INHAGM 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 WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 30, 2017
AT 6:00 P.M., IN THE PERSONNEL CONFERENCE ROOM (D & E), HUMAN SERVICES
BUILDING, 5303 S. CEDAR, LANSING.

NOTE CHANGE IN DATE

Agenda

Call to Order
Approval of the August 10, 2017 Minutes
Additions to the Agenda
Limited Public Comment

1. Budget Hearings
   a. Tri-County Metro Narcotics Squad ................................................................. 5-227
   b. Sheriff ........................................................................................................ 5-165
   c. Prosecuting Attorney ............................................................................. 5-133
   d. Probate Court .......................................................................................... 5-128
   e. Ingham County 911 Dispatch Center ..................................................... 5-106
   f. District Court ............................................................................................ 5-92
   g. Community Corrections ........................................................................ 5-88
   h. Circuit Court
      1. Jury Administration ................................................................................ 5-124
      2. Friend of the Court Division ................................................................. 5-80
      3. Family Division ..................................................................................... 5-27
      4. General Trial .......................................................................................... 5-12
   i. Animal Control ........................................................................................ 5-1

2. Legal Services of South Central Michigan

3. Final Ranking

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.
Members Present: Hope, Banas, Celentino, Crenshaw, Koenig, Maiville, and Schafer

Members Absent: None.


The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Hope 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 July 12, 2017 Minutes

MOVED BY COMM. BANAS, SUPPORTED BY COMM. MAIVILLE, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JULY 12, 2017 LAW AND COURTS COMMITTEE MEETING.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Additions to the Agenda

None.

Substitutes –

1. Sheriff’s Office
   b. Resolution to Authorize Donations to the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office “Sheriff’s Inmate Initiatives” in the Form of Goods, Services, and Money

6. Human Resources – Resolution Approving Implementation of Everbridge Alert System with Capital City Labor Program Inc. – Corrections Non-Supervisory Unit

Limited Public Comment

John Dinon, Animal Control Director, updated the Committee about the pit bull fighting investigation they had uncovered in Lansing. He stated that officers had found evidence of dog fighting, and they had executed six search warrants that led to 43 dogs being held in Ingham County, and ten dogs being housed in Eaton County.

Mr. Dinon stated that there had been a lot of great partners in the area that had helped with the effort, which had led to the arraignment of two of the suspects and another was incarcerated. He
further stated the effort had been a lot of work and had been a big strain on the Animal Control staff, especially in processing the dogs and their next steps, and providing care for them.

Mr. Dinon stated this investigation was also taking a lot of resources, but they had already raised $3,000 and they were now exploring grants they could apply for from the ASPCA. He further stated he was sure Animal Control would recover the money, and while it was straining the staff, they knew this was the most egregious type of animal cruelty and it needed to be addressed.

Mr. Dinon stated he did not expect them to issue more search warrants, as they were now focused on the next steps involving trial and deliberating what would happen next for the dogs. He further stated there had been a lot of publicity about the issue on social media, and they were trying to explore their options, as Michigan Law was ambiguous surrounding dog fighting.

Mr. Dinon stated Animal Control was also consulting other people and organizations that have experience with fighting dogs, and whatever they did, they would balance the animal’s welfare and safety.

Commissioner Crenshaw stated he had noticed earlier reports of the numbers of dogs Animal Control had recovered had differed. He asked why the numbers differed.

Mr. Dinon stated he did not know why the numbers were different, but he assumed it was because he was so busy getting warrants together and processing the dogs, he did not notice the reports differed. He further stated Ingham County currently had 43 dogs, and ten more dogs were being housed in Eaton County.

Commissioner Crenshaw asked where the dogs were being housed in Ingham County.

Mr. Dinon stated they were not disclosing the location of the dogs.

Commissioner Crenshaw asked if anyone had contacted Animal Control regarding a missing dog in light of the dog fighting investigation.

Mr. Dinon stated this was high-level dog fighting, where the dogs had been bred for generations to be that way, and the dogs they recovered were not dogs stolen from someone’s backyard. He further stated since there was interest because of the news, so they had facilitated a response process, but it was unlikely the dogs were anyone’s pets.

Commissioner Crenshaw stated he commended Mr. Dinon and the Animal Control staff for taking this investigation on, as it was not something they looked forward to, but it was important to address.

