

CHAIRPERSON
BRIAN McGRAIN

VICE-CHAIRPERSON
KARA HOPE

VICE-CHAIRPERSON PRO-TEM
RANDY MAIVILLE

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

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, MAY 14, 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 [April 30, 2015](#) Minutes

Additions to the Agenda

Limited Public Comment

1. Law & Courts Committee - Animal Control Advisory Board Interview
2. Update from Lisa McCormick on the Juvenile Justice Millage (JJM) 2015 Agreement for the Small Talk Program
3. Circuit Court / Family Division - Resolution to Authorize Ingham County Circuit Court to Accept [Donations](#) for the Ingham County Youth Center Programs
4. District Court - Presentation on Probation Officer/Assessor Position
5. Sheriff's Office
 - a. Resolution to Enter into a Contract with Mid Michigan Kennels to Accept a Donation of a New [K-9 Dog and Training](#) for the New K-9 Handler
 - b. Resolution to Purchase [21 Body Cameras](#) from L3 Mobile Vision, Inc. Using Homeland Security Grant Program Funds
 - c. Resolution to Name Sheriff's Office Training Room A the [Sgt. Paul Cole](#) Training Room
6. Controller's Office - Resolution Updating Various [Fees](#) for County Services

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
April 30, 2015
Draft Minutes

Members Present: Tsernoglou, Crenshaw, Koenig, Nolan, and Schafer

Members Absent: Celentino, Crenshaw, and Hope

Others Present: Andrew Seltz, Lance Langdon, Jared Cypher, Anne Burns, Robin Stites,
Tom Conner, and Connie Page

2. 9-1-1 Central Dispatch
 - b. Director's Report (Materials to be Distributed at the Meeting)

Lance Langdon, Director of Ingham County 9-1-1, provided the Director's Report.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Tsernoglou at 6:10 p.m. in Personnel Conference Room "D & E" of the Human Services Building, 5303 S. Cedar Street, Lansing, Michigan.

Approval of the April 16, 2015 Minutes

MOVED BY COMM. SCHAFER, SUPPORTED BY COMM. KOENIG, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 16, 2015 LAW & COURTS COMMITTEE MEETING.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioners Celentino, Crenshaw, and Hope.

Additions to the Agenda

4. Inmate Billing – Discussion: Jail Revenue from Inmate Fees

Substitution

2. 9-1-1 Central Dispatch
 - a. Resolution to Approve the Purchase of a Reporting Server and Monitors for use with the 9-1-1 Computer Aided Dispatch Systems

Pull from Agenda

1. Law & Courts Committee - Jury Board Interviews

Limited Public Comment

None.

2. 9-1-1 Central Dispatch
 - a. Resolution to Approve the Purchase of a Reporting Server and Monitors for use with the 9-1-1 Computer Aided Dispatch Systems

MOVED BY COMM. SCHAFER, SUPPORTED BY COMM. KOENIG, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE PURCHASE OF A REPORTING SERVER AND MONITORS FOR USE WITH THE 9-1-1 COMPUTER AIDED DISPATCH SYSTEM.

Mr. Langdon stated that when the Computer Aided Dispatch System (CAD) rollout occurred there was not a reporting server included. He further stated that this caused many issues. He also indicated that there was a great interest to get access to this data and that a reporting server would allow them to do so without any negative effects on the rest of the system.

Commissioner Koenig asked what kind of data they would be accessing and as to what they were looking for from this data.

Mr. Langdon stated they would be looking at every call received, but specifically the calls that are not reportable to law enforcement.

Commissioner Koenig asked if this would track high utilizers of 9-1-1 and be an indicator as to what kinds of issues people have.

Mr. Langdon stated this was a matter of quality of life for people in the neighborhood where the calls came from and could help identify problem areas that need more attention by law enforcement.

Commissioner Schafer asked if Ingham County actively advertised a non-emergency phone number like Livingston County.

