

CHAIRPERSON
BRIAN McGRAIN

VICE-CHAIRPERSON
KARA HOPE

VICE-CHAIRPERSON PRO-TEM
RANDY MAIVILLE

LAW AND COURTS COMMITTEE
PENELOPE TSEBNOGLOU, CHAIR
BRYAN CRENSHAW
CAROL KOENIG
VICTOR CELENTINO
DEB NOLAN
KARA HOPE
RANDY SCHAFFER

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

P.O. Box 319, Mason, Michigan 48854 Telephone (517) 676-7200 Fax (517) 676-7264

THE LAW AND COURTS COMMITTEE WILL MEET ON THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 2015 AT 6:00 P.M., IN THE PERSONNEL CONFERENCE ROOM (D & E), HUMAN SERVICES BUILDING, 5303 S. CEDAR, LANSING.

Agenda

Call to Order

Approval of the [February 26, 2015 Minutes](#)

Additions to the Agenda

Limited Public Comment

1. Circuit Court/Family Division
 - a. Resolution Authorizing a Contract with [Therapy Dogs International](#) and Amending the Ingham County Pet in the Workplace Policy
 - b. [Fourth Quarter Report](#) from 2014
2. Circuit Court/Friend of the Court
 - a. Resolution to Authorize a Contingency Fund Appropriation for the Oasis Supervised Visitation and [Safe Exchange Center](#)
 - b. Resolution to Authorize a Lease Extension Agreement for the Friend of the Court [Safe Haven](#) Grant Program
3. Sheriff's Office
 - a. Resolution to Extend the Canteen Services, Inc. [Inmate Commissary](#) Contract for Two Years
 - b. Resolution to Extend the Contract with Canteen Services, Inc. to Manage the [Kitchen and Laundry Services](#) at the Ingham County Correctional Facility
4. Innovation & Technology Department - Resolution Authorizing the Purchase of 6 Inch [Ortho Photography](#) from the 2015 Tri-County Regional Planning Commission Contract of Digital Aerial Imagery of Ingham County
5. Controller's Office - Resolution Authorizing a Contract for 9-1-1 Public Safety Radio Communications [Consulting Services](#) with Brent Williams

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.

LAW & COURTS COMMITTEE
February 26, 2015
Draft Minutes

Members Present: Tsernoglou, Crenshaw, Koenig, Celentino, Nolan, Hope and Schafer.

Members Absent: None.

Others Present: Sheriff Gene Wriggelsworth, Commissioner Sarah Anthony, John Neilsen, Travis Parsons, Tamara Warren, Anne Burns, Andy Seltz, Lance Langdon, Katie VanSchoick and others.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Tsernoglou 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 February 12, 2015 Minutes

MOVED BY COMM. SCHAFER, SUPPORTED BY COMM. CRENSHAW, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 12, 2015 LAW & COURTS COMMITTEE MEETING.

Commissioner Koenig amended the minutes to state, “~~Chairperson Tsernoglou~~ **Commissioner Koenig** asked for an update on faxes”

Commissioner Koenig amended the minutes to state, “Chairperson Tsernoglou thanked Mr. Ashton for his work. ~~She further asked for an update on Granicus.~~”

Commissioner Koenig asked for an update on Granicus”

John Neilsen, Chief Deputy Controller, amended the minutes to state “Mr. Buck updated the Committee on the history of the locations that the Circuit Court Files were ~~house~~ **housed** and the incidents of damage that had occurred at those locations.”

Mr. Neilsen amended the minutes to state “Mr. Buck stated that digital retention of files was ~~no~~ **now** permissible.”

The amendments were considered friendly.

THE MOTION, AS AMENDED, CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Additions to the Agenda

None.

Limited Public Comment

None.

1. Sheriff's Office - Sheriff Gene Wriggelsworth - Discussion Regarding Potential Legislation that would Increase the Amount a County is Allowed to Offer as a Reward to Citizens for Help in Apprehending Criminals

MOVED BY COMM SCHAFER, SUPPORTED BY COMM. CRENSHAW, TO APPROVE A RESOLUTION TO REPRESENTATIVE COCHRAN IN SUPPORT OF AN INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT A COUNTY IS ALLOWED TO OFFER AS A REWARD TO CITIZENS FOR HELP IN APPREHENDING CRIMINALS.

Commissioner Nolan asked where the funds for a reward would come from and whether or not the funds would come from forfeiture.

Gene Wriggelsworth, Sheriff, addressed the Committee. Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated that it was up to the board where the funds would come from. He further stated that a deputy was killed in November and Crime Stoppers was contacted to provide a reward. Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated that Crime Stoppers policy only allowed them to provide a \$2,000 reward. Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated that he then contacted the controller's office for more funding. He further stated that a State law from 1922 only allowed a \$1,000 reward to be offered. He further stated that he had contacted Representative Cochran to increase the amount of money a County was allowed to offer as a reward. Sheriff Wriggelsworth then stated Representative Cochran supported it and was looking for feedback from the County.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated he hoped the funds would not come out of forfeiture as forfeiture did not provide stable funds.

Chairperson Tsernoglou asked if the Sheriff's Office wanted to offer a reward, would they be required to present a resolution to the Board of Commissioner for their approval.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated that the government would appropriately be required for approval of any reward funding.

Commissioner Hope asked how many times the Sheriff's Office had made requests for reward funds.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated that his office had only requested a reward once, that being last December.

Commissioner Nolan stated that she would appreciate the funds come out of forfeiture as it was such an unusual occurrence to offer a reward.

Mr. Wriggelsworth stated that there would never be a guarantee for how much money was in forfeiture. He further stated that all County money was in the control of the Board of Commissioners.

Commissioner Nolan stated that it would be possible to keep \$25,000 minimum in forfeiture.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated that he did not believe there was that much money in forfeiture currently.

Commissioner Crenshaw stated that the funds should not come just from forfeiture such as in instances where they should offer more than what was available through forfeiture. He further stated that there should be an open amount that could be used as appropriate.

Chairperson Tsernoglou stated that it was her understanding that they were not required to offer any funds specifically.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated it would simply allow the County to provide funding for a reward and the legislature would not be opposed to it.

Chairperson Tsernoglou stated that the issue of funding could be discussed at a later point.

Commissioner Schafer stated he was in support of it and that the money details would be discussed later.

Commissioner Koenig stated she was in support of Representative Cochran moving forward with the legislation. She further stated that the details would be discussed in the future. Commissioner Koenig asked what the forfeiture amount was last year.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated he did not know specifically.

Mr. Neilsen clarified that he was to prepare a resolution for the next Board meeting supporting Representative Cochran's legislation. He stated that on page one of the legislation it stated, "Sec. 19. The board of ~~supervisors~~ COMMISSIONERS OF A COUNTY is hereby authorized to offer and pay out of the general fund of the county not to exceed ~~2,000 dollars~~ MORE THAN \$20,000.00 as a reward for the arrest..."

Chairperson Tsernoglou asked if that meant they were not authorized to pay the reward out of any other funds.

Mr. Neilsen stated that the legislation was specific to the general fund. He further stated that there were other ways of doing it.

Discussion.

Commissioner Schafer asked that the resolution be sent to the other representatives in the county including Representative Andy Schor and Senator Curtis Hertel Jr.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. Community Corrections Advisory Board - Resolution Authorizing the Community Corrections Advisory Board (CCAB) to Continue a Contract for Staff Consultant Services for FY2015

MOVED BY COMM. NOLAN, SUPPORTED BY COMM. CRENSHAW, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS ADVISORY BOARD (CCAB) TO CONTINUE A CONTRACT FOR STAFF CONSULTANT SERVICES FOR FY2015

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Equal Opportunity Committee - Discussion Regarding “Ban the Box” Proposal

Tamara Warren, Chair of the Equal Opportunity Committee (EOC), addressed the Committee. Ms. Warren stated that the EOC had been working on the “Ban the Box” proposal to ultimately bring a resolution before the committee. She further stated that she was working her way through the committees to get feedback on the issue so that the resolution was true and effective.

Ms. Warren stated that “Ban the Box” was a nationwide initiative. She further stated that she did not want Ingham County to be behind the curve. Ms. Warren stated that for individuals with a criminal record finding employment was very difficult. She further stated individuals with felony convictions were twice as likely to be denied employment simply for checking the box stating they have been convicted of a crime. She stated that in most circumstances it was impossible to tell whether that crime was a misdemeanor or a felony.

Ms. Warren stated that the EOC recommended that Ingham County remove the box on some job applications and allow employers to ask whether an individual was convicted of a felony later in the hiring process. She further stated that the resolution would exclude jobs in law enforcement, the courts, the Health Center and the 911 Call Center.

Ms. Warren asked the Committee for questions or concerns.

Chairperson Tsernoglou asked Travis Parsons, Human Resources Director, to come to the table for questions regarding the county’s hiring process.

Commissioner Hope stated that she wholeheartedly supported the initiative. She asked Mr. Parsons how this would change the county’s applications and hiring process.

Mr. Parsons stated the change of the application would be very simple. He further stated that because the applications were now online there were various templates that were used for various positions. Mr. Parsons stated that the exempt positions would have a separate template that would be attached to the application for the felony question.

Chairperson Tsernoglou asked if the resolution was regarding felonies or misdemeanors.

Mr. Parsons stated that what was on the applications was regarding felonies.

Chairperson Tsernoglou asked whether the County currently asked about misdemeanors.

Mr. Parsons stated it did not.

Commissioner Celentino asked if this would remove background checks.

Mr. Parsons stated that it would not remove the background check process. He further stated that the EOC had spent a large amount of time on researching the hiring process. Mr. Parsons stated that all that was changing was the initial application process to insure that only the basic qualifications were addressed.

Chairperson Tsernoglou asked when the background check came into the process.

Mr. Parson stated that there were not many instances where background checks were required. He further stated that it was a position by position basis of what was followed up by a background check.

Commissioner Koenig stated that the memo stated the “recommended action is to 1. ‘Ban the Box’ on the Human Resources Employment Application” to which she stated she did not find a problem with. She further stated that the memo stated the recommended action was to “2. Incorporate ‘background check’ EEOC criteria into the Ingham County EOC plan.”

Commissioner Koenig asked what was meant by that recommendation.

Ms. Warren stated that that statement should read more along the lines of individualized assessments designed to assess each applicant's merit individually for specific positions. She further stated that a report from the County Attorney stated the current applications only ask whether an applicant had a criminal record and did not specify what the conviction was. Ms. Warren stated the Michigan legislature passed House Bills 52-16, 17 and 18, which offered a certificate of employability that offered ex-convicts a helping hand.

Commissioner Hope thanked Ms. Warren for all of her work on this resolution. She further stated that the resolution was in line with the County's embrace of rehabilitation for those who wish to follow the law. Commissioner Hope stated that incarceration disproportionately affected certain populations. She further stated that she hoped this resolution would aid in fixing that problem.

Commissioner Celentino stated that this was first put on the agenda for the County Services Committee and he had requested it be placed on the Law & Courts Committee agenda first because of the nature of the resolution. Commissioner Celentino asked whether the Committee was requesting a resolution for the next meeting.

Discussion.

Ms. Warren stated that they were looking for feedback and would be presenting in front of the County Services Committee for the same reason prior to presenting a resolution. She further stated that the EOC may present in front of the Human Services Committee.

Chairperson Tsernoglou asked Ms. Warren whether or not she wanted action to be taken by the Committee tonight.

Ms. Warren stated that the EOC had a resolution drafted and was looking for the support of the Committee moving forward.

