THE HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE WILL MEET ON MONDAY, JUNE 4, 2018 AT 6:30 P.M., IN THE PERSONNEL CONFERENCE ROOM (D & E), HUMAN SERVICES BUILDING, 5303 S. CEDAR, LANSING.

Agenda

Call to Order
Approval of the May 14, 2018 Minutes
Additions to the Agenda
Limited Public Comment

1. Parks Commission – Interviews

2. Facilities – Resolution to Extend the Current Tri-County Office on Aging (TCOA) Lease Agreement

3. Health Department – Resolution to Enter Agreement with AGS Data, LLC

4. Parks Department – Resolution to Approve the Application Form, Scoring Criteria for the Trails and Parks Millage, and Declaring a Fourth Round of Applications for the Trails and Parks Millage (Discussion/Possible Action)


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.
HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE
May 14, 2018
Draft Minutes

Members Present: Banas, Nolan, Koenig (arrived at 6:46 p.m.), Louney, Tennis, Sebolt, and Naeyaert (left at 7:10 p.m.)

Members Absent: None.

Others Present: Commissioner Crenshaw, Jeff Potter, Ryan Claypool, Samantha Bird, Mark Stevens, Tim Morgan, Tim Dolehanty, Lindsey LaForte, and others.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Banas at 6:30 p.m. in Personnel Conference Room “D & E” of the Human Services Building, 5303 S. Cedar Street, Lansing, Michigan.

Approval of the April 30, 2018 Minutes

MOVED BY COMM. NAeyaERT, SUPPORTED BY COMM. TENNIS, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 30, 2018 HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Koenig.

Additions to the Agenda

None.

Removed from the Agenda –

None.

Limited Public Comment

Jeff Potter, Friends of Ingham County Parks, stated he was before the Committee to express his support for the Park Patron program. He further stated that this program would be a great way to help support the Friends of the Parks financially.

Mr. Potter stated that the Park Patron program would be voluntary and allow people to purchase a special park pass.

Ryan Claypool, Ingham County Youth Commission, stated he was before the Committee in order to give the Youth Commission’s annual report. He further stated that the Youth Commission had participated in projects such as Blessing Bags for the Homeless Angels, Officer Mankowski’s Holiday Party in Haslett, and March is Reading Month.

Mr. Claypool stated that the past week was the Annual Day of Play at Lake Lansing and the weather was not cooperative, but they made the most of it.
Samantha Bird, Ingham County Youth Commission, stated that she was disappointed that the Day of Play was not as successful as it had been in the past, due to the weather.

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

3. Fair Office – Resolution to Authorize Construction of a Cement Floor for the South End Horse Complex Pavilion at the Ingham County Fairgrounds

4. Parks Department
   a. Resolution to Authorize a Voluntary Park Patron Optional Decal – Fundraising Program
   b. Resolution Honoring Jim Hewitt as a 2017 Volunteer of the Year
   c. Resolution Honoring Laurie Kaufman as a 2017 Volunteer of the Year

5. Health Department
   a. Resolution to Amend the Sparrow VOA Transfer Agreement Authorized in Resolution #17-328
   b. Resolution to Convert the Vacant Lead Social Worker Position to Medical Social Worker
   c. Resolution to Establish 340B Pharmacy Coordinator Position
   d. Resolution to Install a Mural at Forest Community Health Center
   e. Resolution Honoring Rose Snyder

6. Controller’s Office – Resolution Updating Various Fees for County Services

7. Board Referral – Letter from the Capital Area Transportation Authority Concerning a Response to the County’s November 29, 2017 Letter and Resolution No. 17-458

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Koenig.

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

1. Youth Commission – Discussion

Chairperson Banas stated that there had been discussions concerning reviving the Youth Commission. She further stated that a staff member, Jacqueline Lloyd, Community Health Worker, had been identified as someone who would be able to staff the group.

Chairperson Banas stated that the staff member would cost about $2,000 annually and a resolution was needed in order to approve that cost. She further stated that the Board of Commissioners would like more formal feedback from the Youth Commission.

Chairperson Banas stated that she would like to task the Youth Commission with investigating how youth were using the trails and how that usage could be increased. She further stated that she had talked to Tim Dolehanty, Controller, about the Youth Commission meeting with Melissa Buzzard, Trails and Parks Millage Coordinator.
Chairperson Banas stated that she and Commissioner Crenshaw had spoken about the Youth Commission reducing the meeting schedule to once a month. She further stated that in light of the cost of having a staff person at meetings, it would be a wise financial decision also.

Ms. Bird stated that one reason having meetings twice a month worked well was because many members of the Youth Commission could only make one meeting or the other, and it gave them two options to participate.

Chairperson Banas stated that she had faith that the Youth Commission could find a way to increase the attendance of one meeting a month. She further stated that the cost of holding two meetings was too great and the members of the Youth Commission needed to make an effort to attend most meetings.

Commissioner Naeyaert stated that she was unsure if the Youth Commission needed a staff member at this time, especially since Commissioner Crenshaw was the liaison and was very active.

Ms. Bird stated that the Youth Commission served to benefit the Board of Commissioners and they were very happy to help with whatever was needed.

Commissioner Sebolt stated that he was happy to see the Youth Commission given some tasks, but this was a two-way street and the Youth Commission needed to bring ideas to the Board of Commissioners too.

Chairperson Banas stated that she did not want to tell the Youth Commission what to do. She further stated that it was up to the Youth Commission to brainstorm what other issues were important, but the task assigned gave them a starting point.

Commissioner Koenig arrived at 6:46 p.m.

Commissioner Crenshaw stated that a staff person would be helpful because they could serve as a liaison between the County and the Youth Commission. He further stated that he enjoyed working with the Youth Commission, but his time was more limited and they would have more access to a staff member.

Ms. Bird stated that she had noticed that there was an issue with communication and maybe a staff person would help improve that. She further stated that they were still linked with the MSU Extension 4-H program, but they were not really a part of 4-H.

Commissioner Crenshaw stated that it would require a resolution to take the 4-H component out of the Youth Commission. He further stated that it may be helpful to provide a curriculum to the Youth Commission.

Commissioner Louney stated that he would like ideas about how to get youth involved from his community.

Ms. Bird stated that having a curriculum to learn about local government would help, and even as an experienced member of the group, she would like to learn more.
Chairperson Banas stated that perhaps speakers could come to discuss their work with local government. She further stated that maybe they could develop a rubric to follow, such as interviewing Board of Commissioners and County staff.

Commissioner Louney stated that perhaps working with local school principals would help to bring more members in.

Ms. Bird stated that they would welcome recruiting other members to the Youth Commission.

Mr. Claypool stated that his principal was the reason he joined the Youth Commission and sending an email to the local schools was helpful in recruiting new members.

Chairperson Banas asked if schools were emailed every year.

Commissioner Crenshaw stated he had emailed all the schools a couple of years ago, but not this past year.

Chairperson Banas stated that they needed to remember to reach out to the schools next fall. She further stated that she thanked the Youth Commission members for joining this discussion.

2. Medical Care Facility – Discussion

Chairperson Banas stated that Mark Stevens, Ingham County Medical Care Facility (ICMCF) Director, had provided an additional handout with more information (included in the minutes as attachment A). She asked Mr. Dolehanty to provide some background on this issue.

Mr. Dolehanty stated that the handout provided by Mr. Stevens was very thorough and he would defer to him for more information.

