THE LAW AND COURTS COMMITTEE WILL MEET ON THURSDAY, JUNE 15, 2017
AT 6:00 P.M., IN THE PERSONNEL CONFERENCE ROOM (D & E), HUMAN SERVICES
BUILDING, 5303 S. CEDAR, LANSING.

Agenda

Call to Order
Approval of the June 1, 2017 Minutes
Additions to the Agenda
Limited Public Comment

1. Sheriff’s Office
   a. Resolution to Extend the Canteen Inmate Commissary Contract
   b. Resolution to Extend the Contract with Canteen Services for Kitchen Management and Laundry Services

2. Animal Control – Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development Inspection Report (Informational Item)

3. Law & Courts Committee – Prosecuting Attorney Diversion Program (Presentation/Discussion)

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 (left at 6:40 p.m.), Crenshaw (left at 7:14 p.m.), Koenig (arrived at 6:04 p.m.), Maiville, and Schafer

Members Absent: None.

Others Present: Sheriff Scott Wriggelsworth, Judge Don Allen, Major Sam Davis, Mary Sabaj, KC Brown, Liz Parker, Krista Haven, Teri Morton, Liz Kane, and others

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Hope at 6:01 p.m. in Personnel Conference Room D & E of the Human Services Building, 5303 S. Cedar Street, Lansing, Michigan.

Approval of the May 11, 2017 Minutes

MOVED BY COMM. CRENSHAW, SUPPORTED BY COMM. MAIVILLE, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 11, 2017 LAW AND COURTS COMMITTEE MEETING.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Koenig

Additions to the Agenda

None.

Additional Information

Resumes from candidates for Criminal Defense Attorney Appointments to Ingham County Indigent Defense Collaborative Committee

Limited Public Comment

None.

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

2. 9-1-1 Center
   a. Resolution Authorizing Software Support Agreement with Tritech for the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) System at the Ingham County 9-1-1 Central Dispatch Center
   b. Resolution Authorizing Gem Smart911 Services Agreement for the 9-1-1 Center
3. **Law & Courts Committee**
   
   b. **Resolution Changing the Composition of the Ingham County Family Center Advisory Board**

   THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Koenig

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

   Please note that later in the meeting, the Committee suspended the rules to allow Commissioner Koenig to vote on the items on the consent agenda. Commissioner Koenig voted in favor of the items on the consent agenda.

1. **Sheriff’s Office** – **Resolution to Name Sheriff’s Office Training Center the Gene L. Wriggelsworth Training Center**

   MOVED BY COMM. CRENSHAW, SUPPORTED BY COMM. BANAS, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION.

   Commissioner Crenshaw stated he was not opposed to the resolution, but he did want to have a discussion about whether there was a County policy in place for naming buildings in the County. He asked if there was a policy in place.

   Chairperson Hope stated she did not think there was a policy, as that was what she understood from what Becky Bennett, Board of Commissioners Office Director, had told her.

   Commissioner Crenshaw stated he thought the County should put a protocol in place for naming buildings, and that it could possibly go through the County Services Committee if Commissioner Celentino thought it was appropriate. He further stated as there were new facilities, like the animal shelter, being built, there was a possibility that people would want to name it after someone.

   Commissioner Banas stated that Meridian Township Parks Commission had formulated a policy for this exact reason, because there was no way to review interest in applications for naming things, and sometimes people could do something the township did not approve of while their name was being put on a building.

   Commissioner Koenig arrived at 6:04 p.m.

   THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. **Law & Courts Committee**
   
   a. **Resolution Making Appointments to the Ingham County Indigent Defense System Collaborative Committee**

(2)
MOVED BY COMM. CRENSHAW, SUPPORTED BY COMM. CELENTINO, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION.

Chairperson Hope introduced the reason why the resolution was before the Committee, which was to nominate up to three criminal defense attorneys to the Ingham County Indigent Defense Collaborative Committee. She stated that Teri Morton, Deputy Controller, had solicited nominations from the Circuit Court, District Court and the Ingham County Bar Association.

Commissioner Celentino stated he was very impressed with all of the nominees presented to the Committee, and appreciated all of their credentials and experience.

A discussion ensued about the candidates and the recommendations made by the Circuit Court, District Court, and the Ingham County Bar Association.

MOVED BY COMM. CRENSHAW, SUPPORTED BY COMM. CELENTINO, TO APPOINT JOE BREHLER AND WAIVE ANY RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT, STACIA BUCHANAN, AND TAKURA NYAMFUKUDZA TO THE INGHAM COUNTY INDIGENT DEFENSE COLLABORATIVE COMMITTEE.

Chairperson Hope stated she had spoken with 30th Circuit Court Judge Joyce Draganchuk and she had suggested Mary Chartier and Christopher Wickman be named to the Ingham County Indigent Defense Committee, because they had already expressed interest and ability in creating a training program for the defense attorneys.

Further discussion ensued about the candidates.

Commissioner Crenshaw withdrew the motion to appoint Joe Brehler, Stacia Buchanan, and Takura Nyamfukudza.

Further discussion ensued about the candidates.

MOVED BY COMM. CRENSHAW, SUPPORTED BY COMM. CELENTINO, TO APPOINT CHRISTOPHER WICKMAN, STACIA BUCHANAN, AND MARY CHARTIER TO THE INGHAM COUNTY INDIGENT DEFENSE COLLABORATIVE COMMITTEE.