Commissioner Anthony stated that the Committee was still in the exploratory stage and did not want to proceed with the resolution without the support of the Board of Commissioners. She further stated that this was an opportunity for Commissioners to mention anything that they would like to see in the resolution.

Commissioner Crenshaw stated that the resolution was a good idea and presenting to other committees was a good idea as well. He further stated that although there was large support for it, the EOC should present their resolution at a later date after speaking with the other committees.

Commissioner Crenshaw stated that the only other committee that the EOC would need to present to was the County Services Committee as it was a personnel issue.

Chairperson Tsernoglou stated that following their presentation to the County Services Committee, the EOC would return to Law & Courts with a resolution.

Commissioner Schafer stated that there seemed to be unanimous support for the resolution. He further stated that he would vote for the resolution.

Ms. Warren stated that she wanted to make sure that the resolution was successful.

Chairperson Tsernoglou thanked Ms. Warren.

Mr. Neilsen stated that one of the reasons to start in the Law & Courts Committee was that law enforcement was the area of concern. He further stated that a resolution could be presented at the same time that the EOC spoke with the County Services Committee or the resolution could also be officially presented to the Law & Courts Committee.

Chairperson Tsernoglou stated that she was comfortable with however the EOC wished to proceed. She further asked Mr. Parsons what positions other than those stated by Mr. Neilsen would be exempted from the new applications.

Mr. Parsons stated that in addition to the positions listed by Mr. Neilsen, elected officials would also have the opportunity to opt out of the EEO plan.

Chairperson Tsernoglou asked for clarification.

Mr. Parsons stated that elected officials by statute do not have to follow the EOC plan. He further stated that there has never been an issue with that.

Chairperson Tsernoglou stated she would like further information on which departments the new applications would apply to and which positions the applications would not apply to.

Chairperson Tsernoglou thanked Ms. Warren for attending.

4. Animal Control Department
a. Director's Report

Andy Seltz, Animal Control Director, addressed the Committee. Mr. Seltz stated that the Animal Control Department was currently in the final stages of hiring a new Vet Technician. He further stated that Brenda Mills, the Department's part time dispatcher, was transferring to the Human Resources Department. Mr. Seltz stated that Animal Control officers have been attending in-service training classes provided by the Sheriff's Office to help them in the field with the public. He further stated that Animal Control officers would be attending Shotgun Qualifications and would be doing so on an annual basis.

Mr. Seltz stated that the Department held a meeting with members of the Foster Program to discuss revamping the whole system. He further stated that there was discussion on what the Department had been doing and how it could improve.

Commissioner Crenshaw asked how members were a part of the Foster Program.

Mr. Seltz stated that the numbers vary. He further stated that there were 69 animals in the Foster Program. Mr. Seltz stated that there were roughly 25 individuals at the meeting. He further stated that they received good feedback from those individuals.

Mr. Seltz stated that Animal Control had meet with MIS and a dialogue on the multi-opts data management system. He further stated that they had hoped the system was now working correctly.

Discussion on the computer system took place.

Commissioner Koenig asked how long it took for a photo to be uploaded.

Anne Burns, Animal Control Deputy Director, addressed the Committee. Ms. Burns stated that photos were uploaded to the website every 24 hours.

Mr. Seltz stated that they were now working on uploading the pictures two to three times a day.

Discussion on uploading pictures took place.

Chairperson Tsernoglou asked why it took 24 hours to upload a picture.

Mr. Neilsen stated that it was the way system was designed.

Mr. Seltz stated that the National Animal Control Association would be conducting an on-site program evaluation in April. He further stated that the Department was currently working on gathering all the required information going back five years on statistics and budgets. He further stated that surveys have been sent out to staff, volunteers and other stakeholders to help gather that information.

Chairperson Tsernoglou asked whether the building would be evaluated.

Mr. Seltz stated that the building would be evaluated and the Department would be offered feedback although it would not be the primary focus.

Ms. Seltz stated that on January 23, the Department was subjected to a surprise inspection by the Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (MDARD) and the Department was working on completing the work on problem areas. He updated the Committee on the problems that were required to be fixed by MDARD.

Mr. Neilsen asked whether this was an annual inspection.

Ms. Burns stated that because of budget constraints, the annual inspections had stopped for a number of years and they would only do inspections on a complaint basis. She further stated that MDARD was now beginning to reinstate the annual inspections for all Animal Control Departments.

Mr. Seltz stated that he expected to receive regular inspections due to their proximity to the capital.

Mr. Seltz provided an update on the January statistics of both cats and dogs. He stated that as of February 17, there were 42 dogs, 60 cats, one goat, four cats at Petco/Pet Supplies Plus, and 69 animals in foster care, for a total of 176 animals.

Discussion on the goat took place.

Mr. Seltz provided an update on the adoption statistics of January. He stated that there were 85 adoptions.

Mr. Seltz stated that 667 licenses were sold.

Commissioner Crenshaw asked if that number included license renewals.

Mr. Seltz stated that the 667 number included license renewals.

Commissioner Koenig asked how many pets were returned to owners.

Mr. Seltz stated that a new section of the report titled “Positive Outcomes” was created in January that listed those results. He updated the Committee on the positive outcomes of January. He further stated that 33 dogs and three cats were returned to owners in January.

Commissioner Koenig asked how often the shelter received cats with microchips.

Mr. Seltz stated that the shelter did not receive cats with microchips very often. He further stated that often times an animal with a microchip did not have a microchip with complete information.

Chairperson Tsernoglou asked if the shelter used microchips.

Ms. Burns stated that the shelter provided microchips with all adoptions. She further stated that microchips were also offered when pets were returned to their families.

Mr. Seltz stated that a dog with a microchip was found that was traced back to Hungary via the microchip.

Discussion on microchips and the dog from Hungary took place.

Mr. Seltz stated that there were 63 cat adoptions in January. He further stated that when compared to 2014, intake numbers had decreased.

Discussion on the intake trend took place.

Mr. Seltz stated that a new shotgun policy was being implemented and would be discussed with the Animal Control Advisory Association.

Chairperson Tsernoglou stated that the Animal Control Advisory Committee met bi-monthly. She asked whether that the Advisory Committee was completing everything it needed to in a timely manner.

Mr. Seltz stated that the Advisory Committee was covering what needed to be covered and was making up for lost time.

Discussion on the timing of the Animal Control Advisory Board took place.

Chairperson Tsernoglou asked what was being done about the freezing temperatures.

Mr. Seltz stated that they had been contacting local news outlets in order to publicize their services.

Discussion.

Chairperson Tsernoglou asked how working with local police departments was going.

Mr. Seltz stated that working with the local police departments had not been very fruitful. He further stated that the Lansing police were not interested in working with the shelter at this point in time.

Discussion on working with local police departments and where police offers could drop off animals took place.

Mr. Seltz updated the Committee on the upcoming events at the Animal Control Department. He stated that the “Bug Mutt Madness” would take place on March 1, 2015 to encourage the adoption of large dogs. He further stated that the Michigan State University Medicine Club would be sponsoring a “Spring Cleaning Day” on March 20, 2015 to provide cleaning for large shelter dogs.

Mr. Seltz stated that the ICAC Community Outreach Center would offer a free rabies vaccination clinic on March 6, 2015 from noon until 4 p.m. He further stated that the Department’s Humanitarian Awards would be held at the Kellogg Center on March 26, 2015. Mr. Seltz stated that invitations to the Commissioners would be going out soon.

Mr. Seltz stated that the “Woofers Walk and 5k Run” would be held on May 16, 2015 at Michigan State University. He further stated that the Department would be participating in the Humane Society’s “Meet Your Best Friend at the Zoo” adoption event at the Detroit Zoo on May 15 and 16, 2015.

Chairperson Tsernoglou asked when the feasibility study of the Annex building would be submitted.

Mr. Neilsen stated that the report would be submitted to the Committee at either the next meeting or the meeting after that.

Discussion of the Annex study took place.

b. Overview of Temperament Tests Performed on Animals

Mr. Seltz stated that the individual who was supposed to discuss the temperament tests was unable to be present. He further stated that the report would be bumped until the next time the Animal Control Department was present.

Chairperson Tsernoglou thanked Mr. Seltz and Ms. Burns for attending.

Commissioner Nolan commended both Mr. Seltz and Ms. Burns on their idea to do their own quality control with the individuals in the Foster Program. She further stated it was both brave and intelligent as well as a great way to keep an organization improving.

Ms. Burns stated that in June there would be an adopt-a-fest at the Potter Park Zoo.

Commissioner Schafer stated that he had taken a tour of the Animal Control Department and was very impressed.

5. Board Referral - Letter from the State 911 Committee Regarding 911 Surcharges in Michigan

Mr. Neilsen stated that this letter was an annual report the State required for a County to complete if there were surcharges. He further stated that Ingham County did not have a surcharge. He stated that the report would be filled out and returned to the State.

Lance Langdon, Director of Emergency Communications, addressed the Committee. Mr. Langdon stated that in regards to the hiring discussion with the EOC, IT and Facility employees would have access to delicate material and should also be excluded from the new applications.

Mr. Neilsen stated that had been the case all along.

Commissioner Koenig stated that IT applicants did not undergo background checks. She further asked what type of access IT staff members had to video recordings that the County had.

Mr. Langdon stated that IT applicants undergo background checks. He further stated that they had access to law enforcement and court documents.

Mr. Langdon stated that he had made three conditional job offers and would be bringing those individuals on board the week of March 23rd. He further stated that CAD training would soon be completed and classroom sessions and academy sessions would begin. He further stated that the 911 Call Center had only one vacancy.

Commissioner Nolan asked if Mr. Langdon could provide information on employment statistics.

Chairperson Tsernoglou stated that the Committee had been receiving monthly reports. She further stated that the reports would now be coming on a quarterly basis.

Discussion on when various departments would present reports to the Committee.

Mr. Langdon stated that the CAD project was going well. He further stated that the system could have been turned on and running weeks ago however individuals needed to be trained and not all individuals had been trained yet. Mr. Langdon stated that all staff had been pleased with what they were seeing with the program during their training.

Commissioner Schafer stated that all issues regarding Animal Control should be taken to Chairperson Tsernoglou as she was an expert on the issue.

Announcements

Commissioner Nolan stated that there was a fabulous diversity luncheon today.

Discussion on the luncheon took place.

Mr. Neilsen stated that on March 10 the RFP for the review of consultants for the Jail, District Court and City of Lansing district court and LPD would be available. He further stated that he would be reporting back to the Committee for where to go.

Commissioner Hope asked if the City of Lansing would have a say in whom the Committee proceeds with.

Mr. Neilsen stated that both the County and the City of Lansing would each have an evaluation team who would pick their top two or three consultants and would then come together in order to decide who to jointly interview.

Commissioner Nolan as if it would be jointly funded.

Mr. Neilsen stated that it would be jointly funded.

Public Comment

None.

Adjourned

The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

MARCH 12, 2015 LAW & COURTS AGENDA STAFF REVIEW SUMMARY

RESOLUTION ACTION ITEMS:

The Chief Deputy Controller is recommending approval of the following resolutions:

- 1a. *Circuit Court/Family Division - Resolution Authorizing a Contract with Therapy Dogs International and Amending the Ingham County Pet in the Workplace Policy*

This resolution will authorize a no cost Memorandum of Understanding with Therapy Dogs International to provide therapeutic services to residents of the Family Division of the Circuit Court Youth Center and other appropriate Court programming. The resolution also waives the customary insurance requirements as Therapy Dogs International will not provide the service with those requirements. In addition, it amends Resolution #09-373 to allow for certified therapy dogs in Ingham County facilities. It should be pointed out that the County does have some liability exposure as we are self-funded and would be liable for the first \$150,000 in potential costs through litigation or a settlement as that is our loss retention fund obligations through the Michigan Risk Management Authority (MMRMA). (see attached Communication for details)

- 1b. *Circuit Court/Family Division - Fourth Quarter Report from 2014*

No action to be taken. This is an informational report.