Mr. Dinon stated he gave his staff a lot of credit, as they were all working hard. He further stated they all knew this was the most egregious type of animal cruelty, so even though they went home tired, they were satisfied.
Commissioner Banas asked how much the medical rehabilitation and care of the dogs would cost, going forward. She further asked what they expected the process to be like and how long it would take, and if it would be possible to reclaim some of the resources they would incur.

Mr. Dinon stated they would seek restitution from the defendants, and the dogs would go before a judge to determine if they should be euthanized. He further stated if it was determined a dog would not be euthanized, then they would consult the Prosecutor’s Office and others with experience in the matter about what they should do with the dog.

Commissioner Banas stated her brother had adopted a bait dog from a dog fighting ring, and it was expensive and timely to rehabilitate it, but had lived a long life afterward.

Mr. Dinon stated they had not recovered any bait dogs, and all of the dogs they had recovered were fighting dogs.

Commissioner Schafer asked if Mr. Dinon could disclose the location of where the dogs were taken from.

Mr. Dinon stated he would not disclose where the dogs were currently housed, but he would disclose that all of the dogs were found in Lansing, specifically northern Lansing.

Commissioner Schafer asked if the dogs were found in basements.

Mr. Dinon stated many of the dogs were recovered from backyards, where they were tied up with heavy chains.

Commissioner Koenig asked if Mr. Dinon had done a dog fighting investigation like this before.

Mr. Dinon stated he had investigated some cock fighting and smaller scale dog fighting rings, but this was by far the largest operation he had been a part of.

Commissioner Koenig asked what he had learned from the investigation.

Mr. Dinon stated he had learned a lot, and he had brought in a lot of resources to help with the investigation, because animal fighting laws were peculiar.

Commissioner Koenig stated they could get guidance on the animal fighting laws.

Mr. Dinon stated that where there was dog fighting, there was usually other illegal things like gambling and firearms. He further stated dog fighting was not something you would want in your community.

Chairperson Hope asked if Lansing had a regulation on how many dogs a person could own.

Mr. Dinon stated Lansing did not have regulations about the amount of dogs allowed.
Chairperson Hope stated that could possibly be a solution to crack down on some of the dog fighting.

Discussion.

Sheriff Scott Wriggelsworth, Ingham County Sheriff, stated he had signed a partnership MOU with Michigan State Police (MSP) to be a member of the Angel Program. He further stated it was a program where community members could walk into the Sheriff’s Office if they were struggling with drug addiction and get the help they needed, without fear of being punished.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated MSP had done a lot of work with the Angel Program, and he was going to announce the partnership next week at a press conference. He further stated he wanted members of the community to be able to get the help they needed, and the program would call an Angel representative to come and help the person fill out the forms, and sit with them until they could be sent to a recovery center, then the recovery center would take over the person’s care.

Chairperson Hope asked what Angel representatives were.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated Angels were typically recovery coaches, and they facilitated getting help for the addicts in the program.

Commissioner Crenshaw clarified that the Angel Program was for people who voluntarily came into the Sheriff’s Office and said they needed help; it was not for people who were brought to the Sheriff’s Office because they were arrested.

Sheriff stated Commissioner Crenshaw was correct, and the Sheriff’s Office would not charge them if they came in under the Angel Program. He further stated his office would run their name through to see if they had any warrants or other issues, but they would not be charged at that point and they could even surrender their drugs to the Sheriff’s Office.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated there were two other initiatives that the Sheriff’s Office was working on to address the opiate crisis, and he would update the Committee about those as they came about.

Chairperson Hope asked where the funding for the Angel Program came from, and what the costs of the program were.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated the program was almost free for the Sheriff’s Office, as the only cost associated with it was the Angel Bag that had a blanket, a bottle of water and a granola bar in it, and the only real investment would be the officers’ time. He further stated that most of the cost was incurred on the other end, once they were handed off to find care.

Commissioner Koenig stated that Community Mental Health discussed the Angel Program a lot, as there was some overlap between the two fields. She further stated that the Angel Program was not just drug-related, it was for any types of issues people have, and it was nice when the Angels were peers that had also been through similar situations.
Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated the MSP in Jackson had had three people use the program so far, and Post 11 just had their first Angel Program participant recently. He further stated there were other programs in the area that dealt with drug addiction, and he invited others to join the effort.