Mr. Stevens stated that the ICMCF had received a complaint that the medical gas system was not being installed properly during construction on the building expansion, so he had halted the project last week. He further stated that there was confusion as to which building codes applied to the medical gas system and that the building codes did not seem uniform.

Mr. Stevens stated that they had received an email from Price Dobernick, United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters Local 333 Business Manager, which stated that the ICMCF did not have the proper permit for the installation of the medical gas system and that it was being installed illegally. He further stated that it was a very real concern for an administrator of a health care facility.

Mr. Stevens stated that the medical gas contractors had provided a lot of information on this and it seemed that there was a code change in 2016 which may be the issue. He further stated that he had been investigating this issue for a week and had found many different codes that may apply for medical gas.
Mr. Stevens stated that the City of East Lansing did the permitting for Meridian Township for medical gas. He further stated that they had a mechanical permit and that the work, thus far, had been approved by the mechanical inspector from the City of East Lansing.

Mr. Stevens stated that when the job was halted, the subcontractor, Diamond Mechanical, contacted the mechanical inspector from the City of East Lansing in order to find out if this project was okay to proceed. He further stated that Mr. Dobernick had reached out to the City of East Lansing’s plumbing inspector concerning this job.

Chairperson Banas asked if it was a mistake to reach out to the plumbing inspector.

Mr. Stevens stated that he did not think it was a mistake, because according to his research, up until 2016, the plumbing code did cover medical gas. He further stated that there was disagreement if this work should be inspected as a mechanical or plumbing project even between the inspectors.

Mr. Stevens stated that the plumbing inspector for the City of East Lansing had sent an email to him explaining that there were real concerns as to if this project was being completed correctly.

Mr. Stevens stated that the City of East Lansing’s Building and Code Administrator had determined that the mechanical inspector had the authority over the medical gas system. He further stated that it was determined by the City of East Lansing that the permit was granted properly.

Mr. Stevens stated that even though the City of East Lansing stated that work could continue, he wanted to further address Mr. Dobernick’s concerns. He further stated the plumbing inspector had fully supported Mr. Dobernick’s perspective and insisted that a master plumber needed to be supervising the installation of the medical gas system.

Mr. Stevens stated that the handout he provided gave additional background about the codes, but he was leaning toward medical gas being a mechanical system. He further stated that he was not comfortable with the work continuing until he had an answer.

Mr. Stevens stated that he was trying to get the City of East Lansing inspectors, their supervisor, and the Meridian Township building inspector to meet to find a solid answer.

Commissioner Naeyaert asked if the State had been contracted. She further stated that the State had a mechanical code and a plumbing code which should provide answers.

Mr. Stevens stated that he had not contacted the State yet, but he had contact information for someone from the Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs (LARA). He further stated that he was concerned that the person from LARA may be too far removed from this situation to provide a clear answer.

Commissioner Naeyaert stated that LARA would know the exact answer.

Discussion.
Commissioner Tennis stated that there had not been any substantial changes to the code concerning the installation of medical gas in 2016 when the Skilled Trades Regulation Act supplanted the State Plumbing Act. He further stated that there was only one mention of medical gas in the State Plumbing Act and that section had not been changed.

Commissioner Tennis stated that he had worked on that legislation with Senator Horn and the act made no substantial changes to regulations, rather it gathered the various construction codes and put them into one act. He further stated that he had just checked the code and the only mention of medical gas in that act said that it could be installed by people without a plumbing license only if they are supervised by a master plumber.

Commissioner Tennis stated that if there was not a master plumber on the job site overseeing the work, then it was not up to code.

Mr. Stevens stated that that had been his understanding at one point too.

Commissioner Tennis stated that the State requirements were more important than the national codes, as there was a lot of variety nationally.

Mr. Stevens referred to page 4 and 5 of his handout and read the portion concerning the codes. He further stated that he was not a building professional, which was why he was relying on the local building inspectors for guidance.

Commissioner Koenig asked when the meeting with the inspectors was scheduled and how much this was delaying the project.

Mr. Stevens stated that he had requested the meeting today and the project was expected to be delayed a few weeks because of this suspension of work. He further stated that he would like to be truthful about a mistake he had made concerning the contract for this medical gas system.

Mr. Stevens stated that that this contract for medical gas was separate from the general contract based on advice from Plante Moran. He further stated that they had pulled this part of the contract out of the general contract and sent it to medical gas contractors.

Mr. Stevens said they had not asked the contractors to seek local labor when soliciting the bid. He further stated that they had delayed the project and asked for bids again reaching out to local plumbers and pipefitters.

Mr. Stevens stated that it was a mistake on his part and if he ever needed another construction process he would make sure that they solicited local bids.

Mr. Stevens stated that the Dobie Road facility attempted to adhere to the purchasing policies of the Ingham County as much as possible.

Commission Tennis asked about the relationship between AirGas and Diamond Mechanical.

Mr. Stevens stated that AirGas was a national medical gas supplier and Diamond Mechanical was their subcontractor to perform the installation.
Commissioner Tennis asked if AirGas was the one selected before the contract went to open bid.

Mr. Stevens stated that AirGas was selected.

Commissioner Tennis stated that after they chose to rebid the project, they chose AirGas again. He asked if Plante Moran handled the bid process.

Mr. Stevens stated that they backed up and had the installers rebid the contract and allowed AirGas to review it. He further stated that AirGas’ role was competitively bid.

Mr. Stevens stated that Plante Moran handled over a billion dollars of construction contracts annually and were experts on this. He further stated that he was satisfied that choosing AirGas was done competitively; however, AirGas’ selection of installers was not competitive.

Commissioner Tennis stated that the selection of installers was corrected with an open bid process before starting the work. He asked what AirGas’ role was in the project.

Mr. Stevens stated that AirGas was a national firm and they did all the engineering. He further stated that Diamond Mechanical was from the Ann Arbor area.

Mr. Stevens stated that during the competitive bidding process, they had placed an advertisement in the Lansing State Journal and reached out to many companies and asked the United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters, Local 333 to also help get the word out. He stated that in that process they only received one additional bid and it was 30% more than the original bid.

Mr. Stevens stated that he personally would like to have local labor, but the additional cost was prohibitive.

Commissioner Tennis asked if it was AirGas’ responsibility to ensure the subcontractor was American Society of Safety Engineers (ASSE) certified.

Mr. Stevens stated that it was their responsibility.

Commission Naeyaert asked if AirGas knew the code.

Mr. Stevens stated that the Air Gas believed this was a mechanical code issue, the United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters, Local 333 believed that this was a plumbing code issue.

Commission Nolan stated that she appreciated the reasonable approach Mr. Stevens had taken to sort out this difficult political problem. She further stated that she trusted that Mr. Stevens would solve this problem and was sorry this mess was delaying the project.

Commission Sebolt stated that he was resentful that this was called a political problem when patients’ safety was at risk.
Commissioner Tennis stated that he would also like to follow up on that, and there had been multiple fatalities because of medical gas being poorly installed. He further stated that there was a reason why there were additional requirements.

Commissioner Nolan stated that of course that was the case, but she questioned why the business did not know the proper code.

Commissioner Tennis stated that some businesses choose to ignore the code and then could charge 30% less than businesses who followed the code.

Commissioner Nolan stated that it was ludicrous that the County was put in this position while trying to get this building done.