- 2a. *Circuit Court/ Friend of the Court - Resolution to Authorize a Contingency Fund Appropriation for the Oasis Supervised Visitation and Safe Exchange Center*
- 2b. *Circuit Court/Friend of the Court - Resolution to Authorize a Lease Extension Agreement for the Friend of the Court Safe Haven Grant Program*

Utilizing a Department of Justice/Office on Violence Against Woman "Safe Havens" grant, the Oasis Visitation and Exchange Center has been operational since 2012 to provide supervised visitation and safe visitation exchange services involving minor children. The Court/FOC and their partners MSU Chance at Childhood, and EVE are striving to secure long term funding to stabilize the Oasis Center program.

The two above resolutions should be viewed as companion resolutions which should be approved together (or rejected together). The first resolution will authorize \$40,000 from the 2015 County Contingency fund to fund the operations of the Oasis Supervised Visitation And Safe Exchange Center from May through September of 2015 (\$8,000 per month * five months = \$40,000). The second resolution would extend the lease from April 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015 (\$2,300 per month * six months = \$13,800) contingent on transitional funding being approved. The intent of this transitional funding is to bridge the gap of the end of one grant period until a potential new grant may be obtained effective October 1, 2015. There is no guarantee EVE will be successful in getting the new grant and the current grant funding is estimated to run out at the end of April.

The Controller's Office is supportive of this request for transitional funding with the understanding that Ingham County will not be expected to fund the full cost of operating the Oasis Center if EVE is not successful in obtaining the JFF continuation three year grant. If EVE is not successful in obtaining the continuation grant, the Court/FOC has committed to seek other sources of funding (such as DHS and the City of Lansing) and if necessary additional County funding would go through the normal Ingham County budget process. (see attached communication for details)

3a. Sheriff's Office - Resolution to Extend the Canteen Inmate Commissary Contract for Two Years

This resolution will authorize the extension of the current Ingham County Sheriff's Office Inmate Commissary contract under the same terms and conditions with Canteen Services, Inc. from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017, by exercising two, one-year extensions. There is no price increase to the items sold to inmates over the two (2) year renewal without mutual agreement by both parties.

The contract will continue the following terms from the current contract:

- The contract provides for a commissary sales commission at 40%
- The contract provides for Canteen Services, Inc. to continue maintaining two Inmate money deposit kiosks
- Canteen Services, Inc. will charge \$4.00 for each kiosk transaction with \$2.00 returned to the Inmate Commissary fund
- Canteen Services, Inc. will provide the interface to partner with Securus Technologies to provide the Ingham County Jail with inmate kiosks
- Canteen Services, Inc. will provide the interface to partner with Securus Technologies to provide the Ingham County Jail with an Automated Information Service and Debit phone time

(See the attached memo from Major Sam Davis for details)

3b. Sheriff's Office - Resolution to Extend the Contract with Canteen Services to Manage the Food and Laundry Services at the Ingham County Correctional Facility

This resolution will authorize the extension of the current Ingham County Sheriff's Office contract with Canteen Services, Inc. for the management of kitchen and laundry operations at the Ingham County Correctional Facility by exercising two, one-year extensions. The two year extension will be under the same terms and conditions as the existing contract from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017.

The per meal cost is based on the census of the Jail's population as follows:

| <u>Census</u> | <u>Per Meal Cost</u> |
|---------------|----------------------|
| 0 – 649 | \$.98 |
| 650 – 674 | \$.97 |
| 675 and above | \$.96 |

Canteen will hold the food prices through the two year extension. (See the attached memo from Major Sam Davis for details)

4. Innovation and Technology Department - Resolution Authorizing the Purchase of Six Inch Ortho Photography from the 2015 Tri-County Regional Planning Commission Contract of Digital Aerial Imagery of Ingham County

This resolution will authorize additional funding for an enhanced level of imagery through the 2015 Tri-County Digital Aerial Imagery Project for Ingham County. Ingham County agreed to participate in this project in 2014 through a \$15,000 budget to obtain photo imagery at the 12" ortho resolution. Four Ingham County departments (Ingham County 911, Drain Commission, Environmental Health and the Road Department) expressed a desire to obtain enhanced imagery at the 6" ortho resolution level for their business purposes. Each of these departments will pay \$8,067.72 each for the additional cost of the 6" ortho resolution. This supplemental appropriation of \$32,270.86 will bring the total cost to of the project including all discounts to \$47,270.86. (see attached communication for details)

5. Controller's Office - *Resolution Authorizing a Contract for 9-1-1 Public Safety Radio Communications Consulting Services with Brent Williams*

This resolution will authorize a contract/purchase order for radio communications consulting services with Brent Williams to evaluate options for the future direction of the 9-1-1 Public Safety Radio Communication System, at a cost not to exceed \$3,200 from the 9-1-1 Emergency Telephone Dispatch Services - 911 Fund balance to be completed within sixty days of the signing of the contract/purchase order. The 9-1-1 Advisory Board is recommending that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hire this consultant to assist the County in making an informed decision. These proposed consulting services for Ingham County are to conduct an evaluation as to the pros and cons of various County options for the future of the 9-1-1 Public Safety Radio Communication System as it approaches the end of life for replacement parts. (see attached Communication for details)

MEMORANDUM

TO: Law and Courts and County Services Committees

FROM: Maureen Winslow

DATE: March 2, 2015

RE: Memorandum of Understanding with Therapy Dogs International

This resolution requests the Ingham County Board of Commissioners to authorize entering into a no cost Memorandum of Understanding with Therapy Dogs International to provide therapeutic services to residents of the Ingham County Youth Center and other appropriate Court programming.

In addition, it amends Resolution #09-373 (see attached) to allow for certified therapy dogs in Ingham County facilities.

As the Law & Courts Committee is aware, I have reached an impasse over obtaining these beneficial therapeutic services for Youth Center residents due to insurance requirements. Therapy Dogs International has insurance in effect which only covers the volunteer dog handler and the dog. They will not obtain additional insurance coverage as recommended by our Attorney and the Michigan Municipal Risk Management Authority (MMRMA).

The Court understands that our Attorney and MMRMA are doing their best to protect the County from liability exposure; however, Therapy Dogs International is doing this service on a volunteer basis.

For the above reason the County Attorney cannot approve the Memorandum of Understanding as to form unless the Board of Commissioners waives the customary contractual insurance requirements. Specifically, the provision that Therapy Dogs International name Ingham County as an additional insured on its liability insurance and the requirement of Therapy Dogs International to, at its own expense, indemnify and hold harmless Ingham County and its agents for all claims, damages, costs etc. arising from this agreement.

The Circuit Court Family Division is requesting that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners approve the no cost Memorandum of Understanding with Therapy Dogs International as we feel the benefits to our residents in the Youth Center and eventually to other Court programming such as the Family Center, outweigh the liability risks of providing these services.

ADOPTED - NOVEMBER 10, 2009

Agenda Item No. 2

Introduced by the County Services Committee of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING A PET IN THE WORKPLACE POLICY

RESOLUTION #09-373

WHEREAS, a need has developed to address the issue of a Pet in the Workplace; and

WHEREAS, the Employer has a duty to keep the Workplace free of potential hazards, promote health, safety and orderly conduct.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby establishes the following Ingham County Pet in the Workplace Policy:

Ingham County Pet in the Workplace Policy

Animals in County Facilities: Animals not (used) as service animals (for law enforcement, leaders for the blind or other animals assisting the disabled) are not permitted in Ingham County facilities as a matter of security, health and safety.

COUNTY SERVICES: Yeas: Celentino, Holman, Copedge, Vickers

Nays: None **Absent:** Koenig, Grebner **Approved 11/3/09**

Introduced by the Law and Courts and County Services Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A CONTRACT WITH THERAPY DOGS INTERNATIONAL AND AMENDING THE INGHAM COUNTY PET IN THE WORKPLACE POLICY

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Circuit Court Family Division manages the Youth Center, a detention facility for juveniles under the jurisdiction of the Court; and

WHEREAS, there is a great deal of research surrounding the benefits of a therapy dog in similar environments, including providing the youth comfort, companionship, and a calming effect as well as serving as a reward and incentive; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Circuit Court Family Division would like to invite a therapy dog from Therapy Dogs International and its handler to come to the Youth Center from one to 3 times per week to visit with the juveniles; and

WHEREAS, there is no cost to the County for using a therapy dog from Therapy Dogs International; and

WHEREAS, dogs from Therapy Dogs International must be trained and certified in order to act as a therapy dog.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes entering into a no cost Memorandum of Understanding with Therapy Dogs International to provide therapeutic services to residents of the Ingham County Youth Center and other appropriate Court programming effective the date of the passage of this resolution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners waives the customary insurance requirements for this no cost contract.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Resolution #09-373 is hereby amended to allow for certified therapy dogs in Ingham County facilities.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Board of Commissioners is hereby authorized to sign a Memorandum of Understanding consistent with this resolution.