MOVED BY COMM. MAIVILLE, SUPPORTED BY COMM. CRENSHAW, TO APPROVE A CONSENT AGENDA CONSISTING OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS:

1. **Sheriff’s Office**
   a. Resolution to Authorize the Sheriff’s Office to Renew a Contract with Lansing Mason Area Ambulance Service for Mobile Emergency Care, Transport Service, and Adding Blood Draw Services
   b. Resolution to Authorize Donations to the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office “Sheriff’s Inmate Initiatives” in the Form of Goods, Services, and Money
   c. Resolution to Authorize the Purchase of a Finger and Palm Print Computer Software Application and Equipment through IDNetworks for the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office to Use to Capture Finger and Palm Prints for State of Michigan and AFIS/FBI Submission as Required by Law

2. **Friend of the Court**
   a. Resolution to Authorize a New Contract with MGT of America Consulting LLC, for the Preparation of the Friend of the Court and Prosecuting Attorney Title IV-D Cooperative Reimbursement Program (CRP) Application and Other Services
   b. Resolution Honoring Vicki Peterson

3. **Circuit Court** – Resolution to Amend Subcontracts Included in the FY 2017 Michigan Mental Health Court Grant Program Operational Grant

4. **Animal Control** – Resolution to Accept a PetSmart Charities Grant

5. **9-1-1 Center**
   a. Resolution to Authorize a Contract with Priority Dispatch for Continued Support for Emergency Medical Dispatch (ProQA) for the Ingham County 9-1-1 Central Dispatch Center
   b. Resolution to Honor Emergency Telecommunicator James Huff of the Ingham County 9-1-1 Central Dispatch

6. **Human Resources** – Resolution Approving Implementation of Everbridge Alert System with Capital City Labor Program Inc. – Corrections Unit

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE ITEMS ON THE CONSENT AGENDA CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
Mary Sabaj, Community Corrections Manager, stated she had attended the meeting where the Committee had discussed community programming in conjunction with the Ingham County Jail. She further stated that pretrial services had direct jail bed savings options for defendants, and worked at reducing recidivism.

Ms. Sabaj stated she had put together a few of the options the Committee had discussed. She further stated even though she would love more money for programming, she thought pretrial services, like electronic monitoring and reporting, would be the best use of money because the largest jail population was felons, and a lot of those were in pretrial.

Ms. Sabaj explained the costs associated with electronic monitoring and highlighted day reporting, which was amazing for felony probationers because the program took a holistic approach in rehabilitating the person. She further stated the services were more expensive earlier on, but the reduction of recidivism itself made it a worthy investment.

Ms. Sabaj stated she echoed Sheriff Wriggelsworth’s thoughts on opioid treatments, and her Community Corrections had recently received a grant from the State to get opiate treatment programming. She further stated with the program, addicts would be transferred to the residential Tri County Community Adjudication Program in the Flint area, and then they would come back into outpatient programs and receive Vivitrol shots if they were doing that course of treatment.

Ms. Sabaj explained the MRT behavioral change groups that Community Corrections also wanted to implement. She stated the electronic monitoring program could be configured in any way the County liked; it did not have to be like the State’s program.

Commissioner Koenig asked what MRT meant.

Ms. Sabaj stated MRT stood for mortal reconation therapy. She further stated it was a different but productive approach to reduce recidivism.

Commissioner Koenig asked how long the therapy had been in practice.

Ms. Sabaj stated the practice had been around for about 20 years.

Commissioner Crenshaw stated he noticed in the packet, it laid out long-term personnel and IT coordinator costs for Community Corrections. He asked if this was a request they would like in the 2018 or 2019 budget, as he was concerned about the budget situation.

Rhonda Swayze, Deputy Court Administrator, stated the approval of new positions would be at the Board of Commissioners’ discretion. She further stated the information in the packet was responding to the specific question about community programs for those other than people who needed to be in jail and could not be properly supervised.
Ms. Swayze stated a lot of investigators were currently doing clerical work, and if Community Corrections had a clerical staff person approved for 2018, then the investigators could shift to handle more cases. She further stated the investigators could focus more on bond interviews, pre-arraignment reports, and other tasks if they had clerical staff.