Commissioner Tennis stated that it was important that this be done correctly and figure this out now, because if the medical gas was installed incorrectly it would lead to the building being unusable, massive litigation, a complete re-haul of the system, and perhaps the building would not be able to be insured. He further stated that this would amount to a huge cost.

Mr. Stevens stated that he was thankful for the complaint because this way they could know 100% that this was done well. He further stated that Commissioner Tennis was correct that this would be a larger problem down the road, especially since the County would be liable for the building.

Commissioner Nolan stated that she did not understand how a local municipality did not know what the code was and did not have agreement among staff. She further asked how projects were to be completed if there was not even agreement between staff.

Commissioner Koenig stated that she had heard of inspectors disagreeing in the past. She further stated that the lesson was to keep these contracts under the general contract, which would have made this the general contractor’s problem and not the County’s.

Commissioner Naeyaert left the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

Commissioner Koenig asked why the contract for AirGas had been separated out.

Mr. Stevens stated that Plante Moran had been hired as ICMCF’s owner representative when working through the bidding process. He further stated that they had recommended medical gas be a separate contract and he had relied on their expertise.

Mr. Stevens stated that he knew if they had kept this under the general contract, this would not have been an issue today.

Commissioner Koenig stated that she thought Mr. Stevens was handling this problem well, she respected the ICMCF, and trusted that this would be resolved soon.

Chairperson Banas stated that she appreciated Mr. Stevens for keeping the Committee informed.

**Commissioner Nolan asked Mr. Stevens for an update when this was resolved.**
Mr. Stevens stated that he would update the Committee.

Announcements

None.

Public Comment

None.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:20 p.m.
Attachment A

Ingham County Medical Care Facility’s Med Gas System Update
May 14, 2018

1. The Medical Care Facility (MCF) is installing a med gas system in its new addition to better serve patients who struggle with breathing and maintaining optimal oxygen levels.

2. March 25, 2018. The MCF’s med gas installer (Algaras Airgas’ subcontractor Diamond Mechanical) contacted Meridian Township and the City of East Lansing’s Mechanical Inspector to seek guidance specific to obtaining the appropriate permit for installing the med gas system.

3. On March 28, 2018 a mechanical permit was issued and work began.

4. April 17, 2018. The East Lansing Mechanical Inspector conducted an inspection and approved the completed portion of the installed med gas system.

5. May 4, 2018 (late on a Friday afternoon). Price Dobernick, Business Manager with the United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters, Local Union 333 emailed an East Lansing Plumbing Inspector (versus the East Lansing Mechanical Inspector who processed and approved the initial permit), alleging (under The State Plumbing Act, 2002 PA 733, which was repealed and replaced during 2016) that the MCF med gas system is in violation of many med gas system legal requirements including:

   a. The med gas system installation doesn’t have the proper permit.
   b. Installers are not certified medical gas brazers and installers.
   c. Apprentices are installing the med gas system.
   d. The subcontractor does not have a Master Plumber or Plumbing Contractors License on file with the State of Michigan.
   e. There hasn’t been a licensed Journeyman or Master Plumber on site to oversee the med gas installation.

6. May 6, 2018 (Sunday afternoon). MCF’s administrator read a forwarded email string that included Mr. Dobernick’s allegation. Diamond Mechanical was directed to halt all work pending the outcome of an investigation specific to Mr. Dobernick’s allegations.

7. May 7, 2018. Diamond Mechanical contacted East Lansing’s Mechanical Inspector. The Mechanical Inspector checked with his supervisor, East Lansing’s Building and Code Administrator, who informed the Mechanical Inspector that it was his call as to whether or not the proper permit had been obtained and if the med gas system was being installed in compliance with legal and code requirements. The Mechanical Inspector determined it was the proper permit and that the work was in compliance with legal and code requirements per his April 17, 2018 inspection approval. However, MCF’s administrator determined the project would continue to be held pending a response from the East Lansing Plumbing Inspector who Mr. Dobernick had emailed.

8. May 8, 2018. The MCF administrator contacted East Lansing’s Plumbing Inspector asking him to address the concerns that had been raised specific to the MCF’s med gas system and the facility’s desire to have a med gas system that is safe and meets all applicable legal/permit/code requirements.

9. May 10, 2018. The East Lansing Plumbing Inspector emailed to the Medical Care Facility his response to the questions Mr. Dobernick’s email:

   a. Will you demand work to stop until properly permitted? Yes and permit has already been canceled.
   b. Will you allow work that has already been installed by unlicensed and unpermitted workers to stay in place, much of which is now concealed or partially concealed? All pipe will need to be
exposed and I will let the plumbing contractor that is contracted to install the Med gas pipe decide if they are willing to accept the responsibility of the piping installed. If they are then it will have to be removed if not then it's a start over.
c. Will you demand that a contractor with a Master Plumbing License and the proper Medical Gas certified employees resume the work on the job? Yes
d. What will the consequences be for Diamond Mechanical for operating without the proper license and permits? Will you report this to the MOH or is that our responsibility? As the permit should never have been issued to them for this work, I believe the loss of income from proceeding without the proper permit might be consequence enough. If you want you can submit the complaint to the State, that is your call.

East Lansing’s Plumbing Inspector went on to say that “Part of the problem here is a disconnect between the permitting process and requirements... Our new mechanical inspector, Wayne, responded to the mechanical contractor’s questions... but was unaware of the requirement for plumbing supervision of med gas nor the need for plumbing permits. The township issued the mechanical permit also unaware of the requirements”.

The Plumbing Inspector then appears to contradict himself by forwarding the new the Plumbing Code requirements. Plumbing Code [A] 101.2 Scope includes “the design and installation of gas piping, chilled water piping in connection with refrigeration process and comfort cooling, and hot water piping in connection with building heating systems shall conform to the Michigan Mechanical Code.”

10. The MCF is arranging a meeting with East Lansing’s Plumbing Inspector, Mechanical Inspector, Building and Code Administrator, and Meridian Township’s Chief Building Inspector to address the issues raised in items one through eight above and to discuss the following recent (2016) changes to med gas system codes and legal requirements:

a. The Michigan Department of Energy, Labor and Economic Growth, Bureau of Construction Codes (the State Plumbing Act, 2002 PA 733) was repealed and replaced by Public Act 407 of 2016 (“Skilled Trades Regulation Act”). The Skilled Trades Regulation Act loosened license requirements for the installation of med gas systems; allowing work to be performed under license authority other than a plumber’s license. Other codes that allow med gas system work to be performed without requiring a plumber’s license include the Michigan Construction Code, Michigan Mechanical Code, the American Society of Mechanical Engineers’ Code for Pressure Piping, and National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 99 2012 Health Care Code.

b. Diffusing jurisdictional interpretations exists specific to the Skilled Trades Regulation Act 339.6107:

1. Section 1107 (2) (1). A license under this article is not required to perform any of the following work... the installation of medical gas piping. If the installation is performed under the supervision of a licensed plumbing contractor.

2. Section 1107 (3). This article does not prevent a person from performing any activities within the scope of license or registration under any other license or registration acts or applicable codes for that licensed or registered professional adopted pursuant to law.