THE MOTION TO APPOINT CHRISTOPHER WICKMAN, STACIA BUCHANAN AND MARY CHARTIER CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Commissioner Crenshaw stated that he was a member of the MAC Judiciary and Public Safety Committee and they were actively working on this issue, and he would be willing to be a part of the Ingham County Indigent Defense Collaborative Committee as well.

Commissioner Koenig stated she would also be interested in joining the committee.

MOVED BY COMM. SCHAFER, SUPPORTED BY COMM. CELENTINO, TO APPOINT COMMISSIONERS CRENSHAW AND KOENIG AS EX OFFICIO LAW & COURTS
COMMITTEE MEMBERS TO THE INGHAM COUNTY INDIGENT DEFENSE COLLABORATIVE COMMITTEE.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

THE RESOLUTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY, WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENT:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby confirms the above-mentioned appointments and appoints Stacia Buchanan, Christopher Wickman, and Mary Chartier as the representatives from the Ingham County Bar Association and Commissioners Bryan Crenshaw and Carol Koenig as the additional representatives from the Law & Courts Committee.

MOVED BY COMM. SCHAFER, SUPPORTED BY COMM. CELENTINO, TO SUSPEND THE RULES AND ALLOW COMMISSIONER KOENIG TO VOTE ON THE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS FOR WHICH SHE HAD BEEN ABSENT.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Commissioner Koenig stated she was in favor of the items on the consent agenda.

3. Law & Courts Committee
   c. Who is Housed in the Ingham County Jail? (Presentation/Discussion)

Sheriff Scott Wriggelsworth, Ingham County Sheriff, introduced the presenters and handed out statistics of inmates at the Ingham County Jail. He pointed out some of the interesting statistics, including the higher average age of the inmates and the average lengths of stays at the jail for sentenced versus un-sentenced inmates.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth pointed out the comparison of the study done by Luminosity in 2010 and the current statistics at the Ingham County Jail, which showed that the numbers had not changed over the past seven years, regardless of the size of the jail.

Commissioner Crenshaw asked if the title “FOC” meant Friend of the Court.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated “FOC” meant “Friend of the Court.”

Commissioner Crenshaw asked why the “Female FOC” number was so much higher than the “Male FOC” number.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated there were only thirty-two females currently housed in the jail, so the statistic was higher when there were only five female inmates in on FOC charges.

Commissioner Koenig stated that the jail was working with small numbers, so statistics could fluctuate quickly.
Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated he knew the Committee wanted to have a discussion about the size of the potential new jail facility.

Commissioner Banas asked about the 17-year-olds who were housed in the jail, and based on the numbers presented and influential factors, what the new jail facility should look like.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated that on occasion, 16- and 17-year-olds were housed in the Ingham County Jail. He further stated that they were a challenge to house and program, because they could not integrate them into the general jail populations.

Major Sam Davis, Ingham County Sheriff’s Office, stated the younger inmates created a separate housing population, because inmates needed to be housed with like inmates. He further stated that one youth inmate could take up an entire dorm by themselves because of this requirement, and if they did not follow the requirements, then the federal government could intervene.

Commissioner Banas asked if the Sheriff or Judge Allen were hopeful that the state law would change to raise the age to 18-years-old as the minimum adult age in criminal law, as she recalled it was brought up in the Michigan Legislature in the previous year.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated he would love for the legal criminal age to be 18-years-old, as it would make life easier for the corrections officers.

Commissioner Banas stated a change in the law would be better for 17-year-olds, because they would get a host of different programs in the juvenile division that could help them and their families.

Judge Don Allen, 55th District Court, stated that the 16- and 17-year-olds probably felt ostracized in the Ingham County Jail, because the average age there was so high and they could not have social privileges, and the Supreme Court had recommended they not be housed there. He further stated that they could be hopeful about a change in the law, but he was not sure if it would happen.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated in reference to the size of the facility, the current Ingham County Jail had just closed another post, so their capacity was at 460 beds. He further stated that a new facility with 400-450 beds would be adequate, if they also allowed for the incorporation of more programming inside and outside the jail to reduce the likelihood of people being put back in jail.

Commissioner Banas stated she would be very interested in hearing more about their programming ideas over time.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated that his office did not put people in jail, they just managed those that the judges sentenced. He further stated that jail was the right place to punish some people, as it was the only thing that would get across to them, but he would defer to the judge to speak more about the issue.
Judge Allen stated that jail could create a motivation to change, but if people did not have the motivation, then they would not change. He further stated they obviously wanted people to change, as they did not want to operate a revolving door in the criminal justice system and create a public safety problem with the repeat offenders.

Judge Allen stated that they tried to use the jail as resource to utilize a person’s stay to give them motivation to change. He further stated jail programming allowed them to look into how to help the inmates change.

Judge Allen stated they did not want jail to be comfortable, but they did want to be able to provide programming to inmates. He further stated that jails had become primary providers of substance abuse and mental health care, because society was bad at providing those services in the free society.

Judge Allen stated that some offenders felt it was better to throw a brick through a window and have to go to jail, because they would then have a stable place to live. He further stated that the jail was an integral part of their community, and it was a valuable resource for the County to have at its disposal, but they needed to use it judiciously when going about operating the judicial system.

