THE LAW AND COURTS COMMITTEE WILL MEET ON THURSDAY, OCTOBER 12, 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 September 28, 2017 Minutes
Additions to the Agenda
Limited Public Comment

1. Circuit Court – Juvenile Division – Youth Service Trip to Costa Rica (Video Presentation)

2. Sheriff’s Office
   a. Resolution to Accept the 2017 Risk Avoidance Grant (RAP) from the Michigan Municipal Risk Management Authority (MMRMA)
   b. Resolution to Authorize an Interlocal Agreement with the City of Lansing and City of East Lansing for the 2017 Local JAG Grant
   c. Resolution to Authorize an Agreement with the Michigan State University School of Psychiatry to Provide Psychiatric Services for Inmates at the Ingham County Jail

3. Friend of the Court – Resolution to Authorize an Agreement with Tel Systems to Upgrade Technology and Provide Maintenance Support for the Friend of the Court Referee Hearing Rooms

4. 55th District Court
   a. Resolution to Accept a Grant Award from the Michigan Supreme Court State Court Administrative Office - Michigan Mental Health Court Grant Program (SCAO-MMHCGP), Continue a Probation Officer Position, and Enter into Subcontracts
   b. Resolution to Accept a Grant Award from the Michigan Supreme Court’s State Court Administrative Office - Michigan Drug Court Grant Program (SCAO-MDCGP) and Enter into Subcontracts

5. Controller’s Office – Third Quarter 2017 Budget Amendments

6. Board Referral – Letter from the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services Regarding the State Ward Chargeback Rates for Calendar Year 2018

Announcements
Public Comment
Adjournment
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 (arrived 6:01 p.m.), Celentino, Crenshaw, Koenig (arrived at 6:05 p.m.), Maiville, and Schafer

Members Absent:  None

Others Present:  Sheriff Scott Wriggelsworth, Lisa McCormick, John Dinon, Lance Langdon, Tom Krug, Sherry Larner, Kathy Murray-Rice, Christy Lawrence, Teri Morton, Liz Kane, and others

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 September 14, 2017 Minutes

MOVED BY COMM. CRENSHAW, SUPPORTED BY COMM. MAIVILLE, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 14, 2017 LAW AND COURTS COMMITTEE MEETING.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioners Banas and Koenig

Additions to the Agenda

None.

Limited Public Comment

Kathy Murray-Rice and Sherry Larner, Ingham County 9-1-1 Center, read a statement into the record, that statement being:

“We as the union, agree with the addition of this position. We feel with outside, fresh ideas, this is a chance to finally make the changes in our center that are so desperately needed. We would like to also emphasize that we are now at a critical staffing point. We have 15 open positions, more than we have ever had there. This means less and less time away, which causes more and more stress. Being unable to decompress after very stressful days is causing severe mental and physical stress on our employees.

Commissioner Banas arrived at 6:01 p.m.

“We hope with the addition of a deputy director of staff services, these issues will become a top priority on their list and we will finally become the center people want to be at, instead of people wanting to leave. We hope our management listens openly to the ideas this position will bring to
them, and they will be willing to make drastic changes if suggested, anything for the betterment
of the employees and our working conditions.

“We hope with the addition of this position, the additional marketing and traditional training that
is in the future the vision of being fully staffed is no longer a myth, but a reality. And being able
to have time off to enjoy a life outside of our career choice will once again be possible.

“We take these issues very seriously and appreciate the fact that the County Controller and
Deputy County Controller are taking time to assist us. Thank you.”

Tom Krug, Capitol City Labor Program, stated he had reviewed the 9-1-1 Center Director’s
report. He further stated that staffing was an issue nationwide, and he did not want the Board of
Commissioners to think that this was just an issue in Ingham County.

Mr. Krug stated that Ingham County employees were applying to work at other 9-1-1 centers in
the area. He further stated that he had begun working with the Controller’s Office to come up
with solutions, and he had looked at Jackson County’s merger of their Sheriff’s Office and 9-1-1
Center where they did not have staffing issues.

Mr. Krug stated it was getting to the point where the 9-1-1 Center could not order the employees
to work anymore, and he did not know what else they could do. He further stated he hoped if the
position was approved, that it could manage the staffing issues.

John Dinon, Animal Control Director, stated he had sent the Board of Commissioners an email,
updating them that they had found a group that they thought was qualified to evaluate the
fighting dogs that were recently rescued. He further stated Animal Control was working out the
details to make sure the County was properly protected in the event the group took some of the
dogs, because they were potentially violent.

Commissioner Koenig arrived at 6:05 p.m.

Mr. Dinon stated he would be remiss in discussing the situation without mentioning all of the
people involved in making it happen. He further stated Animal Control was working with the
Prosecutor’s Office to make sure the dog fighting cases were pursued, the animal care staff was
working very hard to care for the extra dogs and run an extra shelter, and the Sheriff’s Office
helped by lending a Corrections Officer to help Animal Control catch up on calls. He further
stated he appreciated what everyone had done to help out.

Christy Lawrence, Ingham County resident, stated she was pleased to hear Mr. Dinon was
working with the group to evaluate the dogs. She further stated she had emailed a list of nine
other resources to the Board of Commissioners, and she hoped if the group did not go through
with the evaluations, then they would consider the others on the list she had recommended.

Commissioner Koenig asked when Ms. Lawrence had sent the email.

Ms. Lawrence stated she had sent the email that morning at 8:00 a.m.
MOVED BY COMM. SCHAFER, SUPPORTED BY COMM. MAIVILLE, TO APPROVE A CONSENT AGENDA CONSISTING OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS:


3. Circuit Court – Juvenile Division
   a. Resolution to Authorize a Three Year Contract with Various Residential Placements
   b. Resolution to Authorize Acceptance of a Michigan Drug Court Grant for the Ingham County Family Dependency Treatment Court
   c. Resolution to Authorize Entering into a Contract for Attorney Services for the Juvenile Division

4. Animal Control – Resolution to Accept a Bissell Pet Foundation Empty the Shelters Free Adoption Grant

5. 9-1-1 Center
   a. Resolution to Approve the Purchase of Tritech Inform Browser for Use of 9-1-1 Central Dispatch Center and Public Safety Partners

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE ITEMS ON THE CONSENT AGENDA CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.


Lisa McCormick, Chief Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, thanked Sheriff Wriggelsworth for his leadership since the moment he took office, when he had addressed the evidence room situation and had been working with the Prosecutor’s Office to make sure it did not happen again. She introduced the report she had provided to the Committee.

Ms. McCormick stated that she would be implementing the recommended changes for evidence retention, beginning October 1, 2017. She further stated that she would also begin notifying the police agencies when they should not destroy evidence from a case because a claim of appeals had been filed, until the Prosecutor’s Office confirmed the removal, because in the past the police agencies did not know when a case was closed or appealed and therefore did not know when to dispose of evidence.

Discussion.

Commissioner Crenshaw thanked Ms. McCormick for addressing the evidence retention issue and bringing it to the Committee. He asked what the type of response was that she received when she met with local law enforcement about the retention recommendations.
Ms. McCormick stated the response had been extremely positive when she had met with local law enforcement. She further stated that the challenge of any police agency was managing evidence, and she had noticed that some agencies audited their evidence rooms every year, while some only audited them if there was a change in quartermaster.

Ms. McCormick stated that the Prosecutor’s Office could not order the agencies to audit their evidence rooms, but she was recommending they perform an audit every year. She further stated that some of the agencies did not have room for evidence, so they appreciated the recommendations and welcomed the meeting.

Ms. McCormick stated she thought evidence retention was a huge problem, but digital evidence retention was also a huge problem. She further stated that with the recommendations, there was now a way to manage evidence and return items to victims, and agencies also had previously struggled with retaining evidence on appeals, so they were pleased to have guidelines.

Commissioner Crenshaw asked what the reception was for the guidance sheet Ms. McCormick had prepared for the local law enforcement.

Ms. McCormick stated they were thrilled about the documents, because where most agencies did not have guidelines and were also not familiar with appellate rules, now they could make the call. She further stated that the items mentioned on the spreadsheet were just for cases that had been brought to the Prosecutor’s Office.

Ms. McCormick stated that some pieces of evidence were associated with a case that did not have a suspect, which was evidence the County did not consider when drafting the policy. She further stated that the guidelines were for closed cases.

Discussion.

Commissioner Koenig asked what the retention guideline was for felony plea cases, as it was cut off on the page.

Ms. McCormick stated the guidelines for evidence retention was 21 days if the case was timely, and a maximum retention of six months.

Commissioner Koenig stated the document did not speak to cases that were never prosecuted.

Ms. McCormick stated Commissioner Koenig was correct, and that evidence created an issue.