Mr. Langdon stated that the non-emergency number for Ingham County was provided on cards handed out by police officers and available on their website.

Discussion.

Commissioner Koenig asked if there were any federal regulations about what calls should and should not be made to 9-1-1. She indicated that some counties actively promoted calling 9-1-1 for any issue.

Mr. Langdon stated that he was not aware of any regulations and that calling 9-1-1 for non-emergency was more prevalent in small towns.

Discussion.

Mr. Langdon provided an overview of the recent training for his staff on the new system.

Mr. Langdon stated that the new system had lost playback ability on the recording function. He further stated that there were issues with the software that need to be addressed.

Commissioner Nolan stated that the resolution needed to be reworked prior to the Finance Committee meeting to clearly reflect the specific items needed for the \$52,000 request.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioners Celentino, Crenshaw, and Hope.

Chairperson Tsernoglou stated that the resolution passed conditionally and then would be reworked prior to appearing before the Finance Committee.

Commissioner Nolan asked Mr. Langdon for the total money currently in the fund balance.

Mr. Langdon stated that he did not have the exact figure.

Chairperson Tsernoglou asked Jared Cypher, Deputy Controller, to provide the number to the Committee.

3. Animal Control – Discussion: Animal Control Fee Schedules – Potential Revisions

Commissioner Schafer stated that he no longer wished to pursue the issue of lowering licensing fees for unsterilized animals.

Discussion.

Chairperson Tsernoglou asked how boarding fees and redemption fees were different.

Andrew Seltz, Ingham County Animal Control (ICAC) Director, stated that the redemption fee was an impound fee. He further stated that individuals may incur a boarding fee and redemption fee.

Chairperson Tsernoglou read portion of Commissioner Hope's email to the Committee and presented the email for the record.

Mr. Seltz was unable to quantify the numbers requested in Commissioner Hope's email.

Commissioner Nolan asked how the deficit would be recovered from the large decrease in the ICAC budget by the proposed fee reduction.

Mr. Seltz stated that he would need to reduce staff to compensate.

Discussion.

Chairperson Tsernoglou stated that she would continue to support the reduction of boarding and redemption fees due to citizen concerns.

Mr. Cypher reminded the Committee that the Board of Commissioners had passed a resolution this week to waive or reduce fees if population issues at the shelter arose. He further stated that the impact of this was unknown.

Discussion.

Commissioner Schafer stated that his original concern regarding the reduction of the unsterilized animal licensing fee would hurt ICAC. He further stated the reduced fee for senior citizens should be eliminated.

Commissioner Nolan stated that she did not support fee reduction at all. She further stated that she does not want to reduce shelter staff. She indicated that the Shelter Direction had discretion to alter fees

Anne Burns, ICAC Deputy Director stated that recently passed resolution was regarding adoption fees.

Commissioner Nolan stated that she did not agree with the decrease in budget due to the proposed fee reduction. She further stated that she agreed with Commissioner Schafer on the elimination of the reduced senior citizen fee.

Commissioner Nolan suggested that impoverished citizens show a Department of Human Services card to redeem their animals.

Discussion.

Commissioner Schafer stated that he was pleased with the original fee schedule proposed.

Chairperson Tsernoglou stated she still supported some reduction of boarding fee and/or redemption fee. She further stated she wanted to accomplish this without the elimination of any staff.

Discussion.

Commissioner Koenig asked how a pet cannot be redeemed due to money concerns.

Mr. Seltz stated that it comes up almost every day. He further stated that often time pet owners do leave their animal at the shelter because of cost. Mr. Seltz indicated that ICAC did have a payment plan option.

Discussion.

Commissioner Koenig asked what percentages of animals were redeemed.

Ms. Burns provided a tentative figure of about 30-40%, for dogs only.

Commissioner Koenig requested a more exact percentage of animals redeemed when the owner was known.

Ms. Burns stated that ICAC did not keep that specific of information, but would look into it and get back to the Committee.

Commissioner Koenig suggested the creation of a fund that could help people redeem their dog.