3. An example of standards and codes that jurisdictions determine meet the requirements of the Skilled Trades Regulation Act include the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) codes, codes in which there is no reference specifying a Master Plumber or Plumbing Contractors’ license as a requirement.
a. NFPA 99, 2012 5.1.10.11.10.1: The installation of medical gas and vacuum systems shall be made by qualified, competent technicians who are experienced in performing such installations, including all personnel who actually install the piping system.

b. NFPA99, 2012 5.1.10.11.10.2: Installer of medical gas and vacuum piping distribution systems, shall be certified in accordance with ASSE 6010, Professional Qualification Standard for Medical Gas Systems Installers.

4. Additionally, the Michigan Mechanical Code added Sections 1700.0 (Scope) and 1706.1 (Process piping) placing all process gas piping, including medical gas piping, under the jurisdiction of the Mechanical Code.

11. May 11, 2018. Lastly, the mea gas system installation continues to be on hold. The Medical Care Facility will fully comply with whatever version of med gas system codes is determined to be correct, including acquiring a plumbing permit and hiring a Master Plumber to supervise Airgas and its subcontractor's installation of medical gas piping if needed.
ACTION ITEMS:
The Deputy Controller is recommending approval of the following resolutions

2. Facilities – Resolution to Extend the Current Tri-County Office on Aging (TCOA) Lease Agreement
TCOA has a building lease with Ingham County that expired December 31, 2017. Language in the original agreement states an option to renew the lease agreement for an additional (5) five years. TCOA wishes to exercise this option. If approved, the lease will extend through December 31, 2022.

3. Health Department – Resolution to Enter Agreement with AGS Data, LLC
Following a Request For Proposals process overseen by the Purchasing Department, ICHD selected AGS Data LLC to assist the department in conducting a health equity self-assessment. AGS Data, LLC will perform the following services:

1. Administer, analyze, and report on an assessment of ICHD/ICHC staff;
2. Administer, analyze, and report on interviews of ICHD/ICHC administration;
3. Administer, analyze, and report on the assessment of the department’s effectiveness from the viewpoint of its community partners; and
4. Develop a self-assessment tool based on the Bay Area Regional Health Inequities Initiative (BARHII) staff self-assessment for organizations that are not focused on public health.

The cost of this agreement totaling $19,920 is completely funded by the Kresge ELPH Grant and will be effective upon full execution of the contract through September 30, 2018.

4. Parks Department – Resolution to Approve the Application Form, Scoring Criteria for the Trails and Parks Millage, and Declaring a Fourth Round of Applications for the Trails and Parks Millage
The Park Commission reviewed and edited the Trails and Parks Millage Grant Application and Scoring Criteria, taking into consideration the comments from the BOC in the last round of grants. Changes were made to the application itself as well as the scoring criteria.

There were two changes to the Application. The first change clarified the fact that small communities will be scored separately if said communities contribute less than 5% of the total county millage revenue annually. This was previously approved but the Park Commission wanted to specifically outline this. The second change was the addition of the last line in question #4 instructing the communities to reference BOC Resolution #18-054 for design standard clarification.

The Scoring Criteria was streamlined from six questions down to four, focusing on County Trail Priorities as well as creating a formula allowing the percentage of match to carry more weight in the scoring process. The first question now asks if the proposed project contributes to the completion of one of the top five scoring New Trail Preferences as listed in the Ingham County Trails and Parks Comprehensive Report, which will aid the BOC in approving projects that will help reach the overall goal of the County. The match formula was created to assist in assigning points to the amount of match put forth by the applying entity and to give more weight to the percentage given by the entity. The number of points a project will receive is determined by dividing the percent match by 10 then multiplying that number by three. (ex: 63% match will receive 18.9 points) Question four combined original questions five and six by asking scorers to consider how the project will benefit the County as well as other project related questions such a complexity, lengthiness and partnership support.
The resolution also opens the application period for the fourth round of grants. Applications will be open on June 18, 2018 and due on August 31, 2018. Following due diligence by staff and the Park Commission, final approval is expected from the Board of Commissioners in January or February of 2019.

5. **Community Agencies - Resolution Approving Criteria for Evaluating 2019 Applications for Community Agency Funding**

This resolution establishes the criteria by which each agency’s application will be evaluated for the 2019 Community Agency funding process.

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

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

**OTHER ITEMS:**

1. **Parks Commission – Interviews**
TO: Board of Commissioners, Human Services and Finance Committees
FROM: Rick Terrill, Facilities Director
DATE: May 22, 2018
SUBJECT: Extending the current Tri-County Office on Aging (TCOA) lease agreement

For the meeting agendas of: June 5 & June 6

BACKGROUND
TCOA has a building lease with Ingham County that expired December 31, 2017. Language in the original agreement states an option to renew the lease agreement for an additional (5) five years. TCOA wishes to exercise this option. If approved, the lease will extend through December 31, 2022.

ALTERNATIVES
There are no alternatives to this request.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
Monthly lease payments are charged by Financial Services based on square footage, as appropriate.

STRATEGIC PLANNING IMPACT
This resolution supports the goals and strategies which address our service to the community and employees alike.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
There are no other considerations for this agreement.

RECOMMENDATION
Based on the information presented, approval is requested to extend the TCOA lease agreement for an additional (5) five years.
Agenda Item 2

Introduced by the Human Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO EXTEND THE CURRENT TRI-COUNTY OFFICE ON AGING (TCOA) LEASE AGREEMENT

WHEREAS, TCOA has a building lease with Ingham County that expired December 31, 2017; and

WHEREAS, language in the original agreement states an option to renew the lease agreement for an additional (5) five years; and

WHEREAS, TCOA wishes to exercise this option; and

WHEREAS, if approved, the lease will extend through December 31, 2022; and

WHEREAS, monthly lease payments are charged by Financial Services based on square footage, as appropriate.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes a five year lease renewal to begin January 1, 2018 through December 31, 2022, with lease payments handled by the Financial Services Department based on square footage, as appropriate.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that all other terms and conditions set forth in the lease agreement remain unchanged.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the Board Chairperson to sign any necessary documents that are consistent with this resolution and approved as to form by the County Attorney.
TO: Board of Commissioners Human Services and Finance Committees
FROM: Linda S. Vail, MPA, Health Officer
DATE: May 16, 2018
SUBJECT: Agreement with AGS Data LLC
For the meeting agendas of June 4 and June 6, 2018

BACKGROUND
Resolution # 17 – 385 authorized acceptance of the Kresge Foundation’s Emerging Leaders in Public Health (ELPH) Grant funds for a project totaling $125,000 for the period of August 1st, 2017 - September 30, 2018. Under this grant, ICHD is required to establish a new role for ICHD in creating a designation of best practice for exemplifying Health Equity & Social Justice (HESJ) in everyday practice and service; provide technical assistance, consultation, and training for improved service delivery; and position ourselves to pilot test, incubate, and disseminate trainings with applied HESJ concepts.

Since 2005, ICHD has been working to transform public health practice by devising a methodology for organizations to intentionally incorporate a health equity and social justice framework successfully. After a decade, ICHD feels the need to reevaluate its health equity and social justice training program and revise it so that it reflects the knowledge acquired in the areas of health equity and justice that have been developed since the program’s inception and incorporate the experiences of the department in implementing a health equity/social justice program to meet the challenges of the future. A health equity self-assessment of the ICHD workforce is required to lay the groundwork for a new health equity training program.