Commissioner Koenig stated that someone might want to prove that the case had never been found.

Ms. McCormick clarified if Commissioner Koenig meant that the case was never brought to the Prosecutor’s Office.

Commissioner Koenig that was exactly what she meant, due to the fact that there was no suspect.
Ms. McCormick stated it was a big issue, and she had gone around and around with law enforcement about whether to include those types of cases. She further stated that it was hard to make recommendations on cases where the suspect was never found, because some agencies could hold the evidence forever, while some used the statute of limitations, waited until someone called and complained, or in the case of some breaking & entering cases, they returned the evidence and closed the case.

Ms. McCormick stated she had felt that the Prosecutor’s Office making recommendations would be impossible. She further stated all she felt she could do, was be to give the statutes of limitations, which she did, but not everyone followed that.

Ms. McCormick stated there were many different circumstances for cases that had not been brought to the Prosecutor’s Office, that they left the police agencies with the discretion. She further stated if they had questions, they could always call the Prosecutor’s Office and get advice.

Commissioner Koenig asked if Ms. McCormick had looked at sources nationwide in regards to retention guidelines for evidence.

Ms. McCormick stated she did not research nationwide guidelines, but she did ask the Eaton County Prosecutor’s Office what their retention for evidence was. She further stated that Eaton County’s retention guidelines had been six months, whereas she had gone with one year because that was what the Prosecutor’s Office and local law enforcement’s comfort level was.

Ms. McCormick stated that Michigan State Police was consulted to find out what their retention guidelines were, and they did not have specific ones but they saw the Eaton and Ingham County differences in retention policies as a small challenge.

Commissioner Koenig clarified that Eaton County’s retention policy was to hold evidence for six months, while Ingham County’s guidelines were to hold evidence for one year.

Commissioner Schafer asked which law enforcement agencies in the County used the Sheriff’s Office to hold evidence. He further asked if Stockbridge had its own evidence room.

Ms. McCormick stated most law enforcement agencies in the County had their own evidence rooms but it was not to say that if there was a big bust, that they would not request the Sheriff house some of the evidence.

Commissioner Schafer stated he wondered how closely the small departments monitored their evidence rooms.

Ms. McCormick stated it was hard to keep track at times, because not every agency tracked material via barcodes and they used different systems to manage evidence.
Commissioner Schafer stated that was why the Sheriff’s Office needed to be fully staffed at all times.

Ms. McCormick stated she could not disagree with Commissioner Schafer’s comment. She further stated that staffing was a huge issue.

Commissioner Banas thanked Ms. McCormick for her work. She asked what happened to rape kits in cases of sexual assault, as she knew the Prosecutor’s Office was particularly concerned about working on those cases.

Ms. McCormick stated that the law had recently changed so all rape kits were now mandated to go to the lab. She further stated that she had been curious what could come back to the lab from the testing, and she found that any cuttings or underwear would be under the same rules as other evidence.

Ms. McCormick stated that very little came back from the rape kits, like underwear, but the important things was they had gone to the lab to get the DNA profile if there was DNA on the evidence. She further stated in the guideline sheet, they had separated denied CSC cases and warrant CSC cases.

Ms. McCormick stated she communicated with police agencies that they made sure the victim knew evidence would be destroyed after the year.

Discussion.

Commissioner Koenig stated she knew the Prosecutor’s Office had met with police agencies when drafting the guidelines, but she was curious if she had met with any defense attorneys during the process.

Ms. McCormick stated she did not consult defense attorneys.

Ms. McCormick stated she would like to mention the retention of digital media, which was a huge growing problem for the County. She further stated that she acknowledged there was a large price tag associated with the storage of the data as well.

Ms. McCormick stated that body cameras were the most accurate types of evidence, but she understood that the Sheriff had other priorities on his plate before he could take on body cameras. She further stated that storing digital evidence, including photos, videos and MVRs, could take up a lot of space on servers, and the County needed to start looking five to ten years out on how they would continue to store the data.

Ms. McCormick stated the County needed to have a disaster recovery plan in place in case the servers crashed. She further stated she had emailed Deb Fett, Chief Information Officer, regarding how she would like to see the storage to go.
Ms. McCormick stated she knew that the Prosecutor’s Office and the Sheriff’s Office stored a lot of data on the County drives and they were constantly full. She further stated that developing recommendations for police agencies’ storage had been discussed, but everyone used a different system.

Ms. McCormick stated that some jurisdictions used evidence.com, which was a cloud-based storage solution, but it was different from the Sheriff’s Office that did not have a cloud-based system. She further stated that the cloud-based system sent a link that would expire after a certain period of time.

Ms. McCormick stated the same companies that sold cloud-based storage also sold the body cameras, because the storage of those large files was costly and they took space. She further stated that the same items were stored in multiple places on the County server, between the Sheriff’s Office, the Prosecutor’s Office, and 9-1-1 Center.

Ms. McCormick suggested the IT Department could put out an RFP or evaluate how they handled digital media, because it was a growing issue. She further stated that the idea of digital storage was still new, so it was hard to come up with recommendations, but her suggestion would be to have everyone on the same system, but since everyone was already using their own systems, that was unlikely.

Ms. McCormick stated the way the data was being handled now was horrible and it put a strain on the Prosecutor’s Office. She explained the system in which digital evidence was currently handled, which included a lot of manual work to download and transfer data to and from different media.

Ms. McCormick stated the practices also have to be CGIS compliant, so she would like the IT Department to weigh in at this time to give their input on how the issue should be handled. She further stated that the County could not continue to put a Band-Aid on the issue as they had last year when they needed more storage.

Ms. McCormick stated once she heard back from the IT Department, she would contact the police agencies to have a discussion. She further stated that until the County came up with a better way to handle evidence storage, she could not make recommendations, and she was aware of the budget constraints.

Commissioner Crenshaw stated Ms. McCormick had mentioned that sometimes the Prosecutor’s Office reached a critical point where there was no space available. He asked how she determined what stayed and what went on the server.

Ms. McCormick stated IT had resolved that issue last year because they set it up that the Prosecutor’s Office could request additional storage sections when the drive got too full. She further stated otherwise, they had staff come in and clean up the files.

Ms. McCormick stated it was tough when getting rid of some data, because the police agencies were technically the keepers of all original evidence. She further stated that there should be some
type of flag after one year in the Prosecutor’s Office so it could be transferred back to the agency.

Commissioner Schafer asked how phone video recordings or security cameras from stores were handled.

Ms. McCormick stated the practice was to dump all of the data on the phone so it could all be downloaded as evidence.

Commissioner Schafer asked if that also happened with security cameras.

Ms. McCormick stated that was the practice for everything, but the problem with security cameras was there was sometimes security within the video recordings that made it difficult to access and download the data with the programs they had. She further stated when the County had IT issues a few months ago, the IT Department had blocked the use of those programs, and the Prosecutor’s Office had to specifically request access to them in order to access evidence.

Commissioner Schafer stated the problem just kept growing.

Ms. McCormick stated that body cameras were the best type of evidence, especially to get a physical sense of what a situation was like, and many companies provide the cloud-based storage solution for that footage. She further stated if the IT Department was at the meeting, they would have a fit because they did not like cloud storage.

Ms. McCormick stated that she would like the IT Department to weigh in if they want any input.

Commissioner Maiville asked if there were backups made to the current drives with the evidence.

Ms. McCormick stated the IT Department did do backups of their drives every few days because the folders were too large to get it done in one night. She further stated that was not problematic, because the police agency was still responsible for keeping the original record, whatever that term meant in the digital age.

Ms. McCormick stated the issue would be if the Sheriff’s Office evidence drive crashed. She further stated there was an issue with how the data was being backed up, but she had complete confidence in the IT Department’s handling of the secure data.

Commissioner Banas asked in regards to an automatic notification system she had mentioned earlier, if the cloud storage was hugely expensive, and if Ms. McCormick had looked into those options. She further stated as someone who worked in education, she saw what high school students were doing in the tech field with robotics, and she thought this would be the perfect case study to put in front of tech geeks, because the cost of the storage was a big factor.

Ms. McCormick stated that the storage site Evidence.com did have that type of notification, where the agency in possession of the original evidence could set up a link that would expire
after a certain period of time. She further stated that system allowed the defense attorneys and prosecutors access to the evidence at no cost to them, and without downloading the data onto their drives.

Ms. McCormick stated if the County went with that type of option, there would need to be agreement on the length of time a link was valid. She further stated she had not looked into the cost, because she had been focused on trying to save the Assistant Prosecuting Attorney position and did not want to bombard the Commissioners with another financial request.

Ms. McCormick stated that if the Sheriff’s Office went to a cloud-based storage solution as well then the Prosecutor’s Office would not need a mechanism for notifications, because they would not need to store the evidence apart from the cloud. She further stated that this situation called for everyone involved to weigh in with their opinions, not just the Prosecutor’s Office.