Chairperson Tsernoglou asked how they could establish low-income criteria for redemption. She stated that the ICAC advisory board might be best to answer this question.

Commissioner Schafer stated that Ingham County spends a lot of money on ICAC. He further stated that the county has many departments in need. He indicated that the Board of Commissioners did the best they could to provide for ICAC in relation to all other departments of need.

Discussion.

4. Inmate Billing –Discussion Item

Commissioner Schafer reviewed the handout and the email from John Neilsen, Ingham County Chief Deputy Controller, regarding Clinton County jail revenue.

Commissioner Schafer stated there was a possible \$320,000 in extra revenue to be brought in by Ingham County if they followed a similar structure as Clinton County.

Discussion.

Chairperson Tsernoglou asked if an inmate fee was currently in place for Ingham County.

Mr. Cypher stated there is inmate billing in Ingham County. He further stated the difference was between how aggressively Clinton County collected these fees versus Ingham County.

Discussion.

Commissioner Schafer asked that Ingham County pursue fee collection more aggressively.

Commissioner Koenig asked to discuss the numbers and the details from Clinton County's fee structure further.

Discussion.

Chairperson Tsernoglou stated that Mr. Cypher will discuss the matter further with Mr. Neilsen and it will be presented before the Committee again.

Announcements

None.

Public Comment

Tom Connor, volunteer at the ICAC shelter, addressed the Committee on the adoption of cats at the shelter. He stated that Capital Area Humane Society (CAHS) offered free cats adoption an entire month at a time. He further stated that the cats from CAHS do not come from Ingham County and this was hurting ICAC shelter.

Mr. Connor stated that a fee decrease could further impact the ICAC shelter.

Connie Page, volunteer at ICAC shelter, discussed comparisons of ICAC shelter to shelters in surrounding counties and the importance of the animal shelter to the citizens of Ingham County.

Ms. Page indicated that she was statistician and would assist the ICAC shelter in providing statistics regarding the animals to the Committee.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:11 p.m.

MAY 14, 2015 LAW & COURTS AGENDA STAFF REVIEW SUMMARY

RESOLUTION ACTION ITEMS:

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

1. Law & Courts Committee - Animal Control Advisory Board Interview

This is a Board of Commissioners appointment.

2. Update from Lisa McCormick on the Juvenile Justice Millage (JJM) 2015 Agreement for the Small Talk Program

This is a update by the Chief Assistant Prosecuting Attorney on the status of JJM funding for the 2015 award on the Small Talk program.

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

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

4. District Court – Presentation on Probation Officer/Assessor Position

- 5a. Sheriff's Office

- a. Resolution to Enter into a Contract with Mid Michigan Kennels to Accept a Donation of a New K-9 Dog and Training for the New K-9 Handler

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

- 5b. Resolution to Purchase 21 Body Cameras from L3 Mobile Vision, Inc. using Homeland Security Grant Program Funds

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

5c. *Resolution to Name Sheriff's Office Training Room A the Sgt. Paul Cole Training Room*

This resolution authorizes the Sheriff's Office to officially name Training Room A, which has in practice been named the Sgt. Paul Cole Training Room in honor of Sgt. Cole since around 1996 when he tragically lost his life in the line of duty. In researching past County Board resolutions, we found that a resolution was never sought to officially name Training Room A the Sgt. Paul Cole Training Room. This resolution will alleviate that oversight. (see attached memo for details)

6. *Controller's Office - Resolution Updating Various Fees For County Services*

The Controller's Office annually prepares for the Board of Commissioners review details about adjustment of the fees for the upcoming budget process. This review has been completed and some adjustments are being presented to the Board of Commissioners for their consideration. This information was discussed at a previous round of committee meetings as a discussion item for input from the Board of Commissioners. A resolution recommending certain fee increases is now being presented at this round of meetings for adoption. (see attached memo for details)

MEMORANDUM

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

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

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

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

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

The donations received will be used for incentives, rewards, as well as activities and needs surrounding the garden.