Commissioner Banas thanked Judge Allen for his input, and stated it would give her a lot to think about how the jail should look like in the future and how the community should play a role.

Judge Allen stated that corrections could not just be about warehousing people, it had to be about having a plan when a person comes through the door. He further stated that there was a big push ten years ago, to facilitate programs to help inmates with reentry after their sentence and get them more integrated into society.

Judge Allen stated that Sheriff Wriggelsworth and the former Sheriff had helped with these efforts a lot, as had he and Judge Boyd had also taken steps on their end. He further stated that the judges had a philosophy that they would never incarcerate a person just because they owed money, because he thought it was a violation of the Constitution.

Judge Allen stated that they had also worked with the Sheriff’s Office to implement a balance of payment option, where if the person did owe them $500 or less, they could pay the amount to the Sheriff and they could be released. He further stated they found that was not releasing enough people, so they came up with a partial payment option, where the person could pay whatever amount of money they were able, and then they could be released and deal with the collections officer at the Court to handle the terms of the money they still owed.

Judge Allen stated they wanted to look at the populations they were putting into the jail, to see how they could reduce the number of people there who should not be, because they were not a public safety concern. He further stated that they also wanted to make sure that people who should be there stayed there, because they were a public safety concern, and would not be released because of overcrowding.
Judge Allen stated his office received a list of inmates currently housed at the jail each week, which they reviewed to see if bad actors were making progress in the jail and could eventually earn early release credits or enrollment in the tether program. He further stated they looked at whether inmates were involved in the CATS program and making progress on their recovery.

Judge Allen stated that enrollment in the tether program was also contingent upon if the inmate could pay, which was not always the case. He further stated he believed there was grant funding available for tether programs, however it was very limited.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated that in the tether program, inmates currently paid for the tether on their own, but they should explore more funding options. He further stated that the program had a 90% success rate for those who were able to use it, meaning they would not miss court appearances and when they got out of jail, they stayed out.

Commissioner Koenig asked what the tethers cost the offenders per day.

Mary Sabaj, Ingham County/City of Lansing Community Corrections Manager, stated the County indigent funding was $6.25 and $7.55 per day for a tether, but it was about ten dollars per day for private pay.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated the high success rate and the fact that the County did not have to pay to house the indigent were good reasons to consider the tether program.

Ms. Sabaj stated the tether program participants were also able to receive programming in the community as well.

Commissioner Schafer asked what the charges were against the 17-year-olds in the jail.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated the 17-year-olds were significant violent felons, charged with crimes like home invasions and criminal sexual conducts.

Discussion.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated that whatever the new jail facility looked like, they would still have to deal with these special populations.

Commissioner Schafer stated he recalled that not being able to post bonds was a big issue for offenders, and noted sometimes the bonds were set too high.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated he agreed, but it was up to the judges to set the bond.

Commissioner Schafer stated he had noticed that those unable to post bond was a significant portion of the Ingham County Jail population, and he was not sure if it was because the bonds were too high.
Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated that for some offenders, jail was easy compared to coming up with the money for a bond.

Commissioner Schafer stated the jail could use the kind of help with reentry that hospitals had, to make sure people had help as they were preparing to be released, and once they were on the outside again.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated the inmates could also get early release credits if they took part in those types of programs.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated that he, Major Davis and Judge Allen were on the board of Families Against Narcotics, and there were stories that those who were incarcerated or their families told, thanking Judge Allen for putting them in jail because the forced intervention and programming was the only thing that saved them. He further stated that sadly, jail was the place some addicts needed to be in order to get the treatment they needed.

KC Brown, CATS Program Coordinator, stated the longer substance abusers were in jail, the higher the success rate of the addict staying sober.

Commissioner Crenshaw stated he had noticed the amount of medical encounters in a month and was curious about the costs of them. He asked how many of those medical requests were valid medical concerns, and not just inmates trying to get drugs.

Krista Haven, Jail Medical Program Clinical Services Manager, stated they did not keep statistics, because that type of judgment would be subjective. She further stated the statistic in the packet was in reference to medical encounters, not medical referrals, so these were taken care of in-house.

Commissioner Crenshaw asked how many off-site visits there were.

Ms. Haven stated she estimated there would be about thirteen to thirty off-site visits in a month.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated they saw inmates request medication for a symptom they had, and then when they realized their symptom would prevent them from working for early release credits, they miraculously got better. He further stated they could not be sure how many inmates could be playing the system, but there were some.

Major Davis stated the inmates knew there were medications in the building because they had medical staff, and ended up having issues like they could not sleep and needed medication for that which they probably would not have needed out in the real world. He further stated that it was not uncommon for people to go to the Jail Medical Program not for medical issues, but for psychological issues that they wanted to medicate.

Discussion.

Commissioner Celentino left at 6:40 p.m.
Commissioner Koenig stated that one of the reasons the Committee had asked the presenters to come was to see what the Board of Commissioners could do to help them, including how to reduce the population or make the population not come back. She further stated she did not know if the jail had a “frequent fliers” list, but they could examine that to see what they could do to make those peoples’ lives better.

Commissioner Koenig stated the “frequent fliers” list was a difficult population to deal with because they had physical and mental issues, but they needed to address them to keep them from coming back. She further stated that she while she was interested in the high success rate of the tether program, she also wanted to point out that another mechanism that was effective was the zero bond program.