HARD COPIES WILL BE DISTRIBUTED AT THE MEETING

| October 1, 2006 - December 31, 2006 | April 1, 2014 - June 30, 2014 | July 1, 2014 - September 30, 2014 | October 1, 2014 - December 31, 2014 |
|--|--|--|---|
| INTAKE DIVISION | INTAKE DIVISION | INTAKE DIVISION | INTAKE DIVISION |
| PETITIONS RECEIVED DURING THIS PERIOD: 357 <u>78</u> INFORMAL DELINQUENCY <u>124</u> FORMAL DELINQUENCY <u>155</u> NEGLECT <u>142</u> Authorized <u>13</u> Not Authorized / Transferred | PETITIONS RECEIVED DURING THIS PERIOD: 277 <u>79</u> INFORMAL DELINQUENCY <u>60</u> FORMAL DELINQUENCY <u>138</u> NEGLECT <u>95</u> Authorized <u>43</u> Not Authorized / Transferred | PETITIONS RECEIVED DURING THIS PERIOD: 289 <u>102</u> INFORMAL DELINQUENCY <u>86</u> FORMAL DELINQUENCY <u>101</u> NEGLECT <u>97</u> Authorized <u>4</u> Not Authorized / Transferred | PETITIONS RECEIVED DURING THIS PERIOD: 340 <u>128</u> INFORMAL DELINQUENCY <u>63</u> FORMAL DELINQUENCY <u>149</u> NEGLECT <u>101</u> Authorized <u>48</u> Not Authorized / Transferred |
| PETITIONS DISPOSED DURING THIS PERIOD: 239 1). INFORMAL <u>0</u> Consent Calendar <u>2</u> Inactive <u>19</u> Transferred <u>22</u> Diverted <u>43</u> Total 2). FORMAL A). Delinquency <u>61</u> Admission / No Contest <u>1</u> Bench Verdict <u>0</u> Designation Granted <u>18</u> Dismissed <u>0</u> Jury Verdict <u>0</u> Prosecutor Waiver <u>0</u> Nolle Prosequi <u>0</u> Traditional Waiver <u>80</u> Total B). Neglect <u>63</u> Admission / No Contest <u>10</u> Bench Verdict <u>30</u> Dismissed / Withdrawn <u>11</u> Not Authorized <u>2</u> Transferred <u>116</u> Total | PETITIONS DISPOSED DURING THIS PERIOD: 326 1). INFORMAL <u>3</u> Consent Calendar <u>0</u> Inactive <u>13</u> Transferred <u>48</u> Diverted <u>65</u> Total 2). FORMAL A). Delinquency <u>70</u> Admission / No Contest <u>3</u> Bench Verdict <u>5</u> Designation Granted <u>29</u> Dismissed <u>3</u> Jury Verdict <u>0</u> Prosecutor Waiver <u>0</u> Nolle Prosequi <u>3</u> Traditional Waiver <u>113</u> Total B). Neglect <u>55</u> Admission / No Contest <u>25</u> Bench Verdict <u>12</u> Dismissed / Withdrawn <u>0</u> Jury Verdict <u>56</u> Not Authorized <u>0</u> Transferred <u>148</u> Total | PETITIONS DISPOSED DURING THIS PERIOD: 249 1). INFORMAL <u>8</u> Consent Calendar <u>7</u> Inactive <u>12</u> Transferred <u>37</u> Diverted <u>64</u> Total 2). FORMAL A). Delinquency <u>57</u> Admission / No Contest <u>0</u> Bench Verdict <u>1</u> Designation Granted <u>32</u> Dismissed <u>0</u> Jury Verdict <u>0</u> Prosecutor Waiver <u>23</u> Nolle Prosequi <u>1</u> Traditional Waiver <u>91</u> Total B). Neglect <u>44</u> Admission / No Contest <u>24</u> Bench Verdict <u>20</u> Dismissed / Withdrawn <u>0</u> Jury Verdict <u>6</u> Not Authorized <u>0</u> Transferred <u>94</u> Total | PETITIONS DISPOSED DURING THIS PERIOD: 314 1). INFORMAL <u>17</u> Consent Calendar <u>6</u> Inactive <u>12</u> Transferred <u>48</u> Diverted <u>84</u> Total 2). FORMAL A). Delinquency <u>61</u> Admission / No Contest <u>2</u> Bench Verdict <u>1</u> Designation Granted <u>41</u> Dismissed <u>0</u> Jury Verdict <u>0</u> Prosecutor Waiver <u>0</u> Nolle Prosequi <u>0</u> Traditional Waiver <u>105</u> Total B). Neglect <u>45</u> Admission / No Contest <u>34</u> Bench Verdict <u>18</u> Dismissed / Withdrawn <u>0</u> Jury Verdict <u>28</u> Not Authorized <u>0</u> Transferred <u>125</u> Total |
| NEGLECT DIVISION | NEGLECT DIVISION | NEGLECT DIVISION | NEGLECT DIVISION |
| PROGRAM ACTIVITY DURING THIS PERIOD: 194 1). PROGRAMS (JUVENILE STATS) A). Intensive Neglect Services <u>20</u> Emergency Removal <u>113</u> Remain Active <u>11</u> Successful Dismissal <u>2</u> Other <u>146</u> Total B). Family Support Services <u>35</u> Remain Active <u>7</u> Successful Dismissal <u>6</u> Other <u>48</u> Total | PROGRAM ACTIVITY DURING THIS PERIOD: 231 1). PROGRAMS A). Intensive Neglect Services <u>10</u> Emergency Removal <u>76</u> Remain Active <u>23</u> Successful Dismissal <u>2</u> Other <u>111</u> Total B). Family Support Services <u>70</u> Remain Active <u>8</u> Successful Dismissal <u>7</u> Other <u>85</u> Total C). First Step Program <u>4</u> Remain Active <u>31</u> Successful Dismissal <u>0</u> Other <u>35</u> Total | PROGRAM ACTIVITY DURING THIS PERIOD: 189 1). PROGRAMS A). Intensive Neglect Services <u>7</u> Emergency Removal <u>70</u> Remain Active <u>20</u> Successful Dismissal <u>4</u> Other <u>101</u> Total B). Family Support Services <u>63</u> Remain Active <u>8</u> Successful Dismissal <u>12</u> Other <u>83</u> Total C). First Step Program <u>2</u> Remain Active <u>1</u> Successful Dismissal <u>2</u> Other <u>5</u> Total | PROGRAM ACTIVITY DURING THIS PERIOD: 213 1). PROGRAMS A). Intensive Neglect Services <u>14</u> Emergency Removal <u>62</u> Remain Active <u>31</u> Successful Dismissal <u>1</u> Other <u>109</u> Total B). Family Support Services <u>63</u> Remain Active <u>8</u> Successful Dismissal <u>11</u> Other <u>82</u> Total C). First Step Program <u>9</u> Remain Active <u>13</u> Successful Dismissal <u>0</u> Other <u>22</u> Total |
| DEMOGRAPHICS A). Gender <u>86</u> Females <u>108</u> Males B). Race <u>0</u> Asian / Oriental <u>27</u> Bi-Racial <u>79</u> Black <u>5</u> Hispanic <u>0</u> Native American <u>83</u> White | DEMOGRAPHICS A). Gender <u>100</u> Females <u>131</u> Males B). Race <u>0</u> Asian / Oriental <u>34</u> Bi-Racial <u>84</u> Black <u>33</u> Hispanic <u>0</u> Native American <u>80</u> White <u>0</u> Other | DEMOGRAPHICS A). Gender <u>84</u> Females <u>105</u> Males B). Race <u>0</u> Asian / Oriental <u>24</u> Bi-Racial <u>73</u> Black <u>33</u> Hispanic <u>1</u> Native American <u>68</u> White <u>0</u> Other | DEMOGRAPHICS A). Gender <u>99</u> Females <u>115</u> Males B). Race <u>0</u> Asian / Oriental <u>24</u> Bi-Racial <u>84</u> Black <u>30</u> Hispanic <u>1</u> Native American <u>73</u> White <u>2</u> Other |
| 2). PROGRAMS (ADULT STATS & INCLUDES DHS CASES) A). Drug Court Services <u>11</u> Remain Active <u>1</u> Successful Dismissal <u>3</u> Unsuccessful Termination <u>15</u> Total DEMOGRAPHICS A). Gender <u>12</u> Females <u>3</u> Males B). Race <u>0</u> Asian / Oriental <u>0</u> Bi-Racial <u>5</u> Black <u>1</u> Hispanic <u>0</u> Native American <u>9</u> White <u>0</u> Other | 2). PROGRAMS (ADULT STATS & INCLUDES DHS CASES) A). Drug Court Services <u>8</u> Remain Active <u>2</u> Successful Dismissal <u>2</u> Unsuccessful Termination <u>12</u> Total DEMOGRAPHICS A). Gender <u>10</u> Females <u>2</u> Males B). Race <u>0</u> Asian / Oriental <u>0</u> Bi-Racial <u>4</u> Black <u>1</u> Hispanic <u>0</u> Native American <u>7</u> White <u>0</u> Other | 2). PROGRAMS (ADULT STATS & INCLUDES DHS CASES) A). Drug Court Services <u>13</u> Remain Active <u>1</u> Successful Dismissal <u>0</u> Unsuccessful Termination <u>14</u> Total DEMOGRAPHICS A). Gender <u>12</u> Females <u>2</u> Males B). Race <u>0</u> Asian / Oriental <u>0</u> Bi-Racial <u>3</u> Black <u>0</u> Hispanic <u>0</u> Native American <u>11</u> White <u>0</u> Other | 2). PROGRAMS (ADULT STATS & INCLUDES DHS CASES) A). Drug Court Services <u>13</u> Remain Active <u>1</u> Successful Dismissal <u>0</u> Unsuccessful Termination <u>14</u> Total DEMOGRAPHICS A). Gender <u>12</u> Females <u>2</u> Males B). Race <u>0</u> Asian / Oriental <u>0</u> Bi-Racial <u>3</u> Black <u>0</u> Hispanic <u>0</u> Native American <u>11</u> White <u>0</u> Other |

