 2017; and

WHEREAS, the RFP evaluation team reviewed and evaluated responses from four vendors; and

WHEREAS, TEL Systems (Thalner Electronics, Inc.) had the lowest bid per courtroom while meeting all of the requirements set forth in the RFP; proposed ideas to save the court money; has experience with installing courtroom technology along with positive references from past customers to support their qualifications; and has been the provider of the court’s courtroom technology maintenance for at least 14 years during which they provided the court with timely and effective service; and

WHEREAS, the RFP evaluation team recommended in the attached April 25, 2017 evaluation and explanation memo addressed to the Purchasing Director that TEL Systems be awarded the right to proceed with the project to provide a turnkey solution for the design, purchase, installation, and support of new state-of-the-art audio/video system upgrades for the Probate Court courtrooms of the Veterans Memorial Courthouse at a cost not to exceed $95,225 per courtroom.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby approves entering into a contract and service agreement with TEL Systems for a turnkey solution for the design, purchase, installation, and support of new state-of-the-art audio/video system upgrade for one of the two Probate Court courtrooms in the Veterans Memorial Courthouse in 2018 at a cost not to exceed $95,225.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the additional up to $15,225 needed for this project will be funded from the Equipment Revolving Fund.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Controller/Administrator is authorized to make the necessary budget adjustments to the 2018 budget.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that 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.
TO:        Board of Commissioners Law and Courts Committee & Finance Committees
FROM:     Lance Langdon, 9-1-1 Director
DATE:     October 24, 2017
SUBJECT:  9-1-1 Center Recruiting Advertising Proposal
For the meeting agenda of November 2, 2017 & November 8, 2017

BACKGROUND
With the all-time high of open positions in the center, we have looked at additional ways to advertise the jobs to the public where we can bring in more applicants to our hiring process. In reaching out to businesses that do the outdoor advertising, Adams Outdoor provided a 2 phased approach to getting the job out to the public through billboards and online/mobile posting. The center has been active with job fairs and recruiting events but feels that this will give greater exposure to the jobs and recruit more potential employees.

ALTERNATIVES
If we continue with the current recruiting activities we will see the hiring process continue and the center struggling to fill positions quickly with qualified employees. This continues to provide extra burden on staff who work a great amount of overtime to maintain coverage.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
This project would be from 9-1-1 Fund balance and have no effect on the county’s general fund.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
With the time it takes to train staff at the 9-1-1 Center we must make every effort to get people/applicants interested in and to apply for these jobs. This is one of the efforts that will be proposed to increase awareness and find people interested in being a part of our 9-1-1 system.

RECOMMENDATION
Based on the information presented, I respectfully recommend approval of the attached resolution to enter into a contract with Adams Outdoor to advertise/recruit new employees.
The Purchasing Department can confirm bids were sought from qualified and experienced vendors to provide billboard advertising.

The following grid is a summary of the vendors’ costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VENDOR</th>
<th>Outfront Media</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Adams Outdoor Advertising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL PREF.</td>
<td>No, Grand Rapids, MI</td>
<td>No, Saginaw-Port Huron MI</td>
<td>No, Lansing, Clinton County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF BILLBOARDS</td>
<td>7 (1 is free) includes mobile</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8 Digital Billboards on Rotation with 1/2 shares + online/mobile targeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COST - 4 WEEKS</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COST - 3 MONTHS</td>
<td>$36,000.00</td>
<td>$14,100.00</td>
<td>Phase 1, $15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTERNATE</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Phase 2, additional 3 Months $16,625.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You are now ready to complete the final steps in the process: 1) confirm funds are available; 2) submit your recommendation of award along with your evaluation to the Purchasing Department; 3) write a memo of explanation; and, 4) prepare a resolution for Board approval.

This Memorandum is to be included with your memo and resolution submission to the Resolutions Group as acknowledgement of the Purchasing Department’s participation in the purchasing process.

If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me by e-mail at jhudgins@ingham.org or by phone at 676-7309.
Introduced by the Law & Courts and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE A CONTRACT WITH ADAMS OUTDOOR TO PROVIDE RECRUITMENT ADVERTISING FOR THE INGHAM COUNTY 9-1-1 CENTRAL DISPATCH CENTER

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners operates the 9-1-1 Emergency Telephone Dispatch System through the Ingham County 9-1-1 Central Dispatch Center; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County 9-1-1 Central Dispatch Center is in great need to find good applicants to fill fifteen currently open positions; and

WHEREAS, the current processes with job fairs, job boards, and other outreach through the Center’s Facebook pages have not provided the needed pool of applicants to fill the positions; and

WHEREAS, the 9-1-1 Director has recommended the use of Billboards and online advertising to further reach out to potential applicants; and

WHEREAS, the 9-1-1 Director recommends using Adams Outdoor to advertise on billboards and Outdoor Extended - online to reach out to the public to promote employment with the 9-1-1 Center; and

WHEREAS, Adams Outdoor has recommended a 2 phased approach to advertise the centers hiring; Phase 1 for three months of digital billboards and online advertising at a cost of $15,000.00, and an optional Phase 2 with 7 traditional billboards for three months at a cost of $16,625.00.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes a contract not to exceed $31,625.00 with Adams Outdoor for recruitment advertising for Phase 1 for electronic billboards and the online Outdoor Extended program, and optional Phase 2 for traditional poster billboards if needed.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes an appropriation of up to $31,625.00 from 9-1-1 Fund balance for the total cost of this Advertising Contract.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Controller/Administrator is authorized to make the necessary budget adjustments to the 2017 and 2018 budgets.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Ingham County Board of Commissioners is authorized to sign the contract with Adams Outdoor consistent with this resolution and approved as to form by the County Attorney.
TO: Board of Commissioners Law and Courts & Finance Committees
FROM: Lance Langdon, 9-1-1 Director
DATE: October 24, 2017
SUBJECT: 9-1-1 Radio System UPS Service-Battery Replacement
For the meeting agenda of November 2, 2017 & November 8, 2017

BACKGROUND
With our aging radio system, the UPS units that are at each tower site have started to fail and are in need of service. Batteries were approved in our CIP budget, but the units also need to have preventive maintenance completed in addition to the replacement of the batteries. PM Technologies, who does our generator maintenance at these same tower sites, is being recommended.

ALTERNATIVES
If we do not move forward with this project the sites will start to fail and not provide the needed radio coverage to the police, fire, and ambulance services in the county.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
This project would be from the current 9-1-1 budget and have no effect on the county’s general fund.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
We have had some battery failure which has been addressed by the Radio System Admin, but a full maintenance and battery replacement is needed at this time.

RECOMMENDATION
Based on the information presented, I respectfully recommend approval of the attached resolution to enter into a contract with PM Technologies for the maintenance and equipment.
The Purchasing Department can confirm bids were sought from qualified and experienced vendors to contract for the maintenance of twelve (12) public safety radio communication tower sites including the uninterrupted power supply units and replacement of batteries.

The following grid is a summary of the vendors’ costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Local Pref.</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM Technologies</td>
<td>No, Wixom MI</td>
<td>$22,186.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationwide Power</td>
<td>No, Nevada</td>
<td>$25,439.75 + Freight to sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennium UPS</td>
<td>No, California</td>
<td>$26,503.00 when modules become available to vendor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You are now ready to complete the final steps in the process: 1) confirm funds are available; 2) submit your recommendation of award along with your evaluation to the Purchasing Department; 3) write a memo of explanation; and, 4) prepare a resolution for Board approval.

This Memorandum is to be included with your memo and resolution submission to the Resolutions Group as acknowledgement of the Purchasing Department’s participation in the purchasing process.

If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me by e-mail at jhudgins@ingham.org or by phone at 676-7309.
Introduced by the Law & Courts and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE A CONTRACT WITH PM TECHNOLOGIES FOR MAINTENANCE OF 9-1-1 PUBLIC SAFETY RADIO COMMUNICATIONS TOWER SITES, UNINTERRUPTED POWER SUPPLY UNITS, AND REPLACEMENT OF BATTERIES

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners operates a 9-1-1 Public Safety Radio Communication System used by all Ingham County Public Safety Agencies; and

WHEREAS, the system uses UPS Uninterrupted Power Units at each tower site that require the batteries in these units to be replaced due to age and failures; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners has approved $20,000.00 in the 9-1-1 Centers capital improvement budget for the replacement of the UPS batteries; and

WHEREAS, the 9-1-1 Radio System Administrator and 9-1-1 Director recommend that the UPS units also have preventive maintenance and service, in addition to the battery replacements; and

WHEREAS, 9-1-1 staff have obtained bids for this work and equipment, which require an additional $2,186.10 for costs associated to the preventive maintenance; and

WHEREAS, PM Technologies has been recommended to perform the work and supply the battery/equipment needed for the UPS units; and

WHEREAS, the 9-1-1 Center has identified the $2,186.10 in the current operating budget to cover the additional costs not approved in the budgeted CIP project.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes a contract with PM Technologies and the expenditure not to exceed $22,186.10 from the 9-1-1 Center budget to purchase preventative maintenance and batteries/equipment for the tower site UPS units.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Ingham County Board of Commissioners is authorized to sign any necessary contract/Purchase Order documents consistent with this resolution and approved as to form by the County Attorney.
TO:        Law & Courts Committees and Finance Committees
FROM:     Teri Morton, Deputy Controller
DATE:     October 27, 2017
SUBJECT: Resolution to Accept a Consolidated Plan to Meet the Michigan Indigent Defense Commission (MIDC) Minimum Standards and to Create a New Fund within the Chart of Accounts for Purposes of Accepting Grant Funds from the MIDC

For the meeting agendas of November 2 and November 8

BACKGROUND
The Michigan Indigent Defense Commission (MIDC) was created by the Indigent Defense Commission Act in 2013 after an advisory commission recommended improvements to the State of Michigan’s indigent defense system. The Indigent Defense Commission Act requires that the Indigent Defense Commission meets state constitutional obligations and maintains independence from the judiciary while continuing its work to maintain a fair indigent criminal defense system in Michigan. The following minimum standards have been adopted:

- Education and Training of Defense Counsel
- Initial Interview
- Investigation and Experts
- Counsel at First Appearance and Other Critical Stages

The Board appointed the Ingham County Indigent Defense System Collaborative Committee (“Committee”) to develop and submit a plan that meets these first four minimum standards. The Committee has recommended the transition to a Public Defender Office and has developed a plan and cost analysis as required by the MIDC. The Public Defender Office will be a consolidated effort among the four courts (30th Circuit, 54A District, 54B District, and 55th District) and the three funding units (Ingham County, City of East Lansing, and City of Lansing). The proposed office will employ a Chief Public Defender, 26 Attorneys, and 9.5 additional full-time equivalents.

Letters of support from the cities of East Lansing and Lansing are included in this packet.

ALTERNATIVES
The Committee considered alternatives to the Public Defender model, including the continuation of the current contract system and a hybrid system. It was determined that the Public Defender model would the best way for Ingham County, the City of East Lansing, and the City of Lansing to meet the minimum standards adopted by the MIDC.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
The first year grant request is for $4,679,370. This represents a total implementation and operation cost of $5,581,391 less the Local Share calculation of $902,021. The funding units will need to continue to appropriate the local share amounts, which break down as follows; Ingham County, $864,414, City of East Lansing $16,094, and City of Lansing $21,513.
OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
The plan must be implemented within 180 days after funding is appropriated by the MIDC. However, there is no requirement to implement the plan until funding is provided.

This resolution will also create a new fund within the County’s chart of accounts to record all revenues and expenditures related to the MIDC compliance plan for indigent defense.

RECOMMENDATION
Based on the information presented, I respectfully recommend approval of the attached resolution and compliance plan.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Ingham County Indigent Defense Collaborative Committee

FROM: George Lahanas, City Manager

CC: Honorable Andrea Larkin, Nicole Evans, J.D.

DATE: September 20, 2017

SUBJECT: Michigan Indigent Defense Commission Compliance Plan

In order to meet LARA’s standards for indigent criminal defense systems, the City of East Lansing needs to develop a compliance plan for the Michigan Indigent Defense Commission. As the funding unit to the 54-B District Court, the City of East Lansing supports a collaboration with the County to establish an office of the public defender.

The City of East Lansing is willing to commit toward the required local share of the program. This would not only provide the least financial burden for both the 54-B District Court and its funding unit, but would also provide benefits for those that the program is serving. Local share funding is a much more realistic approach to serving those in need than creating our own public defender office and ensures a higher standard for defense than other options.

Those who will be best served by this program are offenders who appear in multiple courts, usually within the same county. The compliance plan would reduce confusion and duplication issues by providing continuity. We would benefit from increased stability and efficiency of the system as well as reduced incarceration levels.
October 13, 2017

Ingham County Board of Commissioners
Ingham County Court House
P.O. Box 319
Mason, Michigan 48854

Re: Indigent Defense Collaborative Committee

Dear Board of Commissioners:

The City of Lansing City Council strongly supports 54-A District Court’s participation on Ingham County’s Indigent Defense Collaborative Committee. It is our understanding that the Committee’s compliance plan will include the creation of a county-wide public defender’s office to provide indigent defense services. The City of Lansing City Council similarly supports the creation of a public defender’s office should that be the Committee’s recommendation.