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

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Law & Courts Committee
Finance Committee

FROM: Major Joel Maatman

DATE: April 27, 2015

RE: Donation of New ICSO K-9

This resolution requests permission for the Ingham County Sheriff's Office to accept a donation of a K-9 dog for our K-9 program. The donation of the K-9 also includes training for its new handler.

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

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners and Sheriff thank HoffenMiller Kennels for their generous donation.

Agenda Item 5b

TO: Law & Courts and Finance Committees

FROM: Sergeant Jeff Weiss, Ingham County Office of Homeland Security & Emergency Management

DATE: August 14, 2012

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

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

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

This technology request has been previously submitted and approved by the Michigan State Police Emergency Management and Homeland Security Division.

Public Safety & Justice Article from Governing.Com

April 13, 2015

What We Can Learn From the Police That Pioneered Body Cameras

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

BY [MIKE MACIAG](#) | APRIL 13, 2015

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

RELATED

- [How Are States Going to Pay for Those Police Body Cameras?](#)
- [What People Want From Police Departments](#)
- [Tulsa Deputy Charged With Manslaughter in Unarmed Man's Death](#)
- [Body Camera Video Shows Tulsa Police 'Accidentally' Shoot Suspect](#)
- [Can Body Cameras Really Reduce Police Use of Force?](#)

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

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

Departments with body cameras are finding that there's much more to it than merely strapping a camera on an officer's uniform. Managing all the hours of video footage comes at a price, both in labor and data storage costs. Perhaps even more significant, body-worn cameras come with numerous unintended consequences, some of which will get worse as the technology becomes widespread.

By now, Chesapeake police officers have grown accustomed to being recorded. They begin their shifts by picking up a camera from docking stations, and they end their shifts by plugging the devices back in. All of the recorded video and audio is automatically uploaded to Evidence.com, an internal website that's sort of a YouTube for Chesapeake police. Officers can review footage at computer terminals while writing up reports, or watch clips right away using an app on their smartphones.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Before cameras can be put in place, police, attorneys and local officials need to decide which types of interactions will be recorded, how long video will be retained and what footage can be released to the public.

Local elected officials in some jurisdictions have attempted to force departments to adopt the technology more quickly than they would prefer. In Baltimore, city council members passed a bill [last year](#) requiring police to wear cameras. Mayor Stephanie Rawlings-Blake vetoed the measure, arguing that the council's powers should not extend into police department operations and that the bill failed to adequately address legal and privacy issues. The program "must be done right and should not be something that is hastily implemented without measures in place to ensure its success," the mayor wrote. Rawlings-Blake, who supports adoption of the cameras, instead formed a city task force that later recommended a pilot program.

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

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

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

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

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

So do cameras make police behave better, or are citizens just more cooperative when the cameras are turned on? Most in the law enforcement community contend that it's a mix of both. "Equipping officers with body cameras does not eliminate use of force," Bueermann says, "but it does appear to have a civilizing effect on the more routine interactions between police and the public."

Chesapeake reports that the cameras have proved particularly useful in DUI cases. Defense attorneys find many clients' accounts of their arrests don't match the videos. Chesapeake prosecutor Parr says she suspects the videos have led to more guilty pleas for DUI charges, although no exact figures are available.

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

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

Every officer's camera has an assigned docking station.

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

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

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

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

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

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

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Law and Courts Committee

FROM: Chief Deputy Greg Harless

DATE: May 7, 2015

RE: Naming a Sheriff's Office Training Room in Honor of Sgt. Paul Cole

This resolution will authorize the Sheriff's Office to officially name our current Training Room A, which has been the Sgt. Paul Cole Training Room in honor of Sgt. Cole's tragic line of duty death in 1996. In researching past County Board Resolutions, we found that a resolution was never sought to officially name Training Room A the Sgt. Paul Cole Training Room.