Following a Request For Proposals process overseen by the Purchasing Department, ICHD selected AGS Data LLC to assist the department in conducting the self-assessment. AGS Data, LLC will perform the following services:

1. Administer, analyze, and report on an assessment of ICHD/ICHC staff;
2. Administer, analyze, and report on interviews of ICHD/ICHC administration;
3. Administer, analyze, and report on the assessment of the department’s effectiveness from the viewpoint of its community partners; and
4. Develop a self-assessment tool based on the Bay Area Regional Health Inequities Initiative (BARHII) staff self-assessment for organizations that are not focused on public health.

The cost of this agreement totaling $19,920 is completely funded by the Kresge ELPH Grant and will be effective upon full execution of the contract through September 30, 2018.

ALTERNATIVES
There are no alternatives.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
Costs associated with this agreement will be completely funded by the Kresge ELPH Grant.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
There are no other considerations.
RECOMMENDATION
Based upon the information presented, I respectfully recommend approval of the attached resolution to enter an agreement with AGS Data, LLC in the amount of $19,920.00, effective from June 15, 2018 through September 30, 2018.
Per your request, the Purchasing Department sought proposals from persons or organizations that can assist the Health Department in conducting a health equity self-assessment and lay the groundwork for a new health equity training program.

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>34</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendors responding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Local Preference</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGS Data LLC</td>
<td>No, Kalamazoo</td>
<td>$19,920.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Consultants Inc.</td>
<td>Yes, Lansing</td>
<td>$20,000.00</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. Please call me at your convenience to discuss the applicability of the Local Purchasing Preference Policy with this project.

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.
PERSONAL LIABILITY UMBRELLA POLICY

Automatic Renewal - If the policy period is shown as 12 months, this policy will be renewed automatically subject to premiums, rules and forms in effect for each succeeding policy period. If this policy is terminated, we will give you written notice in compliance with the policy provisions or as required by law.

Coverage(s)
Coverage L - Personal Liability
Self-Insured Retention

Limit of Liability
$ 1,000,000
$ 500

Required Underlying Insurance
(Terms in bold in this section are defined in the policy)

Minimum Underlying Limits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Policy</th>
<th>Combined Limits (Bodily Injury and Property Damage)</th>
<th>or</th>
<th>Split Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automobile Liability</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bodily Injury - $250,000 Per Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Property Damage - $500,000 Per Accident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Motor Vehicle Liability Including Passenger Bodily Injury</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bodily Injury - $250,000 Per Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Property Damage - $100,000 Per Accident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Residential Liability</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watercraft Liability</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forms & Endorsements
Personal Liability Umbrella
Fuel Oil Exclusion
Notice in Event of Liab Claim

Policy Premium
$ 107

Other limits and exclusions may apply - refer to your policy
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ANDY MCCLISH
289-372-3311
PERSONAL LIABILITY UMBRELLA POLICY
FE-5837 FUEL OIL EXCLUSION ENDORSEMENT

EXCLUSIONS
The following exclusion is added:

We do not provide any coverage under this policy for any loss arising out of the actual, alleged or threatened discharge, seepage, leakage, migration, dispersal, spill, release, emission, escape, leaching or disposal of fuel oil.

FE-5837

NOTICE IN THE EVENT OF A LIABILITY CLAIM

The following apply with respect to any claim for liability protection under this policy:

1. Notice given by or on behalf of the insured to an authorized agent of the company, with particulars sufficient to identify the insured, will be considered to be notice to the company; and

2. Failure to provide initial notice of a claim or any subsequent information required in conjunction with that claim within time frames required by the policy will not invalidate a claim made by the insured if it is shown that it was not reasonably possible to do so and that the notice or information was provided as soon as it was reasonably possible.

FE-5499
WHEREAS, resolution # 17 – 385 authorized acceptance of the Kresge Foundation’s Emerging Leaders in Public Health (ELPH) Grant funds for a project totaling $125,000 for the period of August 1st, 2017 - September 30, 2018; and

WHEREAS, under this grant, ICHD is required to establish a new role for ICHD in creating a designation of best practice for exemplifying Health Equity & Social Justice (HESJ) in everyday practice and service; provide technical assistance, consultation, and training for improved service delivery; and position ourselves to pilot test, incubate, and disseminate trainings with applied HESJ concepts; and

WHEREAS, since 2005, ICHD has been working to transform public health practice by devising a methodology for organizations to intentionally incorporate a health equity and social justice framework successfully; and

WHEREAS, after a decade, ICHD feels the need to reevaluate its health equity and social justice training program and revise it so that it reflects the knowledge acquired in the areas of health equity and justice that have been developed since the program’s inception and incorporate the experiences of the department in implementing a health equity/social justice program to meet the challenges of the future; and

WHEREAS, a health equity self-assessment of the ICHD workforce is required to lay the groundwork for a new health equity training program; and

WHEREAS, following a Request For Proposals process overseen by the Purchasing Department, ICHD selected AGS Data LLC to assist the department in conducting the self-assessment. AGS Data, LLC will perform the following services:

1. Administer, analyze, and report on an assessment of ICHD/ICHC staff;
2. Administer, analyze, and report on interviews of ICHD/ICHC administration;
3. Administer, analyze, and report on the assessment of the department’s effectiveness from the viewpoint of its community partners; and
4. Develop a self-assessment tool based on the BARHII staff self-assessment for organizations that are not focused on public health; and

WHEREAS, the cost of this agreement totaling $19,920 is completely funded by the Kresge ELPH Grant and will be effective upon full execution of the contract through September 30, 2018; and

WHEREAS, the Health Officer recommends approval of this agreement with AGS Data, LLC for the purpose of providing research, assessment, and evaluation consultation services which are necessary components for implementing this transformative role.
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes approval of an agreement with AGS Data, LLC for the purpose of providing research, assessment, and evaluation consultation services effective June 15, 2018 through September 30, 2018 in an amount not to exceed $19,920.

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

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that that Board Chairperson is authorized to sign any necessary contract documents after review and approval as to form by the County Attorney.
TO: Board of Commissioners Human Services & Finance Committees
FROM: Tim Morgan, Parks Director
DATE: May 23, 2018
SUBJECT: Application and Scoring Criteria Forms for the Trails and Parks Millage and Opening of Next Round of Grants
For the meeting agenda of 7/04/18 Human Services and 7/06/18 Finance

BACKGROUND
The Park Commission reviewed and edited the Trails and Parks Millage Grant Application and Scoring Criteria, taking into consideration the comments from the BOC in the last round of grants. Changes were made to the application itself as well as the scoring criteria.

There were two changes to the Application. The first change clarified the fact that small communities will be scored separately if said communities contribute less than 5% of the total county millage revenue annually. This was previously approved but the Park Commission wanted to specifically outline this. The second change was the addition of the last line in question #4 instructing the communities to reference BOC Resolution #18-054 for design standard clarification.

The Scoring Criteria was streamlined from six questions down to four, focusing on County Trail Priorities as well as creating a formula allowing the percentage of match to carry more weight in the scoring process. The first question now asks if the proposed project contributes to the completion of one of the top five scoring New Trail Preferences as listed in the Ingham County Trails and Parks Comprehensive Report, which will aid the BOC in approving projects that will help reach the overall goal of the County. The match formula was created to assist in assigning points to the amount of match put forth by the applying entity and to give more weight to the percentage given by the entity. The number of points a project will receive is determined by dividing the percent match by 10 then multiplying that number by three (ex: 63% match will receive 18.9 points). Question four combined original questions five and six by asking scorers to consider how the project will benefit the County as well as other project related questions such a complexity, lengthiness, and partnership support.