Please do not hesitate to contact our offices if you need anything additional from us.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Patricia Spitzley
City of Lansing City Council President
Agenda Item 10

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

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO ACCEPT A CONSOLIDATED PLAN TO MEET THE MICHIGAN INDIGENT DEFENSE COMMISSION (MIDC) MINIMUM STANDARDS AND TO CREATE A NEW FUND WITHIN THE CHART OF ACCOUNTS FOR PURPOSES OF ACCEPTING GRANT FUNDS FROM THE MIDC

WHEREAS, the United States Constitution and the Michigan Constitution, provide that people charged with criminal offenses are entitled to the right to have an attorney represent them in court proceedings; and

WHEREAS, the judicial system recognizes that a person without the ability to pay for an attorney or other legal services (such as investigators or expert witnesses) has the same rights of legal representation in the court system as a person who can afford to pay for an attorney or other legal services; and

WHEREAS, the Michigan Indigent Defense Commission (MIDC) was created by the Indigent Defense Commission Act, Mich. Comp. Laws 780.981 et seq, in 2013 after an advisory commission recommended improvements to the state’s indigent defense system; and

WHEREAS, the MIDC’s mission is to develop and oversee the implementation, enforcement, and modification of minimum standards, rules, and procedures to ensure that criminal defense services are delivered to indigent adults consistent with the safeguards of the United States constitution, the Michigan constitution of 1963, and with the Indigent Defense Commission Act; and

WHEREAS, the Indigent Defense Commission Act requires that the Indigent Defense Commission meets state constitutional obligations and maintains independence from the judiciary while continuing its work to maintain a fair indigent criminal defense system in Michigan; and

WHEREAS, the following minimum standards have been adopted that apply to the following aspects of indigent defense:

- Education and Training of Defense Counsel;
- Initial Interview;
- Investigation and Experts; and
- Counsel at First Appearance and Other Critical Stages; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners through Resolutions 17-075 and 17-250 appointed the Ingham County Indigent Defense System Collaborative Committee (“Committee”) to develop and submit a plan that meets the first four minimum statutory standards and a cost analysis to the MIDC; and

WHEREAS, the Committee has recommended the transition to a Public Defender Office in order to comply with the minimum standards; and

WHEREAS, the Committee has developed a plan and cost analysis as required by the MIDC; and
WHEREAS, the three local funding units within Ingham County (Ingham County, the City of East Lansing and the City of Lansing) have agreed to submit a consolidated plan; and

WHEREAS, plan implementation is not required until funding is provided by the State; and

WHEREAS, the MIDC is receiving grant applications to fund court-appointed attorney and related legal services from local court funding units to provide funding by the State of Michigan ("State") to the local court funding units beginning October 1, 2018; and

WHEREAS, a new fund within the chart of accounts will accept all funds from the State through MIDC grants and will charge all MIDC related costs to this fund; and

WHEREAS, the MIDC recommends any fund balance and the end of the County’s fiscal year should remain in the newly created fund and not revert to the County’s general fund so that funds are used exclusively for court-appointed attorneys and related legal services; and

WHEREAS, the MIDC recommends any fund balance at the end of the County’s fiscal year shall remain in the fund to carryover to the next year to be used for future compliance expenditures.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners accepts the compliance plan created by the Ingham County Indigent Defense Collaborative Committee, as presented in the attached document.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the recommended Public Defender Office included in this plan will be administered by Ingham County to provide indigent defense and related services at the 30th Circuit Court, 54A District Court, 54B District Court, and the 55th District Court.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this plan will be submitted on our before November 20, 2017, as required by the MIDC.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that within 180 days after receiving funds from the MIDC, Ingham County shall comply with the terms of the grant in bringing its system into compliance with the minimum standards established by the MIDC for effective assistance of counsel.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that, upon plan approval and funding by the MIDC, approval for any new positions, equipment and building needs and budget amendments will be brought before the Ingham County Board of Commissioners and subject to all county budget, human resources, purchasing and other applicable administrative policies of Ingham County.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a separate fund within the local chart of accounts shall be created to accept all funds from the State through MIDC grants and to charge all MIDC related costs to this fund.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that all funds received through the MIDC grant will be placed in this fund and all MIDC related costs shall be charged to this fund; any fund balance at the end of the County’s fiscal year will remaining in the fund and carryover to the next year to be used for future compliance expenditures.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Ingham County Board of Commissioners is hereby authorized to sign any necessary grant applications and contract documents, on behalf of the County, after approved as to form by the County Attorney.
COMPLIANCE PLAN NARRATIVE

Briefly describe the indigent defense delivery system(s) – contract, assigned counsel, or public defender – that the funding unit(s), for which this application is being considered, employed to deliver services before the MIDC Act took effect (July 1, 2013).

The current indigent defense delivery system is a contract system administered separately by each court. The Circuit Court is responsible for all appointments on felony cases at the District Court level.

Generally, how does the system(s) intend to comply with the MIDC standards 1-4? Please address whether you will continue with the model in place above, whether you have already made a transition to a new delivery system, or whether you intend to transition to a new delivery system.

Ingham County is proposing to transition to a public defender delivery system to comply with the approved standards. The Public Defender Office will be a consolidated effort among the four courts (30th Circuit, 54A District, 54B District, and 55th District) and the three funding units (Ingham County, City of East Lansing and City of Lansing). The proposed office will employ a Chief Public Defender, 26 Attorneys, and 9.5 additional full-time equivalents.

The number of attorneys needed was established as follows:

For misdemeanor indigent defense, the calculation was 2,974 total caseload from all 3 district courts in the county, divided by 400 (ACOCD recommended caseloads annually), resulting in 7 attorneys. However, the 2,974 number did not include the misdemeanor PV cases or first appearance requirement. We added 3 attorney positions for a total of 10 to account for first appearance in all three district courts (365 days a year) and the additional PV numbers related by each court.

As to the felony recommendation, the number of cases for 2016 for Ingham County was 2,171 felony appointments and the three year average was 2,051. Because of the current appointment scheme, there is no data on number of cases that would result in a conflict attorney being appointed. The breakdown in case type for 2016 was 1,308 C list (or 25.15 per week), 679 for B list (13.06 per week) and 184 for A list (or 3.54 per week). Using the 150 caseload maximum per year, divided by cases per week, nine lawyers would be needed for C level, 7 for B level and 2 for A level. Of course depending on the caseload in any one week or month, these attorneys may be used in multiple categories. This staffing level does not include vacations, sick time, vacancies etc. This calculation would reflect the funding status for 18 felony level lawyers, however the equivalent of two lawyer positions would be used to create the funding pool for the appointment list of lawyers for conflict cases.

Indigent defense services are also needed for the many specialty courts that are active in Ingham County at both the District and Circuit Court levels.

Consistent indigent defense representation is necessary at team review sessions and potential probation violation hearings.

After determining the need for 26 attorneys, support staff was modeled on the current allocation per attorney at the Ingham County Prosecutor’s Office.
Please identify the name and position held (e.g., county administrator, judge, defense attorney, etc.) for each person involved in the compliance planning process for this delivery system.

Honorable Louise Alderson, Chief Judge, 54A District Court
Honorable Thomas P. Boyd, Judge, 55th District Court
Anethia O. Brewer, 54A District Court Administrator
Honorable Stacia Buchanan, Judge, 54A District Court
Ashley Carter, Regional Administrator, MIDC
Mary Chartier, Ingham County Bar Association
Bryan Crenshaw, Ingham County Commissioner
Michael J. Dillon, 55th District Court Administrator
Honorable Joyce Draganchuk, Judge, 30th Circuit Court
Shauna Dunnings, 30th Circuit Court Administrator
Nicole Evans, 54B District Court Administrator
Kara Hope, Chairperson, Ingham County Law and Courts Committee
Mary K. Kelly, Deputy Court Administrator, 54A District Court
Carol Koenig, Ingham County Commissioner
Honorable Andrea Andrews Larkin, Chief Judge, 54B District Court
Teri Morton, Ingham County Deputy Controller
Carol Siemon, Ingham County Prosecutor
Kristen Staley, Policy Associate, MIDC
Christopher Wickman, Ingham County Bar Association

Provide an attachment with the names, license or P#’s, and years of criminal defense experience for all attorneys the funding units(s) intends to have deliver services as part of the local indigent defense system.

Ingham County plans to hire 26 attorneys for a new public defender office, so does not yet know the names, license or P#’s or years of experience for these attorneys.
Standard 1 – Training and Education

Attorneys with fewer than two years of experience practicing criminal defense in Michigan shall participate in one basic skills acquisition class. Do any of the attorneys included in this plan have fewer than the required experience and require this training? How many?

*It is unknown how many attorneys will have fewer than 2 years of experience, but those who do will participate in a skills training, such as the Hillman Advocacy Program or the Criminal Defense Attorneys of Michigan Trial College.*

*These programs are on-your-feet programs.*

*Hillman is a training program that takes place in the federal courthouse in Grand Rapids and is focused on trial skills. Hillman takes place in January and $750 will cover the cost of the program, lodging, and food.*

*Trial College takes participants through planning and presenting a case to a jury. Trial College occurs in August and $750 will cover the cost of the program, lodging, and food.*

All attorneys shall annually complete at least 12 hours of continuing legal education. How many attorneys require training in this plan?

*All attorneys in the plan require this training.*

*In conjunction with the Ingham County Bar Association’s Criminal Defense Section, the Defender’s Office will participate in monthly training sessions. These monthly sessions will consist of subject matter trainings and skills trainings. Subject matter trainings will consist of topics, such as ballistics, DNA, and fingerprints. Skills trainings will consist of topics, such as handling motions, preliminary examinations, pleas, and sentencings.*

*For attorneys who do not attend the Hillman Program or Trial College, attorneys will choose from an array of training programs, such as those offered by the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers and CDAM’s in-state conferences.*

*NACDL and CDAM’s conferences occur throughout the year.*

*The Defender’s Office will also participate in roundtable discussions – both in the office and through the local criminal defense group – to facilitate strategizing and learning with fellow colleagues.*

*$750 will cover the costs of training for each attorney.*

How will the funding unit(s) ensure that the attorneys satisfy the 12 hours of continuing legal education during the plan year?

*Attorneys will maintain documentation of their continuing legal education, and this will be made available upon request.*
Standard 2 – Initial Interview
When a client is in local custody, counsel shall conduct an initial client intake interview within three business days after appointment. When a client is not in custody, counsel shall promptly deliver an introductory communication so that the client may follow-up and schedule a meeting. To be successful, this requires immediate notification of appointment and client contact information.

How does the plan facilitate immediate attorney assignment and notification of new cases? How will the system ensure attorneys are completing their interviews within three business days? How will the initial interview be accomplished?

As described in greater detail in Standard 4, for misdemeanor and felony cases where retained counsel is not present, the public defender’s office will represent the defendants at arraignment under a limited appearance. These individuals will collect information from the defendant including updated contact information and information relevant to the setting of a bond. If court administration determines that the individual qualifies for representation by the public defender’s office, assignment of the public defender’s office or a conflict attorney will occur immediately. Attorneys will be assigned at the discretion of the office policy reflecting the severity of the case (misdemeanor, low-severity felony, high-severity felony, or capital felony) and the judge and court dates currently assigned with attention towards meeting, but not exceeding, the maximum case load guidelines of public defenders (150 felonies or 400 misdemeanors per year) set out by the American Bar Association. Assignments would be for vertical representation throughout the court process.

The public defender’s office will have an expectation that the attorney assigned the matter will meet with in-custody clients within the prescribed time frame. With regards to out-of-custody clients, immediate contact will be made to have the defendant come in to meet with their assigned attorney as far in advance of their first court date as practicable. At either meeting, a standard information form will be completed and the information will be entered into the public defender’s office’s internal shared computer system. Regular checks will occur to ensure that all employees are meeting the requirements of timely meeting.

The initial interview will take place in lock-up or at the public defender’s office with the attorney who will handle the file throughout all stages of the case. This initial interview will happen at a date and time as soon as practicable to allow for a full-investigation and competent representation at the early stages of the case.

This standard further requires a confidential setting be provided for all client interviews. Does the jail have confidential space for attorney-client interviews? Describe the space available for the interviews or the plan to provide confidential space.

The only county jail in the county is the Ingham County Jail located at 700 Buhl Street, Mason, Michigan. For posts 1 through 9, there is one private attorney room to meet with clients. For post 10, there is a room that can be made private by closing doors, but may have individuals walking through as needed. For each area identified as a private attorney room, there is a closed-door room with cement block walls, two to three chairs, and a table. The room is monitored visually, but is not audio-recorded or monitored. There are working power outlets to facilitate use of technology to assist in meeting with clients. The rooms are rated as being sufficient in conditions to allow for confidential space for an attorney-client interview.
In an informal survey of the defense bar, the Ingham County Jail was rated as insufficient in quantity of rooms largely due to rules at the jail related to attorney visits. Attorneys are only permitted to visit at limited hours, are required to request and receive permission 24 hours in advance to be able to bring a laptop or other technology, are not allowed to see clients at a different post than the individual is currently assigned, and are not allowed to bring a briefcase or bag into the jail to visit clients among other concerns. This leads to a delay in being able to visit with clients, if at all, on a given date and affects the ability to establish and maintain an attorney-client relationship. It is believed that such can be remedied by changes to policy by the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office without significant or any financial expenditure in order to meet the requirements of Standard 2.

Does the courthouse have confidential space for attorney-client interviews? Describe the space available for the interviews or the plan to provide confidential space.

Ingham County has three district courts and two circuit courts. For each courthouse, a portion of the local defense bar, primarily composed of court-appointed attorneys, was informally polled regarding the sufficiency in conditions and quantity of in-custody, out-of-custody, and teleconference facilities. After the assessment of each court was compiled, court administration for each court was contacted to discuss potential remedies to address any shortcomings. Find a summary of each facility’s current space available, the assessment for such, the modifications proposed to bring the courthouse into compliance with Standard 2, and the basis of costs for such.

54-A District Court
The 54-A District Court’s sixth floor was recently renovated and provided multiple private meeting areas for out-of-custody clients. Each room has a table and multiple chairs to meet with clients in a private and secure location. Although these rooms are sometimes used by non-attorneys, one room is only for attorneys and their clients. The out-of-custody confidential spaces were rated as sufficient in conditions and sufficient in quantity so as to meet Standard 2.

The Lansing Police Department lockup on the third floor of the 54-A District Court is used as lock-up for the courthouse to meet with in-custody clients. There are two fully private meeting rooms complete with chairs and a table surface that are video-monitored, but are not auditorily-monitored or recorded. In addition, there is a non-private room and a phone on which to share non-confidential information with defendants. These areas are not sufficient for meeting and discussing the case with clients, but allow the attorney to share non-confidential information with the client in a time-efficient way. There are concerns that policies of the Lansing Police Department and/or 54-A District Court are trending in such a way that the right to counsel and the expectations of Standard 2 could be affected. At this time, the Lansing Police Department is representing that the currently-used areas are a security concern and should not be used any longer for meetings with in-custody clients. To maintain security of the police department, the two rooms currently used for private meetings would be outfitted with audio and video conferencing to two other rooms near the courtrooms that would provide a sufficient environment for confidential client discussions. The department received a quote of $6,000.00 to purchase and install the audio-visual equipment for these two rooms.
The private room for attorneys and their clients only also has teleconference capabilities for meeting with clients who are in-custody in the Michigan Department of Corrections and that have not been transported for the day’s proceedings. The teleconference confidential spaces were rated as sufficient in conditions and sufficient in quantity so as to meet Standard 2.

54-B District Court
There are currently only a total of three private rooms to meet with out-of-custody clients at the 54-B District Court. Two of these rooms are usually occupied by the city attorney/municipal attorneys and the prosecutor’s office. The remaining one room is often in use or it is requested that defense counsel refrain from using such. The one room is rated as sufficient in conditions, but is insufficient in quantity to meet Standard 2. In speaking with court administration, it was agreed that the room next to the currently available room will be reclaimed for these purposes. Improvements would also be made to the existing rooms. The court received a quote of $23,200 to reclaim and update out-of-custody conference rooms.

For visiting in-custody clients, there is one room to meet with your client in a private area through glass and a vent. There is a door to the holding area that can and should be closed to ensure privacy. Furthermore, there are multiple private rooms between holding and the courtrooms that court administration has agreed to allow defense attorneys to meet with their in-custody clients in these rooms. There are no costs associated with allowing such use. With the changes agreed upon, the in-custody confidential spaces are sufficient in conditions and quantity so as to meet Standard 2.