Summary of Proposed Action: This resolution will authorize the Sheriff's Office too officially, by Resolution name of our Training Room A to the Sgt. Paul Cole Training Room.

Financial Implications: There are no financial implications for this resolution.

Introduced by the Law and Courts Committee of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

**RESOLUTION TO NAME SHERIFF'S OFFICE TRAINING ROOM A
THE SGT. PAUL COLE TRAINING ROOM**

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Sheriff's Office has two (2) Regional Training Rooms, one that honors in name, Sgt. Paul Cole who died in the line of duty and the other Grant Whitaker Training Room who also died in the line of duty; and

WHEREAS, on October 6, 1996, Sgt. Paul Cole while responding to a domestic disturbance call, bravely and valiantly, lost his life in the line of duty; and

WHEREAS, to honor Sgt. Paul Cole and to keep his memory alive, the Sheriff's Office wishes to name Training Room A, the Sgt. Paul Cole Training Room.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners approves the renaming of Training Room A at the Sheriff's Office to the Sgt. Paul Cole Training Room.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Finance and Liaison Committees

FROM: Timothy J. Dolehanty, Controller/Administrator

DATE: May 8, 2015

SUBJECT: Resolution Updating Various Fees for County Services

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

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

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

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

Attachments

Introduced by the Finance Committee of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION UPDATING VARIOUS FEES FOR COUNTY SERVICES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the fees struck out in the Attachments are to be eliminated.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the fees within major Health Department services are not included on the attachments and were not set by the policy above, but rather through policy established in Resolutions #05-166 and #05-242.

ATTACHMENT A: FEES WHICH ARE ADJUSTED

County Services Committee

Location of Service	Fee Description	Target Percent	2015 Fee	2016 Fee
Drain Comm.	Photography	100.0%	\$275.00	\$280.00
Drain Comm.	Topography	100.0%	\$555.00	\$565.00
Drain Comm.	Preliminary Comm. Site Plan Review	75.0%	\$680.00	\$690.00
Drain Comm.	Preliminary Plat Review	75.0%	\$680.00	\$690.00
Drain Comm.	Plat and Commercial Drainage Review - First acre	100.0%	\$680.00	\$690.00
Drain Comm.	Additional acre	100.0%	\$76.00	\$77.00
Drain Comm.	Re-submission Admin fee	100.0%	\$220.00	\$225.00
Drain Comm.	Plat Drain Administration Fee	75.0%	\$2,400.00	\$2,450.00
Drain Comm.	Drain Crossing Permit- (Residential)	100.0%	\$125.00	\$130.00
Drain Comm.	Tap in Permit - Residential	75.0%	\$100.00	\$105.00
Drain Comm.	Tap-in Permit - Commercial	75.0%	\$400.00	\$410.00
Drain Comm.	Soil Erosion Permit - Commercial-12 mo. Duration - 1/2 acre or less	100.0%	\$590.00	\$600.00
Drain Comm.	Soil Erosion (12 mo.) - Commercial- each additional acre	100.0%	\$59.00	\$60.00
Drain Comm.	Soil Erosion Permit - Commercial -9 mo. Duration - 1/2 acre or less	100.0%	\$520.00	\$525.00
Drain Comm.	Soil Erosion Permit - Commercial - 6 mo. Duration - 1/2 acre or less	100.0%	\$440.00	\$450.00
Drain Comm.	Soil Erosion (6 mo.) - Commercial- each add'l acre	100.0%	\$44.00	\$45.00
Drain Comm.	Soil Erosion Permit Transfer	100.0%	\$90.00	\$95.00
Drain Comm.	Escrow account-1/2 acre or less	100.0%	\$555.00	\$565.00
Drain Comm.	Escrow account - 1/2 to 1 acre	100.0%	\$1,675.00	\$1,685.00
Drain Comm.	Escrow account - 1 to 5 acres	100.0%	\$3,350.00	\$3,375.00
Drain Comm.	Escrow account - 5 to 10 acres	100.0%	\$5,590.00	\$5,600.00
Drain Comm.	Escrow account - each add'l 10 acres	100.0%	\$2,795.00	\$2,800.00
Drain Comm.	Soil Erosion Permit-Residential-12 mo.	100.0%	\$255.00	\$260.00
Drain Comm.	Soil Erosion Permit - 9 month duration	75.0%	\$245.00	\$250.00
Drain Comm.	Commercial Minor Disturbance Soil Erosion - Permit/Review/Inspection	75.0%	\$310.00	\$320.00
Drain Comm.	Residential Minor Disturbance Soil Erosion - Permit/Review/Inspection	75.0%	\$45.00	\$46.00
Drain Comm.	Violation and Cease&Desist Order	100.0%	\$290.00	\$295.00
Equalization	17" x 22"	100.0%	\$18.00	\$19.00
Equalization	34" x 44"	100.0%	\$37.00	\$38.00
Equalization	17" x 22"	100.0%	\$37.00	\$38.00
Equalization	28" x 40"	100.0%	\$62.00	\$63.00
Equalization	34" x 44"	100.0%	\$75.00	\$76.00
Equalization	Custom Maps	100.0%	\$70.00	\$71.00