Chairperson Hope stated she assumed this topic would be revisited in future Committee meetings.

Ms. Morton stated it was on the list of priorities for both the Controller’s Office and the IT Department.

Ms. McCormick stated that she expected the topic to be revisited. She further stated that she had already scheduled a meeting with the local law enforcement to review the current guidelines in April 2018, because the input from them was invaluable.

Commissioner Koenig asked if she could receive a copy of the retention guidelines via email. She further asked if this item could be moved up on the agenda as an action item in a future meeting to have IT discuss the digital evidence storage.

Ms. Morton stated that would likely have to be put on the County Services agenda, as it involved the IT Department.

Discussion.

Commissioner Koenig stated regardless of what happened with the tax millage in November, this issue was not going away and it needed to be solved.

Commissioner Maiville stated he agreed with Commissioner Koenig, because the issue would continue to snowball.

Ms. Morton stated that without a doubt, the County needed to work on the issue of storing the same evidence multiple times.

Ms. McCormick stated she could follow up with Ms. Morton and Ms. Fett regarding the evidence storage and what the IT department had purchased last year to alleviate storage issues.
Law & Courts Committee – Resolution Authorizing 2018 Agreements for Juvenile Justice Community Agencies

Alex Brace, Small Talk Children’s Assessment Center Executive Director, introduced the work of the organization and the reason it was requesting more funding in 2018. He stated that in the last two or three years, the organization had seen expansive growth in the number of cases, from having a waitlist of about fifteen children to a waitlist of about twenty-six children.

Mr. Brace stated the organization provided informed, trauma-focused therapy services to sexually and physically abused children to help them lead productive lives and have tools to deal with the trauma they had been exposed to. He further stated there were about 50 children in treatment currently and the organization usually covered about 50-60 children in a year, and they had already conducted more forensic interviews this year than they ever had previously.

Mr. Brace stated that they wanted to make sure the organization’s needs were met to make services more readily available to the public.

Commissioner Crenshaw stated that in 2017, the Board of Commissioners had given Small Talk $10,000, and now they were asking for $19,000. He further stated that was a significant increase, and he wanted to know what services Small Talk was going to provide with the extra $9,000 if it was given to them.

Mr. Brace stated the funding would go to providing direct services for children. He further stated with the sheer volume of children going through the program, he wanted to make sure the capacity of his staff was properly handled.

Commissioner Crenshaw asked how many children were seen on average in a year.

Mr. Brace stated that a counselor’s caseload was about 25 children at any given time. He further stated that in addition to serving as the Executive Director, he was also the crisis counselor.

Mr. Brace stated in their organization, they needed all hands on deck to provide the best services they could to the victims.

Commissioner Schafer stated that he taught in public school for many years, and he saw the dramatic need for the types of services Small Talk provided.

Mr. Brace agreed with Commissioner Schafer, stating that child abuse was a crime of secrecy and it was not a popular topic to speak about, but the ability to speak about this with the Committee was powerful. He further stated while it was a shame organizations like this had to exist, Small Talk had a dedicated staff and board, and many community leaders recognized the need for the services because it did not get the media attention it deserved.

Commissioner Banas stated she noticed that Small Talk was the only organization requesting a significant increase in funding. She asked Mr. Brace to explain what percentage of Small Talk’s budget the $19,000 would amount to, as she knew the organization also received donations.
Mr. Brace stated the contribution was going to be huge, as it would go toward the direct services, which was their bread and butter and there were not a lot of agencies in the community that could address the problems of child abuse. He further stated that the organization also had applied for grants and solicited donations, and in addition to direct services, they educated adults on prevention, and had a therapy dog program.

Commissioner Banas asked if $19,000 would be 10% of Small Talk’s budget.

Mr. Brace stated Small Talk was looking at a $500,000 operating budget for 2018.

Commissioner Banas noted that the total organizations’ requests for funding from the Juvenile Justice Millage was $17,214 over the budget of the millage from 2018. She stated she wanted to recommend trimming from the other organizations listed to accommodate Small Talk’s request, while she did not want to take from other agencies, what Small Talk did in the community was rare and needed.

Commissioner Celentino asked if Small Talk had heard back from their request for funding from the Ingham County Bar Association.

Mr. Brace stated they had not heard back yet, but the Ingham County Bar Association had given to Small Talk in the past.

Commissioner Celentino asked if funding for the Foundation was going toward something else.

Mr. Brace stated the funding was going toward prevention.

Commissioner Celentino stated that as a schoolteacher, he knew how important the services Small Talk provided was, however he also saw Resolution Services in his school, and their budget request had stayed the same for 2018. He further stated out of fairness, he did not think they should cut from other organizations, because they were not expecting their funding to get cut, otherwise they would have attended the meeting as well.

Commissioner Celentino stated he was not saying that Small Talk was not worthy of the extra funding, but out of fairness to the other organizations, they should not take funding to cover the gap from them.

Commissioner Maiville asked how much impact there was from the Juvenile Justice Millage and how much funding the Board of Commissioners had to play with in the millage funds.

Ms. Morton stated that the year-end millage fund balance was $2.2 million, so an extra $17,214 was not going to make a big difference. She further stated in the long term, the millage was expected to spend down each year by the amount of money going to the Child Care Fund, but that would just mean that projecting out, the County would not have those funds available later and it might not be sustainable year after year.
MOVED BY COMM. CRENSHAW, SUPPORTED BY COMM. BANAS, TO APPROVE THE
RESOLUTION AS AMENDED TO INCLUDE THE FULL FUNDING AMOUNTS FOR
EACH ORGANIZATION, AND TO ADD A FINAL “BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,”
NOTING THAT THE ADDITIONAL $17,214 WILL COME FROM THE JUVENILE
JUSTICE MILLAGE FUND BALANCE.

Commissioner Crenshaw stated that agencies should be note that this was a one-time situation, as
the County was going to be facing critical budget challenges, and in the future requests will need
to come in under the $100,000 cap.

Commissioner Koenig asked why Small Talk’s funding was reduced to $9,000 from $18,000 in
2016.

Ms. McCormick stated Small Talk did not fill the position they were hiring for, and she wanted
to be responsible with the money and not sit on it.

Commissioner Koenig asked why the funding was reduced to $10,000 for 2017.

Ms. McCormick stated that since Mr. Brace had taken over as Executive Director while also
providing crisis counseling, Small Talk only wanted to bill for his counseling time and they were
unsure of how much time that would end up being in the first year and they did not want to spend
the money in ways it was not supposed to be spent. She further stated that now, they had a better
idea of how his time would be spent and could ask for more money for the counseling services.

Commissioner Koenig asked how many clients Small Talk saw in a year.

Mr. Brace stated Small Talk counselors saw about 100 clients per year.

Commissioner Koenig asked what the percentage was of physical abuse victims versus sexual
abuse victims.

Mr. Brace stated about 80% of cases were related to sexual abuse.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Commissioner Hope stated she appreciated Small Talk’s fair play with other organizations, and
she suspected the organization’s return on investment was huge, especially when it came to a
quality of life for the children.

Ms. McCormick relayed one story she had heard being on the Small Talk Board of Directors
about a girl who was afraid to speak after being abused. She further stated that after counseling,
the girl had told her counselor she was strong and she could do anything, and now the 12-year-
old girl was fundraising for Small Talk, so she saw the difference the organization made in their
lives.
Ms. McCormick stated Small Talk had a fundraiser on October 12, 2017 at the Radisson Hotel in Lansing.

Discussion.

5. 9-1-1 Center
   b. 9-1-1 Center Update

Lance Langdon, 9-1-1 Center Director, gave an overview of the report he had provided to the Committee. He stated he was trying to work with advertising and recruitment firms responding to an RFP to get the word out about the many open positions the 9-1-1 Center currently had, as previous recruitment methods were not working.

Commissioner Crenshaw left at 7:09 p.m.

Mr. Langdon stated some of the firms suggested targeting social media to get the message out further, as well as target people who were not actively looking for jobs.

Commissioner Crenshaw returned at 7:11 p.m.

Mr. Langdon stated that part of the negotiation with a firm would be to establish a finder’s fee, if they were able to hire a person successfully. He further stated he was reaching out to other firms to encourage them to respond to the RFP as well.

Chairperson Hope asked when a person would be considered successfully hired.

Mr. Langdon stated he wanted to work that out with the firms, because the firms did an initial screening before sending them through the 9-1-1 Center’s testing and interview process. He further stated he would like to see a partial payment if a person was initially hired, and then the rest of the payment if the person was still employed in six months, as an incentive for them to find good people, not just people coming in the door and leaving two weeks later.