The 54-B District Court courtrooms and holding facility currently has teleconference access. Polycom is currently not available in a private and confidential setting. This is insufficient in quality and conditions to meet Standard 2 requirements. The Court requests funding to provide Polycom/teleconference capabilities to all four conference rooms that can or will be used by defense attorneys. The cost for each unit is $3,819.95 for each unit for a total of $15,279.80.

55th District Court
There is one private meeting room to meet out-of-custody clients in. This room is directly next to, and smaller than, the room that prosecutor witnesses and police officers are currently located when awaiting their matter being heard. This room is also directly across from the prosecutor’s office in the courthouse. The room is not sufficiently soundproofed to permit confidential conversations to occur in such proximity to the other accommodations. Furthermore, since the 55th District Court employs, and continues to employ, the important first appearance project, this private room for the defense is usually taken by the attorneys responsible for representation on arraignments and misdemeanors leaving next to no private meeting areas to meet with out-of-custody clients in a confidential setting. The current accommodations for meeting with out-of-custody clients are insufficient in quantity and conditions. There is no area inside the current courthouse that can be repurposed to meet Standard 2. Upon facilities review by court administration, the 55th District Court requests funding in the amount of $75,000 to add three 10 foot by 10 foot meeting rooms to the courthouse at a rate of $250.00 per square foot. The Court also requests $2,400 for furnishing these new rooms with one table and five chairs per room at a cost of $800 per room.
For meeting with **in-custody** clients, there is currently two seats and a table area. Other individuals may stand to meet with a client in the same room. While meeting with clients, other defendants will frequently watch the attorney speak with their client and other individuals may be present in the room. These accommodations are rated as insufficient in both quality and conditions to meet Standard 2 requirements. In speaking with court administration, there was only one option for renovation that would not require extensive addition to the courthouse. It was decided that the current court administrator’s office, bordering current in-custody facilities, could be remodeled and renovated into three private meeting areas for meeting with in-custody clients. The current library would have to be renovated to serve as his new office. The 55th District Court requests funding in the amount of $90,000.00 to accomplish these renovations.

Currently, meeting with Michigan Department of Corrections clients via **teleconference** is accomplished by clearing one courtroom and having the defense attorney share information with the client in that courtroom. The courtroom is monitored and individuals may walk in and out of the courtroom still. This accommodation is neither sufficient in conditions or quantity to satisfy the requirements of Standard 2. In speaking with court administration, it is believed that teleconference/Polycom capabilities may be added to each of the new meeting rooms. The Court requests funding in the amount of $11,459.85 at a rate of $3,819.95 per Polycom unit.

**30th Circuit Court**
There are two locations of the 30th Circuit Court. One courthouse is located in Mason and the other is located in Lansing. The courtrooms will be discussed independently.

**Lansing**
There are many private meeting rooms on the 3rd and 2R floors for meeting with **out-of-custody** clients. These rooms are private and numerous and have sufficient chairs and tables. These accommodations are sufficient in conditions and quantity to meet the requirements of Standard 2.

For meeting with **in-custody** clients, there are four meeting rooms that are outfitted with cement block walls and telephones to facilitate communication from one side of the glass to the other. These areas are not video or audially monitored or recorded. These facilities do not allow the client to sign paperwork, but such may be accomplished in the courtroom itself. While not fully soundproof, these accommodations are sufficient in conditions and quantity to meet the requirements of Standard 2.

There is one private meeting area to meet with MDOC clients via **teleconference**. This room is not video or audially monitored or recorded. These accommodations are sufficient in conditions and quantity to meet the requirements of Standard 2.

**Mason**
There are two large private meeting rooms to meet with **out-of-custody** clients near the courtroom. There are also many unoccupied offices and other areas in which to meet with clients. Because the building is a historic building, renovations and additions to the building are quite limited. These accommodations are sufficient in conditions and quantity to meet the requirements of Standard 2.
Currently, there is one small lock-up area attached to the courtroom in which all attorneys are to meet with their in-custody clients. This area frequently will have more than one attorney-client pair present in the same area and may include a deputy. These conditions are not sufficient in conditions or quantity. In speaking with court administration, adjoining this area there is currently one room that is currently used for storage. If a filing cabinet for storage is added, in addition to a table and chairs, it can and will be repurposed to provide a private meeting room to meet with in-custody clients. The Court requests funds in the amount of $1,400.00 for the filing cabinet in addition to $500.00 for the table and chairs for the room.

There are currently no teleconference options for meeting with defendants currently incarcerated with the MDOC in a confidential manner. The Court requests funds in the amount of $3,819.95 for one Polycom unit to be added to a private meeting room. Due to the building’s historic status, there may be difficulties in providing a sufficient location where such may be wired in.
Standard 3 – Experts and Investigators

This standard requires counsel to conduct an independent investigation. When appropriate, counsel shall request funds to retain an investigator to assist with the client’s defense. Counsel shall request the assistance of experts where it is reasonably necessary to prepare the defense and rebut the prosecution’s case. Counsel has a continuing duty to evaluate a case for appropriate defense investigations or expert assistance.

How will this standard be complied with by the delivery system?

INVESTIGATORS

The public defender’s office will hire two full-time investigators for indigent defense clients. The public defender will also contract with outside investigators for conflict cases for up to 275 hours per year.

Outside investigators will be paid an hourly rate not to exceed $75.

EXPERT WITNESSES

The public defender will retain expert witness as needed. The expenses incurred for expert witnesses will be paid at the hourly rates published by the MIDC. Expert witnesses will be compensated according to a tiered level of compensation based on education level and type of expert, not to exceed these amounts:

- High School or Equivalent $30/hr.
- Associate’s Degree $50/hr.
- Bachelor’s Degree $70/hr.
- Master’s Degree $85/hr.
- Crime Scene and Related Experts $100/hr.
- CPA/Financial Expert $100/hr.
- Pharmacy/PharmD. $125/hr.
- Information Technology Experts $150/hr.
- Ph.D./Licensed Doctor $200/hr.

COST

The public defender’s office will establish budget line items for outside investigators and expert witnesses. The capped amount of funds for outside investigators and expert witnesses in Ingham County is $50,000.

BUDGET FOR EXPERTS AND INVESTIGATORS:

| (2) Full Time Investigators Positions | $57,164/yr. each + fringe benefits |
| Expert Witness | $30,000 |
| Outside Investigators | $20,000 |
Standard 4 – Counsel At First Appearance and Other Critical Stages of the Case
Counsel shall be appointed to provide assistance to the defendant as soon as the defendant’s liberty is subject to restriction by a magistrate or judge. All persons determined to be eligible for indigent criminal defense services shall also have appointed counsel at pre-trial proceedings, during plea negotiations and at other critical stages, whether in court or out of court. How will this standard be complied with by the delivery system?

Counsel at First Appearance
Ingham County piloted counsel at first appearance (with Kent County) and continues to provide counsel at arraignment in the county funded court (D55). To meet MIDC Standard 4, we will continue to provide this representation in each district court as it is currently provided in D55. The Public Defender Office (PD) will provide an appropriate attorney at all hours the district courts are open for business. PD will work with district courts to assure representation at both in-custody and walk-in arraignments. Representation will be a limited appointment for the purposes of arraignment only. PD arraignment counsel will be made available to all defendants appearing for arraignment without counsel. Assignment of counsel for the balance of each case will be made as described below. There is no guarantee to counsel for the rest of the case.

Appointment of Counsel
The courts will continue to determine eligibility. This will be done based on written application and utilizing the eligibility criteria set out in the MIDC Act (see MCL 780.991(3)(b) below). Misdemeanor cases: Application will be made to and reviewed by the arraigning judge or magistrate who will make the initial eligibility determination. Felony cases: Application will be made to and reviewed by C30 Pretrial Services Division who will make the initial eligibility determination. Each district court currently appoints counsel and assesses contribution to partially indigent defendants pursuant to MCR 6.005(C). This practice will continue. The district courts will coordinate to assure consistency in such eligibility and amount of contribution. Determination of eligibility will be forwarded to the PD. PD will assign counsel or initiate conflict panel process for private bar assignment as appropriate. Eligibility determination can be revisited at any time subsequent at the request of a party or at the initiation of the court.

Other Critical Stages
It is well settled law that an indigent defendant is entitled to representation at every critical stage of a criminal proceeding. The Ingham County compliance plan will assure assignment by PD or conflict panel promptly after arraignment. This attorney will represent the defendant at each future court appearance (vertical representation) consistent with MCL 780.991(2)(d).
COST ANALYSIS

Note: all cost included in this analysis are new as a result of the compliance plan.

### Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title</th>
<th>2018 Salary</th>
<th>Full Time Equivalent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Public Defender</td>
<td>124,968</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>124,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Attorney</td>
<td>48,393</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>145,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 Attorney</td>
<td>52,793</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>158,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3 Attorney</td>
<td>57,493</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>172,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4 Attorney</td>
<td>62,768</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>188,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5 Attorney</td>
<td>67,502</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>202,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6 Attorney</td>
<td>72,473</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>217,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 7 Attorney</td>
<td>79,836</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>239,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 8 Attorney</td>
<td>87,004</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>261,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 9 Attorney</td>
<td>90,488</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>180,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Administrator</td>
<td>74,697</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>74,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>45,990</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>45,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralegal/Legal Secretary</td>
<td>49,014</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>98,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Liaison</td>
<td>57,170</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>57,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>38,573</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>77,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Clerk</td>
<td>19,287</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>19,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>57,164</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>114,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Salaries</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>2,377,376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fringe Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fringe Benefit</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>11,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer FICA</td>
<td>7.65%</td>
<td>181,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Insurance</td>
<td>22.82%</td>
<td>542,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Insurance</td>
<td>1.43%</td>
<td>34,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision Insurance</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>4,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Retiree Health Insurance</td>
<td>5.36%</td>
<td>127,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Retiree Health Insurance</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>106,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Insurance</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td>4,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Insurance</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>3,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>23.88%</td>
<td>567,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers Compensation</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>1,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Assistance Program</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>1,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation Buyout</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>29,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,616,658</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Operating Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Computation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>$750 per attorney (including Chief PD), 27 x $750</td>
<td>20,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Witnesses</td>
<td>$30-200 per hour for estimated 260 hours (See Standard 3 Narrative for detailed compensation rates)</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Investigators</td>
<td>Estimated rate of $75 per hour for up to 275 hours</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Attorney Costs</td>
<td>Estimated Rate of $85 per hour for 2,700 hours</td>
<td>230,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Rental</td>
<td>Office space in Downtown Lansing. 9,000 square feet at $25 per square foot. Includes utilities, janitorial, trash and parking.</td>
<td>225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$950 per Full-time Equivalent</td>
<td>34,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mileage</td>
<td>$0.535 per mile for 17,000 miles</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Library Subscription</td>
<td>Annual subscription for online legal research resources</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phones</td>
<td>$135 per Full-time Equivalent</td>
<td>4,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to County Network and IT Services</td>
<td>$4,000 per user for 37 users</td>
<td>148,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Bar Dues</td>
<td>$300 each for 26 attorneys and Chief PD</td>
<td>8,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingham County Bar Dues</td>
<td>$80 each for 26 attorneys and Chief PD</td>
<td>2,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>757,113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Remodel/Supply Costs for Confidential Meeting Rooms at Court Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54A District Court</td>
<td>Add Audio Visual Equipment for 2 Existing Rooms ($5,000 each)</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54B District Court</td>
<td>Update Conference Rooms</td>
<td>23,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54B District Court</td>
<td>Install Polycom Units in 4 Conference Rooms ($3,820 each)</td>
<td>15,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55th District Court</td>
<td>Expand Building to add 3 – 10’ x 10’ Meeting Rooms (300 square feet @ $250 per square foot) (There is no existing space within the current building to remodel. Contractor would be identified after funds are approved through the County’s bidding process.)</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55th District Court</td>
<td>Furnishings for New Meeting Rooms ($800 per room for 5 chairs and 1 table)</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55th District Court</td>
<td>Install Polycom Units in 3 Meeting Room ($3,820 each)</td>
<td>11,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55th District Court</td>
<td>Renovate Existing Space for In-Custody Meeting Rooms</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th Circuit Court</td>
<td>Remodel Existing Space in Mason Courthouse - file cabinet, overfile system and 2 sliding doors ($1,389) and table with chairs ($500)</td>
<td>1,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th Circuit Court</td>
<td>Install Polycom Unit in Existing Space</td>
<td>3,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>233,049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Startup Costs for Public Defender Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings/Building Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings for 17 Offices</td>
<td>58,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Cubicles and Furnishing</td>
<td>42,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 12’ x 16’ Conference Room</td>
<td>5,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 12’ x 14’ Conference Room</td>
<td>3,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting Room</td>
<td>1,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating</td>
<td>32,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>3,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation</td>
<td>15,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Buildouts for Rental Space</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Furnishings/Building Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>237,238</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Printers/Copiers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Medium</td>
<td>5,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Large</td>
<td>6,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Printers/Copiers</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,312</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computer Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laptops with Docking Station/DVD Drive, 24”</td>
<td>48,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor for each attorney and Chief PD ($1,800 x 27)</td>
<td>13,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computer Equipment</strong></td>
<td><strong>62,150</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>311,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document Processing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scanning Stations</td>
<td>4 at $7,000 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and Implementation</td>
<td>1,200 hours at $180 per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OnBase Licenses</td>
<td>$483.62 per year for 13 work stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OnBase Licenses with Workflow Access</td>
<td>$1,257.42 per year for 28 work stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>285,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost Analysis (sum of all expenditure sections)</strong></td>
<td>$5,581,391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grant Calculation

- Total Cost Analysis: $5,581,391
- Local Share: $902,021
- **Compliance Plan Grant Request**: $4,679,370
MEMORANDUM

To: County Services & Finance Committees

From: William Conklin, Managing Director
Road Department

Date: September 13, 2017

RE: Brief Presentation on Road PASER Ratings & Current / Upcoming Roadwork

As requested, information regarding the current PASER condition rating of the Ingham County roads is attached and can be presented if desired on color coded maps in a brief presentation at upcoming County Services and Finance Committee meetings.

PASER stands for Pavement Surface Evaluation & Rating, was developed by the University of Wisconsin for use on roads in northern climates, and is that most widely used in Michigan. It essentially involves rating the extent and severity of road distress and deterioration on a scale of 1 through 10, 1 being failed or very close thereto and 10 being new. The maps to be presented will show the county road network color coded by current PASER rating ranges—1 through 3 poor, 4-7 fair, and 8-10 good, with fair further divided into separate colors for rating ranges 4-5 and 6-7.

The road network is divided into logical segments having similar conditions for rating. Rating is done every 2 years on the Primary road system and every 4 years on the local system, by staff trained for this purpose to rate consistently and accurately per the PASER rating guidelines. Ingham County’s Primary system was last rated in 2016 and the Local system was last rated in 2014. Both systems will thus be rated next in 2018.