The resolution also opens the application period for the fourth round of grants. Applications will be open on June 18, 2018 and be due on August 31, 2018. Following due diligence by staff and the Park Commission, final approval is expected from the Board of Commissioners in January or February of 2019.

ALTERNATIVES
The results were refined to produce the most viable and acceptable approach to Trails & Parks Application and Scoring and Ranking for the applications. This process will be repeated annually with the review by the Park Commission moving forward with the Trails & Parks Millage to ensure that the application and scoring criteria stay current and are in line with the needs of the program. The only alternative is to keep the Trails & Parks Millage funding process as it currently is.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
There are no financial impacts. This resolution continues with the framework of allowing the Board of Commissioners to allocate Trails & Parks Millage funding over a multi-year period, and providing a mechanism for small communities to have small funding requests considered separately. Funds available for allocation include $928,817.00 for 2019 and $2,218,575.00 for 2020.
STRATEGIC PLANNING IMPACT
This resolution supports the overarching long-term objective of striving to make facilities and services user-friendly, specifically Section A. 1(f) - Maintain and improve existing parkland, facilities and features, 1(g) - Work to improve accessibility for visitors of all ages and abilities and 1(h) - Enhance existing trails and blueways, and develop new multi-use trails and blueways, that connect parks with recreational, residential, cultural, and business centers throughout Ingham County.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
The Parks & Recreation Commission support this resolution and have thoroughly edited the application and scoring/ranking criteria at their May 21, 2018 meeting.

RECOMMENDATION
Based on the information presented, I respectfully recommend approval of the resolution authorizing the edits to the Trails and Parks Program Application, the scoring criteria, and the timeline.
Introduced by the Human Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION FORM, SCORING CRITERIA FOR THE TRAILS AND PARKS MILLAGE, AND DECLARING A FOURTH ROUND OF APPLICATIONS FOR THE TRAILS AND PARKS MILLAGE

WHEREAS, in November 2014, the electorate approved a countywide trails and parks millage levy of 50/100 (.50) of one mill to be used for the purpose of creating and maintaining a county system of recreational trails and adjacent parks trail system, which may incorporate trails or parks created by local units of government, including Lansing’s River Trail, and may acquire rights of way to connect and extend existing trails; and

WHEREAS, the Park Commission reviewed and edited the Application and Scoring Criteria forms and has developed the following attachments for approval by the Board of Commissioners; and

WHEREAS, the Application shown in Attachment A reflects changes outlining the separate scoring of small communities and including the instruction that the awarded communities need to reference BOC Resolution #18-504 for design standards; and

WHEREAS, the Scoring Criteria shown in Attachment B has been edited to allow the percentage of match to be weighted more heavily, allows the County to recognize if the project is one of the County Trail Priorities as well as recognizing project complexities, lengthiness, and partnership support.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners adopts the recommended application edits for Trails and Parks Millage funding (attachment A) with the changes outlined above.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners adopts the scoring criteria for use by Park Commission and staff for scoring applications for funding (attachment B) with the changes outlined above.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a fourth round of applications will be taken beginning June 18, 2018 that will address new construction as identified as regional priority corridors in figure 24 of the Mannik & Smith Trails and Parks Comprehensive Report, and special projects (including blue ways) as well as repairs, rehabilitation, and long-term maintenance projects.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that application forms will be reviewed and approved by the Board of Commissioners prior to the fifth round.
Exhibit A:

Ingham County Trails and Parks Program Application

Ingham County
Parks and Recreation Commission
P.O. Box 178
121 E. Maple Street, Suite 102
Mason, MI 48854

Trails and Parks Program Application

In November 2014, Ingham County voters approved a 0.5 mill tax millage to support the development of a countywide regional trails and parks system through 2020. The overall goal of the Ingham County Regional Trails and Parks Millage Fund is to create and maintain a sustainable countywide system of recreation trails and adjacent parks within Ingham County. All Ingham County municipalities are eligible to apply. In addition, 501(c) (3) non-profit organizations may apply for grant funds so long as they partner with an Ingham County municipality which contributes tax dollars to the Trails and Parks Millage.

Funds must be matched by the local community with their own funds, or in-kind services, or funds obtained from other sources, i.e., state, federal, private or other allocations. Applications for County Trails and Parks Program funding must include a resolution(s) of support for the project from the governing body(ies) of the community where the trail project or blueways project is proposed. Eligible projects must fit the following categories: New Construction; Repair, Rehabilitation, or Long-Term Maintenance; and Special Project(s), (including blueways).

Project applications must be received by 5pm August 31 for funding consideration in the following year. Projects deemed worthy of funding may be approved at the January Ingham County Board of Commissioners meeting. The following information will be used by the Ingham County Parks and Recreation Commission in determining and recommending which projects should be funded by the Board of Commissioners. Projects already locally approved and bid will not be eligible for millage funding. Please submit applications to Melissa Buzzard at mbuzzard@ingham.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agencies:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Title:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Amount Requested: $</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distance of repaired/new construction in feet/miles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail/blue ways:</th>
<th>Boardwalk:</th>
<th>Bridge:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ New Construction</td>
<td>□ Repair, Rehabilitation, Long-term Maintenance</td>
<td>□ Special Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

□ Small grant: Up to $50,000 for municipalities contributing less than 5% of total county millage revenue annually. See Figure 1.* (Small grants will be scored separately)
If you have applied for *multiple projects*, please prioritize and rank your projects within each category from highest priority to lowest priority in each category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Construction</th>
<th>Repair/Rehabilitation/Long-term Maintenance</th>
<th>Special Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Town, Range and Section Numbers of Site Location |
| (Town):                                          |
| (Range):                                         |
| (Section):                                       |

Brief Project Description (Provide a brief project description and why it should be funded. 250 word limit.)
### ESTIMATED COSTS/BUDGET

Provide each scope/budget item and how the budgeted amount was calculated. List amounts requested from local sources, state or federal grants as well as amounts from foundations, corporations, and other funding sources (in-kind support or other). Engineering amount generally not to exceed 15% of total project expenses. Contingency amount not to exceed 10%.

#### EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope Item(s)</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Acquisition/Right-of-Way/Easement/Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Design Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Construction Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Fees** (i.e., Permitting, etc…)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Project Expenses</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide detailed cost estimate for Project</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### APPLICANT FUNDS

When municipalities apply for funding from the Ingham County Trails and Parks Millage using a local match, the match should represent new investment in land acquisition and trail development, as opposed to dollars spent in previous years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Contribution</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Grant Contributions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Grantor(s)</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Partner(s)</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Donor(s)</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In-Kind Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Applicant Funds</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Millage Funds REQUESTED (does not count as match)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*This amount (Millage Funds Request) plus the Total Applicant Funds must equal Total Project Expenses</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total % of matching Funds</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**DESIGN/SCOPE OF THE PROJECT - (Attachments as needed)**

Provide a (detailed) description of the project you are proposing, with reference to specific scope items. Describe the features of the project and all factors that affected your design or program. Describe how your design was chosen, and why it is appropriate for the proposed project. Use this opportunity to explain why you chose the type and placement of particular scope and design elements. Explain how your project design meets or exceeds standards. (If your project addresses a clearly identified item from the Ingham County Trails and Parks Comprehensive Report, please identify that with a reference to the report – page #, table #, or identifying marker (ie. Bridge # CL-01-SCT-SC)). (No minimum word count-

| Attachments as needed |
# PROJECT INFORMATION & DETAILED DESCRIPTION (as applicable)

1. Describe in detail any other available funders and partners.

   Your discussion should address whether your project has funding available through grants or partner contributions; has funding available through donations or in-kind services; and/or has funding available through local community match and what total percent of the project these all account for. This should be detailed on the Estimated Costs/Budget sheet also. Local agencies are required to list Ingham County Parks as a contact in TAP applications that propose Ingham County Parks Millage funding as part of their match. 250 word limit.