| DELINQUENCY DIVISION | | DELINQUENCY DIVISION | | DELINQUENCY DIVISION | | DELINQUENCY DIVISION | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| PROGRAM ACTIVITY DURING THIS PERIOD | | PROGRAM ACTIVITY DURING THIS PERIOD | | PROGRAM ACTIVITY DURING THIS PERIOD | | PROGRAM ACTIVITY DURING THIS PERIOD | | | |
| 1). COURT ORDERED PROGRAMS | | 1). COURT ORDERED PROGRAMS | | 1). COURT ORDERED PROGRAMS | | 1). COURT ORDERED PROGRAMS | | | |
| <u>36</u> Aftercare <u>42</u> Crossroads <u>86</u> In-Home Detention <u>92</u> Intensive Probation Services <u>23</u> Sex Offender Program <u>209</u> Standard Probation <u>162</u> Truancy Court <u>650</u> Total | | <u>23</u> Aftercare <u>11</u> Community Placement Program <u>215</u> In-Home Detention <u>40</u> Intensive Probation Services <u>17</u> Sex Offender Program <u>158</u> Standard Probation <u>77</u> Truancy Court <u>541</u> Total | | <u>23</u> Aftercare <u>10</u> Community Placement Program <u>229</u> In-Home Detention <u>42</u> Intensive Probation Services <u>19</u> Sex Offender Program <u>169</u> Standard Probation <u>34</u> Truancy Court <u>527</u> Total | | <u>18</u> Aftercare <u>7</u> Community Placement Program <u>246</u> In-Home Detention <u>36</u> Intensive Probation Services <u>17</u> Sex Offender Program <u>153</u> Standard Probation <u>76</u> Truancy Court <u>553</u> Total | | | |
| 2). RESIDENTIAL PLACEMENT | | 2). RESIDENTIAL PLACEMENT | | 2). RESIDENTIAL PLACEMENT | | 2). RESIDENTIAL PLACEMENT | | | |
| A). In-State <u>8</u> Clarinda Transitional Living Center <u>2</u> Florence Crittenton Services <u>1</u> Havenwyck Hospital RTC <u>6</u> Highfields <u>4</u> Maurice Spears <u>7</u> Peckham Footprints Group Home <u>15</u> Shiawassee Detention Center <u>3</u> St. Vincent's Home <u>1</u> Turning Point Youth Center <u>5</u> Wedgwood Christian Services <u>52</u> Total B). Out-of-State <u>5</u> Clarinda Academy <u>2</u> Girls and Boys Town <u>10</u> Glen Mills Schools <u>6</u> Mings Mountain Academy <u>13</u> Muncie Reception & Diagnostic <u>6</u> Normative Services, Inc. <u>7</u> Woodward Academy <u>49</u> Total | | A). In-State <u>0</u> Angel House <u>5</u> Bethany Christian Services <u>0</u> Eaton County Youth Facility <u>0</u> Eagle Village, Inc. <u>0</u> Havenwyck Hospital RTC <u>1</u> Highfields Phoenix Program <u>2</u> Highfields Stabilization Program <u>0</u> Holy Cross Children's Services <u>2</u> Lakeside Academy <u>1</u> Maurice Spears <u>0</u> New Hope Youth & Family Services <u>0</u> Ottawa County Youth Facility <u>0</u> Pine Rest Christian Mental Health <u>2</u> Recovery High <u>6</u> Spectrum Juvenile Justice Services <u>0</u> St. Vincent's Home <u>0</u> Starr Commonwealth <u>0</u> Turning Point Youth Center <u>0</u> Wedgwood Christian Services <u>19</u> Total B). Out-of-State <u>0</u> Abraxas Academy <u>5</u> Boys Town <u>0</u> Clarinda Academy <u>1</u> Glen Mills Schools <u>0</u> KidsPeace Mesabi Academy <u>0</u> Midwest Center for Youth & Families <u>2</u> Mings Mountain Academy <u>0</u> Mountain Home <u>0</u> Normative Services, Inc. <u>0</u> Rite of Passage <u>0</u> Woodward Academy <u>8</u> Total C). Local Group Homes <u>9</u> Clarinda Transitional Living Center <u>9</u> Peckham Footprints Group Home <u>18</u> Total | | A). In-State <u>0</u> Angel House <u>4</u> Bethany Christian Services <u>0</u> Eaton County Youth Facility <u>0</u> Eagle Village, Inc. <u>0</u> Havenwyck Hospital RTC <u>2</u> Highfields Phoenix Program <u>2</u> Highfields Stabilization Program <u>2</u> Lakeside Academy <u>2</u> Maurice Spears <u>1</u> Murack Lodge <u>0</u> Ottawa County Youth Facility <u>0</u> Pine Rest Christian Mental Health <u>2</u> Recovery High <u>6</u> Spectrum Juvenile Justice Services <u>0</u> St. Vincent's Home <u>0</u> Starr Commonwealth <u>0</u> Turning Point Youth Center <u>0</u> Wedgwood Christian Services <u>1</u> Wolverine Secure Treatment-Endeavor <u>20</u> Total B). Out-of-State <u>0</u> Abraxas Academy <u>5</u> Boys Town <u>0</u> Clarinda Academy <u>1</u> Glen Mills Schools <u>0</u> KidsPeace Mesabi Academy <u>0</u> Midwest Center for Youth & Families <u>3</u> Mings Mountain Academy <u>0</u> Mountain Home <u>0</u> Normative Services, Inc. <u>0</u> Rite of Passage <u>0</u> Woodward Academy <u>9</u> Total C). Local Group Homes <u>5</u> Clarinda Transitional Living Center <u>8</u> Peckham Footprints Group Home <u>13</u> Total | | A). In-State <u>0</u> Angel House <u>4</u> Bethany Christian Services <u>0</u> Eaton County Youth Facility <u>0</u> Eagle Village, Inc. <u>2</u> Highfields Phoenix Program <u>0</u> Lakeside Academy <u>0</u> Maurice Spears <u>1</u> Murack Lodge <u>0</u> Ottawa County Youth Facility <u>0</u> Pine Rest Christian Mental Health <u>1</u> Recovery High <u>2</u> Spectrum Juvenile Justice Services <u>0</u> St. Vincent's Home <u>0</u> Starr Commonwealth <u>0</u> Turning Point Youth Center <u>1</u> Washenaw County Girls Treatment Prog <u>0</u> Wedgwood Christian Services <u>1</u> Wolverine Secure Treatment-Endeavor <u>13</u> Total B). Out-of-State <u>0</u> Abraxas Academy <u>3</u> Boys Town <u>0</u> Clarinda Academy <u>0</u> Glen Mills Schools <u>0</u> KidsPeace Mesabi Academy <u>0</u> Midwest Center for Youth & Families <u>2</u> Mings Mountain Academy <u>1</u> Mountain Home <u>0</u> Normative Services, Inc. <u>0</u> Rite of Passage <u>0</u> Woodward Academy <u>6</u> Total C). Local Group Homes <u>8</u> Peckham Footprints Group Home <u>8</u> Total | | | |
| DEMOGRAPHICS | | DEMOGRAPHICS | | DEMOGRAPHICS | | DEMOGRAPHICS | | | |
| 1). COURT ORDERED PROGRAMS | | 1). COURT ORDERED PROGRAMS | | 1). COURT ORDERED PROGRAMS | | 1). COURT ORDERED PROGRAMS | | | |
| A). Gender <u>217</u> Females <u>433</u> Males B). Race <u>2</u> Asian / Oriental <u>316</u> Black <u>65</u> Hispanic <u>0</u> Native American <u>265</u> White <u>0</u> 7 Years <u>0</u> 8 Years <u>0</u> 9 Years <u>2</u> 10 Years <u>40</u> 12 Years <u>85</u> 13 Years <u>115</u> 14 Years <u>194</u> 15 Years <u>145</u> 16 Years <u>60</u> 17 Years <u>3</u> 18 Years <u>0</u> 19 Years | | A). Gender <u>107</u> Females <u>215</u> Males B). Race <u>3</u> Asian / Oriental <u>9</u> Bi-Racial <u>177</u> Black <u>24</u> Hispanic <u>6</u> Native American <u>102</u> White <u>1</u> Other <u>0</u> 7 Years <u>0</u> 8 Years <u>0</u> 9 Years <u>1</u> 10 Years <u>11</u> 12 Years <u>34</u> 13 Years <u>39</u> 14 Years <u>57</u> 14 Years <u>76</u> 15 Years <u>81</u> 16 Years <u>47</u> 17 Years <u>9</u> 18 Years <u>0</u> 19 Years <u>0</u> 20 Years | | A). Gender <u>89</u> Females <u>205</u> Males B). Race <u>2</u> Asian / Oriental <u>13</u> Bi-Racial <u>159</u> Black <u>23</u> Hispanic <u>6</u> Native American <u>91</u> White <u>0</u> Other <u>0</u> 7 Years <u>0</u> 8 Years <u>0</u> 9 Years <u>1</u> 10 Years <u>3</u> 11 Years <u>7</u> 12 Years <u>25</u> 13 Years <u>49</u> 14 Years <u>65</u> 15 Years <u>85</u> 16 Years <u>51</u> 17 Years <u>8</u> 18 Years <u>0</u> 19 Years <u>0</u> 20 Years | | A). Gender <u>168</u> Females <u>385</u> Males B). Race <u>4</u> Asian / Oriental <u>26</u> Bi-Racial <u>285</u> Black <u>73</u> Hispanic <u>15</u> Native American <u>149</u> White <u>1</u> Other <u>0</u> 7 Years <u>0</u> 8 Years <u>0</u> 9 Years <u>2</u> 10 Years <u>4</u> 11 Years <u>20</u> 12 Years <u>37</u> 13 Years <u>99</u> 14 Years <u>162</u> 15 Years <u>154</u> 16 Years <u>61</u> 17 Years <u>11</u> 18 Years <u>3</u> 19 Years <u>0</u> 20 Years | | | |
| 2). RESIDENTIAL PLACEMENT | | 2). RESIDENTIAL PLACEMENT | | 2). RESIDENTIAL PLACEMENT | | 2). RESIDENTIAL PLACEMENT | | | |
| A). Gender <u>38</u> Females <u>62</u> Males B). Race <u>0</u> Asian / Oriental <u>0</u> Bi-Racial <u>55</u> Black <u>14</u> Hispanic <u>0</u> Native American <u>32</u> White <u>0</u> 7 Years <u>0</u> 8 Years <u>0</u> 9 Years <u>0</u> 10 Years <u>3</u> 12 Years <u>7</u> 13 Years <u>17</u> 14 Years <u>31</u> 15 Years <u>32</u> 16 Years <u>10</u> 17 Years <u>1</u> 18 Years <u>0</u> 19 Years | | A). Gender <u>22</u> Females <u>22</u> Males B). Race <u>1</u> Asian / Oriental <u>2</u> Bi-Racial <u>21</u> Black <u>2</u> Hispanic <u>0</u> Native American <u>18</u> White <u>0</u> Other <u>0</u> 7 Years <u>0</u> 8 Years <u>0</u> 9 Years <u>0</u> 10 Years <u>12</u> 12 Years <u>5</u> 13 Years <u>3</u> 14 Years <u>8</u> 15 Years <u>12</u> 16 Years <u>13</u> 17 Years <u>2</u> 18 Years <u>0</u> 19 Years <u>0</u> 20 Years | | A). Gender <u>18</u> Females <u>19</u> Males B). Race <u>1</u> Asian / Oriental <u>2</u> Bi-Racial <u>18</u> Black <u>2</u> Hispanic <u>0</u> Native American <u>14</u> White <u>0</u> Other <u>0</u> 7 Years <u>0</u> 8 Years <u>0</u> 9 Years <u>0</u> 10 Years <u>2</u> 12 Years <u>4</u> 13 Years <u>3</u> 14 Years <u>3</u> 15 Years <u>11</u> 16 Years <u>11</u> 17 Years <u>13</u> 18 Years <u>0</u> 19 Years <u>0</u> 20 Years | | A). Gender <u>14</u> Females <u>13</u> Males B). Race <u>1</u> Asian / Oriental <u>1</u> Bi-Racial <u>11</u> Black <u>1</u> Hispanic <u>1</u> Native American <u>12</u> White <u>0</u> Other <u>0</u> 7 Years <u>0</u> 8 Years <u>0</u> 9 Years <u>0</u> 10 Years <u>2</u> 12 Years <u>0</u> 13 Years <u>0</u> 14 Years <u>6</u> 15 Years <u>5</u> 16 Years <u>7</u> 17 Years <u>1</u> 18 Years <u>0</u> 19 Years <u>0</u> 20 Years | | | |
| NEGLIGENCE AND DELINQUENCY DIVISIONS | | NEGLIGENCE AND DELINQUENCY DIVISIONS | | NEGLIGENCE AND DELINQUENCY DIVISIONS | | NEGLIGENCE AND DELINQUENCY DIVISIONS | | | |
| LANSING ZIP CODES (Residency of Youth Served) | | LANSING ZIP CODES (Residency of Youth Served) | | LANSING ZIP CODES (Residency of Youth Served) | | LANSING ZIP CODES (Residency of Youth Served) | | | |
| LANSING <u>121</u> 48906 - North <u>137</u> 48910 - Central to Eastside <u>129</u> 48911 - South <u>69</u> 48912 - Central <u>68</u> 48915 - Central <u>26</u> 48917 - West <u>6</u> 48933 - Central | | LANSING <u>82</u> 48906 - North <u>131</u> 48910 - Central to Eastside <u>150</u> 48911 - South <u>67</u> 48912 - East <u>57</u> 48915 - Central <u>15</u> 48917 - West <u>11</u> 48933 - Central | | LANSING <u>61</u> 48906 - North <u>101</u> 48910 - Central to Eastside <u>111</u> 48911 - South <u>50</u> 48912 - East <u>50</u> 48915 - Central <u>19</u> 48917 - West <u>10</u> 48933 - Central | | LANSING <u>61</u> 48906 - North <u>101</u> 48910 - Central to Eastside <u>111</u> 48911 - South <u>50</u> 48912 - East <u>50</u> 48915 - Central <u>19</u> 48917 - West <u>10</u> 48933 - Central | | LANSING <u>61</u> 48906 - North <u>101</u> 48910 - Central to Eastside <u>111</u> 48911 - South <u>50</u> 48912 - East <u>50</u> 48915 - Central <u>19</u> 48917 - West <u>10</u> 48933 - Central | |
| INGHAM COUNTY YOUTH CENTER | | INGHAM COUNTY YOUTH CENTER | | INGHAM COUNTY YOUTH CENTER | | INGHAM COUNTY YOUTH CENTER | | | |
| 1). ADMISSIONS | | 1). ADMISSIONS | | 1). ADMISSIONS | | 1). ADMISSIONS | | | |
| Total: <u>184</u> <u>11</u> Average Length of Stay (days) <u>36</u> # of youths exceeding <u>22</u> days | | Total: <u>134</u> <u>13</u> Average Length of Stay (days) <u>38</u> # of youths exceeding <u>26</u> days | | Total: <u>137</u> <u>15</u> Average Length of Stay (days) <u>27</u> # of youths exceeding <u>30</u> days | | Total: <u>171</u> <u>11</u> Average Length of Stay (days) <u>26</u> # of youths exceeding <u>22</u> days | | | |
| 2). RELEASES | | 2). RELEASES | | 2). RELEASES | | 2). RELEASES | | | |
| Total: <u>162</u> | | Total: <u>111</u> | | Total: <u>119</u> | | Total: <u>152</u> | | | |