The PASER program has the ability to predict future road condition deterioration based on models developed for various road types and conditions. The program can also reset a given road’s condition rating as appropriate if the road is resurfaced and its condition is improved between ratings. Thus we can get current year conditions reflecting the combined effect of latest rating, improvements done since last rating, and program predicted continuing deterioration.

The attached Current Surface Rating Summaries reflect road conditions as of the report dates—early 2017, with all improvements and resurfacing up through and including 2016, but with some continuing program predicted degradation beyond 2016 reflected in the attached data. The color coded map to be presented will reflect this same data.

The map presentation will focus on the primary road system, as the 2014 ratings for the local system are now rather dated, and the amount of detail of the local system given all the residential streets does not lend itself to a brief presentation to a group.
Two additional copies of the same primary road PASER condition color-coded map can also be presented with highlighting added to show preservation (maintenance skip-paving and chip-sealing) and improvements (recycling and resurfacing) being done in 2017 and tentatively planned for 2018 on the primary system.

The presentation should take no more than 5 minutes plus any time for questions.
Current Surface Rating Mileage Summary

Ingham (County)

Report Module: Road Surface Management Analysis
Today's Date: Monday, February 27, 2017
Grouped By: Surface Subtype

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Name</th>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Value(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal System</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>2: County Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintained By</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Current Surface Rating Mileage Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface Subtype</th>
<th>PASER Rating</th>
<th>Total Centerline Mileage</th>
<th>APR*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Not Rated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt-Standard</td>
<td>0.000 25.814 94.183 12.151 19.954 20.549 35.164 89.236 191.530 10.886 0.774</td>
<td>416.960</td>
<td>4.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 1.128 1.451 0.000 0.000 0.000</td>
<td>2.559</td>
<td>2.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete - White Topping</td>
<td>0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 1.348 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000</td>
<td>1.248</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete - Non Rein. Agg Interlock</td>
<td>0.000 0.000 0.132 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete-Standard</td>
<td>0.000 0.514 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 1.037 3.736 10.331 0.000 0.000</td>
<td>16.656</td>
<td>2.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undefined</td>
<td>0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.496 0.000 0.000</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Centerline Mileage</td>
<td>0.000 26.128 94.315 12.462 20.407 20.391 36.231 94.049 123.37 10.866 1.250</td>
<td>439.461</td>
<td>4.519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*APR = Average PASER Rating calculated by weighting the mileage with the paser value
# Current Surface Rating Mileage Summary

**Ingham (County)**  
Report Module: Road Surface Management Analysis  
Today's Date: Wednesday, May 24, 2017  
Grouped By: Surface Subtype

## Report Filter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Name</th>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Value(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal System</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>3-County Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Twp</td>
<td>&lt;&gt;</td>
<td>Dansville or East Lansing or Lansing or Leslie or Mason or Stockbridge or Webberville or Williamston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Type</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>Asphalt or Brick or Concrete or Seal Coat or Undefined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Current Surface Rating Mileage Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface Subtype</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Not Rated</th>
<th>Total Centerline Mileage</th>
<th>APR*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt-Standard</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>12.836</td>
<td>38.505</td>
<td>45.727</td>
<td>26.914</td>
<td>35.113</td>
<td>96.384</td>
<td>157.368</td>
<td>212.359</td>
<td>34.223</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>688.329</td>
<td>3.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete-Standard</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sealed-Standard</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.012</td>
<td>2.799</td>
<td>7.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undefined</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Centerline Mileage | 0.000 | 12.836 | 38.505 | 45.727 | 26.914 | 35.113 | 96.384 | 157.368 | 212.359 | 34.223 | 0.000 | 748.158 | 3.424 |

*APR* = Average Paser Rating calculated by weighting the mileage with the paser value.
TO: County Services and Finance Committees

FROM: Tom Gamez, Director of Operations

DATE: October 23, 2017

SUBJECT: Disposal of Surplus Road Department Vehicles and Equipment

This is a resolution authorizing a publically advertised auction conducted by the Road Department and supported by the Purchasing Department to disposal of certain vehicles and equipment which have been replaced or have exceeded the useful life, and therefore no longer serves the Ingham County Road Department needs.

Surplus vehicles and equipment will be auctioned off through Rangerbid.com, a competitive internet auction site, with a publically advertised bidding process whereby awards will be made to the highest responsive bidder. If a bidder does not claim the item(s) awarded, the item will be awarded to the next highest responsive bidder. Due to the uniqueness of Road Department vehicles and equipment, Rangerbid.com is being utilized to appeal to a larger pool of potentially vendors and a larger revenue stream. There will be no fees or commissions charged to Ingham County or the Road Department. Only the buyer pays a commission.

All Monies received will be deposited in Revenue control 201-44700-400001 or appropriate account. Vehicles and Equipment to be auctioned are identified in Attachment “A”.

I respectfully request approval of the resolution.
Introduced by the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE DISPOSAL OF ROAD DEPARTMENT SURPLUS PROPERTY

WHEREAS, the Road Department has inspected their equipment and determined that there is a list of surplus equipment that has exceeded their useful life and/or is no longer safe for operations; and

WHEREAS, the surplus equipment will be auctioned off through a competitive internet auction site, with a publically advertised bidding process whereby awards will be made to the highest responsive bidder; and

WHEREAS, the ICRD Director of Operation has reviewed the surplus items before placement on the surplus property list, and other County departments have been contacted to review surplus items for usefulness before the public auction.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Ingham County Road Department is authorized to place in an auction, the surplus equipment from the attached listing which has no further use or value to the Road Department in the Rangerbid.com auction site, at no expense to the County or Road Department.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that any vehicle or equipment not sold at the auction may be disposed of by the ICRD, Director of Operations in the manner deemed to be in the County's best interest.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the proceeds from the sale of surplus items will be deposited in Revenue control 201-44700-400001 or appropriate account.
2017 SURPLUS LISTING

Attachment “A”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Make Model</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Mileage</th>
<th>VIN #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989 Volvo -GMC, 10-12 yard dump truck</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>4V2JCBME3IR803783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>In rough condition. Missing tires and rims. The floor in the dump box has holes. Very rusty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988 Ford F-600, former bucket truck</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>1FDNK64P8JVA40577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Very rusty. In need of multiply repairs. Brake lines are failing, due to rust.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978 Ford L-9000, Single axle semi-tractor</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>171,000</td>
<td>K909VDE6850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Needs complete front end parts replaced and alignment. Rusty undercarriage. Unsafe to drive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986 International S2574, 5 yard dump truck</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>1HTZMKCR7GHA58173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Poor condition. Batteries need replacing. Undercarriage is very rusty. Multiple oil leaks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Make</td>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>F-800, Single axle Aerial truck</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Vehicle has been red tagged due to the safety issues. Aerial boom drifts down at random moments. Batteries need replacing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>ram 1500, pick-up</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Engine noise, engine uses 2 quart of oil daily, very rusty, needs the battery replaced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>/ Omaha Truck (F-350)</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Truck runs okay, poor condition, rusty, exhaust leaks, emission light on, and lift box does work well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>L- Shaped</td>
<td>100 Gal. fuel tank</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Tank is in poor condition. Leaks due to rust holes. Fuel pump is broke.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Make Model</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Mileage</td>
<td>VIN #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Mckenzie Equipment 8' rear flail mower</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2005565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department: Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs repair- bearings and gear box repair, mower teeth and welding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year unknown, John Deere 390 - 7.5 foot rear flail mower</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>P00390X006445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department: Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs – Bearings, belts and welding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year unknown, 8 foot pick-up truck shell and plastic bed liner</td>
<td>White and black</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department: Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Former animal control shell and liner. Needs repair- broken and missing doors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year unknown, John Deere 390 - 7.5 foot rear flail mower</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>P00390X006442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department: Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs – bearings, belts and welding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Make Model</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Mileage</td>
<td>VIN #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year unknown, Galvanized Truck box</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover - Fabricated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former wood chipper truck box. Wood frame is rotted. Will not fit any current trucks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Make Model</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Mileage</th>
<th>VIN #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year unknown, Scissor Hoist and dump box for single axle truck</td>
<td>Orange/rust</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Make Model</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Mileage</th>
<th>VIN #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year Unknown, Sioux valve grinder</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>64182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing parts. Out dated parts are not available. Very old grinder, that is not MIOHSA compliant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Make Model</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Mileage</th>
<th>VIN #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallet of signal lights monitors and controllers</td>
<td>Black/Gray/Yellow</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdated, not to be used with new LED technology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Make Model</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Mileage</td>
<td>VIN #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year unknown, 5 - parking lot lights 21” x 21”</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department: Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outdated lighting system. Replaced by LED lighting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Make Model</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Mileage</td>
<td>VIN #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978 Onan Generator</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A780296511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department: Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Runs poorly, voltage output is low.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Make Model</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Mileage</td>
<td>VIN #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year unknown, 2 Homelite portable air handlers</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department: Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-running. Not MIOHSA compliant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Make Model</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Mileage</td>
<td>VIN #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year unknown, Blade Sharpener/Grinder</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department: Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not MIOHSA compliant. Fabricated many years ago.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Make Model</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Mileage</td>
<td>VIN #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969 Green lite striping cart</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>GLG-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Designed for oil base road paint. Not DEQ compliant for roads or parking lots.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Make Model</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Mileage</th>
<th>VIN #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003 Cannon C6800 office printer</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Outdated printed. Has not been in service in 6 years. Would not print clearly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Make Model</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Mileage</th>
<th>VIN #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976 Ingersoll Rand GR250 air compressor</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>4000 hours</td>
<td>250TR42059M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Slow to build air pressure. Needs new batteries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Board of Commissioners County Services and Finance Committees
FROM: Sandra Dargatz, Executive Director, Ingham County Fair
DATE: October 3, 2017
SUBJECT: Resolution Authorizing the Amendment of the 2017 Fair Fund
For the meeting agenda of October 17, 2017 and October 18, 2017

BACKGROUND
Revenues for the Ingham County Fair were approximately $58,000 less than budgeted. Additionally, expenses for Fair week exceeded what was approved in the 2017 budget by approximately $94,000. When looking at the Fair Budget in total (including non-Fair) it is clear that a transfer from the General Fund, Fund Balance to the Fair Fund in the amount of $165,000 is necessary to avoid a deficit fund situation.

ALTERNATIVES
The Board of Commissioners could let the Fair Fund end the year in a deficit and then approve a deficit elimination plan, which must be filed with the State of Michigan.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
This resolution authorizes the County Controller/Administrator to transfer up to $165,000 from the 2017 General Fund, Fund Balance account to the Fair Fund in order to avoid a deficit fund situation.

The Fair will amend its 2018 expense budget to stay within the revised revenue projections to ensure that no general fund appropriation is required to avoid a deficit fund balance in 2018.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
The Fair is taking steps to contain costs for the remainder of 2017, including not filling a vacant maintenance worker position, and utilizing existing staff to clean the community hall instead of relying on contractors. This is expected to save about $20,000.

RECOMMENDATION
Based on the information presented, I respectfully recommend approval of the attached resolution.
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Introduced by the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE 2017 FAIR FUND BUDGET

WHEREAS, 2017 revenues for the Ingham County Fair came in significantly under budget, primarily due to a decrease in fair revenue; and

WHEREAS, 2017 expenses for the Ingham County Fair significantly exceeded the approved budget; and

WHEREAS, the current unrestricted fund balance in the Fair Fund (F561) is not sufficient to cover this shortfall; and

WHEREAS, a transfer from the General Fund to the Fair Fund is necessary to avoid a deficit fund situation.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby authorizes the Controller/Administrator to transfer up to $165,000 from the fund balance of the General Fund to the Fair Fund in order to avoid a deficit fund situation.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Fair will amend its 2018 budget to stay within the revised revenue and expense projections to ensure that no general fund appropriation is required to avoid a deficit fund balance in 2018.
TO: Board of Commissioners Human Services and Finance Committees  
FROM: Linda S. Vail, MPA, Health Officer  
DATE: October 17, 2017  
SUBJECT: Amendment to Resolution #16-114  
For the meeting agenda of November 14th, 2017

BACKGROUND  
Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) forms 855A and 855B must be completed and filed each time the ICHD establishes, changes, or terminates a health center location or it will lose its ability to obtain enhanced reimbursements through Medicaid and Medicare. The Public Health Services Act enables ICHD Community Health Centers as Federally Qualified Health Centers under section 330e and Federally Qualified Health Center Look-Alikes to obtain enhanced reimbursement through Medicaid and Medicare. CMS requires that those authorized to sign CMS forms 855A and 855B be named. CMS form 855A indicates that an exact percentage of management control be stated for each health center position. Resolution #16-114, authorized the following positions/names to sign CMS forms 855A and 855B with the following percent of management control:

- Russell Kolski, Deputy Health Officer/Executive Director (40%)  
- Linda Vail, Health Officer (35%)  
- Eric Thelen, Health Department Chief Financial Officer (25%)

With the resignation of Russell Kolski as Executive Director/Deputy Health Officer, and the appointment of Anne Scott at Interim Executive Director, Resolution #16-114 must be amended as follows:

- Anne Scott, Interim Deputy Health Officer/Executive Director (40%)  
- Linda Vail, Health Officer (35%)  
- Eric Thelen, Health Department Chief Financial Officer (25%)

ALTERNATIVES 
There are no alternatives

FINANCIAL IMPACT 
There are no financial impacts.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS 
There are no other considerations.

RECOMMENDATION 
Based on the information presented, I respectfully recommend approval of the attached resolution to support amending Resolution 16-114 to authorize the following people to sign CMS forms 855A and 855B with the following percent of management control:

- Anne Scott, Interim Deputy Health Officer/Executive Director (40%)  
- Linda Vail, Health Officer (35%)  
- Eric Thelen, Health Department Chief Financial Officer (25%)
Introducing by the Human Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE AN AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION #16-114 TO AUTHORIZE CERTAIN HEALTH DEPARTMENT STAFF TO SIGN CMS FORMS 855A AND 855B

WHEREAS, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) forms 855A and 855B must be completed and filed each time the ICHD establishes, changes, or terminates a health center location or it will lose its ability to obtain enhanced reimbursements through Medicaid and Medicare; and

WHEREAS, the Public Health Services Act enables ICHD Community Health Centers as Federally Qualified Health Centers under section 330e and Federally Qualified Health Center Look-Alikes to obtain enhanced reimbursement through Medicaid and Medicare; and

WHEREAS, the CMS require that those authorized to sign CMS forms 855A and 855B be named; and

WHEREAS, CMS form 855A indicates that an exact percentage of management control be stated for each health center position; and

WHEREAS, Resolution #16-114, authorized the following positions/names to sign CMS forms 855A and 855B with the following percent of management control:

- Russell Kolski, Deputy Health Officer/Executive Director (40%)
- Linda Vail, Health Officer (35%)
- Eric Thelen, Health Department Chief Financial Officer (25%)

WHEREAS, with the resignation of Russell Kolski and appointment of Anne Scott as Interim Deputy Health Officer/Executive Director, Resolution #16-114 must be amended to reflect this change.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the following people to sign CMS forms 855A and 855B with the following percent of management control:

- Anne Scott, Interim Deputy Health Officer/Executive Director (40%)
- Linda Vail, Health Officer (35%)
- Eric Thelen, Health Department Chief Financial Officer (25%)

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Ingham County Board of Commissioners is authorized to sign the necessary contract documents on behalf of the County after approval as to form by the County Attorney.
TO: Board of Commissioners Human Services and Finance Committee
FROM: Linda S. Vail, MPA, Health Officer
DATE: October 10, 2017
SUBJECT: Agreement with Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan
For the meeting agenda of November 14th, 2017

BACKGROUND
The Ingham County Health Department and Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan (BCBSM) entered into an agreement in 1996 wherein BCBSM would pay the claims of health care services provided to inmates of the Ingham County Jail. The agreement is updated annually by executing Schedule A – Addendum to the Administrative Services contract.