Commissioner Koenig stated that whether the person paid a bond or not did not affect their appearance in court. She further stated that if the County did some simple math to figure out how much it cost to house an inmate for the thirteen days they needed to spend in jail for not posting a small bond, they would realize they were spending more than they were making on those inmates and it seemed like a dumb idea.

Major Davis stated that this idea would be another good use for the tether program, to allow those not able to pay bond to receive a tether at little to no cost to them. He further stated he thought that some people may take advantage of the system and try to get out of paying a bond when they could be placed on a tether, but he thought it was valuable to look into for those who should not be in jail anyway.

Major Davis stated that there certainly were some “frequent fliers” around the jail who kept coming back, because oftentimes, there were things in their communities that caused them to get caught up in the system again. He further stated they needed to use the programs set up by Ms. Haven, Ms. Brown, Ms. Parker and Ms. Sabaj to help get these repeats offenders back into society and they wanted to do more, but folks kept coming back.

Judge Allen stated that one issue was chronicity in frequent fliers at the jail, where they had chronic mental health problems and stop taking their medications. He further stated once a person became addicted, it set up a paradigm that made it difficult for them to realize they had put themselves in a bad situation.

Judge Allen related the statistic that says on average, it took a cigarette smoker 17 times to quit smoking before it stuck, and someone trying to quit something more addictive than tobacco could take more than a few times to get sober. He further stated that incarceration and treatment was better than the alternative of overdosing or having a stroke because of the drugs, but it made a challenging environment for people in the jail.

Judge Allen stated all that being said, the Court was looking at doing more presumptive bonds, where there was a presumption of innocence, no matter how heinous the crime, and therefore the accused should be able to have a personal recognizance bond, unless it was something...
treasonous like murder, robbery or criminal sexual conduct. He further stated there was a movement to educate judges on the presumptive bonds rather than using the cash bonds.

Judge Allen stated Major Davis made good points, in which if there were more resources available, more people could be released back into the community and judges did not have all of that information. He further stated Ingham County was moving in that direction.

Judge Allen stated that the fact of the matter was they were dealing with human beings that did not fit into perfect criteria boxes. He further stated that there was a pressure on the judges, as elected officials, to make a decision on whether or not an individual was able to be released back into the community on bond.

Commissioner Koenig stated she did not think judges were held accountable politically in this community based on whether they released someone on bond or not.

Judge Allen stated that Judge Boyd had been challenged in his election for his decision to release an offender on bond.

Discussion.

Commissioner Koenig stated there were a lot of issues go along with bond, including people ending up being found guilty because they were in jail and they wanted to get out. She further stated the person then ended up with a felony conviction on their record because they just wanted to get out of jail.

Judge Allen stated that the Committee had just voted today to help with these issues in the form of appointing people to the Ingham County Indigent Defense Collaborative Committee. He further stated the quality of the minds nominated to the committee would be great.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated he was impressed with all of the options and programs available to inmates in the facility, however there were still a lot of factors involved in the revolving door which he saw first-hand when he stayed at the jail in January. He further stated it was a vicious circle they could not get out of.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated that in taking into account of all of these factors, the question before them was how big they wanted to make the new facility, if they only wanted to keep worst of worst in jail. He further stated that 350-400 beds was right size if they wanted to do it right.

Commissioner Banas asked what else the Board of Commissioners could do to help and raise awareness and support to do this work, based on what the Sheriff had experienced.

Discussion.

Ms. Brown stated in the CATS program, they had four substance abuse therapists that do weekly or bi-weekly individual counseling, and were beginning to do case management and co-
occurring groups as well to work with them on what they would need to be stable. She further stated that if the person had a felony conviction, that automatically eliminated them from a lot of support.

Mr. Brown stated that a lot of the inmates had traumatic upbringings and pasts, which was where mental health issues and substance abuse could develop. She further stated they had seen an increase in the severity of the mental illness cases, including more hospitalizations, and there were not resources available to them in the community, so they come to the facility to keep them stable.

Ms. Brown stated a lot of what they were currently doing was crisis management, with substance abuse management if they could. She further stated that they also struggled with managing the developmentally disabled population that usually came from the group homes, especially if someone needed to be assigned to monitor the person one-on-one all day.

Ms. Brown stated she was amazed at what the corrections officers were able to do with little to no health training to care for these inmates. She further stated the housing options for those populations were very minimal, and she did not know what the answers to these problems were, but she knew there were problems and it was hard to figure out why that was.

Ms. Brown stated it was hard to manage these inmates when they did not have a cognitive understanding of why they were in jail and the purpose of being in jail.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated that it was hard to manage these cases in the current facility, because it was built fifty years ago when none of these issues came to mind.

Major Davis stated society needed to understand what the jail was there for. He further stated that the traditional idea of a jail being a custodial institution was not right anymore, so when they were thinking of the new facility, these ideas came to mind.

Major Davis stated Liz Parker, Sheriff’s Office, was trying to work with the community, but the community was not as excited about working with jail as they could be. He further stated they were finding stop-gaps in their programming because potential community partners were not interested.

Ms. Parker stated she was trying to implement a reading program in the jail, where an inmate could record themselves reading a book and it could be sent to their families. She further stated this helped keep the families together while the parent or grandparent was incarcerated, and it also promoted literacy in children and helped stop some of the generational issues they saw.