| | OTHER DETENTION | OTHER DETENTION | OTHER DETENTION |
|--|---|---|---|
| | PROGRAM ACTIVITY DURING THIS PERIOD 0 0 Eaton County Youth Facility 0 Ottawa County Youth Facility DEMOGRAPHICS A). Gender B). Race C). Age 0 Females 0 Asian / Oriental 0 7 Years 0 14 Years 0 Males 0 Bi-Racial 0 8 Years 0 15 Years 0 Black 0 9 Years 0 16 Years 0 Hispanic 0 10 Years 0 17 Years 0 Native American 0 11 Years 0 18 Years 0 White 0 12 Years 0 19 Years 0 Other 0 13 Years | PROGRAM ACTIVITY DURING THIS PERIOD 1 0 Eaton County Youth Facility 1 Roscommon County Detention Facility 0 Ottawa County Youth Facility DEMOGRAPHICS A). Gender B). Race C). Age 1 Females 0 Asian / Oriental 0 7 Years 0 14 Years 0 Males 0 Bi-Racial 0 8 Years 0 15 Years 0 Black 0 9 Years 0 16 Years 0 Hispanic 0 10 Years 0 17 Years 0 Native American 0 11 Years 0 18 Years 1 White 0 12 Years 0 19 Years 0 Other 0 13 Years | PROGRAM ACTIVITY DURING THIS PERIOD 1 1 Eaton County Youth Facility 0 Roscommon County Detention Facility 0 Ottawa County Youth Facility DEMOGRAPHICS A). Gender B). Race C). Age 0 Females 0 Asian / Oriental 0 7 Years 0 14 Years 1 Males 0 Bi-Racial 0 8 Years 0 15 Years 1 Black 0 9 Years 0 16 Years 0 Hispanic 0 10 Years 0 17 Years 0 Native American 0 11 Years 0 18 Years 0 White 0 12 Years 0 19 Years 0 Other 0 13 Years |
| | ACT 150 /220 | ACT 150 /220 | ACT 150 /220 |
| | PROGRAM ACTIVITY DURING THIS PERIOD: FAMILY DIVISION 62 WAIVER GENERAL 3 1). ACT 150 2 2). DHS ACT 220 60 DEMOGRAPHICS C). Age A). Gender 0 7 Years A). Gender C). Age 0 Females 0 8 Years 0 Females 0 7 Years 2 Males 0 9 Years 3 Males 0 8 Years 0 10 Years 0 9 Years 0 11 Years 0 10 Years B). Race 0 12 Years B). Race 0 11 Years 0 Asian / Oriental 0 12 Years 0 Bi-Racial 0 13 Years 0 Asian / Oriental 0 12 Years 2 Black 0 14 Years 0 Bi-Racial 0 13 Years 0 Hispanic 0 15 Years 2 Black 0 14 Years 0 Native American 0 16 Years 0 Hispanic 0 15 Years 0 White 0 17 Years 1 Native American 0 16 Years 0 Other 0 18 Years 0 White 0 17 Years 0 19 Years 0 Other 0 18 Years 0 20 Years 1 19 Years 0 20 Years | PROGRAM ACTIVITY DURING THIS PERIOD: FAMILY DIVISION 60 WAIVER GENERAL 3 1). ACT 150 2 2). DHS ACT 220 58 DEMOGRAPHICS C). Age A). Gender 0 7 Years A). Gender C). Age 0 Females 0 8 Years 0 Females 0 7 Years 2 Males 0 9 Years 3 Males 0 8 Years 0 10 Years 0 9 Years 0 11 Years 0 10 Years B). Race 0 12 Years B). Race 0 11 Years 0 Asian / Oriental 0 12 Years 0 Bi-Racial 0 13 Years 0 Asian / Oriental 0 12 Years 2 Black 0 14 Years 0 Bi-Racial 0 13 Years 0 Hispanic 0 15 Years 2 Black 0 14 Years 0 Native American 0 16 Years 0 Hispanic 0 15 Years 0 White 0 17 Years 1 Native American 0 16 Years 0 Other 0 18 Years 0 White 0 17 Years 0 19 Years 0 Other 0 18 Years 0 20 Years 1 19 Years 0 20 Years | PROGRAM ACTIVITY DURING THIS PERIOD: FAMILY DIVISION 63 WAIVER GENERAL 2 1). ACT 150 2 2). DHS ACT 220 61 DEMOGRAPHICS C). Age A). Gender 0 7 Years A). Gender C). Age 0 Females 0 8 Years 0 Females 0 7 Years 2 Males 0 9 Years 2 Males 0 8 Years 0 10 Years 0 9 Years 0 11 Years 0 10 Years B). Race 0 12 Years B). Race 0 11 Years 0 Asian / Oriental 0 12 Years 0 Bi-Racial 0 13 Years 0 Asian / Oriental 0 12 Years 2 Black 0 14 Years 0 Bi-Racial 0 13 Years 0 Hispanic 0 15 Years 2 Black 0 14 Years 0 Native American 0 16 Years 0 Hispanic 0 15 Years 0 White 0 17 Years 1 Native American 0 16 Years 0 Other 0 18 Years 0 White 0 17 Years 0 19 Years 0 Other 0 18 Years 0 20 Years 1 19 Years 0 20 Years |
| | INGHAM COUNTY FAMILY CENTER | INGHAM COUNTY FAMILY CENTER | INGHAM COUNTY FAMILY CENTER |
| | PROGRAM ACTIVITY DURING THIS PERIOD 173 70 Ingham Academy Day Treatment 41 Peckham Crossroads Program 62 Pride Program 10 Attending Ingham Academy & Pride Program DEMOGRAPHICS A). Gender B). Race C). Age D). Grade** 54 Females 0 Asian / Oriental 1 12 Years 6 8 th 104 Males 7 Bi-Racial 5 13 Years 26 9 th 85 Black 14 14 Years 41 10 th 20 Hispanic 25 15 Years 25 11 th 3 Native American 55 16 Years 4 12 th 43 White 49 17 Years 1 Ingham Academy 0 Other 9 18 Years Students ONLY 0 19 Years 0 19 Years | PROGRAM ACTIVITY DURING THIS PERIOD 167 75 Ingham Academy Day Treatment 35 Peckham Crossroads Program 57 Pride Program 9 Attending Ingham Academy & Pride Program DEMOGRAPHICS A). Gender B). Race C). Age D). Grade** 54 Females 0 Asian / Oriental 1 12 Years 5 8 th 100 Males 7 Bi-Racial 4 13 Years 40 9 th 84 Black 18 14 Years 36 10 th 15 Hispanic 17 15 Years 21 11 th 1 Native American 56 16 Years 4 12 th 47 White 48 17 Years 1 Ingham Academy 0 Other 10 18 Years Students ONLY 0 19 Years 0 19 Years | PROGRAM ACTIVITY DURING THIS PERIOD 143 66 Ingham Academy Day Treatment 28 Peckham Crossroads Program 49 Pride Program 6 Attending Ingham Academy & Pride Program DEMOGRAPHICS A). Gender B). Race C). Age D). Grade** 44 Females 0 Asian / Oriental 2 12 Years 5 8 th 88 Males 7 Bi-Racial 5 13 Years 37 9 th 74 Black 16 14 Years 33 10 th 15 Hispanic 18 15 Years 16 11 th 1 Native American 36 16 Years 2 12 th 35 White 45 17 Years 1 Ingham Academy 0 Other 10 18 Years Students ONLY 0 19 Years 0 19 Years |

MEMORANDUM

TO: LAW & COURTS AND FINANCE COMMITTEES
FROM: HARRY MOXLEY, DEPUTY COURT ADMINISTRATOR/FOC
RE: CONTINGENCY FUNDING REQUEST FOR OASIS VISITATION AND EXCHANGE CENTER
DATE: MARCH 2, 2015
CC: HON. JANELLE LAWLESS, SHAUNA DUNNINGS, ROBERT HOTCHKISS

As of the end of February, \$328,925.60 had been spent out of \$350,745 available for the Department of Justice/Office on Violence Against Woman “Safe Havens” grant, which has been used to set up the Oasis Visitation and Exchange Center. Taking into account outstanding invoices and other grant requirements, I am projecting there is enough to fund Oasis Center through the end of April. This is one month longer than was projected last summer when we requested our last six month extension, and both the landlord and DOJ have been notified that we are able to keep the center open for at least another month.

Given the cost of running the center--approximately \$8,000/month, of which \$5,000 is for FOC/MSU Chance at Childhood/End Violent Encounters (EVE) salary and time reimbursement, and \$3,000 is for rent, supplies, electronic monitoring and phones--it is unlikely Oasis will be able to remain open and viable on a long-term basis without another federal grant, or at the very least a sustained collaborative effort between local Ingham County, DHS and City of Lansing agencies. To this end, EVE has applied for a \$500,000, three-year Justice For Families grant to continue the center’s funding. The grant application was due on February 11, and per Kim Steed of MSU Chance at Childhood, approval will not be known until July or August. Judge Lawless has written a letter to the Director of the Department of Justice/Office on Violence Against Women in support of the application.

It is a matter of concern to FOC, as well as to DHS, the City of Lansing, MSU Chance at Childhood, and EVE, regarding what will happen to the Oasis Center in the interim period between the end of April and late summer, when we will have a better idea as to how to pursue its long-term viability. If Oasis had to shut its doors for five months, even with federal grant approval we may be faced with the need to “reinvent the wheel” as there is no guarantee the same staff, space and equipment will be available. This is no small consideration, given that it took almost four years and tremendous effort from all partners involved to get the Oasis Center up and running.

The unique configuration of the location—near a CATA stop, with separate, locked, electronically monitored entrances on different sides of the building—make Oasis a truly unique asset to our community, which may not be easily recreated were it to shut down on even a temporary basis. Out of approximately 12,000 active FOC cases with minor dependent children (and over 20,000 active FOC cases overall), 4,633—almost 40%—have at least one party or dependent with an active family violence component. This clearly shows the continued need for a safe exchange/supervised visitation center in Ingham County. There are no other options for safe exchanges in our community, and without Oasis such exchanges would have to occur in Police Precinct parking lots (many of which are now closed) or public places which do not offer staggered drop off times and provide at best minimal security. At their February 20 meeting, the Oasis Center Board of Directors granted Ingham County FOC referrals a permanent waiver of exchange and visitation fees (normally \$25 for intake and sliding scale thereafter; assuming acceptance for the JFF grant, fees will be eliminated for both Ingham and non-Ingham parties and referrals).

In the years since its opening, there has also been a marked increase in volume at Oasis: in 2013, the center's first full year of operation, 7 families with 12 children were served, and there were 163 exchanges and 7 supervised visits. By 2014 this had increased to 19 families with 38 children, 197 exchanges and 157 supervised visits. And as of the end of February—just two months into the year—13 families were being served, and 115 supervised visits and/or exchanges had been scheduled. Such usage and increase in volume also demonstrates a genuine need in our community for this resource, and shutting down even on a temporary basis would harm the credibility of Oasis among clients and service providers, who even upon the center's re-opening may think twice before referring parties to an establishment no longer regarded as a consistent entity.