Commissioner Banas stated she recalled spending a lot of time on this staffing issue on the Law & Courts Committee last year, and while she was glad they had found a new way to recruit employees, they were still in the same place as they were last year in terms of staffing levels. She asked why it took so long to find new recruits, as she was concerned that the 9-1-1 Center was losing veteran employees faster than they were able to hire new employees and that was troublesome given the current low staffing levels.

Mr. Langdon stated that the problem was they could not find good applicants. He further stated that his department was testing applicants continually, but they were trying to find good fits for the job.

Mr. Langdon stated that some smaller centers did not have the turnover the County 9-1-1 Center did, but that was because they had 8-12 people total and the stress was not as heavy with the type
or volume of calls. He further stated that other centers also had better benefits or wages, but the County was in contract talks so some suggestions might come from that.

Mr. Langdon stated he was not sure if the marketing company would give them more applicants, but he knew that East Lansing and Delta Township were also having a hard time even getting people to apply for the jobs. He further stated he thought it was because people did not want to get into public safety, and before, the draw to the job was the pension, which was not the case anymore.

Mr. Langdon stated the advertising company had thought the wages and benefits were competitive and they were surprised the County was not getting applicants for the jobs. He further stated that unemployment rate was low, which meant that many people were not looking for jobs, and he had noticed many businesses with “Help Wanted” signs in their windows.

Mr. Langdon stated they needed to find something to make the job more attractive, and he was unsure whether that was to target different people or increase wages or benefits. He further stated for current employees, the drive was not necessarily wages, it was to get more time off because they were stressed out.

Commissioner Banas stated increasing wages might be a good idea, since the department was already spending $1 million on overtime costs.

Commissioner Maiville thanked Mr. Langdon for his brutally honest report. He stated that there was no quick fix, as this had been an ongoing issue that did not seem to be gaining any traction.

Commissioner Maiville stated he hoped the joint labor team would be effective to help and make more progress. He further stated that the competitiveness of the wages and benefits might need to be reevaluated to make the jobs more attractive.

Commissioner Maiville stated he recalled when they had discussed the issue in previous years there had been mention that in order to hire a person, there needed to be about 40 people in the pipeline to get the seats filled. He further stated getting that many recruits might require several things, but they needed to get more people in the pipeline and figure out if they were competitive.

Ms. Morton stated there would be a closed session at the County Services meeting to discuss bargaining next week.

Commissioner Maiville asked if the County’s pay was competitive.

Ms. Morton stated she was not sure if it was an appropriate discussion for the Law & Courts Committee. She further stated it might be better suited for the County Services Committee.

Commissioner Maiville stated he also thought it would be nice if people were considering a career at the 9-1-1 Center, not just using it as a pass-through on their way to another public safety position.
Commissioner Koenig asked what the starting wage was at the 9-1-1 Center.

Mr. Langdon stated the starting wage was $17.17 for a call taker.

Commissioner Koenig asked if it was the same amount of pay when they were training.

Mr. Langdon stated it was the same amount of pay.

Commissioner Koenig asked out of 40 applicants, how many would make it to the next step.

Mr. Langdon stated if 40 applicants were invited to test, then maybe 15-20 would actually show up for the test, and then 4-8 might pass that test and go to the oral board interview.

Commissioner Koenig asked what skills people were usually lacking when they did not make it through the pipeline. She asked if they were lacking the typing skills.

Mr. Langdon stated it was not the typing skills, because those people would have been weeded out during the testing process.

Commissioner Koenig asked what the required typing speed was.

Mr. Langdon stated 35 words per minute was the required typing speed for the position.

Ms. Larner stated many applicants lacked the ability to multitask.

Mr. Langdon stated he would identify that applicants were missing common sense, and when they were given a set of information, they could not process it.

Discussion.

Commissioner Celentino stated that the second-biggest problem identified in the report was that employee morale was not improving. He further stated that he hoped adding the new position and reorganizing staff would be a big improvement in morale.

Commissioner Celentino asked if employee concerns were not being addressed in a timely manner.

Mr. Langdon stated there were too many issues in a day to handle, and in order to tackle all of the issues in a day, they would need about nine new positions. He further stated that there were tasks, like reviewing and preparing responses to FOIA requests, which took specialized report-writing skills.

Commissioner Celentino asked if the 9-1-1 Center handled their own FOIA requests, rather than going through the Board of Commissioners Office.
Ms. Morton stated the 9-1-1 Center coordinated with the Board of Commissioners Office, but the data for the FOIA request was processed at the center.

Mr. Langdon stated outlined the tasks that could come up in a day, including public requests, mapping system updates from jurisdictions, street fixes to improve location services, software issues, vendors, and complaints. He further stated that wherever there was a fire, that got addressed and everything else piled up.

Commissioner Crenshaw stated toward the end of last year, there had been a discussion regarding the start of an employee recognition program. He asked if the program had gotten off the ground yet.

Mr. Langdon stated the program was not completely off the ground, but there was a committee made up of employees and supervisors that were handling the awards. He further stated there had been an email sent out a few weeks ago, updating the employees about the program and looking for nominations for awards.

Mr. Langdon stated the employees were working on that and he had not seen the final drafts of their work.

Discussion.

5. 9-1-1 Center
   c. 9-1-1 Center Reorganization (Discussion)

Ms. Morton introduced the proposal for a reorganization of the 9-1-1 Center, and stated that there needed to be something different done. She stated that it had become apparent that when there was an emergency that needed to be attended to, the thing that went by the wayside was dealing with staff.

Ms. Morton stated the new position was not going to help fill seats in the call center, but maybe if employees felt like they were being heard more and consistent management, things would look up, which was hard to do when they had to put fires out. She further stated that the current Deputy Director’s duties would be split into a systems manager focused more on the technology, and a staff services manager focused on personnel, which would also free up the Director to accomplish his long-term projects.

Commissioner Banas stated it was encouraging to see a position that prioritized staffing. She further stated that she noticed the third task on the list was recruitment of staff, and she wanted to make sure that was a top priority, not just one of 17 tasks assigned to this position.

Ms. Morton stated Mr. Langdon had listed the tasks in order of priority, so it was a pretty high priority for that position. She further stated that all management positions had a priority to hire and maintain staff.
Commissioner Crenshaw asked if both positions would need to be posted, or if the incumbent in the Deputy Director position would need to reapply for the other position.

Ms. Morton stated it was intended for the incumbent to be put in the Systems Manager position. She further stated there was no change in pay or grade from what the Deputy Director was currently at.

Ms. Morton stated that the Staff Services position would be posted nationwide.

Commissioner Schafer asked if they would approve a resolution authorizing the reorganization at a later meeting.

Ms. Morton stated that the reorganization policy was to hold a discussion during Committee first, and then revisit the proposal at a later meeting with a resolution. She further stated she did have a draft resolution prepared, as there was precedent to move on a resolution immediately.

Ms. Morton stated that given the want from employees and staff to move quickly on the reorganization, it would be in order to move on the resolution now.

Discussion.

Mr. Langdon stated the 9-1-1 Center had hired some 18 year-old employees, but they were not very successful, because they did not have a lot of life experiences that helped when they were taking phone calls. He further stated he had been asked by staff to raise the age requirement on the application, which he had not done because there might be some 18 year-olds that could be successful.

Commissioner Banas stated she did not mean the 9-1-1 Center should necessarily hire people right out of high school, but rather there were many people who did not go to college and had plenty of life experiences that would make them otherwise qualified for the job.

Mr. Langdon stated that was why they were going to use social media to target that age group.

Commissioner Celentino stated Ms. Morton had distributed the draft resolution, and considering the calls by staff for immediate action, he thought the Committee should vote on the resolution.

MOVED BY COMM. CELENTINO, SUPPORTED BY COMM. CRENSHAW, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE A REORGANIZATION OF THE 9-1-1 CENTER.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Announcements

None.
Public Comment

Ms. Larner stated that she wanted to clarify that when she had said the 9-1-1 Center was 15 staff people down, they were more like 20 staff people down, because there were five trainees who could not take shifts yet. She further stated that there had been 25 fully trained dispatchers leave since the merger.

Ms. Larner stated the work environment and how the employees were treated was difficult. She further stated she hoped the new position would help improve that.

Mr. Larner stated that a majority of employees were not happy where they were at, and if she could go back to East Lansing 9-1-1, she would. She further stated that when she was asked if she would refer someone to work with her at the 9-1-1 Center, she said she would not, because of the overtime.

Ms. Murray-Rice stated the way the employees were treated was poor, and it was something she saw on a daily basis. She commended the Controller for identifying and fixing some small issues, but she had five employees complain to her last night that they were mistreated.