Ms. Swayze stated the pre-arraignment reports were important as the Michigan Indigent Defense Council wanted to put representation at initial court appearances as a standard practice. She further stated her staff could independently verify reports of employment or other information before the offender went to trial.

Commissioner Crenshaw asked if there were any fees assessed by the individuals being interviewed by the investigators.

Ms. Swayze stated there was no fee assessed, because they had to be careful in pre-sentencing situations and they had not been convicted yet. She further stated with the exception of electronic monitoring, if they did not qualify for indigent grant money, then it was a participant-funded program.

Chairperson Hope asked if Ms. Swayze knew what percentage of the program was participant-funded versus grant-funded.

Ms. Sabaj stated in the last twelve months, 183 were grant-paid, and 232 were offender-paid.

Chairperson Hope asked if Community Corrections needed a part-time or full-time clerical person.

Ms. Swayze stated Community Corrections would like a full-time staff person, but they would take what they could get.

Chairperson Hope asked if the presenters knew how many more people the investigators could see if they did not have clerical work on their plates.

Greg Feamster, Pretrial Services Investigator, stated he saw about 185 individuals who reported in pretrial services per week. He further stated some cases he managed each week were more intensive than others, and it was impossible to keep a pulse on what went on with each client when he had that type of caseload.

Mr. Feamster stated some cases were more urgent, and there was a significant amount of time doing data and other clerical tasks that took away from other cases. He further stated that he estimated about half of his day was spent doing clerical work.

Ms. Swayze stated because the investigators’ non-clerical time was so precious, they usually took care of more urgent matters. She further stated even if they had clerical staff, they might not increase the amount of cases, but take care of more tasks that they had not been doing, like rounding up the people who were supposed to report to them after they bonded out.
Ms. Swayze stated judges also asked for services that investigators had not done before, like home visits and employment checks which they could not currently do because they did not have the personnel.

Mr. Feamster stated he would also like to provide pretrial services supervision summary reports to the judges, because he did not want to notify them only when offenders were bad. He further stated he wanted to report that they complied and gained employment or enrolled in school.

Mr. Feamster stated it was an important service pretrial services could provide when it came to sentencing the defendants. He further stated that currently, they were only able to target a certain number of pretrial defendants because there was only so much time in the day to get work done.

Commissioner Schafer stated he acknowledged additional services had been mentioned before, and he would like to see this conversation included in the budget process, because he believed it would be pertinent.

Chairperson Hope stated the other services were not part of the budget request this time, and this conversation would be part of the jail millage discussion.

Commissioner Schafer stated he thought the two topics were related.

Ms. Sabaj stated they had complied with budget guidelines to reduce their department budget.

Commissioner Banas stated the investment in services or programs early on would save money down the road. She asked if the presenters could provide data on savings.

Ms. Swayze stated Mr. Feamster would be attending the National Association of Pretrial Services annual conference, and could compile statistics there.

Commissioner Banas stated she saw a great return on investment in her work in early childhood education. She thanked the presenters for their services and for advocating for themselves.

Commissioner Crenshaw asked how much time it took to train an intern on the clerical tasks of the department. He stated he knew it was hard when interns were only with the department for a short period of time.

Jessica Escobedo-Emmons, Pretrial Services Investigator, stated the department spent at least two to three days training new interns on systems they had, and then they had to train and observe them on interviewing defendants. She further stated it was a long and time-consuming process to train the interns, and while the interns they had hired were good, it was hard because of their caseloads and the variation in their days.

Ms. Escobedo-Emmons stated they already had a lot of the data somewhere; it was more a matter of entering it and consolidating it.

A discussion ensued regarding interns and data entry.
Ms. Swayze stated that the interns were instrumental to their work.

Ms. Sabaj stated she did have the information that 8,322 jail bed days had been saved in 2017 so far, in reference to Commissioner Banas’ question.

Commissioner Koenig stated she agreed with Commissioner Banas, that it was helpful if they could link the services to savings, either financial or human savings. She further stated that she believed there could be a better return on investment for the investigators, if a clerical staff person was hired at minimum wage and freed up the investigators to do more casework.

Ms. Escobedo-Emmons stated it would also be helpful to not have so much data entry to do, because the judge would tell the defendant a pretrial services investigator would visit them in jail, and the person could be waiting in jail for a week before an investigator could visit them.