In short, it is the belief of FOC, as well as our collaborators, that the community as a whole would benefit if Ingham County were to “buy time” for Oasis to try and get on its feet, and that a \$40,000 Ingham County contingency fund request would at least carry the center through to 9/30/15. This would cover the \$8,000/month “no frills/no extras” cost of the center for five months from May 1 through the end of the FOC fiscal year. I have spoken with the Budget Director, who indicated that \$268,307 remains in the county contingency fund for FY 2015, and that no other requests are on the horizon. I have also spoken with the Chief Deputy Controller, who indicated this request has the support of both he and the Controller, so long as it does not entail Ingham County funding the full cost of Oasis Center if EVE is not successful in obtaining the JFF grant, and that if this were the case FOC would need to seek other sources of funding (such as DHS and the City of Lansing) through the normal budgetary process.

Finally the landlord, Cedar IV LLC, has indicated they are willing to guarantee a lease extension through 9/30/15 at essentially the same price which has been paid for the space since 2012 (\$2300/month, up from \$2268 in 2012-2014). I am therefore submitting, in addition to a contingency fund request resolution, a lease extension resolution, passage of which is tied to the passage of the contingency funding request.

In order to better understand the functions of the center, Commissioners, staff and other interested parties are cordially invited to attend either (or both) Oasis Center open houses, which have been scheduled prior to the meetings of the Law & Courts and Finance Committees:

Oasis Center Open House Dates:

Thursday, March 12, 4:30 pm-5:45 pm

OR

Wednesday, March 18, 4:30 pm-5:45 pm

5656 South Cedar Street, Lansing

Donated light refreshments will be served. The building is located on the west side of South Cedar between Jolly and Miller, and there is a sign that says “Cedar Point.” Use the entrance driveway on the north side of the building and park in the back. There is an entrance to the building on the south side, where the second/exit driveway is located. There is a door marked “Oasis Center”, and a staff member or volunteer will be keeping an eye out for guests.

Thank you for your consideration. In addition to myself there will be community collaborators in attendance at both open houses, as well as the Law & Courts and Finance Committee meetings, to answer any questions you may have.

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

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

**RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE A CONTINGENCY FUND APPROPRIATION FOR
THE OASIS SUPERVISED VISITATION AND SAFE EXCHANGE CENTER**

WHEREAS, in 2008 the Office on Violence Against Women, U.S. Department of Justice awarded to Ingham County a \$350,745 “Safe Haven” grant, for purposes of providing supervised visitation and safe visitation exchange services; and

WHEREAS, this funding has been used to establish the Oasis Family Center for Supervised Visitation and Safe Exchange, located at 5656 South Cedar Street in Lansing; and

WHEREAS, the establishment and opening of the Oasis Family Center in 2012 was accomplished with tremendous time and effort on the part of Ingham County Friend of the Court staff and its community collaborators, End Violent Encounters (EVE), Inc., and MSU Chance at Childhood; and

WHEREAS, the need for Oasis Family Center clearly exists in our community, as is evidenced by the fact that the center has seen an increase in usage since opening its doors in 2012, as well as the large number of Friend of the Court cases with minor dependent children and a family violence component; and

WHEREAS, it is projected that federal funds used to cover the cost of running Oasis Family Center, approximately \$8,000 per month, will be exhausted by the end of April; and

WHEREAS, an application was made through EVE for a \$500,000 three-year federal Justice For Families grant to continue to fund Oasis Family Center; and

WHEREAS, federal acceptance of this application will not be known until later this year; and

WHEREAS, closing the Oasis Family Center for the period between the two grants may damage its long-term viability as there is no guarantee the same staff, equipment and space would be available if the center was re-opened; and

WHEREAS, at their February 20, 2015 meeting, the Oasis Center Board of Directors committed to long-term partnership and collaboration with the Ingham County Friend of the Court by granting a permanent fee waiver for all Ingham FOC referrals.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes a \$40,000 contingency fund appropriation to cover the cost of keeping the Oasis Family Center open through the Friend of the Court fiscal year ending September 30, 2015.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that that this request is tied to and contingent upon passage of the Oasis Family Center Lease Extension Resolution for the period April 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Controller/Administrator is authorized to make the necessary budget adjustments to the Circuit Court Family Division, Friend of the Court FY 2015 budget in accordance with this resolution.

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

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

**RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE A LEASE EXTENSION AGREEMENT FOR
THE FRIEND OF THE COURT SAFE HAVEN GRANT PROGRAM**

WHEREAS, the Office on Violence Against Women, U.S. Department of Justice has awarded to Ingham County a \$350,745 "Safe Haven" grant, for purposes of providing supervised visitation and safe visitation exchange services; and

WHEREAS, the Office on Violence Against Women, U.S. Department of Justice award approved by the Board of Commissioners (Resolutions #08-286, #09-399, #12-020 and #14-243) was extended until March 31, 2015 by the Office on Violence Against Women; and

WHEREAS, the grant from the Office on Violence Against Women, U.S. Department of Justice requires obtaining office space for a supervised visitation center; and

WHEREAS, the Safe Haven Grant Consulting Committee identified space, and the Office on Violence Against Women, U.S. Department of Justice, approved the space recommended by the consulting committee at 5656 South Cedar Street (known as the Cedar Point Building) in Lansing; and

WHEREAS, by prior Resolutions (#12-021, #13-423 and #14-421), the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorized the initial lease agreement and subsequent extension to March 31, 2015 with JWW Company, LLC (n/k/a Cedar IV LLC) for 2,087 square feet of rental space at the building known as Cedar Point; and

WHEREAS, the Landlord, CEDAR IV, LLC has agreed to extend the lease for the term of six months, commencing April 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes a lease amendment extension to the agreement with JWW Company, LLC (n/k/a Cedar IV LLC) at 5656 South Cedar Street, Lansing, Michigan in the building known as Cedar Point.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the terms of the lease amendment extension shall be from April 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015 at the rate of \$2,300.00 per month.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this extension is tied to and contingent upon passage of the Oasis Center Contingency Fund Appropriation Resolution for the period April 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015, in the amount of \$40,000.00.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Controller/Administrator is authorized to make the necessary budget adjustments to the Circuit Court Family Division, Friend of the Court FY 2015 budget in accordance with this resolution.

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

Agenda Item 3a and 3b

TO: Law & Courts and Finance Committees
FROM: Major Sam L. Davis
DATE: February 23, 2015
RE: Canteen Services, Inc. Commissary & Kitchen and Laundry Services

The Ingham County Sheriff's Office presently has two contracts with Canteen Services. Canteen Services provides the Commissary Services to the Ingham County Jail and also provides the Kitchen and Laundry Services to the Ingham County Jail.

I am recommending that the Board exercise two one year options to extend the Ingham County Sheriff's Office Commissary Services current contract under the same terms and conditions with Canteen Services, Inc. from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017.

Canteen Services will not increase the cost that inmates pay for commissary items without mutual consent during the two year extension and will also assume the risk of inflation for kitchen and laundry Services without a price increase for the two year extension.

Canteen Services, Inc. has been a great vendor to work with. They are flexible and very much client oriented. They are a visible and easily accessible partner that strives to bring the best products in the business to us at the fairest prices.

I believe that they are the company that best suits the needs of the inmates, the Sheriff's Office and the County.

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

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

**RESOLUTION TO EXTEND THE CANTEEN SERVICES, INC.
INMATE COMMISSARY CONTRACT FOR TWO YEARS**

WHEREAS, the Sheriff's Office has devoted extensive efforts to establish and ensure that the jail commissary operates effectively; and

WHEREAS, the Sheriff's Office has been pleased with the current contractual relationship with Canteen Services, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, this base contract expires February 28, 2015 and the Ingham County Sheriff's Office recommends that the Board of Commissioners exercise two one year options to extend the agreement from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017, under the same terms and conditions of the base contract; and

WHEREAS, this contract provides for a commissary sales commission of 40%; and

WHEREAS, this contract provides for Canteen Services, Inc. to continue to provide and maintain two inmate money deposit kiosks; and

WHEREAS, Canteen Services, Inc. will continue to charge \$4.00 for each kiosk transaction with \$2.00 returned to the Inmate Commissary fund; and

WHEREAS, Canteen Services, Inc. will assume the risk of inflation without a price increase for two (2) years; and

WHEREAS, Canteen Services, Inc. will provide the interface to partner with Securus Technologies to provide the Ingham County Jail with an Automated Information Service and Debit phone time.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes exercising two one year options to extend the Ingham County Sheriff's Office Commissary Services contract under the same terms and conditions with Canteen Services, Inc. from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the Board Chairperson to sign any necessary contract documents to extend the current contract, subject to approval as to form by the County Attorney.

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

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

**RESOLUTION TO EXTEND THE CONTRACT WITH CANTEEN SERVICES, INC. TO
MANAGE THE KITCHEN AND LAUNDRY SERVICES AT THE
INGHAM COUNTY CORRECTIONAL FACILITY**

WHEREAS, in 2014 the Ingham County Correctional Facility had an average daily population of 608 inmates, the current rated capacity is 601 inmates; and

WHEREAS, the Sheriff’s Office has been pleased with Canteen Services’ management of kitchen and laundry services under their current contract; and

WHEREAS, this base contract expires February 28, 2015 and the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office recommends that the Board of Commissioners exercise two one year options to extend the agreement from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017, under the same terms and conditions of the base contract; and

WHEREAS, Canteen Services, Inc. has been responsible for feeding all inmates housed within the facility, providing medical meals for inmates who have dietary needs as stated by a doctor; and

WHEREAS, in 2014 the Ingham County Correctional Facility kitchen staff served 719,648 meals; and

WHEREAS, in 2014 the Ingham County Correctional Facility Kitchen Supervisor was responsible for washing the clothing in over 140,000 inmate bags; and

WHEREAS, in 2014 the Ingham County Correctional Facility Kitchen Supervisor was responsible for training and supervising approximately 20 workers for kitchen and laundry duties every month or sooner.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes exercising two one year options to extend the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office contract for the management of kitchen and laundry operations at the Ingham County Correctional Facility under the same terms and conditions with Canteen Services, Inc. from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017 with the per meal cost based on the census of the Jail’s population as follows:

| <u>Census</u> | <u>Per Meal Cost</u> |
|---------------|----------------------|
| 0 – 649 | \$.98 |
| 650 – 674 | \$.97 |
| 675 and above | \$.96 |

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the Board Chairperson to sign any necessary contract documents to extend the current contract, subject to approval as to form by the County Attorney.

Ingham County Innovation and Technology Department
Michael E. Ashton, Chief Information Officer - Email: mashton@ingham.org

To: Board of Commissioners
From: Michael E. Ashton, CIO
Date: February 17, 2015
Re: Ingham County

Dear Commissioners,

This resolution authorizes the funds necessary to purchase the 6 inch ortho photography for the 2015 Tri-County Digital Aerial Imagery Project for Ingham County.

The State of Michigan has partnered with Sandborn Map Company to fly the Tri-County area of Ingham, Eaton and Clinton counties. This flight will occur in the spring time, March-April 2015 during the “leaf off” period dependent on the weather. The photo imagery will be delivered in October 2015. Once the data is processed, either the State or Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (TCRPC) will deliver the product to Ingham County. Sanborn will provide either DVD’s or portable hard drives.

Ingham County, in partnership with TCRPC, is receiving a 17.7% contiguity discount on the 12” base product with an additional savings of \$4.90 per sq. mile, from the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA). Ingham County is also receiving a \$5.21 per sq. mile discount for the 6” ortho resolution.