ATTACHMENT A: FEES WHICH ARE ADJUSTED				
County Services Committee				
Location of Service	Fee Description	Target Percent	2015 Fee	2016 Fee
Parks	NEW - Winter Sports Building - reservation fee/non operational hrs	100.0%	\$0.00	\$30.00
Parks	Pedal Boat - per 1/2 hour (Weekday)	100.0%	\$5.00	\$5.00
Parks	Pedal Boat - per 1/2 hr (Weekend)	100.0%	\$6.00	\$6.00
Parks	Pedal Boat - Senior (+60) - per 1/2 hr-	100.0%	\$1.00	\$1.00
Parks	Pedal Boat - 1/2 hour - NEW	100.0%	\$0.00	\$6.00
Parks	1st hour	100.0%	\$4.00	\$4.00
Parks	Each additional hour-	100.0%	\$1.00	\$1.00
Parks	Cross Country Skiing Adults: Wknds & Holidays(Burchfield) ****			
Parks	1st hour	100.0%	\$8.00	\$8.00
Parks	Each additional hour	100.0%	\$3.00	\$3.00
Parks	X-Country Skiing Children(12&under): Wkds& Holidays(Burchfield)- ****			
Parks	1st hour-	100.0%	\$4.00	\$4.00
Parks	Each additional hour-	100.0%	\$1.00	\$1.00
Parks	NEW - Cross Country Ski Rental- adult per hour	100.0%	\$0.00	\$7.00
Parks	NEW - Cross Country Ski Rental - child per hour	100.0%	\$0.00	\$5.00
Parks	— Adult Pass - Snow Tubing (2 hours) Mon-Fri	100.0%	\$10.00	\$10.00
Parks	— Child Pass - Snow Tubing (12 & under 2 hours) Mon-Fri	100.0%	\$5.00	\$5.00
Parks	Family Pass - Snow Tubing (2 adults & 2 children 2hrs) Mon-Fri	100.0%	\$25.00	\$25.00
Parks	— Adult Pass - Snow Tubing (2 hours) Sat, Sun and Holidays	100.0%	\$12.00	\$12.00
Parks	— Child Pass - Snow Tubing (12 & under 2 hours) S, S and hol-	100.0%	\$8.00	\$8.00
Parks	Family Pass - Snow Tubing (2 adults & 2 children 2hrs) S, S, hol-	100.0%	\$35.00	\$35.00
Parks	— Group Rate (30-100 people, 2 hours)/per person	100.0%	\$5.00	\$5.00
Parks	Each add'l child for Snow Tubing-	100.0%	\$5.00	\$5.00
Parks	— Adult Pass - Snowboarding (open to close) Mon-Fri	100.0%	\$15.00	\$15.00
Parks	— Adult Pass - Snowboarding S,S, Holidays-	100.0%	\$20.00	\$20.00
Parks	— Child Pass - Snowboarding - all day (12 & under) Mon-Fri	100.0%	\$12.00	\$12.00
Parks	— Child Pass - Snowboarding (12 & under) S,S, holiday-	100.0%	\$15.00	\$15.00
Parks	Season Pass for Adults ** Resident-	100.0%	\$149.00	\$149.00
Parks	Season Pass-Children 12 & under **	100.0%	\$99.00	\$99.00
Parks	Season Pass for Adults ** Non-Resident-	100.0%	\$159.00	\$159.00
Parks	Season Pass-Children 12 & under ** Non-Resident-	100.0%	\$109.00	\$109.00
Parks	NEW - Per person (adults and children) (2 hours)	100.0%	\$0.00	\$10.00
Parks	NEW - Group Rate - (4 + people) (per person) (2 hours)	100.0%	\$0.00	\$8.00
Parks	NEW - Non-operational hour reservation (2hours) + pp group rate of \$8.00	100.0%	\$0.00	\$100.00
Parks	— Snowtubing Group Rate (1-50 people) 2 hours (normal fee pp + \$50)	100.0%	\$299.00	\$299.00
Parks	— Snowtubing Group Rate (50+ people) 2 hours (normal fee pp + \$100)	100.0%	\$399.00	\$399.00
Parks	— Snowtubing Per additional adult	100.0%	\$10.00	\$10.00
Parks	— Snowtubing Per additional child	100.0%	\$5.00	\$5.00
Parks	Snow Board & Boot rental-	100.0%	\$15.00	\$15.00
Parks	Board or Boot rental	100.0%	\$10.00	\$10.00
Parks	Helmet rental	100.0%	\$5.00	\$5.00