Commissioner Koenig asked what the hierarchy of tasks would be that they would have the clerical staff person do, and if they would be involved in rounding up those that should be reporting to them.

Ms. Swayze stated she would expect the clerical staff would help in part with case management, in tasks like making sure someone’s drug test was reported on time, and reporting any anomalies to investigators. She further stated that rounding up those who should report to them was also important.

Commissioner Koenig asked if they had created a training manual to instruct interns on the tasks they performed frequently.

Ms. Escobedo-Emmons stated they did have a training manual that a previous intern had put together.

Commissioner Koenig asked how the judges were with these programs. She asked what judges said, as they probably understood they were on a limited budget and had limited time.

Mr. Feamster stated that when he went to court, judges would specifically ask him how defendants were doing with the programs, either during another proceeding or afterwards. He further stated judges often told defendants to get drug tests and enroll in pretrial programs, and to have that point of contact in their department was helpful.

Discussion.

Chairperson Hope asked how much money was currently in the County’s contingency fund.

Teri Morton, Deputy Controller, stated there was about $160,000 to $180,000 left in their contingency fund currently.
Ms. Sabaj stated there were a lot of options for supervising and managing people and pretrial services was an important aspect of the criminal justice system that could not be denied. She further stated that they could supervise and manage people all day long in the jail and they would not change their behavior, which was why it was important to consider treatment and services as well.

Ms. Sabaj stated it was important to note there were also things in place to reduce the jail population, like work credits or MRT and CATS programs, both which gave credit toward early release. She further stated the gatekeeper function mad ensure eligible people went to programs as soon as possible, which was also important.

Chairperson Hope stated she thought the term return on investment was cold when it came to talking about humans. She further stated it was important to keep these services in mind when they were asking taxpayers for money for the jail, because this could be a small amount of taxpayer money that would help to reduce the jail population and would help the defendants down the road.

Announcements

Commissioner Crenshaw stated the Ingham Academy graduation and the Garden Gala were great events that were well-attended.

A discussion ensued regarding the Garden Gala.

Public Comment

None.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:55 p.m.
Memo

To: Ingham County Law and Courts Committee
From: Elizabeth Rios, Managing Attorney
Date: August 17, 2017
Re: Strategic Funding Request

On July 18, 2017, the Ingham County Controller’s Office notified Legal Services of South Central Michigan (LSSCM) that due to a general fund budget shortfall of approximately $3.5 million, LSSCM’s 2018 funding request of $20,000 will not be included in the 2018 Controller Recommended Budget. As a result, LSSCM is requesting that the Ingham County Law and Courts Committee recommend LSSCM be funded $20,000 through the Strategic Fund.

LSSCM is a 501(c)3 private non-profit providing free civil legal assistance to low-income individuals and families for more than fifty years, with an emphasis on homelessness prevention, domestic violence prevention, and assistance in accessing health care, food, and needs-based income programs. LSSCM provides a full range of legal services to eligible clients, from specifically-tailored legal advice to full, in-court representation, depending on the nature and complexity of the case, as well as the resources available. We ensure that low-income Ingham County residents have access to the courts and judicial processes, thus affording these individuals and families the opportunity to resolve any legal barriers limiting their ability to meet their most basic needs. Any cut in our budget is a direct cut to our clients, limiting both the scope and level of services we are able to provide.

LSSCM attorneys are trained to conduct client interviews that not only clarify the current legal issue at hand, but identify interdependent issues that are also interfering with a client’s ability to maintain stability in his or her life, ensuring holistic services that target the root of the legal problem. For example, in housing cases, we work with landlords and mortgage companies to prevent and resolve evictions and foreclosures, or restore essential utility services. In public benefits cases, we help individuals and families who may have been denied or received improper reductions or terminations for needs-based assistance programs like food stamps, Medicaid, and Social Security benefits. We are often able to assist clients in restoring benefits, enabling these families to continue to meet their basic needs. We also help victims of domestic violence obtain divorces, custody, stable housing, and assist with other related issues. These services permit vulnerable individuals and families to achieve housing stability and obtain or maintain self-sufficiency.

We appreciate your consideration of this funding request and look forward to talking with you more about our program and the economic benefits we provide to Ingham County.

Thank you.