ALTERNATIVES
There are no alternatives.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
The Schedule A addendum proposed through the attached resolution will cover the period of December 1, 2017 – November 30, 2018. Terms and conditions have remained the same as the December 1, 2016 – November 30, 2017 agreement.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
Blue Cross/Blue Shield has included a Schedule B (Blue Card Disclosure Inter-Plan Agreement) which addresses services performed outside the BCBSM geographic coverage area.

RECOMMENDATION
Based on the information presented, I respectfully recommend approval of the Schedule A Addendum and Schedule B to the Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan Administrative Service agreement for the period of December 2017 – November 2018.
SCHEDULE A-Renewal Term (Effective December 2017 through November 2018)

Administrative Services Contract (ASC)
Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan

1. Group Name: Ingham County Inmates
2. Group Number: 067004013
3. Initial ASC Contract Effective Date: December 01, 2007
4. ASC Funding Arrangement: Quarterly Settled Monthly Wire
5. Line(s) of Business:
   - [X] Facility
   - [X] Professional
   - [X] Prescription Drugs
   - [ ] Dental
   - [ ] Vision
   - [ ] Facility Domestic

6. Administrative Fees: The below administrative fees cover the Lines of Business checked in Section 5 above, unless otherwise indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Fee and Additional Administrative Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Administrative Fee (Fixed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Fee Percent of Claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Additional Administrative Compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Additional Admin Compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Additional Administrative Compensation (AAC) is nine percent (9%) of BCBSM discounts on Michigan hospital claims.

7. This Schedule A does not include any fees payable by Group to an Agent. If Group has an Agent Fee Processing Agreement on file with BCBSM, please refer to that agreement for fees and details.

8. Late Payment Charges/Interest:
   A. Late Payment Charge 2%
   B. Yearly Statutory Interest Charge (Simple Interest) 12%
   C. Provider Contractual Interest

9. BCBSM Account: 1840.0989713 Georgia 0720-90086
   Wire Number Back American Bank Assoc

10. The Group acknowledges that BCBSM or a Host Blue may have compensation arrangements with providers in which the provider is subject to performance or risk-based compensation, including but not limited to withholdings, bonuses, incentive payments, provider credits and other management fees. Often the compensation amount is determined after the medical service has been performed and after the Group has been invoiced. The Claims billed to Group include both service-based and value-based reimbursement to health care providers. Group acknowledges that BCBSM’s negotiated reimbursement rates include all reimbursement obligations to providers, including provider obligations and entitlements under BCBSM Quality Programs. Service-based reimbursement means the portion of the negotiated rate attributable to a particular health care service. Value-based reimbursement is the portion of the negotiated reimbursement rate attributable to BCBSM Quality Programs, as described in Exhibit 1 to Schedule A. BCBSM negotiates provider reimbursement rates and settles provider obligations on its own behalf, not Group. Group receives the benefit of BCBSM provider rates, but it has no entitlement to a particular rate or to unbundled the service-based or value-based components of Claims. See Exhibit 1 to Schedule A and Schedule B to ASC for additional information.

11. The rebate administration and claims processing fee charged and retained by Express Scripts is (i) 4.89% of gross rebates for BCBSM clinical formulary, co-pay formulary, custom select formulary, and specialty drug Claims and (ii) 5.2% of gross rebates for part D formulary drug Claims, including Part D specialty drug Claims. The rebate administration fee charged and retained by Highmark is up to 5.5% of gross rebates for medical benefit drug Claims.
Pursuant to Express Scripts’s Inflation Protection Program, Express Scripts contracts with pharmaceutical manufacturers for inflation protection payments ("IPP") to offset increases in certain brand drugs. Express Scripts will pay a predetermined portion of the IPP that it receives to BCBSM as set forth in the contract between Express Scripts and BCBSM. Express Scripts contracts for IPP on its own behalf and may realize positive margin between amounts paid to BCBSM and amounts received from pharmaceutical manufacturers. BCBSM will distribute Group’s share of the IPP that it receives from Express Scripts based on the total IPP received by BCBSM divided by the total number of brand drug claims multiplied by the number of Group’s brand drug claims. IPPs will be distributed to Group through the Consumer Savings Refund process.

BCBSM:

BY: ____________________________
   (Signature)

NAME: __________________________
   (Print)

TITLE: __________________________

DATE: __________________________

BY: ____________________________
   (Signature)

NAME: __________________________
   (Print)

TITLE: __________________________

DATE: __________________________

THE GROUP:

BY: ____________________________
   (Signature)

NAME: __________________________
   (Print)

TITLE: __________________________

DATE: __________________________

Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association.

Group Name

Group Number - 0071224556
As in prior years, the Claims billed to Group include amounts that BCBSM reimburses health care providers including reimbursement tied to value. BCBSM has adopted a provider payment model that includes both fee-based and value-based reimbursement. BCBSM does not unbundle Claims and does not retain any portion of Claims as compensation. Provider reimbursement is governed by separate agreements with providers, BCBSM standard operating procedures, and BCBSM Quality Programs.

BCBSM negotiates provider reimbursement rates on its own behalf and makes those rates available to customers through its products and networks. The reimbursement rates can, and often do, vary from provider to provider. Providers may qualify for higher reimbursement rates for satisfying requirements of certain BCBSM Quality Programs, including, for example, Pay-for-Performance (P4P) and Value-Based Contracting (VBC) rates earned by hospitals and Patient Centered Medical Home (PCMH) rates earned by physicians.

Provider reimbursement rates also capture provider commitments to BCBSM Quality Programs. For example, hospitals participating in Hospital Collaborative Quality Initiatives (CQIs) agree to allocate a portion of their reimbursement to fund inter-hospital quality initiatives. Intellectual property may be developed through BCBSM Quality Programs for subsequent license and use by BCBSM or a third party. Group specifically understands, acknowledges, and agrees that it has no rights to any intellectual property, or derivatives thereof, including, but not limited to, copyrights, patents, or licenses, developed through BCBSM Quality Programs.

Providers may also receive reward and incentive payments from BCBSM Quality Programs funded through an allocation from provider reimbursement or collected from Group’s Customer Savings Refund. Such allocations may be to a pooled fund from which value-based payments to providers are made. For example, pursuant to the Physician Group Incentive Program (PGIP), physicians agree to allocate 5% of each Claim to a PGIP fund, which in turn makes reward payments to eligible physician organizations demonstrating particular quality and pays physician organizations for participation in collaborative initiatives.

As explained in the Blue Card Program disclosure (Schedule B to ASC), an out-of-state Blue Cross Blue Shield Plan (“Host Blue”) may also negotiate fee-based and/or value-based reimbursement for their providers. A Host Blue may include all provider reimbursement obligations in Claims or may, at its election, collect some or all of its value-based provider (VBP) reimbursement obligations through a per attributed member per month (PAMPM) benefit expense, as in, for example, the Blue Distinction Total Care (B-DTC) Program. All Host Blue PAMPM benefit expenses for VBP reimbursement will be consolidated on your monthly invoice and appear as “Out-of-State VBP Provider Reimbursement.” The supporting detail for the consolidated amount will be available on e-Boxshelf as reported by each Host Blue Plan. Host Blues determine which members are attributed to eligible providers and calculate the PAMPM VBP reimbursement obligation based only on those attributed members. Host Blue have exclusive control over the calculation/reimbursement rates and sizes.

Value-based reimbursement includes other obligations and entitlements pursuant to other BCBSM Quality Programs funded in a similar manner to those described in this Exhibit. Additional information is available at www.valuepartnerships.com and www.bcbs.com/collective-care. Questions regarding provider reimbursement and BCBSM Quality Programs or Host Blue VBP reimbursement should be directed to your BCBSM account representative.
Schedule B
BlueCard Disclosures
Inter-Plan Arrangements

I. Out-of-Area Services

Overview

BCBSM has a variety of relationships with other Blue Cross and/or Blue Shield Licensees referred to generally as "Inter-Plan Arrangements." These Inter-Plan Arrangements operate under rules and procedures issued by the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association ("Association"). Whenever Enrollees access healthcare services outside the geographic area BCBSM serves, the Claim for those services may be processed through one of these Inter-Plan Programs and presented to BCBSM for payment in accordance with the rules of the Inter-Plan Arrangements. The Inter-Plan Arrangements are described generally below.

Typically, when accessing care outside the geographic area BCBSM serves, Enrollees obtain care from Providers that have a contractual agreement ("Participating Providers") with the local Blue Cross and/or Blue Shield Licensee in that other geographic area ("Host Blue"). In some instances, Enrollees may obtain care from Providers in the Host Blue geographical area that do not have a contractual agreement ("Non-participating Providers") with the Host Blue. BCBSM remains responsible for fulfilling its contractual obligations to you. BCBSM's payment practices in both instances are described below.

This disclosure describes how Claims are administered for Inter-Plan Arrangements and the fees that are charged in connection with Inter-Plan Arrangements. Note that Dental Care Benefits, except when paid as medical claims/benefits, and those Prescription Drug Benefits or Vision Care Benefits that may be administered by a third party contracted by BCBSM to provide the specific service or services, are not processed through Inter-Plan Arrangements.

A. BlueCard® Program

The BlueCard® Program is an Inter-Plan Arrangement. Under this Arrangement, when Enrollees access covered healthcare services within the geographic area served by a Host Blue, the Host Blue will be responsible for contracting and handling all interactions with its Participating Providers. The financial terms of the BlueCard Program are described generally below.

1. Liability Calculation Method Per Claim – In General
   a. Enrollee Liability Calculation

   The calculation of the Enrollee liability on Claims for covered healthcare services processed through the BlueCard Program will be based on the lower of the Participating Provider's billed covered charges or the negotiated price made available to BCBSM by the Host Blue.

   Under certain circumstances, if BCBSM pays the Healthcare Provider amounts that are the responsibility of the Enrollee, BCBSM may collect such amounts from the Enrollee.

   In situations where participating agreements allow for bulk settlement reconciliations for Episode-Based Payment/Bundled Payments, BCBSM may include a factor for such settlement or reconciliations as part of the fees BCBSM charges to Group.

   Where Group agrees to use reference-based benefits, which are service-specific benefit dollar limits for specific procedures, based on a Host Blue's local market rates, Enrollees will be responsible for the amount that the healthcare Provider bills for a specified procedure above the reference benefit limit for that procedure. For a Participating Provider, that amount will be the difference between the negotiated price and the reference benefit limit. For a Non-participating Provider, that amount will be the difference between the Non-Participating Provider's billed charge and the reference benefit limit. Where a reference benefit limit exceeds either a negotiated price or a Provider's billed charge, the Enrollee may incur no liability, other than any applicable Enrollee cost sharing.
b. Group Liability Calculation

The calculation of Group liability on Claims for covered healthcare services processed through the BlueCard Program will be based on the negotiated price made available to BCBSM by the Host Blue under contract between the Host Blue and the Provider. Sometimes, this negotiated price may be greater for a given service or services than the billed charge in accordance with how the Host Blue has negotiated with its Participating Provider(s) for specific healthcare services. In cases where the negotiated price exceeds the billed charge, Group may be liable for the excess amount even when the Enrollee’s deductible has not been satisfied. This excess amount reflects an amount that may be necessary to secure (a) the Provider’s participation in the network and/or (b) the overall discount negotiated by the Host Blue. In such a case, the entire contracted price is paid to the Provider, even when the contracted price is greater than the billed charge.

2. Claims Pricing

The Host Blue determines a negotiated price, which is reflected in the terms of each Host Blue’s healthcare Provider contracts. The negotiated price made available to BCBSM by the Host Blue may be represented by one of the following:

(i) an actual price. An actual price is a negotiated payment in effect at the time a Claim is processed without any other increases or decreases, or

(ii) an estimated price. An estimated price is a negotiated payment in effect at the time a Claim is processed, reduced or increased by a percentage to take into account certain payments negotiated with the Provider and other Claim- and non-Claim-related transactions. Such transactions may include, but are not limited to, anti-fraud and abuse recoveries, Provider refunds not applied on a Claim-specific basis, retrospective settlements, and performance-related bonuses or incentives, or

(iii) an average price. An average price is a percentage of billed charges for covered services in effect at the time a Claim is processed representing the aggregate payments negotiated by the Host Blue with all of its healthcare Providers or a similar classification of its Providers and other Claim- and non-Claim-related transactions. Such transactions may include the same ones as noted above for an estimated price.

The Host Blue determines whether it will use an actual, estimated or an average price in its respective Provider agreements. The use of estimated or average pricing may result in a difference (positive or negative) between the price Group pays on a specific Claim and the actual amount the Host Blue pays to the Provider. However, the BlueCard Program requires that the amount paid by the Enrollee and Group is a final price; no future price adjustment will result in increases or decreases to the pricing of past Claims.

Any positive or negative differences in estimated or average pricing are accounted for through variance accounts maintained by the Host Blue and are incorporated into future Claim prices. As a result, the amounts charged to Group will be adjusted in a following year, as necessary, to account for over- or underestimation of the past years’ prices. The Host Blue will not receive compensation from how the estimated price or average price methods, described above, are calculated. Because all amounts paid are final, neither positive variance account amounts (funds available to be paid in the following year), nor negative variance amounts (the funds needed to be received in the following year), are due to or from Group. If Group terminates, Group will not receive a refund or charge from the variance account.

Variance account balances are small amounts relative to the overall paid Claims amounts and will be liquidated/drawn down over time. The timeframe for their liquidation depends on variables, including, but not limited to, overall volume/number of Claims processed and variance account balance. Variance account balances may earn interest at the federal funds or similar rate. The Host Blue may retain interest earned on funds held in variance accounts.