2. Discuss how the project is improving regional connectivity.

   Your discussion should address how the project provides, supports and relates to the Ingham County regional priority corridors as depicted on Figure 24 of the Ingham County Regional Trails and Parks Network either as an existing trail repair/rehabilitation/long-term maintenance, new regional trail construction or new local trail access to the regional network (including enabling water trail access); improves access to Ingham County Parks; improves access to major regional destinations such as commercial and employment centers as well as community facilities, schools, colleges and universities; expands transportation options; provides for recreation; increases access to sites of natural, scenic or historic interest; and any other related information. 250 word limit.
3. Describe how the project responds to public demand and has public support.

Your discussion should address how the project is based on public demand; has been prioritized in adopted plans; has volunteer and/or partner organization support; is a community interest project that supports partnerships, shared resources or concides with other planning and development activities; has the support of multiple jurisdictions and/or stakeholders; and any other related information. 250 word limit.

4. Explain how the project meets acceptable design standards and is the best design solution.

You must have on staff, or hire a Michigan licensed professional engineer or a landscape architect, and all construction (new or rehab) must be according to current MDOT standard and specifications for construction of trails, bridges, and boardwalks and any other support facilities. Trail repair and maintenance projects may not require an engineer or landscape architect. (Deviation from this requirement needs to be stated and explained. The County will review on a case by case basis.) Any work in the road Right of Way, not just ped crossings, needs to meet applicable permit requirements. You must meet permit requirements for any pedestrian crossings of the given road agency—Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), Ingham County Road Department or whatever City your community is in. You must have the necessary/required permitting, be it public/road rights-of-way, local ordinance (township or municipality), environmental (Michigan Department of Environmental Quality-MDEQ), Drain office, etc. Your description should address how the project is physically separated from streets and roadways where possible; provides a variety of experiences that can be enjoyed by a diversity of users, including people of all ages and abilities; meets or exceeds the minimum accessibility requirements of the ADA; design alternatives to the project have been examined to minimize impact on the environment; meets AASHTO guidelines for alignment, grade, width, vertical clearance, and loading intersection and crossing design (deviation from AASHTO guidelines need to be stated and explained. The County will review on a case by case basis.); considers low impact development techniques that protect and enhance significant natural features; and any other related information. Please review attached BOC Resolution #19-054 for design standard clarification. 250 word limit.
5. Explain how the project is feasible and ready for implementation or development.
   Your discussion should address whether your project area is under public ownership or is currently accessible for public use; does not require complex or lengthy acquisition process; does not require a complex or lengthy permitting process; is within an existing corridor such as a transmission line and railroad corridor where it may be feasible to negotiate public access without needing to acquire land; there is an imminent threat to lose the project opportunity; demonstrates cost efficiency; and/or is appropriate and in line with available funds. 250 word limit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Discuss how the project supports equitable opportunities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your discussion should address how your project increases or improves access and provides low cost transportation and recreation options for low income populations; is located in a high use area; is located in an underserved area; and/or contributes to an equitable geographical distribution of the millage funds. 250 word limit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Maintenance Commitment & Plan
Describe your operation and maintenance plan (with budget costs) detailing the amount of money needed to operate and maintain the trail after it is completed, and identify who will be responsible for the work. Describe in detail how the trail will be managed. Include discussion on season length, hours of operation, enforcement provisions, and scheduling. 250 word limit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTACHMENTS - REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Project Location Map &amp; Photos. Attach a project location map and site photographs (clearly identify photos and locations in correlation with your location map).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Site Plan. The site plan must show the entire site to be improved/developed, and should delineate and label the location and type of all existing and proposed uses. Features such as wooded areas, wetlands, water bodies, overhead utility lines, and all existing uses, including buildings and other development, need to be identified. The placement of all scope items proposed in the application should be depicted on the site plan. Indicate on your site plan the destinations to which the proposed trail project will connect. Provide a map of the trail network (existing or proposed) to which your project will link.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Documentation of Other Funding Sources. You must provide documentation for all the funding sources you indicated on your application form, as follows: If any portion of the match is to be made up of funds from other grant funding sources. If any portion of the match is to be made up of cash, labor, or material and/or in-kind donations; include a letter from each donor committing to their donation. If the donor is an adjacent community contributing to the match, include a resolution from their governing body that supports the application and commits to their portion of the match.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Certified Resolution. The governing body of the local unit of government must pass a resolution. The resolution should list and commit to the amount of the local match in terms of dollar amount or percentage of total project cost, and all source(s) of match as specified in the application. (This may be obtained and submitted after submission of the application if timing is an issue, but must be before the date of the award by the BOC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Contract Signatures. No project work may begin prior to approval by the BOC and all contracts are signed and returned to the County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. After the award, and during construction, entities must display temporary millage recognition signage on site of projects provided by the County. Once complete, must display a permanent recognition plaque on site also provided by the County.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature of Applicant:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Figure 1, the table illustrates the estimated revenue by municipality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Total Generated Revenue</th>
<th>Estimated Loss to Tax Capture</th>
<th>Estimated Available Revenue</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alairod Township</td>
<td>$109,741</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$109,741</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Township</td>
<td>$68,726</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$68,726</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunker Hill Township</td>
<td>$30,949</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$30,949</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi Township</td>
<td>$347,613</td>
<td>$85,205</td>
<td>$262,408</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingham Township</td>
<td>$36,313</td>
<td>$2,953</td>
<td>$33,359</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing Township</td>
<td>$132,989</td>
<td>$25,128</td>
<td>$107,860</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lercy Township</td>
<td>$58,849</td>
<td>$4,955</td>
<td>$53,894</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Township</td>
<td>$40,164</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$40,164</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locke Township</td>
<td>$34,146</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$34,146</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Township</td>
<td>$776,105</td>
<td>$755</td>
<td>$775,350</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onondaga Township</td>
<td>$39,593</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$39,593</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockbridge Township</td>
<td>$57,918</td>
<td>$2,698</td>
<td>$55,219</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vevay Township</td>
<td>$63,027</td>
<td>$816</td>
<td>$62,211</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheatfield Township</td>
<td>$34,763</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$34,763</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Oak Township</td>
<td>$28,502</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$28,502</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamston Township</td>
<td>$109,531</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$109,531</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lansing (City)</td>
<td>$416,404</td>
<td>$15,819</td>
<td>$400,585</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing (City)</td>
<td>$958,232</td>
<td>$32,290</td>
<td>$925,942</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie (City)</td>
<td>$17,981</td>
<td>$3,272</td>
<td>$14,708</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason (City)</td>
<td>$106,781</td>
<td>$12,822</td>
<td>$93,959</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamston (City)</td>
<td>$50,716</td>
<td>$7,295</td>
<td>$43,422</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingham County (Total)</td>
<td>$3,519,041</td>
<td>$194,009</td>
<td>$3,325,033</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Created 2-23-15
INTRODUCED BY THE HUMAN SERVICES AND FINANCE COMMITTEES OF THE:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION CLARIFYING DESIGN STANDARDS FOR TRAILS AND PARKS MILLAGE PROJECTS