ATTACHMENT A: FEES WHICH ARE ADJUSTED

County Services Committee

Location of Service	Fee Description	Target Percent	2015 Fee	2016 Fee
Parks	Test rental	100.0%	\$5.00	\$5.00
Zoo	Admission- Children (age 3-12) (April - October)	25.0%	\$2.00	\$3.00
Zoo	Admission- All Adults(November-March): Res, Non-Res, or Senior	25.0%	\$2.00	\$3.00
Zoo	Admission- Children (age 3-12) (November - March)	25.0%	\$1.00	\$2.00
Zoo	Potter Park Penquin Cove Shelter	100.0%	\$75.00	\$79.00
Zoo	Potter Park Eagle Landing Shelter	100.0%	\$100.00	\$105.00
Zoo	Potter Park 1/2 of Tiger Den Shelter	100.0%	\$100.00	\$105.00
Zoo	Potter Park - Tiger Den Shelter	100.0%	\$175.00	\$180.00
RoD	Laredo product,0-250 minutes,chrq/month	100.0%	\$50.00	\$53.00
RoD	Laredo Min. Overage for 0-250 min. plan	100.0%	\$0.20	\$0.21
RoD	Laredo product, 250-1000 mins.-chrq/mo.	100.0%	\$100.00	\$105.00
RoD	Laredo Min. Ovrq for 250-1000 min. plan	100.0%	\$0.15	\$0.16
RoD	Laredo product,1001-3000 mins-chrq/mo	100.0%	\$200.00	\$210.00
RoD	Laredo Min. Ovrq for 1000-3000 min. plan	100.0%	\$0.12	\$0.13
RoD	Laredo product,Unltd mins-chrq/mo.	100.0%	\$250.00	\$260.00
Treasurer	NSF Checks	100.0%	\$30.00	\$31.00