3. BlueCard Program Fees and Compensation

Group understands and agrees to reimburse BCBSM for certain fees and compensation which BCBSM is obligated under the BlueCard Program to pay to the Host Blue, to the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association (BCBSA), and/or to vendors of BlueCard Program related services. The specific Blue Card Program fees and compensation that are charged to Group and which Group is responsible related to the foregoing are set forth in Exhibit 1 to this Schedule B. BlueCard Program Fees and compensation may be revised annually from time to time as described in H below.
B. Negotiated Arrangements

With respect to one or more Host Blue, instead of using the BlueCard Program, BCBSM may process your Enrollee claims for covered healthcare services through Negotiated Arrangements.

In addition, if BCBSM and Group have agreed that a(i) Host Blue(s) shall make available (a) custom healthcare Provider network(s) in connection with this Agreement, then the terms and conditions set forth in BCBSM’s Negotiated Arrangement(s) for National Accounts with such Host Blue(s) shall apply. These include the provisions governing the processing and payment of Claims when Enrollees access such network(s). In negotiating such arrangement(s), BCBSM is not acting on behalf of or as an agent for Group, the Group’s health care plan or Group Enrollees.

1. Enrollee Liability Calculation

Enrollee liability calculation for covered healthcare services will be based on the lower of either billed covered charges for covered services or negotiated price that the Host Blue makes available to BCBSM that allows Group’s Enrollees access to negotiated participation agreement networks of specified Participating Providers outside of BCBSM’s service area.

Under certain circumstances, if BCBSM pays the Healthcare Provider amounts that are the responsibility of the Enrollee, BCBSM may collect such amounts from the Enrollee.

In situations where participating agreements allow for bulk settlement reconciliations for Episode-Based Payment/Bundled Payments, BCBSM may include a factor for such settlement or reconciliations as part of the fees BCBSM charges to Group.

Where Group agrees to use reference-based benefits, which are service-specific benefit dollar limits for specific procedures, based on a Host Blue’s local market rates, Enrollees will be responsible for the amount that the healthcare Provider bills for a specified procedure above the reference benefit limit for that procedure. For a Participating Provider, that amount will be the difference between the negotiated price and the reference benefit limit. For a Non-Participating Provider, that amount will be the difference between the Non-Participating Provider’s billed charge and the reference benefit limit. Where a reference benefit limit exceeds either a negotiated price or a Provider’s billed charge, the Enrollee will incur no liability, other than any applicable Enrollee cost sharing.

2. Group Liability Calculation

The calculation of Group liability on Claims for covered healthcare services processed through the BlueCard Program will be based on the negotiated price made available to BCBSM by the Host Blue under the contract between the Host Blue and the Provider. Sometimes, this negotiated price may be greater for a given service or services than the billed charge in accordance with how the Host Blue has negotiated with its Participating Provider(s) for specific healthcare services. In cases where the negotiated price exceeds the billed charge, Group may be liable for the excess amount even when the Enrollee’s deductible has not been satisfied. This excess amount reflects an amount that may be necessary to secure (a) the Provider’s participation in the network and/or (b) the overall discount negotiated by the Host Blue. In such a case, the entire contracted price is paid to the Provider, even when the contracted price is greater than the billed charge.

3. Claims Pricing

Same as in the BlueCard Program above.

4. Fees and Compensation

Group understands and agrees to reimburse BCBSM for certain fees and compensation which we are obligated under applicable Inter-Plan Arrangement requirements to pay to the Host Blue, to the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association, and/or to vendors of Inter-Plan Arrangement-related services. Fees and compensation under applicable Inter-Plan Arrangement may be revised annually as described in section H below. In addition, the participation agreement with the Host Blue may provide that BCBSM must pay an administrative and/or network access fee to the Host Blue, and Group further agrees to reimburse BCBSM for any such applicable administrative and/or network access fees. The specific fees and compensation that are charged to Group under the Negotiated Arrangements are set forth in Exhibit 1 to this Schedule B.
C. Special Cases: Value-Based Programs

Value-Based Programs Overview

Group Enrollees may access covered healthcare services from Providers that participate in a Host Blue’s Value-Based Program. Value-Based Programs may be delivered either through the BlueCard Program or a Negotiated Arrangement. These Value-Based Programs may include, but are not limited to, Accountable Care Organizations, Global Payment/Total Cost of Care arrangements, Patient Centered Medical Homes and Shared Savings arrangements.

Value-Based Programs under the BlueCard Program

Value-Based Programs Administration

Under Value-Based Programs, a Host Blue may pay Providers for reaching agreed-upon cost/quality goals in the following ways, including but not limited to retrospective settlements, Provider Incentives, share of target savings, Care Coordinator Fees and/or other allowed amounts.

The Host Blue may pass these Provider payments to BCBSM, which BCBSM will pass directly on to Group as either an amount included in the price of the Claim or an amount charged separately in addition to the Claim.

When such amounts are included in the price of the Claim, the Claim may be billed using one of the following pricing methods, as determined by the Host Blue:

(i) Actual Pricing: The charge to accounts for Value-Based Programs incentives/Shared Savings settlements is part of the Claim. These charges are passed to Group via an enhanced Provider fee schedule.

(ii) Supplemental Factor: The charge to accounts for Value-Based Programs incentives/Shared Savings settlements is a supplemental amount that is included in the Claim as an amount based on a specified supplemental factor (e.g., a small percentage increase in the Claim amount). The supplemental factor may be adjusted from time to time.

When such amounts are billed separately from the price of the Claim, they may be billed as a Per Attributed Member Per Month (PaMPPM) amount for Value-Based Programs incentives/Shared Savings settlements to Group outside of the Claim system. BCBSM will pass these Host Blue charges directly through to Group as a separately identified amount on the Group’s invoices.

The amounts used to calculate either the supplemental factors for estimated pricing or PaMPPM billings are fixed amounts that are estimated to be necessary to finance the cost of a particular Value-Based Program. Because amounts are estimates, there may be positive or negative differences based on actual experience, and such differences will be accounted for in a variance account maintained by the Host Blue (in the same manner as described in the BlueCard Claim pricing section above) until the end of the applicable Value-Based Program payment and/or reconciliation measurement period. The amounts needed to fund a Value-Based Program may be changed before the end of the measurement period if it is determined that amounts being collected are projected to exceed the amount necessary to fund the program or if they are projected to be insufficient to fund the program.

At the end of the Value-Based Program payment and/or reconciliation measurement period for these arrangements, the Host Blue will take one of the following actions:

- Use any surplus in funds in the variance account to fund Value-Based Program payments or reconciliation amounts in the next measurement period.

- Address any deficit in funds in the variance account through an adjustment to the PaMPPM billing amount or the reconciliation billing amount for the next measurement period.
The Host Blue will not receive compensation resulting from how estimated, average or PaMPM price methods, described above, are calculated. If Group terminates, you will not receive a refund or charge from the variance account. This is because any resulting surpluses or deficits would be eventually exhausted through prospective adjustment to the settlement billings in the case of Value-Based Programs. The measurement period for determining these surpluses or deficits may differ from the term of the administrative services contract.

Variance account balances are small amounts relative to the overall paid Claims amounts and will be liquidated/drawn down over time. The timeframe for their liquidation depends on variables, including, but not limited to, overall volume/number of Claims processed and variance account balance. Variance account balances may earn interest, and interest is earned at the federal funds or similar rate. The Host Blue may retain interest earned on funds held in variance accounts.

Note: Enrollees will not bear any portion of the cost of Value-Based Programs except when the Host Blue uses either average pricing or actual pricing to pay Providers under Value-Based Programs.

Care Coordinator Fees

The Host Blue may also bill BCBSM for Care Coordinator Fees for Covered Services which BCBSM will pass on to Group as follows:

1. PaMPM billings; or
2. Individual Claim billings through applicable care coordination codes from the most current editions of either Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) published by the American Medical Association (AMA) or Healthcare Common Procedure Coding System (HCPCS) published by the U.S. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS).

As part of this agreement/contract, BCBSM and Group will not impose Enrollee cost sharing for Care Coordinator Fees.

Value-Based Programs under Negotiated Arrangements

If BCBSM has entered into a Negotiated National Account Arrangement with a Host Blue to provide Value-Based Programs to Enrollees, BCBSM will follow the same procedures for Value-Based Programs administration and Care Coordination Fees as noted in the BlueCard Program section.

D. Return of Overpayments

Recoveries of overpayments from a Host Blue or its Participating Providers and Non-participating Providers can arise in several ways, including, but not limited to, anti-fraud and abuse recoveries, audits/healthcare Provider/hospital bill audits, credit balance audits, utilization review refunds, and unsolicited refunds. Recoveries will be applied.Recovery amounts determined in the ways noted above will be applied so that so that corrections will be made, in general, on either a Claim-by-Claim or prospective basis. If recovery amounts are passed on a Claim-by-Claim basis from the Host Blue to BCBSM they will be credited to Group account. In some cases, the Host Blue will engage a third party to assist in identification or collection of overpayments/recovery amounts. The fees of such a third party may charge to Group as a percentage of the recovery.

Unless the Host Blue agrees to a longer period of time for retroactive cancellations of membership, the Host Blue will provide BCBSM the full refunds from Participating Providers for a period of only one year after the date of the Inter-Plan financial settlement process for the original Claim. For Care Coordinator Fees associated with Value-Based Programs, BCBSM will request such refunds for a period of up to ninety (90) days from the termination notice transaction on the payment innovations delivery platform. In some cases, recovery of Claim payments associated with a retroactive cancellation may not be possible if, as an example, the recovery (a) conflicts with the Host Blue’s state law or healthcare Provider contracts (b) would result from Shared Savings and/or Provider Incentive arrangements or (c) would jeopardize the Host Blue’s relationship with its Participating Providers, notwithstanding to the contrary any other provision of this agreement/contract.
E. Inter-Plan Programs: Federal/State Taxes/Surcharges/Fees

In some instances, federal or state laws or regulations may impose a surcharge, tax or other fee that applies to self-funded accounts. If applicable, BCBSM will provide prior written notice of any such surcharge, tax or other fee to Group, which will be Group liability.

F. Non-Participating Healthcare Providers Outside BCBSM’s Service Area

1. Enrollee Liability Calculation

   a. In General

   When covered healthcare services are provided outside of BCBSM’s service area by Non-participating Providers, the amount an Enrollee pays for such services will generally be based on either the Host Blue’s Non-participating Provider local payment or the pricing arrangements required by applicable state law. In these situations, the Enrollee may be responsible for the difference between the amount that the Non-participating Provider bills and the payment BCBSM will make for the covered services as set forth in this paragraph. Payments for out-of-network emergency services will be governed by applicable federal and state law.

   b. Exceptions

   In some exception cases, BCBSM may pay Claims from Non-participating Providers outside of BCBSM’s service area based on the Provider’s billed charge, such as in situations where an Enrollee did not have reasonable access to a Participating Provider, as determined by BCBSM in BCBSM’s sole and absolute discretion or by applicable state law. In other exception cases, BCBSM may pay such Claims based on the payment BCBSM would make if BCBSM were paying a Non-participating Provider inside of its service area where the Host Blue’s corresponding payment would be more than BCBSM’s in-service area Non-participating Provider payment. BCBSM may choose to negotiate a payment with such a Provider on an exception basis.

   Unless otherwise stated, in any of these exception situations, the Enrollee may be responsible for the difference between the amount that the Non-participating Provider bills and the payment BCBSM will make for the covered services as set forth in this paragraph.

2. Fees and Compensation

   Group understands and agrees to reimburse BCBSM for certain fees and compensation which we are obligated under applicable Inter-Plan Arrangement requirements to pay to the Host Blue, to the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association, and/or to vendors of Inter-Plan Arrangement-related services. The specific fees and compensation that are charged to Group and that Group will be responsible for in connection with the foregoing are set forth in Exhibit 1 to this Schedule B. Fees and compensation under applicable Inter-Plan Arrangements may be revised from time to time as provided for in H below.

G. Blue Cross Blue Shield Global Core (Formerly known as BlueCard Worldwide® Program)

1. General Information

   If Enrollees are outside the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands (hereinafter “BlueCard service area”), they may be able to take advantage of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Global Core Program when accessing covered healthcare services. The Blue Cross Blue Shield Global Core Program is unlike the BlueCard Program available in the BlueCard service area in certain ways. For instance, although the Blue Cross Blue Shield Global Core Program assists Enrollees with accessing a network of inpatient, outpatient and professional providers, the network is not served by a Host Blue. As such, when Enrollees receive care from Providers outside the BlueCard service area, the Enrollees will typically have to pay the Providers and submit the Claims themselves to obtain reimbursement for these services.
• **Inpatient Services**

In most cases, if Enrollees contact the Blue Cross Blue Shield Global Core Service Center for assistance, hospitals will not require Enrollees to pay for covered inpatient services, except for their cost-share amounts/deductibles, coinsurance, etc. In such cases, the hospital will submit Enrollee Claims to the Blue Cross Blue Shield Global Core Service Center to initiate Claims processing. However, if the Enrollee paid in full at the time of service, the Enrollee must submit a Claim to obtain reimbursement for covered healthcare services. Enrollees must contact BCBSM to obtain precertification for non-emergency inpatient services.

• **Outpatient Services**

Physicians, urgent care centers and other outpatient Providers located outside the BlueCard service area will typically require Enrollees to pay in full at the time of service. Enrollees must submit a Claim to obtain reimbursement for covered healthcare services.

• **Submitting a Blue Cross Blue Shield Global Core Claim**

When Enrollees pay for covered healthcare services outside the BlueCard service area, they must submit a Claim to obtain reimbursement. For institutional and professional claims, Enrollees should complete a Blue Cross Blue Shield Global Core International claim form and send the claim form with the Provider’s itemized bill(s) to the Blue Cross Blue Shield Global Core Service Center address on the form to initiate claims processing. The claim form is available from BCBSM, the Blue Cross Blue Shield Global Core Service Center, or online at [www.bcbsglobal.com](http://www.bcbsglobal.com). If Enrollees need assistance with their claim submissions, they should call the Blue Cross Blue Shield Global Core Service Center at 1.800.810.BLUE (2583) or call collect at 1.804.673.1177, 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

2. **Blue Cross Blue Shield Global Core Program-Related Fees**

Group understands and agrees to reimburse BCBSM for certain fees and compensation which we are obligated under applicable Inter-Plan Arrangement requirements to pay to the Host Blue, to the Association and/or to vendors of Inter-Plan Arrangement-related services. The specific fees and compensation that are charged to Group under the Blue Cross Blue Shield Global Core Program and that Group is responsible for relating to the foregoing are set forth in Exhibit 1 to this Schedule B. Fees and compensation under applicable Inter-Plan Arrangements may be revised from time to time as provided for in section H below.