Ms. Murray-Rice stated that something needed to happen right away, because the employees were not able to tolerate the amount of overtime, and it was affecting their health and livelihoods.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:46 p.m.
RESOLUTION ACTION ITEMS:

The Deputy Controller recommends approval of the following resolutions:

2a. **Sheriff’s Office – Resolution to Accept the 2017 Risk Avoidance Grant (RAP) from the Michigan Municipal Risk Management Authority (MMRMA)**

This resolution will authorize the acceptance of a 2017 MMRMA RAP Grant of $8,000 toward the purchase a new Jail Live Scan Fingerprinting System. The total cost to Ingham County is $48,260. The remaining cost of the project will come from the Inmate Commissary fund, as authorized by Resolution 17-335.

2b. **Sheriff’s Office – Resolution to Authorize an Interlocal Agreement with the City of Lansing and City of East Lansing for the 2017 Local JAG Grant**

This resolution will authorize entering into the Interlocal agreement between Ingham County and the City of Lansing and the City of East Lansing to accept the $111,513 allocated portion of the 2017 Local JAG grant for the time period of October 2017 through September 2020. The City of Lansing is the fiduciary for this grant. The Lansing Police Department will allocate from this grant $10,253 to the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office to be spent on upgrades to duty side arms.

2c. **Sheriff’s Office – Resolution to Authorize an Agreement with the Michigan State University School of Psychiatry to Provide Psychiatric Services for Inmates at the Ingham County Jail**

This resolution will authorize the renewal of an agreement with the Michigan State University School of Psychiatry to provide psychiatry services for inmates at the Ingham County Jail. The renewal would include an hourly pay rate increase from $140.00 to $145.00 per hour, at a total cost of up to $58,240. This will be funded by the Health Services Millage for those inmates who are health services millage eligible. $16,000 is also included in the Health Department budget to cover the cost for inmates who are not health services millage eligible. This will be the second year for this agreement.

3. **Friend of the Court – Resolution to Authorize an Agreement with Tel Systems to Upgrade Technology and Provide Maintenance Support for the Friend of the Court Referee Hearing Rooms**

This resolution will approve entering into a contract and service agreement with TEL Systems for the purchase, installation, and support of a replacement audio recording system in the three Friend of the Court hearing rooms, at a cost not to exceed $6,962 per hearing room. Funding for the project is included in the 2017 capital budget.

See attached memo for additional information.

4a. **55th District Court – Resolution Authorizing the Ingham County 55th District Court to Accept a Grant Award from the Michigan Supreme Court State Court Administrative Office - Michigan Mental Health Court Grant Program (SCAO-MMHCGP), Continue a Probation Officer Position, and Enter Into Subcontracts**
This resolution will authorize the acceptance of $389,468 in grant funding from the Michigan Mental Health Court Grant Program (MMHCGP), administered by the State Court Administrative Office (SCAO). The District Court has received MMHCGP funding for Mental Health Court since 2014. This resolution will also authorize $49,825 Ingham County In-Kind funding and acknowledge $26,916 CMHA-CEI Local Cash Contributions, resulting in a total Mental Health Court budget not to exceed $466,209.

Additionally, the resolution authorizes continuation of a probation officer position and the following subcontracts:

1. Electronic Monitoring Services with Sentinel Offender Services and/or Judicial Services Group – not to exceed a total of $1,500
2. Substance Use Testing with Alcohol and Drug Administrative Monitoring (ADAM) – not to exceed a total of $35,000
3. Mental Health Services with Community Mental Health Authority of Clinton, Eaton, and Ingham Counties: not to exceed $270,957 ($244,041 grant funding + $26,916 CMHA-CEI Local In-Kind Contributions)

See attached memo for additional information.

4b. 55th District Court – Resolution to Accept a Grant Award from the Michigan Supreme Court’s State Court Administrative Office - Michigan Drug Court Grant Program (SCAO-MDCGP) and Enter into Subcontracts

This resolution will authorize the acceptance of $137,471 in grant funding from the Michigan Drug Court Grant Program (MDCGP), administered by the State Court Administrative Office (SCAO). The District Court has received MDCGP funding for Sobriety Court since 2004. The resolution will also authorize $132,939.40 Ingham County In-Kind funding and acceptance of future possible donations from the Ingham County Sobriety Court Foundation, resulting in a current total Sobriety Court budget of $270,410.40.

The resolution will also authorize the continuation of one full time and one part time probation officer and the following subcontracts:

1. Substance Abuse Testing with Alcohol and Drug Administrative Monitoring (ADAM) – not to exceed $12,288
2. Evaluation and Counseling services with Cognitive Consultants – not to exceed $50,000

See attached memo for additional information.

5. Controller’s Office – Resolution Authorizing Adjustments to the 2017 Ingham County Budget

This resolution would authorize the recommended adjustments to the Ingham County budget for the third quarter of 2017. The total increase to the General Fund is $249,873. Included with this memo is an update of the 2017 Contingency Account and a Budget to Actual Report of the General Fund as of September 30, 2017.

See attached memo for details.

PRESENTATION:

1. Circuit Court – Juvenile Division – Video Presentation of Youth Service Trip to Costa Rica
TO: Law & Courts Committee
    Finance Committee
FROM: Undersheriff Andrew R. Bouck
DATE: October 3, 2017
RE: 2017 MMRMA RAP Grant

This is a resolution requesting the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office, be allowed to accept
$8,000.00 from a 2017 MMRMA RAP Grant to purchase a new Jail Live Scan Fingerprinting
System. The total cost to Ingham County is $48,260.00 with MMRMA reimbursing agency 50%
with a maximum of $8,000.00 of the project.
 Introduced by the Law & Courts and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO ACCEPT THE 2017 RISK AVOIDANCE GRANT (RAP) FROM THE MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL RISK MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY (MMRMA)

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office, have applied for, and have been approved to receive, a Risk Avoidance Grant (RAP Grant) from the Michigan Municipal Risk Management Authority; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of this grant is to utilize the approved funding from the RAP Grant MMRMA to assist in purchasing a new Jail Live Scan Fingerprinting System; and

WHEREAS, the new Live Scan Fingerprinting System is replacing the current computer and software application due to the Ingham Sheriff’s Office transitioning records management systems; and

WHEREAS, the cost of the new Live Scan Fingerprinting System is $48,260.00; and

WHEREAS, the grant requires a 50% in-kind match with a maximum award amount to be approved of $8,000.00 per application: and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office was approved for the full grant request of $8,000.00; and

WHEREAS, this grant will allow the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office to utilize the new fingerprint system for all individuals requiring fingerprinting per State of Michigan Laws.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners approves acceptance of the 2017 Risk Avoidance Grant (RAP) from the Michigan Municipal Risk Management Authority (MMRMA) in the amount of $8,000.00, with Ingham County’s match requirement of $40,260.00 to come from the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office Inmate Commissary Fund with a 50% refund from this RAP grant.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners directs the Controller to make any necessary budget adjustments in the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office 2017 budget.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the Board Chairperson to sign any necessary contract documents that are consistent with this resolution and approved as to form by the County Attorney.
TO: Law & Courts Committee  
Finance Committee  

FROM: Undersheriff Andrew R. Bouck  

DATE: October 3, 2017  

RE: 2017 Local JAG Grant  

This is a resolution requesting the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office be allowed to enter into an Interlocal Agreement with the City of Lansing and City of East Lansing for the 2017 Local JAG Grant.  

The Ingham County Sheriff’s Office will receive a 2017 Local JAG grant of $10,253.00 to be used for upgrades to duty side arms.
INTRODUCED BY THE LAW & COURTS AND FINANCE COMMITTEES OF THE:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY OF LANSING AND CITY OF EAST LANSING FOR THE 2017 LOCAL JAG GRANT

WHEREAS, the City of Lansing Police Department, the City of East Lansing, and the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office were allocated $111,513.00 from the 2017 Local JAG grant from the Department of Justice; and

WHEREAS, the City of Lansing is the fiduciary of this grant; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office portion allocated from this grant is $10,253.00; and

WHEREAS, as part of the application process to receive this funding from the 2017 Local JAG grant, the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office must enter into an Interlocal agreement with the City of Lansing and the City of East Lansing allowing for disbursement of allocated funds to both government police agencies; and

WHEREAS, the portion allocated for the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office will be spent on upgrades to duty side arms.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes entering into the Interlocal agreement between Ingham County and the City of Lansing to accept the $111,513.00 allocated portion of the 2017 Local JAG grant for the time period of October 2017 through September 2020.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Lansing Police Department will allocate from this grant $10,253.00 to the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office to be spent on upgrades to duty side arms.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners directs the Controller to make the necessary adjustments to the 2017-2020 Sheriff’s Office budgets consistent with this resolution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the Board Chairperson to sign any necessary contract documents that are consistent with this resolution and approved as to form by the County Attorney.
TO:       Law & Courts Committee
          Human Services Committee
          Finance Committee