Ms. Parker stated that a lot of organizations she had approached were not interested in helping inmates’ children, even when the jail was not asking for money from them to put these programs on, they were simply looking for books.

Major Davis stated there was a real disconnect between an inmate and their family right now, aside from a phone call or occasional visitation. He further stated that programs like this helped
with the mental connection, and it would not be a cure-all, but he would like to bring more things like this in, and society needed to work with them to make that happen.

Commissioner Banas stated there was a big focus on ACE scores right now in child development, and one of the highest risk factors on that score was an incarcerated parent. She further stated that the Michigan Children’s Trust Fund raised money to prevent the abuse and neglect of children, and she suggested the jail should reach out to them or CADL to make the request to help out.

Major Davis stated that the Board of Commissioners had abilities for contact that law enforcement did not, and it was beneficial to have people who could listen to their needs. He further stated that the County needed to have a facility large enough to do the programming they wanted to have to prevent this cycle, and it was not just a matter of a certain number of beds in a box.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated that there was a reason they were called “corrections,” not “incarcerations.” He further stated that a large number of people housed in the jail were Ingham County residents, which meant they would be returning to their communities after they would be released.

Ms. Sabaj stated that pretrial services and electric monitoring had impacts on the recidivism rate. She further stated it was very important that they engaged the inmates and linked them with community resources and programming while they were in jail, so that when they left they would know what to do. She further stated there was a difference between handing a released inmate a piece of paper and telling them to call, versus making connection with them before they were released, as they were much more likely to follow through with programs if they had a connection first.

Ms. Sabaj stated the PA511 Community Program that was a day reporting program was also successful, however the State funding limited the populations they could work with to solely felony probationers, but she saw the opportunity to open it to more populations. She further stated that it made them more accountable and they had the guidance available to them, and the program had a 77% success completion rate.

Ms. Sabaj stated that substance abuse treatments could be successful, if they were willing to put in the resources to give the addicts the time and resources they needed, as well as having an understanding that it could take multiple times.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated that when the County pitched the new facility to the public, they need to market that they were not just warehousing inmates, but providing all of these programs to them to help them in the long run. He further stated they could make a smaller facility, but set aside money to help with these programs with a potential millage as well.

Commissioner Crenshaw stated that was why he thought calling the new facility a law enforcement complex, not a jail, would go over a lot better with the public.
Commissioner Crenshaw left at 7:14 p.m.

Commissioner Schafer stated he also thought vocational education would be beneficial, as inmates needed goals and something to strive for. He further stated he thought they should have a wing dedicated to vocational training and education in the new facility.

Commissioner Schafer stated he would be willing to advise and assist in those efforts at the jail, as he had experience in that field.

Discussion.

Major Davis stated that the Sheriff’s Office was looking at other things inmates could do, rather than just sitting in a cell. He further stated while this other work could help the inmates earn early release credits, being busy also helped prevent depression and other issues.

Major Davis stated they had asked their work coordinator to find more things inmates could do, and recently used an inmate’s painting skills to perform some tasks around the jail. He further stated they would continue to look at what else they could do, as their mentality when they trained staff was that they were a correctional facility, not a custodial facility.

Commissioner Banas suggested that it would be helpful to have communication that went out to the public about the success stories in these programs. She further stated it was not early to start pitching these to civic groups and the media, to provide hope and understanding for both the public and the incarcerated.

Discussion.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated the way to do that was to have boots on ground and to promote those stories when they did hear them, similar to what they did with his jail stay back in January 2017.

Chairperson Hope thanked the presenters and stated this discussion was important as they made decisions about the future of the Ingham County Jail.

Announcements

None.

Public Comment

None.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:21 p.m.
RESOLUTION ACTION ITEMS:

The Deputy Controller recommends approval of the following resolutions:

1a. **Sheriff’s Office – Resolution to Extend the Canteen Inmate Commissary Contract**

This resolution will authorize a contract extension with Canteen Services, Inc., through September 30, 2017 under the same terms and conditions of the existing contract, which expired on February 28. There will be an option for month to month extensions as needed until a new contract is awarded through the Request for Proposal process. The Sheriff’s Office has been pleased with the current contractual relationship with Canteen Services.

Please see attached for additional detail.

1b. **Sheriff’s Office – Resolution to Extend the Contract with Canteen Services for Kitchen Management and Laundry Services**

This resolution will authorize a contract extension with Canteen Services, Inc., through September 30, 2017 under the same terms and conditions of the existing contract, which expired on February 28. There will be an option for month to month extensions as needed, until a new contract is awarded through the Request for Proposal process.

Under the current contract, Canteen Services was responsible for the day to day operations supervision of three county employees. All three of these employees will be pursuing other opportunities on or before June 24, 2017. Canteen Services has agreed to provide three kitchen staff during this extension period at no additional cost.

Please see attached for additional detail.

INFORMATIONAL ITEM:

2. **Animal Control – Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development Inspection Report**

PRESENTATION/DISCUSSION:

3. **Law & Courts Committee – Prosecuting Attorney Diversion Program**
TO: Law & Courts and Finance Committee’s

FROM: Major Sam L. Davis

DATE: June 9, 2017

RE: Canteen Services, Inc. Commissary

The Ingham County Sheriff’s Office presently has two expired 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 extend the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office Commissary Services current contract under the same terms and conditions with Canteen Services, Inc. as provided in the contracts that expired February 28, 2017.