H. Modifications or Changes to Inter-Plan Arrangement Fees or Compensation

Modifications or changes to Inter-Plan Arrangement fees are generally made effective Jan. 1 of the calendar year, but they may occur at any time during the year. In the case of any such modifications or changes, BCBSM shall provide Group with at least thirty (30) days’ advance written notice of any modification or change to such Inter-Plan Arrangement fees or compensation describing the change and the effective date thereof and Group right to terminate the ASC without penalty by giving written notice of termination before the effective date of the change. If Group fails to respond to the notice and does not terminate this Agreement during the notice period, Group will be deemed to have approved the proposed changes, and BCBSM will then allow such modifications to become part of this Agreement.
Schedule 1

BlueCard Program Access Fees may be charged separately each time a claim is processed through the BlueCard Program. All other BlueCard Program-related fees are included in BCBSM's administrative fee. The BlueCard Access Fee is charged by the Host Blue to BCBSM for making its applicable Provider network available to Group's Enrollees. The BlueCard Access Fee will not apply to Non-participating Provider Claims. The BlueCard Access Fee is charged on a per-Claim basis and is charged as a percentage of the discount/differential BCBSM receives from the applicable Host Blue. The percentage for 2018 is 4.30% for fewer than 1,000 PPO or traditional enrolled Blue contracts; 2.40% for 1,000–9,999 Blue PPO enrolled contracts; and 2.22% for 10,000–49,999 Blue PPO enrolled contracts, all capped at $2,000.00 per Claim. For Groups with more than 50,000 Blue PPO enrolled contracts, Blue Card Access Fees are waived and not charged to the Group. If Group's enrollment falls below 50,000 PPO enrolled contracts, BCBSM passes the BlueCard Access Fee, when charged, directly on to the Group.

Instances may occur in which the Claim payment is zero or BCBSM pays only a small amount because the amounts eligible for payment were applied to patient cost sharing (such as a deductible or coinsurance). In these instances, BCBSM will pay the Host Blue's Access Fee and pass it along directly to the Group as stated above even though the Group paid little or had no Claim liability.
Introduced by the Human Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE AN ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE AGREEMENT WITH BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF MICHIGAN AT THE INGHAM COUNTY JAIL

WHEREAS, in Resolution #16-497 the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorized the existing agreement between Ingham County Health Department (ICHD) and Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan (BCBSM) for the period of December 1, 2016 – November 30, 2017; and

WHEREAS, ICHD and BCBSM entered into an agreement in 1996 wherein BCBSM would pay the claims of health care services provided to inmate of Ingham County jail; and

WHEREAS, that agreement is updated annually by executing a Schedule A Addendum; and

WHEREAS, BCBSM has proposed a 2017-2018 Schedule A Addendum to the Administrative Services Agreement; and

WHEREAS, there are no other changes to the proposed 2017-2018 Schedule A Addendum to the Administrative Services Agreement; and

WHEREAS, BCBSM has proposed an additional addendum, Schedule B – BlueCard Disclosures Inter-Plan Agreements, which addresses services performed outside the geographic coverage area; and

WHEREAS, the Health Officer recommends that the Board of Commissioners to authorize the 2017-2018 Schedule A and Addendum to the BCBSM Administrative Services Agreement for the inmates of Ingham County Jail.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Commissioners authorize the Schedule A Addendum to the Administrative and Schedule B – BlueCard Disclosures Inter-Plan Agreement with BCBSM for paying claims for health care services provided to inmates of the Ingham County Jail.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Schedule A Addendum and Schedule B shall be effective December 1, 2017 through November 30, 2018.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that there are no other changes to the proposed 2017-2018 Schedule A Addendum to the Administrative Services Agreement.

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

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the Board Chairperson to sign the agreement after it is approved as to form by the County Attorney.
TO: Board of Commissioners Human Services and Finance Committee
FROM: Linda S. Vail, MPA, Health Officer
DATE: October 13, 2017
SUBJECT: Accept FY 2018 Child and Adolescent Health Center Program Funds
For the meeting agenda of November 14th, 2017

BACKGROUND
The Ingham County Board of Commissioners has authorized the Ingham County Health Department (ICHD) to accept Child and Adolescent Health Center (CAHC) Program Funding from the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS), as administered through the Michigan Primary Care Association (MPCA), for the period of October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2017, through resolutions #11-235, 12-199, 13-049, 14-358, 15-412, and 16-448. The purpose of this agreement is to provide funds to ICHD to promote the health of children, adolescents and their families by providing important primary, preventative, and early intervention health care services. The CAHC program funding supports continued operations of ICHD’s school-based/school-linked health centers.

ALTERNATIVES
There are no alternatives.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
CAHC program funding for the term of October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2018 is as follows:

- Eastern - $195,000
- Sexton - $195,000
- Willow - $250,000

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
Ingham Community Health Center Board has reviewed and supports the acceptance of the award and supports any budget adjustments necessary.

RECOMMENDATION
Based on the information presented, I respectfully recommend that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the agreement with MPCA for the acceptance of $640,000 in CAHC program funding for the period of October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2018.
WHEREAS, Ingham County Board of Commissioners has authorized the Ingham County Health Department (ICHD) to accept Child and Adolescent Health Center (CAHC) Program Funding from the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS), as administered through the Michigan Primary Care Association (MPCA), for the period of October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2017, through resolutions #11-235, #12-199, #13-049, #14-358, #15-412, and #16-448; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of this agreement is to provide funds to ICHD to promote the health of children, adolescents and their families by providing important primary, preventative, and early intervention health care services; and

WHEREAS, CAHC program funding supports continued operations of ICHD’s school-based/school-linked health centers; and

WHEREAS, the CAHC program funding award for the term of October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2018 is as follows: Eastern $195,000, Sexton $195,000 and Willow $250,000; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham Community Health Center Board has reviewed and supports the acceptance of this award and supports any budget adjustments necessary as part of this agreement; and

WHEREAS, the Health Officer recommends that the Board of Commissioners authorize an agreement with MPCA for acceptance of the CAHC program funding in the amount of $640,000 for the term of October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2018.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby authorizes the agreement with MPCA for the acceptance of $640,000 in CAHC program funding for the period of October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2018.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Controller 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 the necessary contract documents on behalf of the county after approval as to form by the County Attorney.
TO:       Board of Commissioners Human Services & Finance Committees
FROM:    Ingham County Department of Veteran Affairs (Director of Veterans)
DATE:    10/26/2017
SUBJECT: Authorization to accept monetary donation
               For the meeting agendas of November 6 & 8, 2017

BACKGROUND
Ingham County Department of Veteran Affairs has a reputation of adhering to the highest professional standards while maintaining the trust and confidence of the veterans in Ingham and Clinton Counties. This long-standing reputation had been recognized and honored by the surviving family of Joseph E. Meritt.

ALTERNATIVES
N/A

FINANCIAL IMPACT
Ingham County Department of Veteran Affairs will utilize these funds to honor all veterans of Ingham/Clinton County with a Veterans Day Program.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
N/A

RECOMMENDATION
Based on the information presented, I respectfully recommend approval of the attached resolution.
Introduced by the Human Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE INGHAM COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF VETERAN AFFAIRS TO ACCEPT FOUR HUNDRED TWENTY-FIVE DOLLARS DONATED FROM THE FAMILY OF DECEASED VETERAN, JOSEPH E. MERRITT

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Department of Veteran Affair’s mission is to fulfill President Lincoln’s promise “To care from him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan” by serving and honoring the men and women who are America’s Veterans; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Veteran Affairs is committed to working diligently to serve veterans and are driven by an earnest belief in VA’s mission; fulfilling both individual and organizational responsibilities; and

WHEREAS, the family members of deceased veteran, Joseph E. Merritt; has donated Four Hundred Twenty-Five Dollars to Ingham County Department of Veteran Affairs.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the acceptance of Four hundred twenty-five dollars from the family members of Joseph E. Merritt to the Ingham County Department of Veteran Affairs to be used for the purpose of serving the veterans.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners expresses their appreciation to the Merritt Family for their support of the Ingham County Department of Veteran Affairs.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the Ingham County Department of Veteran Affairs to accept the donation of four hundred twenty-five dollars and directs the Department of Veteran Affairs to utilize the funds for the purpose of providing the highest quality of service and continuous improvement.
TO: Board of Commissioners Finance Committee
FROM: Michael A. Townsend, Budget Director
DATE: October 20, 2017
SUBJECT: 2018 Appropriations Resolution
For the meeting agendas of 11/8/17 Finance

BACKGROUND
Attached is the 2018 Appropriations Resolution, which will adopt the 2018 operating and capital budgets and millage rates as recommended by the Finance Committee at its budget hearing held on September 13, 2017.

ALTERNATIVES
The Uniform Budgeting and Accounting Act, Public Act 621 of 1978, requires that each local unit of government adopt a balanced budget for all required funds.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
This resolution will adopt Ingham County’s spending plan for 2018. The details of this budget can be found in the “2018 Ingham County Budget as Recommended by the Finance Committee” that was distributed at the October 10 Board of Commissioners meeting.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
A public hearing on the 2018 Budget will be held at the Board of Commissioners meeting on Tuesday, November 14, 2017. A notice of public hearing will appear in the City Pulse on Wednesday, November 1, 2017.

RECOMMENDATION
The Controller’s Office recommends the adoption of the 2018 Appropriations Resolution as recommended by the Finance Committee.
WHEREAS, the Uniform Budgeting and Accounting Act, Public Act 621 of 1978, requires that each local unit of government adopt a balanced budget for all required funds; and

WHEREAS, county offices, the courts, county departments, and others have submitted requests for a county appropriation in the 2018 budget; and

WHEREAS, the County Controller has considered these requests and has submitted a recommended budget as required by statute and Board of Commissioners’ resolution; and

WHEREAS, the various liaison committees of the Board of Commissioners have reviewed their section of the Controller's Recommended Budget and have made recommendations for approval or modification to the Finance Committee; and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee has reviewed each liaison committees’ recommendations and together with its own Strategic Planning Initiatives Fund allotment has presented a recommended balanced budget to the Board of Commissioners and to the public; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners annually adopts a balanced budget and authorizes appropriations subject to the conditions set forth in its annual General Appropriations Resolution.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the 2018 Ingham County Budget, as set forth in the Finance Committee Recommended Budget, dated September 13, 2017 and incorporated by reference herein, is hereby adopted on a basis consistent with Ingham County's Budget Adoption and Amendment Policies and subject to all county policies regarding the expenditure of funds and the conditions set forth in this resolution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the following tax levies are hereby authorized for the 2017 tax year/2018 budget year for a total county levy of 10.1106 mills, including authorized levies for General Fund operations and special purpose millages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Millage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Operations</td>
<td>6.3876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Operations – Indigent Veterans Support</td>
<td>.0330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Purpose - Emergency Telephone Services</td>
<td>.8500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Purpose - County-wide Transportation</td>
<td>.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Purpose - Juvenile Justice</td>
<td>.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Purpose - Potter Park Zoo and Potter Park</td>
<td>.4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Purpose – Farmland/Open Space Preservation</td>
<td>.1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Purpose – Health Care Services</td>
<td>.3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Purpose – Trails and Parks</td>
<td>.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Purpose – Animal Shelter</td>
<td>.2400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the revenues received by the County under Public Acts 106 and 107, 1985 (Convention Facility Tax revenue) shall not be used to reduce the County's 2017/2018 operating millage as defined by Public Act 2, 1986.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that in accordance with Public Act 2 of 1986, that 50% of the actual Convention Facility Tax revenue not used to reduce the County's operating tax rate shall be transmitted to the Mid-State Health Network, with the remaining revenues to be deposited in the County's General Fund.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the revenues received by the County under Public Act 264 of 1987 (Health and Safety Fund Act) shall not be used to reduce the County's 2017/2018 operating millage levy, and that 11/17 of the actual Health and Safety Fund Act revenue not used to reduce the County's operating tax rate shall be appropriated to the Ingham County Health Department budget for those public health prevention programs and services whose costs are in excess of 1989 appropriation levels.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that in accordance with Public Act 264 of 1987, that 5/17 of the actual Health and Safety Fund Act revenue not used to reduce the County's operating tax rate shall be used for personnel and operating costs which are in excess of 1988 appropriation levels at the Circuit Court, Family Court, District Court, and Sheriff Department Law Enforcement with the remaining revenues generated by P.A. 264 of 1987 to be used for other General Fund expenditures.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the adopted budget is based on current estimates of revenues and expenditures, and that the Board of Commissioners may find it necessary to adjust budgeted revenues and expenditures from time to time during the year.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the County Controller is hereby authorized to make budgetary transfers within the various funds and authorize expenditures in accordance with the budgetary procedures established by the Board of Commissioners in Resolution #90-274, as amended by Resolutions #94-93 and #04-253, a summary of which has been forwarded by the Controller to each department head, court and elected official.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that expenditures shall not be incurred in excess of the individual budgets adopted herein without first amending the budget pursuant to the budgetary procedures established by the Board of Commissioners in Resolution #90-274, as amended by Resolutions #94-93 and #04-253.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that all purchases made with funds appropriated in this budget shall be made in conformance with the County’s Purchasing Procedures, as adopted and amended by the Board, and that these budgeted funds are appropriated contingent upon compliance with the County’s Purchasing Procedures.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the approved Position Allocation List contained in the budget shall limit the number of permanent employees who can be employed in all departments, offices, and the courts, and no funds are appropriated for any permanent position or employee not on the approved Position Allocation List.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Commissioners may, from time to time during the year, change the approved Position Allocation List and/or impose a hiring freeze, as circumstances warrant, and that the same limitation as to the number of permanent employees who can be employed with a revised Position Allocation List.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that certain positions contained in the Position Allocation List which are supported in some part by a grant, cost sharing, reimbursement, or some other source of outside funding are only approved contingent upon the County receiving the budgeted revenues.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that in the event that such anticipated outside funding is not received or the County is notified that it will not be received, said positions shall be considered not funded and removed from the approved Position Allocation List.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the policies regarding temporary employees shall remain in full force and effect.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that budgets for all funds are adopted on a January 1st fiscal year, with the following exceptions: Friend of the Court Services Fund (215), County Health Fund (221), Community Corrections Fund (267), Community Development Block Grant Fund (287), DHS - Child Care Fund (288), DHS - Social Welfare Fund (290), Family Division – Child Care Fund (292), Prosecuting Attorney Cooperative Reimbursement Grant Fund (298), and Community Health Center Network Fund (511), all of which are adopted on an October 1st fiscal year.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Commissioners authorizes the use of budgeted funds for the purchase of vehicles and necessary equipment such as marking kits, light bars, sirens, prisoner transport shields, radar, etc., from the State of Michigan and other municipal cooperative purchasing programs approved by the Purchasing Department.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the vehicles being replaced are authorized to be transferred to another county department or agency for fair-market value established by the Purchasing Director, or are authorized to be sold at state auction or to a private company; the method of disposal shall be that which is deemed to be in the best interest of the County as determined by the Purchasing Director.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office is authorized to sell at fair-market value any used Ingham County Patrol Vehicles to the Ingham Intermediate School District for its Law Enforcement Program.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that all grants and funding arrangements with entities whose fiscal years do not coincide with the County's fiscal year be considered authorized providing that they have been authorized in the adopted budget, and the remaining portion of the time period and funds are included in the Controller’s Recommended Budget for the succeeding fiscal year.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that funds appropriated to a community agency but not spent by the end of the fiscal year may be carried over into the next fiscal year without additional Board approval, provided the Controller and Budget Office certify that the funds are available, and that the agency wishing to have said funds reappropriated provides a definitive scope of work for review by the Controller’s Office and the County Attorney.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that any request for reappropriation to the 2018 budget of funds not spent in 2017 for a specific project must be received by the Budget Office no later than March 15, 2018, otherwise the request for reappropriation will not be considered.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Human Services and Finance Committees

FROM: Jared Cypher, Deputy Controller

DATE: October 24, 2017

SUBJECT: Resolution Authorizing 2018 Agreements for Community Agencies

For the meeting agendas of November 6 and November 8

BACKGROUND
Attached is the resolution approving community agency funding for FY 2018. Each application was evaluated making the “meeting basic needs” criteria a priority as approved in Board of Commissioners resolution #17-248.