FROM:    Undersheriff Andrew R. Bouck

DATE:    October 5, 2017

RE:       Agreement with the Michigan State University School of Psychiatry to provide psychiatry services for inmates at the Ingham County Jail

This is a resolution requesting the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office, be allowed to renew an Agreement with the Michigan State University School of Psychiatry to provide psychiatry services for inmates at the Ingham County Jail. The renewal would include an hourly pay rate increase of $5.00, making the rate $145.00 an hour.
RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE AN AGREEMENT WITH THE MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF PSYCHIATRY TO PROVIDE PSYCHIATRIC SERVICES FOR INMATES AT THE INGHAM COUNTY JAIL

WHEREAS, effective May 27, 2016 psychiatric assessments and treatment plans were no longer being offered by the Community Mental Health Authority of Clinton, Eaton, and Ingham Counties (CMHA-CEI) at the Ingham County Jail; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Jail recognizes the need to appropriately address the psychiatric needs of all inmates in the interest of maintaining inmate and staff safety, and in protecting inmates’ Eighth Amendment rights against cruel and unusual punishment; and

WHEREAS, the United State Supreme Court has ruled on numerous occasions that the failure to provide appropriate mental health and medical care may constitute a violation of the Eighth Amendment (Estelle v Gamble, 429 U.S. 97 (1976) (deliberate indifference to prisoners’ serious medical needs constitutes cruel and unusual punishment); see, e.g., Hunt v Uphoff, 199 F.3d 1220 (10th Cir. 1999) (prison officials violated Eighth Amendment by providing such inadequate medical treatment for inmate’s diabetes and hypertension that inmate consequently suffered heart attack); LaFaut v Smith, 834 F.2d 389 (4th Cir. 1987) (prison officials violated Eighth Amendment by failing to provide disabled inmate with needed physical therapy and adequate access to facilities); Madrid v Gomez, 889 F. Supp. 1146, 1265-66 (N.D. Ca. 1995) (continued confinement of mentally ill inmates in the facility’s security housing unit violated the Eighth Amendment); and

WHEREAS, beginning November 1, 2016, the Michigan State University Department of Psychiatry agreed to extend its existing arrangement with 55th District Court Mental Health Court to contract with the Ingham County Jail to assign one senior-level resident psychiatrist to provide psychiatric services to any inmate at the Ingham County Jail for up to eight hours weekly and contract the services of one attending psychiatrist to supervise the resident psychiatrist, or provide psychiatric services to any inmate at the Ingham County Jail in the absence of a resident; and

WHEREAS, the Health Services Millage funding has been identified to fund this contract to the extent the services are Health Services Millage eligible; and

WHEREAS, certain inmates of the Ingham County jail are eligible for services funded by the Health Services Millage as Ingham County residents that have no access to private or third party paid services, and are ineligible for Medicaid by virtue of their status as inmates, and have income of less than $28,000 annually; and

WHEREAS, for those inmates who are not health services millage eligible, up to $16,000 has been included in the Health Department’s FY2018 budget.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes entering into a contract with the Michigan State University Department of Psychiatry to assign one senior-level resident psychiatrist to provide psychiatric services to any inmate at the Ingham County Jail for up to eight hours weekly and contract the services of one attending psychiatrist to supervise the resident psychiatrist, or provide
psychiatric services to any inmate at the Ingham County Jail in the absence of a resident, for up to eight hours weekly at the rate of $145 an hour for a total budget not to exceed $58,240 with up to $58,240 from the Health Services Millage and up to $16,000 from the Health Department Budget for the time period of November 1, 2017 through October 31, 2018.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Health Services Millage shall be used to fund eligible services, and the Controller/Administrator is directed to make the necessary adjustments to the 2017 and 2018 Sheriff’s Office and Health Department budgets.

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

TO: LAW & COURTS AND FINANCE COMMITTEES

FROM: HARRY MOXLEY, DEPUTY COURT ADMINISTRATOR/FOC

RE: RECOMMENDATION OF TEL SERVICES PROPOSAL FOR FOC HEARING ROOM RECORDING EQUIPMENT AND SOFTWARE

DATE: SEPTEMBER 26, 2017

CC: SHAUNA DUNNINGS, ROBERT HOTCHKISS, TERI MORTON

For the FY 2017 FOC budget, $20,000 was approved for replacement/upgrade of the existing “For the Record” digital recording system for three Friend of the Court Referee hearing rooms, due to the existing equipment being seven years old, and therefore approaching its end-of-life with regards to being supportable.

This memo is being written as a follow-up to our meeting of last month, which was held to review the two responses received for RFP packet #32-17 (Recording System for FOC), from TEL systems and Business Information System, Inc. (BIS).

Following our review, TEL systems clearly appears to be the better option. Their total quote of $20,886 was the lowest (BIS quote was $34,022). The BIS quote included reference to video capability, which we did not request, as FOC is only looking to replace/upgrade its current audio recording equipment and software. TEL systems is a Michigan vendor who would presumably have better capacity to support this product, as they are based in Ann Arbor, and BIS is based in Fort Lauderdale, FL. TEL is also already the Circuit Court’s current vendor for courtroom technology upgrades (approved following issuance of RFP packet #10-17 (Courtroom Technology Upgrades for 30th Judicial Circuit Court and Probate Court) and passage of Resolution 17-215).

Finally, the TEL systems quote incorporates usage of FTR (“For The Record”) Gold recording software. FTR is the software currently in use at FOC, and is familiar to our IT technicians and Referees who will be using the software on a day-to-day basis. BIS uses their own proprietary software package for which Ingham County does not, to my knowledge, have any experience or familiarity with.
TO:    Harry Moxley, Deputy Court Administrator/FOC Director

FROM:  James Hudgins, Director of Purchasing
        jhudgins@ingham.org

DATE:  July 11, 2017

RE:    Memorandum of performance for RFP No. 32-17: Recording System
        for the Ingham County Friend of the Court

Per your request, the Purchasing Department sought proposals from experienced and qualified
vendors for the purchase and installation of a turnkey new digital recording system that will be
used by the Ingham County Friend of the Court (FOC).

The RFP was advertised in the Lansing State Journal and City Pulse, as well as, posted on the
and Ingham County Purchasing Department’s website.

The Purchasing Department can confirm the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Overall Number of Vendors</th>
<th>Number of Local Vendors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vendors invited to propose</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendors responding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Local Pref</th>
<th>Hearing Room #1 Total Cost</th>
<th>Hearing Room #2 Total Cost</th>
<th>Hearing Room #3 Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEL SYSTEMS</td>
<td>No: Ann Arbor, MI</td>
<td>$6,962.00</td>
<td>$6,962.00</td>
<td>$6,962.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preconstruction meetings are required when the construction cost exceeds $10,000. A
preconstruction meeting may be required depending on the pricing options chosen. Please make
sure the Purchasing Department is invited and is able to attend the preconstruction meeting to
ensure that all contractors are in compliance with the Prevailing Wage Policy and proper
bonding.

You are now ready to complete the final steps in the process: 1) Evaluate the submissions based
on the criteria established in the RFP; 2) confirm funds are available; 3) submit your
recommendation of award along with your evaluation to the Purchasing Department; 4) write a
memo of explanation; and, 5) prepare a resolution for Board approval.
This Memorandum is to be included with your memo and resolution submission to the Resolutions Group as acknowledgement of the Purchasing Department’s participation in the purchasing process.

If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me by e-mail at jhudgins@ingham.org or by phone at 676-7309.
INTRODUCED BY THE LAW & COURTS AND FINANCE COMMITTEES OF THE:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE AN AGREEMENT WITH TEL SYSTEMS TO UPGRADE TECHNOLOGY AND PROVIDE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT FOR THE FRIEND OF THE COURT REFEREE HEARING ROOMS

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Friend of the Court needs to replace Referee hearing room recording equipment and software that is approaching its end-of-life with regards to being supportable by Ingham County Information Technology staff; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham Friend of the Court secured Capital Improvement Project funding for the replacement and upgrade of recording equipment in three hearing rooms for the Fiscal Year 2017 budget in the amount of $20,000; and

WHEREAS, a Request for Proposal (RFP packet #32-17) for the purchase, installation, and maintenance of a replacement audio recording system in the three FOC hearing rooms was issued by the Purchasing Department in May, 2017; and

WHEREAS, the RFP evaluation team reviewed and evaluated responses from two vendors; and

WHEREAS, TEL Systems (Thalner Electronics, Inc.) had the lowest bid per hearing room, while meeting all of the requirements set forth in the RFP; was the only Michigan vendor to respond to the RFP, and would therefore have better capacity to support its product; has experience with installing courtroom technology, along with positive references from past customers to support their qualifications; and has been the past provider of the court’s courtroom technology maintenance, and are known to be providers of timely and effective service.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby approves entering into a contract and service agreement with TEL Systems for the purchase, installation, and support of a replacement audio recording system in the three FOC hearings rooms, at a cost not to exceed $6,962 per hearing room.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that funding for this purchase will be paid from 2017 CIP Equipment Revolving Fund line item 664-14299-735100.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that if the project is not completed prior to December 31, 2017, the balance of the budget will be carried forward to the 2018 budget.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Controller/Administrator is hereby authorized to make any adjustments necessary to properly budget and account for these expenditures.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the Board Chairperson to sign any necessary documents that are consistent with this resolution and approved as to form by the County Attorney.
To: Ingham County Law & Courts and Finance Committees
From: Da’Neese Wells
Date: 9/26/17
Subject: Mental Health Court Resolution for Fiscal Year 2018

Attached please find a Resolution requesting authorization for the 55th District Court Mental Health Court to accept $389,468 in grant funding from the Michigan Mental Health Court Grant Program (MMHCGP), administered by the State Court Administrative Office (SCAO).