Canteen will not increase the cost that inmates pay for Commissary items without mutual consent during the extension and will also assume the risk of inflation for Kitchen and Laundry Services without a price increase for the duration of the 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 while we prepare a Request For Proposal for these same services.

Respectfully submitted,
RESOLUTION TO EXTEND THE CANTEEN INMATE COMMISSARY CONTRACT

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; and

WHEREAS, this base contract expired February 28, 2017 and the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office recommends that the Board of Commissioners opt to extend the agreement through September 30, 2017, with an option for a month to month until a new contract is awarded through the RFP process 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 the duration of the extension.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes to extend the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office Commissary Services contract under the same terms and conditions with Canteen Services, Inc. from June 24, 2017 through September 30, 2017, with an option for a month to month extension, until a new contract is awarded through the RFP process.

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 FOR KITCHEN MANAGEMENT AND LAUNDRY SERVICES

WHEREAS, in 2014, the Ingham County Correctional Facility had an average daily population of 608 inmates, the current rated capacity is 444 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 expired February 28, 2017 and the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office recommends that the Board of Commissioners opt to extend the agreement from June 24, 2017 through September 30, 2017, under the same terms and conditions of the base contract with an option for a month to month extension until a new contract is awarded through the RFP process under the same terms and conditions of the base contract; and

WHEREAS, Canteen Services 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 Canteen Service, Inc. Kitchen Supervisor was responsible for washing the clothing in over 140,000 inmate bags; and

WHEREAS, in 2014, the Canteen Service, Inc. Kitchen Supervisor was responsible for training and supervising approximately 20 workers for kitchen and laundry duties every month or sooner; and

WHEREAS, the Canteen Services, Inc. Kitchen Supervisor was responsible for the day to day operations supervision of three County Employees; and

WHEREAS, all three County employees will be pursuing other opportunities by June 24, 2017; and

WHEREAS, Canteen Services Inc. agrees to provide three kitchen staff to handle the feeding of inmates at the Ingham County Jail during this extension period with no cost to the County.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes 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 June 24, 2017 through September 30, 2017 under the same terms and conditions of the base contract with an option for a month to month extension until a new contract is awarded through the RFP process under the same terms and conditions of the base contract with the per meal cost based on the census of the Jail’s population as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Per Meal Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 649</td>
<td>$ .97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650 – 674</td>
<td>$ .96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>675 and above</td>
<td>$ .95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
TO: Board of Commissioners Law & Courts Committee
FROM: John Dinon – Director, Ingham County Animal Control
DATE: 1 June 2017
SUBJECT: ICAC inspection report – for information only

For the meeting agenda of 15 June 2017

BACKGROUND

Ingham County Animal Control is licensed and inspected by the Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development as an animal control shelter under Michigan Act 287, PA 1969 and rules promulgated thereunder. MDARD conducted a surprise annual inspection of the ICAC shelter on 24 May 2017. No non-compliant items or violations were found during the inspection. The inspector was very complimentary of ICAC and our staff and commented that he is only allowed to note violations on the inspection report but wishes he were able to officially note all the good things we are doing here on his report. A copy of the inspection report is attached.
**ANIMAL SHELTER INSPECTION**
(In accordance with Act 287, PA 1969 as amended)

**Full Legal Name of the Shelter:** INGHAM COUNTY ANIMAL SHELTER

**Shelter Manager:**
- Name: JOHN DINON
- Email: jdinon@ingham.org

**Full Legal Name of the Organization Operating the Shelter:**

**Physical Address:**
- New? Yes
- City: MASON
- State: MI
- Zip Code: 48854
- County: INGHAM

**Mailing Address (if different):**
- New? Yes
- City (Mailing): MASON
- State: MI
- Zip Code: 48854
- Phone: 517-676-8370

**Shelter Manager email:**
- jdinon@ingham.org

**SHELTER VETERINARIAN(S) INFORMATION ON FILE**

**Legal Name of the Business/Practice/Clinic (if applicable):** INGHAM COUNTY ANIMAL SHELTER

**Name:** KAREN WORTHINGTON
- Address: 600 CURTIS
- City: MASON
- State: MI
- Zip Code: 48854
- Phone: 517-676-8370
- Email: kworthington@ingham.org

**SCOPE OF SHELTER OPERATIONS**

**ANIMALS**

- **STRAIGHT DOGS (AP Shelters):**
  - Does the shelter take in stray dogs? Y
  - If yes, is an agreement in place? Y

- **CONFINEMENT:**
  - Does the shelter house court-held dogs? Y

- **SOURCE OF ANIMALS:**
  - Are imported animals taken in? N

**HOUSING**

- **SHELTER CAPACITY:**
  - _66_ Dog Kennels
  - _75_ Cat Cages

- **ALTERNATIVE HOUSING:**
  - Are there off-site adoption events? Y
  - Are shelter animals housed at pet shops? Y
  - Does the shelter maintain a cat colony? N

- **OUTDOOR CATS:**
  - Does the shelter participate in TNR? Y

**RESOURCES**

- **STAFFING:**
  - Shelter Volunteers ___(#), ___ hrs per week
  - Shelter Employees full time, part time

- **PARTNER PROGRAMS:**
  - Does the shelter work with rescues? Y
  - Does it have a foster program(s)? Y
  - Number of animals in foster: _4_ Dogs _12_ Cats

**SCOPES OF INSPECTION**

**ANIMALS & DOCUMENTATION**

- **ANIMAL CARE**
  - _X_ RECORDS (also IMPORT if applicable)

- **ADOPTION(S)/TRANSFER(S)**
  - _X_ BUILDING(S)
  - _X_ HOUSING/PRIMARY ENCLOSURES
  - _X_ TRANSPORT VEHICLES: _5_ inspected

**HOUSING & TRANSPORT**

- **STAFFING FOR ADEQUATE CARE**
- **VETERINARY SERVICES & PROTOCOLS**
- **OTHER**

**INSPECTION SUMMARY INCLUDING ISSUES OF CONCERN AND COMPLIANCE INITIATIVES**

(For Pre-Registration Inspections ONLY) This facility appears to meet/be in compliance with the requirements for a shelter registration.