ALTERNATIVES
N/A

FINANCIAL IMPACT
For 2018, Twenty eight (28) applications were received, requesting a total of $268,800; and $200,000 is included in the 2018 Finance Recommended Budget for community agency funding. Each funded agency included in the recommendation is funded either at their request, or at what they received last year plus a $500 increase, totaling $200,400. If the resolution is approved as recommended, the additional $400 could be utilized from the 2018 contingency fund. Agencies receiving funding in 2017 that did not apply for 2018 include Capital Area Community Services, Edgewood Village, Tuesday Toolmen, Hosanna House and Mid-Michigan Recovery Service. The recommendation for Advent House is $0 because the application was submitted after the deadline.

Binders containing the applications of each agency have been previously distributed to you. Please bring those with you to the meeting, as they will provide helpful information for your discussions.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
N/A.

RECOMMENDATION
Based on the information presented, I respectfully recommend approval of the attached resolution.
Resolved by the Human Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING 2018 AGREEMENTS FOR COMMUNITY AGENCIES

WHEREAS, the 2018 Ingham County Budget has been approved by the Board of Commissioners; and

WHEREAS, under the Community Agency Program a number of agencies have been allocated funds to provide important services that are consistent with the County’s Strategic Planning objective to Ingham County residents; and

WHEREAS, the 2018 Finance Recommended Budget includes $200,000 allocated for community agencies; and

WHEREAS, the Controller/Administrator has provided recommended funding levels for each agency that were determined using the criteria set forth in Resolution #17-248.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby directs the County Attorney to draft contracts for the period of January 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018, in the amount specified for each community agency listed on the attached, for the services to Ingham County residents previously approved by the Human Services and Finance Committees.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board Chairperson is authorized to sign the necessary documents after review by the County Attorney.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>2017 AMT. RECEIVED</th>
<th>2018 REQUEST</th>
<th>2018 CONTROLLER RECOMMENDED</th>
<th>2018 HUMAN SERVICES RECOMMENDED</th>
<th>2018 FINANCE RECOMMENDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advent House Ministries, Inc.</td>
<td>To serve lunch to youth ages 6-18 at the Boys &amp; Girls Club of Lansing during the summer and Meals to youth after school</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys &amp; Girls Club of Lansing</td>
<td>To serve lunch to youth ages 6-18 at the Boys &amp; Girls Club of Lansing during the summer and Meals to youth after school</td>
<td>$5,200</td>
<td>$5,200.00</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Area Community Services, Inc.</td>
<td>To increase the college attainment rate of students, particularly those who are low-income, first generation, and of color through developing a college-going culture and school-based support for college readiness, participation, and completion</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Area United Way Capital College Access Network</td>
<td>To increase the college attainment rate of students, particularly those who are low-income, first generation, and of color through developing a college-going culture and school-based support for college readiness, participation, and completion</td>
<td>$9,750</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristo Rey Community Center Community Kitchen</td>
<td>To serve daily meals to individuals of the community in a safe, respectful environment</td>
<td>$4,250</td>
<td>$4,250.00</td>
<td>$4,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristo Rey Community Center Direct Assistance Food Pantry Program</td>
<td>To provide residents with a week's worth of groceries, including hygiene products and necessities year-round</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristo Rey Community Center Prescription Assistance</td>
<td>To provide efficient assistance and advocacy in acquiring prescription medications that are critical for the prevention and treatment of medical conditions and illnesses</td>
<td>$5,750</td>
<td>$6,750.00</td>
<td>$6,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood Village Non-Profit Housing Corp</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVE, Inc.</td>
<td>To serve victims of domestic, sexual, and elder abuse through provision of safe shelter support services (crisis line, advocacy, and counseling) and legal protections to maintain safety of the victim and to support the re-structuring of their lives</td>
<td>$15,500</td>
<td>$18,000.00</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Community Services - Child &amp; Family Services</td>
<td>To serve food, clothing, shelter, and hygiene products, crisis intervention, counseling, and independent living skills to homeless, runaway, at-risk, and street youth ages 12-21 in Ingham County</td>
<td>$15,300</td>
<td>$15,300.00</td>
<td>$15,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Lansing Food Bank</td>
<td>To improve the food security of low-income families and individuals in the mid-Michigan region through gardening</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Lansing Housing Coalition - Ball furnace</td>
<td>To provide shelter and housing stability with supportive services to all residents</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Lansing Housing Coalition - Tuesday Toolman</td>
<td>To provide shelter and housing stability with supportive services to all residents</td>
<td>$3,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat for Humanity</td>
<td>To help low-income homeowners afford projects like replacing windows, doors, gutters, and roofs; porch repairs; ramps; and exterior painting</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven House</td>
<td>To provide food for breakfast, lunch, and dinner as well as beverages to the homeless families of Haven House</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount 1</td>
<td>Amount 2</td>
<td>Amount 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosanna House of Michigan</td>
<td>To provide direct client assistance in the form of a food pantry, housing, utilities, medical/mental health assistance, and transportation for HIV/AIDS individuals with LAAN</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing Area Aids Network</td>
<td>To serve low-income residents of the Leslie Public School District with food bank assistance, transportation, education, and community-donated household items</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$1,400.00</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Outreach, Inc.</td>
<td>To offer well-trained, para-professional services with empathy and crisis intervention skills to help callers through their crisis through distress reduction, feelings de-escalation, future plans, and to work toward resolving the issue</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Michigan Recovery Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU Safe Place</td>
<td>To provide services related to basic needs of survivors of domestic violence and stalk, including their minor children, specifically food and supplies, advocacy assistance funds, and shelter telephone service</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,900.00</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Initiative</td>
<td>To help cover the cost of purchasing items emergency needs items for ex-offenders returning to the community from a federal or state correctional institution or long-term jail stay (&gt;6 months)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Development Center</td>
<td>To help at-risk refugees and immigrants in Ingham County who are in need of food, clothing, and the necessary resources to obtain such supplies on their own</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>To provide community outreach events, specialty training for all volunteers, activity supplies, nutritional snacks for day center clients, and costs associated with assessment of need and referrals for RSVP</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Family Services of Ingham County</td>
<td>To help Ingham County residents afford their homes and keep local food banks supplied with food</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$14,000.00</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside Community Coalition</td>
<td>To provide after school program-healthy snacks to children, monthly bruises for seniors, bi-weekly food distribution to families, summer camp breakfasts to children, and breakfast and lunch to children of the No School Days program</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside Community Kitchen</td>
<td>To provide well balanced meals to citizens in need free of cost</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Vincent Catholic Charities</td>
<td>To help refugee families with a &quot;pre-paycheck&quot; for one month's rent while the family works toward self-sufficiency</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockbridge Community Outreach</td>
<td>To provide milk coupons to families in the Tide Me Over backpack program</td>
<td>$4,550</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-County Office on Aging</td>
<td>To provide a 24-hour year-round emergency response system that provides seniors experiencing crises that impact basic needs</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount 1</td>
<td>Amount 2</td>
<td>Amount 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA-IAM Care Unit</td>
<td>To provide a stabilizing environment to house individuals who are medically stable yet have to wait for a bed in treatment to return to a RISE home with necessities such as a hygiene kit, towels, and bedding</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA-IAM Recovery Community</td>
<td>To provide housing for recovering addicts by providing support for health, home, purpose, and community</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA Westside Community</td>
<td>To serve students in families who have been adversely affected by the current economic climate by providing meals during meetings &amp; referring participants' families to local agencies</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Amount                                                                 | $220,000.00 | $268,800.00 | $200,400 |
October 11, 2017

Board of Commissioners
Ingham County Courthouse
PO Box 319
Mason, Michigan 48854

Dear Board of Commissioners:

Please find enclosed Form 4564, Assessing Officers Report for Industrial Facility Exemption Certificates, for Delhi Charter Township for 2017.

Michigan Compiled Law (MCL) 207.567 requires the Delhi Charter Township Assessor to provide annual notification to the State Tax Commission, the legislative body of each unit of government which levies taxes on property subject to an industrial facility exemption certificate and the holder of the certificate. The notification is to include the determination of the value of property subject to an industrial facility exemption certificate. This letter and the enclosed report are provided to comply with the provisions of MCL 207.567 for 2017.

Please contact me at 517-694-1502 or by email at elizabeth.tobias@delhitownship.com with any questions regarding the matter.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth A. Tobias, MAAO(3), MCPPE
Township Assessor

Enclosure
Assessing Officers Report for Industrial Facility Exemption Certificates
Issued under authority of Public Act 198 of 1974. Filing is mandatory.

In accordance with the requirements of Section 17 of Public Act 198 of 1974, as amended, the city or township assessor is required to furnish an annual report not later than October 15, showing the taxable valuations of real and personal property on the Industrial Facilities Tax Roll as of the preceding December 31, as finally equalized.

For assistance with this form, please see the instructions page or contact the Local Audit and Finance Division at (517) 373-3227. THIS FORM IS FOR TAX YEARS 2008 AND AFTER for the 2017 Tax Year

**Due by October 15, 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City / Twp / Vlg Code*</th>
<th>33104</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City / Twp / Vlg</td>
<td>DELHI CHARTER TWP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>INGHAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor’s Name</td>
<td>ELIZABETH A TOBIAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>(517) 694-1502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Townships responsible for certificates issued by a village should report the village certificates under the village code.

### SCHOOL DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL DISTRICTS</th>
<th>School District Codes</th>
<th>Enter this reference number on subsequent pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>School District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33070</td>
<td>HOLT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33130</td>
<td>MASON</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23050</td>
<td>EATON RAPIDS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33020</td>
<td>LANSING</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCHOOL SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Replacement</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOLT</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,645,152</td>
<td>$5,645,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASON</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>$322,500</td>
<td>$326,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EATON RAPIDS</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANSING</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,967,652</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,971,252</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Summary Totals include Renaissance Zone exempt taxable value

### SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Taxable Value of IFT Personal on Industrial Class Land</th>
<th>Taxable Value of IFT Personal on Commercial Class Land</th>
<th>Taxable Value of all other IFT Personal</th>
<th>Taxable Value of IFT Real</th>
<th>Total Taxable Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total New</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Replacement</td>
<td>$2,615,700</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>$3,351,952</td>
<td>$5,967,652</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>$2,615,700</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>$3,351,952</td>
<td>$5,971,252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary Totals exclude Renaissance Zone exempt taxable value

This report is to be sent certified mail (MCL 207.567(2)) to:
1. Michigan Department of Treasury, Local Audit and Finance Division, PO Box 30728, Lansing, MI 48909-8228.
2. Each tax-levying unit involving the certified property.
3. The holder of the certificate.

Continued on Page 2
### NEW CERTIFICATES

List certificates in numeric order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cert. No.</th>
<th>Certificate Holder</th>
<th>School District Reference Number</th>
<th>Enter 1-6</th>
<th>Taxable Value of IFT Personal on Industrial Land</th>
<th>Taxable Value of IFT Personal on Commercial Class Land</th>
<th>Taxable Value of all other IFT Personal</th>
<th>Taxable Value of IFT Real Property</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>Specify if Parcel located in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-SAMPLE</td>
<td>ABC COMPANY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-143</td>
<td>LEIGHTRONIX, INC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Check box if continued on additional pages]
### REPLACEMENT CERTIFICATES

List certificates in numeric order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cert. No.</th>
<th>Certificate Holder Name</th>
<th>School District Reference Number</th>
<th>Frozen Real Taxable Value</th>
<th>Frozen Personal Taxable Value</th>
<th>Frozen Total Taxable Value</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>Specify if Cert is located in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002-125</td>
<td>HOLT PRODUCTS CO, INC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>229,400</td>
<td>229,400</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-234</td>
<td>HOLT PRODUCTS COMPANY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-497</td>
<td>STEALTH MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-576</td>
<td>MPT LANSING LLC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>788,533</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>830,533</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-302</td>
<td>FIBERTEC, INC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57,400</td>
<td>57,400</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-602</td>
<td>MOLDED PLASTICS INDUSTRIES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-619</td>
<td>DART CONTAINER OF MICHIGAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>901,300</td>
<td>117,800</td>
<td>1,019,100</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-622</td>
<td>HID STEALTH ORTHOPEDICS SOL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>315,500</td>
<td>315,500</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-621</td>
<td>MPT LANSING LLC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14,826</td>
<td>57,700</td>
<td>72,526</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-125</td>
<td>EISEN ELECTRIC CORPORATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>181,900</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>188,700</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-329</td>
<td>MOLDED PLASTICS INDUSTRIES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54,900</td>
<td>54,900</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-150</td>
<td>SCITEX, LLC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>161,300</td>
<td>161,300</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-226</td>
<td>DART CONTAINER OF MICHIGAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>845,642</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>845,642</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-012</td>
<td>FIBERTEC, INC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41,300</td>
<td>41,300</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-096</td>
<td>XG SCIENCES, INC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>420,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>420,400</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-331</td>
<td>EISEN ELECTRIC CORPORATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-073</td>
<td>FIBERTEC, INC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78,200</td>
<td>78,200</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-217</td>
<td>HOLT PRODUCTS CO INC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>299,300</td>
<td>299,300</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-088</td>
<td>XG SCIENCES, INC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-121</td>
<td>MPT LANSING LLC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-122</td>
<td>SCITEX, LLC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99,100</td>
<td>99,100</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-337</td>
<td>FIBERTEC, INC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93,500</td>
<td>93,500</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-186</td>
<td>ORCHID ORTHOPEDIC SOLUTION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>748,800</td>
<td>748,800</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-312</td>
<td>SCITEX, LLC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>151,300</td>
<td>151,300</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-364</td>
<td>EISEN ELECTRIC CORPORATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180,351</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180,351</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-049</td>
<td>LEIGHTRONIX, INC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-117</td>
<td>TRICK TITANIUM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Check box if continued on additional pages] [Help?] [Need more lines?]