RESOLUTION # 18 – 054

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Trails and Parks Program Application states that the Trails and Parks Millage projects must meet acceptable design standards and is the best design solution as adopted by Board of Commissioners Resolution 17-275; and

WHEREAS, the County will review any deviations from such standards on a case by case basis; and

WHEREAS, applicants must obtain necessary permits for the projects, be it public/road rights-of-way, local ordinance (township or municipality), environmental (Michigan Department of Environmental Quality-MDEQ), Drain office, etc.; and

WHEREAS, at least one case has surfaced where the announced design standards of the Trails and Parks Millage may conflict with the standards and rules of a permitting agency; and

WHEREAS, on reflection, the Parks Commission does not believe that wise administration of the millage money should require the applicant to be caught between the standards of a permitting agency and the general standards demanded by the County for its millage projects.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham Board of Commissioners adopt the following policy: in cases where a permitting authority disagrees with use of a particular county standard, the terms of the draft permit proposed by the permitting authority will control; but the applicant is required to promptly notify the County Park Commission of the permitting authority’s position.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, Parks Department staff are to raise any concerns with the permit in consultations with the applicant and the permitting authority.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, this policy is retroactive for any signed agreements that have not yet been completed and any future agreements.

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

HUMAN SERVICES: Yeas: Banas, Tennis, Sebolt, Nolan, Koenig Nays: None Absent: Naeyaert
Approved 02/05/2018

FINANCE: Yeas: Grebner, Anthony, Crenshaw, Tennis
Nays: None Absent: Koenig, Schafer Approved 02/07/2018
Attachment B:

**Ingham County Trails and Parks Program Scoring Criteria**

The following criteria will be used to evaluate and select projects. The project’s final score will be based on the sum of all the scores. Criteria to be scored are as follows:

1. Does this project either contribute to the completion of one of the top five scoring New Trail Preferences as listed in the Ingham County Trails and Parks Comprehensive Report Table 18 (attached)?
   
   **0= no 5= yes**
   
   ____pts

2. Does this contribute to County connectivity?
   
   **0= no 10= yes** (If you meet any of the criteria listed below, you get 10 points).
   
   ____pts

**Improves Regional Connectivity:** Projects that improve regional connectivity and access throughout Ingham County will receive a higher priority. To determine whether a project improves regional connectivity or access, the project should address the following:

- Contributes to the completion of the Ingham County regional priority corridors as depicted on Figure 24 (attached) either as existing trail reconstruction, new regional trail gap construction or new local trail access to the regional network (including enabling water trail access);
- Improves access to or within Ingham County Parks;
- Improves access to major regional destinations such as commercial and employment centers as well as community facilities, schools, colleges and universities;
- Expands transportation options as well as provide for recreation;
- Increases access to sites of natural, scenic or historic interest.

3. **How the project provides for other available funders and partners.**

   **Has Potential Available Funds:** Projects that have the potential to be funded through state or federal grants, donations, partner contributions, or other funding sources will receive a higher priority than projects without other identified funding opportunities. Only monetary contributions will be considered. To determine whether a project has leveraged potential available funds, a project should address the following matching % to receive points, \( \text{match} = \text{what total percent of the project all matching dollars account for} \). The number of points a project will receive is determined by dividing the percent match by 10 then multiplying that number by three. (ex. 63% match will receive 18.9 points)

   ____pts
4. Overall, how do you rate the project?

Considerations:

- Project area is under public ownership or is currently accessible for public use;
- Does not require complex or lengthy acquisition process;
- Does not require a complex or lengthy permitting process;
- Is within an existing corridor such as a transmission line and railroad corridor where it may be feasible to negotiate public access without needing to acquire land;
- There is an imminent threat to lose the project opportunity;
- Demonstrates cost efficiency;
- Is appropriate and in line with available funds.
- Has been prioritized in adopted plans;
- Has volunteer and/or partner organization support;
- Is a community interest project that supports partnerships, shared resources or coincides with other planning and development activities;
- Has the support of multiple jurisdictions and/or stakeholders.
- The project increases or improves access and provides low cost transportation and recreation options for low income populations;
- Is located in a high use area;
- Is located in an underserved area;
- Contributes to an equitable geographical distribution of the millage funds.

Rate the project on a scale of 1-20, 1 being least desirable and 2 being most desirable.

______ pts

______ Total Points Scored
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Trail Preferences</th>
<th>Highlighted Corridor</th>
<th>South Lansing/Delhi Township</th>
<th>Meridian Township</th>
<th>East Lansing</th>
<th>North Lansing</th>
<th>Mason/Leslie/Stockbridge</th>
<th>Williamson/Webberville</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Online Survey</th>
<th>Combined Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSU to Lake Lansing Parks</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt to Mason</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing River Trail North Extension</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing River Trail South Extension</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing River Trail to Northern Tier Trail</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing River Trail to Clinton County</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cedar Water Trail</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAM Trail to Burchfield Park</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand River Water Trail</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayhoe Trail to Vevay Twp. Hall</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt RAM Trail Extension East</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Township to Webberville</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-South artery along Onondaga Rd.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason west to Eaton County</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest connector to Eaton and Jackson counties</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason East to M-52</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-52 connection - Stockbridge to Webberville</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue Rd. Connection - Leslie to Eaton County</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-52 connection - Webberville to Shiawassee County</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The highlighted corridors are shown on Figure 32.
TO: Board of Commissioners Human Services and Finance Committees

FROM: Jared Cypher, Deputy Controller

DATE: May 25, 2018

SUBJECT: Resolution Approving Criteria for Evaluating 2019 Community Agency Funding Applications

For the meeting agendas of June 4 and June 6

BACKGROUND
This resolution establishes the criteria by which each agency’s application will be evaluated for the 2019 Community Agency funding process.

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

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

ALTERNATIVES
One alternative would be to have no criteria and accept applications for a variety of different types of initiatives. Another alternative is for the Board of Commissioners to go back to the old way of awarding funding, which was to have agencies come to the Human Services Committee and make presentations on Community Agency night.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
This resolution has no direct financial impact.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
The community agency process has grown to 30 applications requesting funding, with total requests of approximately $269,000 annually.

RECOMMENDATION
Based on the information presented, I respectfully recommend approval of the attached resolution approving criteria for evaluating 2019 community agency funding applications.
INTRODUCED BY THE HUMAN SERVICES AND FINANCE COMMITTEES OF THE:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION APPROVING CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING 2019 APPLICATIONS FOR COMMUNITY AGENCY FUNDING

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

WHEREAS, over the years the community agency process has grown to 30 applications requesting funding, with total requests of approximately $269,000 annually; and

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

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

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the 2019 community agency funding process, with priority given to those proposals that directly contribute to addressing the County’s overarching long-term objective of “Meeting Basic Needs”, such as food, clothing, and shelter.

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

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that no agency shall receive more than 10% of the total available funding for community agencies in FY 2019.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Commissioners wishes for applicants to understand that solicitation of proposals is not a commitment to fund those proposals in fiscal year 2019.