**ITEM NO.**

Refer to the Animal Shelter Requirements checklist for the details and legal cites of the requirements for each ITEM No. Except as otherwise listed if applicable, the inspected areas appear to be in compliance at the time of this inspection. All listed items must be corrected by the next inspection unless a specific due date is noted. Some items may require you to submit documentation of compliance. Compliance initiatives from prior inspection(s) may also be noted.

Be advised that failure to correct items annotated in this report and send requested documentation as asked for may be cause for further action by the Michigan Department of Agriculture & Rural Development. You are encouraged to contact us with questions and requests for time extensions by contacting your local MDARD staff or the Animal Shelter Program Manager as soon as possible.

**Copy/Transmitted To:**
- jdinon@ingham.org

**Manager John Dinon**
- Date: 5/30/2017
- Email: jdinon@ingham.org

**MDARD Staff (printed):**
- Fred Peabody
- MDARD Staff signature: Fred Peabody
- Date: 5/30/2017
## INSPECTION SUMMARY INCLUDING ISSUES OF CONCERN AND COMPLIANCE INITIATIVES

Refer to the Animal Shelter Requirements checklist for the item(s) details and legal cites of the requirements for each ITEM No. Except as otherwise listed if applicable, the inspected areas appear to be in compliance at the time of this inspection. All listed items must be corrected by the next inspection unless a specific due date is noted. Some items may require you to submit documentation of compliance. Compliance initiatives from prior inspection(s) may also be noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Be advised that failure to correct items annotated in this report may be cause for further action by the Michigan Department of Agriculture & Rural Development. You are encouraged to contact us with questions and requests for time extensions by contacting your local MDARD staff or the Animal Shelter Program Manager as soon as possible.

Copy Received By/Mailed/E-mailed To:                      Title:                      Date: 3/XX/2017

MDARD Staff (printed):                                    MDARD Staff signature:        Date: 3/XX/2017
ANIMAL SHELTER REQUIREMENTS
LISTED BELOW ARE MANY OF THE COMPANION ANIMAL AND SHELTER REQUIREMENTS.
UNSATISFACTORY FINDINGS & THEIR CORRESPONDING REQUIRED CORRECTIVE MEASURES ARE LISTED ON THE FRONT OF THIS FORM.

RECORD KEEPING/TRANSPORTATION/STAFF

1. INTAKE RECORDS [285.151.13]
   a. Date of acquisition.
   b. Location where animal found if brought in as a stray. Reminder that stray dogs are required to be reported to local animal control law enforcement within 48 hours [287.30B].
   c. Name & address of person surrendering animal, if animal is owner surrender.
   d. Name & address of shelter if animal is a transfer from another registered shelter (also see #4 below).
   e. Description of animal including; color, breed, sex, approximate age, & weight.
   f. Imported animals must have an official Interstate Certificate of Veterinary Inspection (ICI) issued by a veterinarian issued that is USDA accredited and licensed in the originating state (age, vaccinations, & treatments) [287.720].

2. DISPOSITION RECORDS [285.151.13]
   a. Date of disposition.
   b. Method of disposition (euthanasia, return to owner, adoption, lateral transfer).
   c. Name & address of receiving shelter or adopter, or name of owner if returned to owner.

3. ADOPTIONS/TRANSFERS
   a. Must have contracts for all adopters; exceptions are transfers to current MDARD registered shelters, law enforcement agencies, or service dog organizations [287.338a(4)].
   b. Includes statutory minimum $25.00 refundable deposit [287.338a(4)(6)].
   c. Contains language regarding liquidated damages of the greater of $100.00 or actual reasonable costs. Adopter’s attention is at a minimum verbally directed to this language [287.338a(8)].
   d. For transfers, prior to the animal’s release, shelter must have written acceptance statement & afterwards, shelter must maintain records that include animal description, acknowledgement of its receipt, & date [287.338a(7)].
   e. Ferret Health Advisory sheet distributed to adopters of ferrets [287.866].

4. CHANGES IN INFORMATION
   a. Primary veterinarian. [285.151.36]
   b. Animal control officer(s), if applicable.*
   c. Shelter manager.*
   d. Phone number(s) or email address(es)*
   e. Shelter Name. (requires new shelter registration)
   f. Mailing address.*

5. VETERINARY SERVICES [285.151.36]
   a. Preventative services shall be available & the name of at least one licensed veterinarian associated with the shelter shall be on the shelter’s registration.
   b. The shelter shall use the services of a licensed veterinarian when there is a health hazard arising.
   c. MDARD shall promptly notified of any change in veterinary service(s).