Human Services Committee

Location of Service	Fee Description	Target Percent	2015 Fee	Proposed 2016 Fee
Comm. Health	INS Vaccination Verif Form I-693	100.0%	\$37.00	\$38.00
Comm. Health	MIHP Tran. Bus/Van	100.0%	\$35.04	\$35.60
Comm. Health	MIHP - Trans Taxi	100.0%	\$32.04	\$32.56
Comm. Health	Compreh Envir Investigation	100.0%	\$290.00	\$300.00
Comm. Health	Immigration Physical Exams	100.0%	\$195.00	\$200.00
Imm. Clinic	Internat'l Travel Consult	100.0%	\$61.00	\$62.00
Med Examiner	Autopsy Report Copies (family)	100.0%	\$18.00	\$0.00
Med Examiner	Autopsy Report Copies (others)	100.0%	\$45.00	\$25.00
OYC	Agency Training Request- Base, 1.5 hr.	100.0%	\$212.00	\$215.00
OYC	Agency Training Request- Base, 2.5 hr.	100.0%	\$352.00	\$355.00
OYC	Agency Training Request- Base, 5.0 hr.	100.0%	\$687.00	\$688.00
OYC	OYC-Advertised Train.- 1-2 hr./per person (min. 15 attending)	100.0%	\$27.00	\$28.00
OYC	OYC-Advertised Train.- 2.5-4.5 hr./per person (min. 15 attending)	100.0%	\$35.00	\$36.00
OYC	OYC-Advertised Train.- 5-7 hrs./per person (min. 15 attending).	100.0%	\$70.00	\$71.00
OYC	OYC-Agency Request Head Start CPR & 1st Aide	100.0%	\$0.00	\$70.00

Law and Courts Committee

Location of Service	Fee Description	Target Percent	2015 Fee	2016 Fee
Animal Control	Adoption Fee- Dogs(under six years of age)	75.0%	\$72.00	\$73.00
Animal Control	Adoption Fee - Dogs(six years or older)	75.0%	\$18.00	\$19.00
Animal Control	Adoption Fee - Cats(under six years of age)	75.0%	\$62.00	\$63.00
Animal Control	Animal Redemption - 1st offense	50.0%	\$31.00	\$25.00
Animal Control	Euthanasia Fee	100.0%	\$120.00	\$125.00
Animal Control	Ten Dog Kennel Inspection Fee	100.0%	\$150.00	\$155.00
Animal Control	Over Ten Dog Kennel Inspection Fee	100.0%	\$175.00	\$180.00
Animal Control	Owner Surrender	100.0%	\$44.00	\$45.00
Animal Control	Owner Pick-up Fee	100.0%	\$45.00	\$46.00
Animal Control	Tranq. At-Large Fee	100.0%	\$45.00	\$46.00
Pros Atty	Diversion - Initial Interview	50.0%	\$34.00	\$35.00
Pros Atty	Diversion - Misdemeanor Offender	50.0%	\$445.00	\$450.00
Pros Atty	Diversion - Felony Offender	50.0%	\$795.00	\$800.00
Pros Atty	Costs-eligible convictions - Guilty Plea	75.0%	\$106.00	\$110.00
Pros Atty	Costs for eligible convictions - Trial	10.0%	\$225.00	\$230.00
Sheriff	Costs for Command per hour	100.0%	\$63.80	\$64.82
Sheriff	Costs for Deputy per hour	100.0%	\$57.22	\$58.14
Sheriff	False Alarm Fee- third offense	100.0%	\$42.00	\$43.00

ATTACHMENT B: FEES WHICH ADJUSTMENT IS RECOMMENDED				
Law and Courts Committee				
Location of Service	Fee Description	Target Percent	2015 Fee	2016 Fee
Circuit Court	Copies	25.0%	\$1.00	\$1.50
Circuit Court	Criminal Histories	100.0%	\$10.00	\$0.00
Circuit Court	Felony Case Costs	100.0%	\$650.00	\$1,470.00
Circuit Court	Show Cause - Probation	100.0%	\$150.00	\$175.00
Circuit Court	GTD Bench Warrants NEW	100.0%	\$0.00	\$150.00
Family Division	Delinquency Court Costs	100.0%	\$250.00	\$275.00
Family Division	Tether	25.0%	\$30.00	\$31.00