We have received Michigan Mental Health Court Grant Program funding for Mental Health Court since FY2014. The basic premise of the program is a collaborative relationship between the 55th District Court and the Community Mental Health Authority of Clinton, Eaton, and Ingham Counties (CMHA-CEI) designed to link mentally ill criminal defendants to appropriate treatment in hopes of better addressing the needs of individuals with mental illness, reducing recidivism and enhancing public safety.

The grant funding supports one full-time probation officer assigned the program. This position has already been approved in the 2018 Ingham County budget.

The resolution also authorizes $49,825 Ingham County In-Kind funding and acknowledges $26,916 CMHA-CEI Local Cash Contributions, resulting in a total Mental Health Court budget not to exceed $466,209.

Additionally, the resolution authorizes continuation of a probation officer position, and subcontracts as follows:

1. Electronic Monitoring Services with Sentinel Offender Services and/or Judicial Services Group – not to exceed a total of $1,500
2. Substance Use Testing with Alcohol and Drug Administrative Monitoring (ADAM) – not to exceed a total of $35,000
3. Mental Health Services with Community Mental Health Authority of Clinton, Eaton, and Ingham Counties: not to exceed $270,957 ($244,041 grant funding + $26,916 CMHA-CEI Local In-Kind Contributions)

Thank you for your consideration.
INTRODUCED BY THE LAW & COURTS AND FINANCE COMMITTEES OF THE:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO ACCEPT A GRANT AWARD FROM THE MICHIGAN SUPREME COURT STATE COURT ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE - MICHIGAN MENTAL HEALTH COURT GRANT PROGRAM (SCAO-MMHCGP), CONTINUE A PROBATION OFFICER POSITION, AND ENTER INTO SUBCONTRACTS

WHEREAS, the Community Mental Health Authority of Clinton, Eaton, and Ingham Counties (CMHA-CEI) estimates there are over 5,000 seriously mentally ill adults in our region; and

WHEREAS, the 55th District Court has identified a need for specialized case handling for mentally ill defendants; and

WHEREAS, research indicates such specialized case handling results in lower recidivism rates, increased public safety, and more efficient public sector spending; and

WHEREAS, the 55th District Court and CMHA-CEI have received a grant from the State Court Administrative Office - Michigan Mental Health Court Grant Program in the amount of $389,468 to continue a Mental Health Court at the 55th District Court; and

WHEREAS, continuation of the Mental Health Court will require continuing to employ a probation officer to provide staffing for the program; and

WHEREAS, sources of Mental Health Court grant funding have been identified which would not obligate the County to provide matching funds, including but not limited to the SCAO-Michigan Mental Health Grant Program.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes entering into a contract with the State Court Administrative Office - Michigan Mental Health Court Grant Program for a total budget not to exceed $466,209 to include SCAO/MMHCGP grant funds in the amount of $389,468, Ingham County In-Kind matching funds not to exceed $49,825 with no local hard cash matching funds, and Community Mental Health Authority of Clinton, Eaton, and Ingham Counties Local In-Kind Contributions not to exceed $26,916 for the time period of October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2018.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes continuation of one FTE Grant-funded Probation Officer, an ICEA Court Professional, Grade 7, contingent upon the availability of grant funds.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that grant funded Mental Health Court program direct service subcontracts for the following services in the following amounts are authorized:

1. Electronic Monitoring Services with Sentinel Offender Services and/or Judicial Services Group – not to exceed a total of $1,500
2. Substance Use Testing with Alcohol and Drug Administrative Monitoring (ADAM) – not to exceed a total of $35,000
3. Mental Health Services with Community Mental Health Authority of Clinton, Eaton, and Ingham Counties: not to exceed $270,957 ($244,041 grant funding + $26,916 CMHA-CEI Local In-Kind Contributions)

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Controller/Administrator is directed to make the necessary adjustments to the 2017 and 2018 55th District Court budget and Position Allocation List.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the Board Chairperson to sign any necessary contract/subcontract documents that are consistent with this resolution and approved as to form by the County Attorney.
To: Ingham County Law & Courts and Finance Committees

From: Da’Neese Wells

Date: 9/25/17

Subject: Sobriety Court Resolution for Fiscal Year 2018

Attached please find a resolution requesting authorization for the 55th District Court Sobriety Court to accept $137,471 in grant funding from the Michigan Drug Court Grant Program (MDCGP), administered by the State Court Administrative Office (SCAO).

We have received grant funding administered by SCAO for Sobriety Court since FY2004. Our program targets OWI 2nd and OWI 3rd offenders found dependent on alcohol or other drugs who are not violent offenders (as defined in MCL 600.1062). Research suggests case handling should be expedited for these defendants. Prior to the implementation of Sobriety Court we had no specific mechanisms for this purpose. Now, potential Sobriety Court participants are identified at arraignment and placed on Sobriety Court bond conditions, which include testing and reporting. Compliance with these conditions is monitored throughout the pre-adjudication process. We’ve found that the combination of pretrial supervision and Sobriety Court motivates participants to remain sober during the period of supervision and after graduation, reducing recidivism, and enhancing public safety.

The grant funding supports one full-time probation officer assigned the program. Ingham County In-Kind funding supports one half-time probation officer assigned to the program. These positions have already been approved in the 2018 Ingham County budget.

The resolution also authorizes $132,939.40 Ingham County In-Kind funding and acceptance of future possible donations from the Ingham County Sobriety Court Foundation, resulting in a current total Sobriety Court budget of $270,410.40.

The resolution also authorizes subcontracts as follows:

1. Substance Abuse Testing with Alcohol and Drug Administrative Monitoring (ADAM) – not to exceed $12,288
2. Evaluation and Counseling services with Cognitive Consultants – not to exceed $50,000

Thank you for your consideration.
Introduced by the Law & Courts and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO ACCEPT A GRANT AWARD FROM THE MICHIGAN SUPREME COURT’S STATE COURT ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE - MICHIGAN DRUG COURT GRANT PROGRAM (SCAO-MDCGP) AND ENTER INTO SUBCONTRACTS

WHEREAS, the 55th District Court Sobriety Court Program ("Sobriety Court") has since 2004 provided quality services to the citizens of Ingham County; and

WHEREAS, continuation of the Sobriety Court will require continuing to employ two probation officers to provide staffing for the program; and

WHEREAS, the increased caseloads seriously threaten the level and quality of services; and

WHEREAS, sources of sobriety court grant funding have been identified which would not obligate the County to provide matching funds, including but not limited to the SCAO - Michigan Drug Court Grant Program.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes acceptance of a State Court Administrators Office grant including the SCAO-MDCGP grant in the amount of $137,471 to the Ingham County 55th District Court Sobriety Court Program for the time period of October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2018.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes acceptance of donations from the Ingham County Sobriety Court Foundation as well as other organizations, groups and individuals to the Ingham County 55th District Court Sobriety Court.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby expresses its appreciation to the Ingham County Sobriety Court Foundation for any future possible donations to the 55th District Court Sobriety Court Program.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners approves the total grant budget of $270,410.40 to include SCAO/MDCGP grant funds in the amount of $135,000, Ingham County In-Kind matching funds of $132,939.40 with no local hard cash matching funds, and future possible donations from the Ingham County Sobriety Court Foundation, all of which are required to continue the Sobriety Court Program.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that grant-funded Sobriety Court program direct service subcontracts for the following services in the following amounts are authorized:

1. Substance Abuse Testing with Alcohol and Drug Administrative Monitoring (ADAM) – not to exceed $12,288
2. Evaluation and Counseling services with Cognitive Consultants – not to exceed $50,000

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Controller/Administrator is directed to make the necessary adjustments to the 2017 and 2018 55th District Court budget and Position Allocation List.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the Board Chairperson to sign any necessary contract documents that are consistent with this resolution and approved as to form by the County Attorney.
MEMORANDUM

October 6, 2017

TO: Finance and Liaison Committees

FROM: Michael A. Townsend, Budget Director

RE: Third Quarter 2017 Budget Adjustments, Contingency Fund Update, and Quarterly Statement

Enclosed please find the recommended adjustments to the Ingham County budget for the third quarter of fiscal year 2017. The total increase to the General Fund is $249,873.