6. TRANSPORT VEHICLES [285.151.41]
   a. Vehicle is mechanically sound & shall not be overcrowded.
   b. Vehicle is equipped to provide fresh air to all animals being transported.
   c. Interior of animal cargo space is to be kept clean.
   d. Animals transported in the same primary enclosure(s) shall be of the same species & maintained in compatible groups.
   e. Puppies/kittens shall not be transported in the same enclosure with adult animals except for their dams.

7. STAFFING [285.151.36]
   a. Sufficient number of employees shall be used to maintain the prescribed level of animal care & husbandry given the number of animals housed at the shelter.

FACILITY/PRIMARY ENCLOSURES/ANIMAL CARE**

8. PRIMARY ENCLOSURES/HOUSING FACILITY
   a. Indoor housing facility surfaces constructed of nonabsorbent material, readily sanitizable includes community cat rooms/cat furniture [285.151.22(4)].
   b. Enclosure floors prevent injury to the animal’s feet/tails [285.151.25(4)].
   c. Dog/cat can remain dry/clean; no accumulation of fecal material, urine, spilled food, &/or water [285.151.25(1)&285.151.32].
   d. Enclosures in good repair, protect from injury & predators. [285.151.25(1)]
   e. Enclosures large enough to allow each dog/cat to turn about freely, easily stand/sit in a comfortable, normal position & constructed/maintained so that cat/dog has convenient access to food & water [285.151.25(2)].
   f. Adequate litter, appropriate litter box(s) provided for each cat [285.151.25(6)].
   g. The number of animals sharing a primary enclosure shall not exceed a number which would prevent proper sanitation/ventilation [285.151.25(6)].
   h. Different species can’t be housed in primary enclosure. [285.151.34 & 285.151.36]
   i. Females not in estrus not housed with sexually intact males [285.151.287].
   j. Puppies/kittens not housed with adults other than their dams [285.151.34(3)].

9. FOOD & WATER/HUSBANDRY
   a. Dogs & cats in enclosures have convenient access to clean food & water [285.151.25(3)]. Animals are fed appropriate, free of contamination food (nutritive, age, size, species) at least once a day & if water is not available at all times, offered water at least twice daily 1 hour min(unless otherwise required). If not always available, at least 1 hour 2 X/day [285.151.31(2)].
   b. Food/bedding shall be stored in shelves to adequately protect against infestation & contamination. Perishable food is refrigerated [285.151.22(1)].
   c. Food receptacles accessible to all dogs/cats, located to minimize contamination, durable, & kept clean. New disposables ok for each feeding.
   d. Dogs/cats with communicable disease symptoms are separated from all other susceptible species in such a manner to prevent spreading it [285.151.34(5)].

10. CLEANING/SANITATION
    a. Excreta shall be removed from primary enclosures to prevent accumulation of debris/excreta, disease hazard or contamination of the housed animals [285.151.32, 285.151.33(1)].
    b. Animals removed from primary enclosures whenever housing/flushing used to clean. They must remain dry & clean [285.151.25(1)]. Cleaning does not contaminate/expose them or other animals to water/disease [285.151.33(1)].
    c. Food/animal wastes, bedding, dead animals, debris removed & disposed; minimizes infestation/odors/disease hazards. [285.151.22(3)].

11. FACILITY/BUILDINGS/GROUNDS
    a. Housing facility [room/building/area containing primary enclosure(s)] is structurally sound/mainained in good repair preventing injury [285.151.21].
    b. Indoor housing facility surfaces nonabsorbent/readily sanitized[285.151.22(4)]
    c. All buildings/grounds included in premises kept clean in good repair protecting animals from injury and facilitating care [285.151.33(2)].
    d. Premises remains free of the accumulation of debris [285.151.33(2)].

12. DRAINAGE
    a. Suitable method provided eliminating excess water from housing facility. Closed drainage system equipped with traps to prevent backups [285.151.25(6)].
    b. Any drains shall be properly constructed & shall be kept in good repair to avoid foul odors. [285.151.22(6)].

13. HEATING/VENTILATION/LIGHTING
    a. Indoor housing facility is sufficiently heated; ambient temperature not < 50°. (Similarly not too warm) [285.151.23(1)]
    b. Indoor housing facility is adequately ventilated; provided with fresh air (windows/doors/vent/air conditioning) & minimizes drafts, odors, & moisture condensation, [285.151.23(1)]
    c. The number of animals sharing an enclosure shall not exceed a number which would prevent proper ventilation. [285.151.25(6)]
    d. Facility shall have good quality ample light (not excessive), by natural &/or artificial means, permitting routine inspection & cleaning during entire working period. [285.151.23(2)]

14. INSECT & PEST CONTROL [285.151.33]
    a. Effective program for the control of insect, ectoparasites, avian & mammalian pests shall be established & maintained.

Violations of Act 287, PA 1969 as amended, & the rules promulgated thereunder provide for registration suspension &/or revocation, & administrative fines of up to $1,000.00 for each violation. Any person who violates the provisions of Act 287, PA 1969 as amended, & the rules promulgated thereunder is guilty of a misdemeanor.

* required by MDARD as part of registrant’s responsibilities
** adequate care, neglect, sanitary conditions, shelter, health, & water are also regulated in Chapter IX of the Michigan Penal Code, MCL 750.50 regarding animal care for those having care/custody of them.