Resolution #14-483 authorized the Board of Commissioners to use \$15,000 from contingency funds for the participation of the 12” ortho resolution. The additional cost of \$32,270.86 will be divided among the four departments wanting the 6” ortho resolution. Each department will pay \$8,067.72 for the additional cost of the 6” ortho resolution. These enhanced imagery will bring the total cost to \$ 47,270.86.

The funds will be coming from the four departments; 911, Drain Commissioner’s Office, Environmental Health, and Roads, who have requested the 6” ortho photography instead of the 12” ortho photography from the approved previous Resolution #14-483.

Users of the imagery include, but are not limited to, 911 Emergency Operations, Drain Commissioner’s Office, Environmental Health, and the Department of Roads and Transportation.

Introduced by the Law & Courts, Human Services, County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE PURCHASE OF 6 INCH ORTHO PHOTOGRAPHY FROM THE 2015 TRI-COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION CONTRACT OF DIGITAL AERIAL IMAGERY OF INGHAM COUNTY

WHEREAS, the State of Michigan is coordinating a regional flight of Ingham, Eaton, and Clinton Counties with Tri-County Regional Planning Commission order to produce aerial imagery; and

WHEREAS, Resolution #14-483 authorized participation in this regional project for Ingham County and payment for 12 inch pixel, true color, leaf off digital orthoimagery; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County 911, Drain Commission, Environmental Health, and Road Department have requested to upgrade to 6 inch ortho photography; and

WHEREAS, the additional \$32,270.86 cost will be divided among the four departments requesting the 6 inch ortho resolution; and

WHEREAS, each department will pay \$8,067.72 for the additional cost of the 6 inch ortho resolution.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes participation in the 2015 Tri-County Regional Planning Commission digital aerial imagery project with the upgrade from 12 inch ortho photography to 6 inch ortho photography as requested by Environmental Health, the Drain Commission, the Road Department, and Ingham County 911.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, each department listed below will pay for this upgrade in the amount of \$8,067.72 and funds for this project will come from the department's operating budgets as follows:

Environmental Health - 22160200-818000-03043

Drain Commission - 639-27500-802000

Road Department – 201-44700-700001

Ingham County 911 - 26132500-818000 (911 funding will be transferred from their fund balance)

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Ingham County Board of Commissioners is authorized to sign the necessary agreements with Tri-County Regional Planning Commission and the State of Michigan, after approval as to form by the County Attorney.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the County Controller/Administrator is authorized to make the budget adjustments and transfers contemplated by the resolution.

Agenda Item 5

TO: Law & Courts and Finance Committees

FROM: John L. Neilsen , Chief Deputy Controller

DATE: March 3, 2015

SUBJECT: Resolution Authorizing a Contract for 9-1-1 Public Safety Radio Communications Consulting Services with Brent Williams

Commissioners:

The 9-1-1 Public Safety Radio Communication System used by all Ingham County public safety agencies will need to be upgraded or replaced as it approaches the end of life for replacement parts.

The Ingham County Board of Commissioners has asked for input from the 9-1-1 Advisory Board and Ingham County public safety agencies on the best way to move forward with the 9-1-1 Public Safety Radio Communication System.

Brent Williams has been identified as an independent consultant with expertise and direct experience working with both the current Harris Inc. EDACS trunked-simulcast radio systems and with a potential alternative, the Michigan Public Safety Communications System/Motorola 800 MHz digital trunked radio system.

The 9-1-1 Advisory Board is recommending that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hire Brent Williams to assist the County in making a decision on how to proceed. These proposed consulting services for Ingham County are to conduct an evaluation as to the pros and cons of the various County options for the future of the 9-1-1 Public Safety Radio Communication System.

This resolution authorizes a contract/purchase order for radio communications consulting services with Brent Williams to evaluate options for the future direction of the 9-1-1 Public Safety Radio Communication System, at a cost not to exceed \$3,200 from the 9-1-1 Emergency Telephone Dispatch Services - 911 fund balance to be completed within sixty days of the signing of the contract/purchase order.

I recommend approval of the resolution.

SCOPE OF WORK
FOR BRENT WILLIAMS TO SERVE AS A CONSULTANT FOR 911 RADIO SYSTEM

As 9-1-1 Central Dispatch looks at options for dealing with the current radio system reaching end of life, they are looking to have a consultant review the data that collected so far and further evaluate possible options and their impact on operations and costs.

An evaluation as to the Pros and Cons of the options have been identified below:

- Upgrade the current Harris UHF System in place to a P25 system that will operate in both phase 1 and phase 2
- Replace the Current Harris UHF system with a 700-800 MHz MPSCS/Motorola system
- Upgrade to a new Harris 700MHz system with 800MHz capabilities to interoperate with MPSCS

This evaluation would also include:

- Full feature comparison of the system.
- Options to maintain functionality with schools or businesses currently set up to communicate with public safety.
- Options for backup channels with both systems.
- Availability of backup channels with the MPSCS system and if they are Simplex? or Duplex?
- Long term costs-Maintenance and mic fees, with both MPSCS and County maintaining sites.
- Interoperability gateway functionality descriptions.
- Paging options for fire- looking at band? Equipment options?
- MPSCS proposal-what sites do they propose (7)? 1 new site, where?
- How many frequencies would the MPSCS use? # of 800? # of 700?
- Tower maintenance costs for the MPSCS?
- Response time for outages/issues?
- Fail-soft and redundancies?
- End user equipment service-warranty period?
- End user equipment costs after warranty?
- System warranty how long? Costs listed above.
- Tower loading specs-microwaves existing tower issues?
- Harris tower work costs?
- MPSCS tower work costs?
- Pricing from Motorola? \$8-10 million from the presentation, did that include consoles?
- Over the air programming options/costs?
- Encryption options/costs?
- Interference issues with both systems? UHF and 700/800 MHz.
- Bi Directional Amplifiers currently used, needs for each new system?
- Transport Vans for ICSO.
- Interop with MPSCS/surrounding counties?
- Ongoing user equipment programming? Costs? How often can this be done?

The contractor will provide a written report of his findings within 60 days of signing the contract/purchase order. The total to Ingham County will not exceed the cost of \$3,200 and include invoices to reflect only actual time spent on the project which is estimated not to exceed 40 hours. This cost includes all expenses involved, including travel and other miscellaneous costs.

| | Current Ingham Co. Radio System | Harris Upgrade | Harris or Other Stand alone system | MPSCS / Motorola State System |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Estimated Cost | N/A | \$5-6,000,000.00 | \$15-17,000,000.00 | \$15-17,000,000.00 |
| Can this system adequately meet the needs of Ingham County Public Safety? | Yes it does currently | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Type of System | Analog/Digital | Digital | Digital | Digital |
| Frequency Used | UHF 450MHz | UHF 450MHz | 700MHz | 700MHz sub system of the State 800MHz System |
| Radio Frequencies Available | Currently a 9 channel system, with a control channel and 8 talk paths | Would remain the same as current system | There are supposed to be 15- 700MHz frequencies available to Ingham County that could be used for this system | There are supposed to be 15- 700MHz frequencies available to Ingham County that could be used for this system |
| Bandwidth used per channel | 12.5MHz | 12.5MHz | 6.25MHz | 12.5MHz |
| Protocol Used | EDACS | P25 Phase 1 and Phase 2 capable | P25 Phase 2 | P25 Phase 1 |
| System infrastructure owned by | Ingham County | Ingham County | Ingham County | Ingham & State of Michigan |
| Tower Sites Used | Current 5 Transmit/Receive-8 Receive sites | Current 5 Transmit/Receive-8 Receive sites | Unknown # sites/locations | Unknown # sites/locations if use current sites \$500,000.00 new site \$1,000,000.00 |
| End User Equipment | Department owned radios 1900 | 1900 radios need programing \$220.00 per unit \$418,000.00 Most radios are only Phase 1 capable | 1900 new radios would be needed about \$3500.00 per unit \$6,650,000.00 | 1900 new radios would be needed about \$3500.00 per unit \$6,650,000.00 |
| Radio Backbone | Master 3 Switches | Need to change to Master 5 Switches P25 | Need new P25 switches | Need new P25 switches |
| Mic Fees | Maintenance divided by # of radios, Currently \$149.46 | Maintenance divided by # of radios | Maintenance divided by # of radios | State has set Mic Fee. \$200.00 *offset by portion of backbone equipment |
| Interoperability with State System | Currently done with patch radios | Would also use Patch Radios | With proper end user radios, could be seamless with state system programed into 700 MHz-800 MHz capable radios | With proper end user radios, could be seamless with state system programed into 700 MHz-800 MHz capable radios |
| Interoperability with other Counties | Use Star Gate with Clinton, Eaton has our radios they work conventional, Livingston on State system, they have on of our radios at their center | Similar connections to what we currently have would be used. | Patch radios would be needed to talk with Eaton, talk groups could be added to talk with Livingston on State System, and Clinton if they move forward with 800 P25 system | Similar to 700 system can be direct with 800 or 700 P25 systems, otherwise patch radios would be needed |
| Interoperability with Schools | Working on UHF Conventional, direct communications from end user radios with a change of systems. | Can work as it does currently | Would need to purchase more expensive multi band radios to have communications with the schools. | Would need to purchase more expensive multi band radios to have communications with the schools. |
| Vendor that would be supplying end user equipment | Harris Radio | Harris Radios upgraded, may also use any other vendor with a P25 radio | Any vendor's P25 phase 2 compatible radio | Any vendor's P25 phase 1 compatible radio |
| Back up system | Conventional Back up coverage in place currently, 7 channels | Same back up channels would remain | Some of the 700 MHz channels would be needed for Back up | None provided with State System, they would have to be added from the Counties 700 MHz channels |
| Concerns with systems | Current system end of life 2017, currently approx. 97% in building coverage with a portable radio. 20db urban, 10 db. rural | Currently equipment is 7-8 years old, some parts that would be reused might need repair. (ie. Microwaves, feed lines) Change to Phase 1 is supposed to maintain current coverage. | New system would require more tower sites to maintain our coverage requirements which was 95% in building portable 20db urban, 10 db. rural | From the MPSCS web site: "MPSCS has a 97 percent all-weather, mobile radio coverage guarantee. Portable radio coverage is not guaranteed." System would need to be designed to meet higher coverage, more tower sites would be needed. |

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

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A CONTRACT FOR 9-1-1 PUBLIC SAFETY RADIO COMMUNICATIONS CONSULTING SERVICES WITH BRENT WILLIAMS

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 went live in 2006 and will need to be upgraded or replaced as it approaches end of life; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners has asked for input from the 9-1-1 Advisory Board and Ingham County Public Safety Agencies on the best way to move forward with the 9-1-1 Public Safety Radio Communication System; and

WHEREAS, Brent Williams has been identified as an independent consultant with expertise and direct experience working with both the Harris Inc. EDACS trunked-simulcast radio systems and Michigan Public Safety Communications System/ Motorola 800 MHz digital trunked radio system; and

WHEREAS, Brent Williams is willing to provide consulting services to Ingham County to conduct an evaluation as to the pros and cons of the various County options for the future of the 9-1-1 Public Safety Radio Communication System; and

WHEREAS, the 9-1-1 Advisory Board is recommending that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hire Brent Williams to assist the County in this critical decision point.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes a contract/purchase order for radio communications consulting services with Brent Williams to evaluate options for the future direction of the 9-1-1 Public Safety Radio Communication System, at a cost not to exceed \$3,200 from the 9-1-1 Emergency Telephone Dispatch Services - 911 fund balance to be completed within sixty days of the signing of the contract/purchase order.

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