The quarterly budget amendment process as authorized by the Board of Commissioners is necessary to make adjustments to the adopted budget. Usually, adjustments are made as a result of updated revenue and expenditure projections, grant revenues, reappropriations, accounting and contractual changes, and general housekeeping issues.

There are few revenue adjustments to the general fund this quarter. First, our current year property tax adjustments are trending higher which requires a $25,000 increase.

In the Animal Control Department donations are accumulating in the liability fund 797. This fund is accounted for by the General Fund at year end. This first time adjustment will set up a $200,000 revenue and expense budget in the General Fund to recognize and expense these funds in 2017.

Projecting out revenue has identified an increase in Real Estate revenue for 2017. Based on trends and taking a conservative approach a slight increase of $18,595 will be added to the Register of Deeds revenue budget.

Two vehicles in the Sherriff Department budgets have been totaled and replaced by insurance proceeds. Therefore, an increase is being made to both revenue and expense in the Sherriff’s budget of $56,278.

On the expense side, due to the Separate Tax Limitation Millage Proposal on the November ballot, the Elections budget will be increased by $180,000 to cover the cost of this special election.

In the Equalization Department, BS&A Assessing Software Support was not included in the 2017 budget and it is necessary to continue service. An adjustment of $10,216 is being added to the Equalization’s budget.
To help balance the General Fund this adjustment includes using the remaining balance of $96,621 in the contingency funds. The attached document details how the Board has allocated the contingency funds throughout the year, beginning with a balance of $350,000.

An appropriation of $303,000 was received in 2017 from the State of Michigan in the Child Care Fund for the 2015-2016 year. The General Fund and the Juvenile Justice Fund provide a portion of the local match for the Child Care Fund. Therefore, the General Fund shall be returned its portion of these funds by decreasing the transfer in 2017 to the Child Care Fund in the amount of $100,000. The Juvenile Justice Millage Fund’s budget will also decrease its transfer to the Child Care Fund in the amount of $203,000.

The Zoo has received donations in the amount of $5,420 and is asking to recognize this revenue and set up the appropriate expense.

The Community Mental Health Bond was approved by County resolution in 2017; however, the capital and debt budgets have not been set up. The CMH Debt Fund budget for 2017 will be established at $140,099. The CMH capital project fund budget will be established in the amount of $10,065,000.

GASB 68 of 2015 required a change in the pension expense accounting for the Community Health Network Fund. The change requires the General Fund to pay for CHN employees’ pension directly. Resolution #15-428 amended the 2015 and 2016 budget; this year’s budget needs to be amended by $1,431,831 by increasing pension expenses and decreasing transfer out.

The Machinery and Equipment Revolving Fund is increased by $9,081 to complete the scheduled replacement of computer equipment in 2017 at the Sheriff Department. This was originally budgeted in 2018 but was needed in 2017.

Attached is the 3rd quarter general fund budget to actual year to date report. Our bond rating agency suggested that we present this information to Commissioners on a quarterly basis.

Should you require any additional information or have questions regarding this process, please don’t hesitate to contact me.
Ingham County
General Fund - Budget Actual Report
Year To Date as of September 30, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>(Unaudited)</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>$ 46,400,675</td>
<td>$ 34,641,293</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Revenue</td>
<td>11,898,931</td>
<td>7,350,338</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register of Deeds Revenue</td>
<td>1,853,889</td>
<td>1,760,319</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Contract</td>
<td>3,773,151</td>
<td>3,554,540</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>1,482,272</td>
<td>1,012,043</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment earning (loss)</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>232,717</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer in From Other Funds</td>
<td>3,585,341</td>
<td>2,367,776</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7,605,303</td>
<td>4,407,172</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>76,949,568</strong></td>
<td><strong>55,326,198</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.58</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>(Unaudited)</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wages and Fringes</td>
<td>44,031,289</td>
<td>30,428,293</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Postage</td>
<td>2,181,833</td>
<td>1,359,031</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td>5,497,967</td>
<td>3,503,590</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and Equip.</td>
<td>2,428,889</td>
<td>1,860,179</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>510,005</td>
<td>451,154</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Assessment</td>
<td>460,000</td>
<td>491,134</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities and Telephone</td>
<td>1,405,864</td>
<td>904,884</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Services</td>
<td>2,263,978</td>
<td>1,515,385</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health and Substance Abuse</td>
<td>2,683,570</td>
<td>1,944,540</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenditures</td>
<td>628,886</td>
<td>382,757</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Out To Other Funds</td>
<td>19,186,255</td>
<td>16,782,912</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>116,621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>285,341</td>
<td>313,373</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>81,684,504</strong></td>
<td><strong>59,937,212</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.73</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revenues over expenditures 

$ (4,734,936) $ (4,611,014)

Prepared October 2, 2017 - additional activity will be recorded after this date including accrual of the October 6th payroll

Notes:

1. These statements are prepared on a cash basis and have not been reviewed for accruals.
2. 50% of the July 1 tax levy has been included as tax revenue.
3. 75% of the transfer in from the Delinquent Tax Fund has been recognized even though the actual transfer will not occur until December.
4. The majority of the transfers to other funds represents 100% of the annual appropriation since many of the receiving funds have a September year end.
INTRODUCED BY THE FINANCE COMMITTEE OF THE:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ADJUSTMENTS TO THE 2017 INGHAM COUNTY BUDGET

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners adopted the 2017 Budget on October 25, 2016 and has authorized certain amendments since that time, and it is now necessary to make some adjustments as a result of updated revenue and expenditure projections, fund transfers, reappropriations, accounting and contractual changes, errors and omissions, and additional appropriation needs; and

WHEREAS, the Liaison Committees and the Finance Committee have reviewed the proposed budget adjustments prepared by the Controller’s staff and have made adjustments where necessary; and

WHEREAS, Public Act 621 of 1978 requires that local units of government maintain a balanced budget and periodically adjust the budget to reflect revised revenue and expenditure levels.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby directs the Controller to make the necessary transfers to adjust revenues and expenditures in the following funds, according to the attached schedules:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>2017 BUDGET 10/2/17</th>
<th>PROPOSED CHANGES</th>
<th>PROPOSED BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$82,684,504</td>
<td>($249,873)</td>
<td>$81,934,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Zoo</td>
<td>4,166,210</td>
<td>5,420</td>
<td>4,171,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Juvenile Justice Millage</td>
<td>4,926,454</td>
<td>(203,000)</td>
<td>4,723,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>Family Div. Child Care Fund</td>
<td>13,836,970</td>
<td>(303,000)</td>
<td>13,533,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>Community Mental Health Debt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>140,099</td>
<td>140,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>Community Mental Health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,065,000</td>
<td>10,065,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>Community Health Center</td>
<td>20,402,626</td>
<td>(1,431,831)</td>
<td>18,970,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>664</td>
<td>Mach. &amp; Equip. Revolving</td>
<td>1,877,799</td>
<td>9,081</td>
<td>1,886,880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GENERAL FUND REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Revenues</th>
<th>2017 Budget – 10/2/17</th>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
<th>2017 Proposed Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Property Tax</td>
<td>46,050,675</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46,050,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Adjustments</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>(75,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent Real Property Tax</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid Personally Property Tax</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFT/CFT</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailer Fee Tax</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intergovernmental Transfers

| State Revenue Sharing          | 6,149,564             | 0                | 6,149,564            |
| Convention/Tourism Tax - Liquor| 1,429,396             | 0                | 1,429,396            |
| Court Equity Funding           | 1,510,000             | 0                | 1,510,000            |
| Use of Fund Balance - Committed| 1,600,000             | 0                | 1,600,000            |
| Use of Fund Balance - Uncommitted| 3,134,936            | 0                | 3,134,936            |

### Department Generated Revenue

| Animal Control                 | 949,041               | 200,000          | 1,149,041            |
| Circuit Court - Family Division| 728,656               | 0                | 728,656              |
| Circuit Court - Friend of the Court| 587,000             | 0                | 587,000              |
| Circuit Crt - General Trial    | 2,388,631             | 0                | 2,388,631            |
| Controller                     | 3,170                 | 0                | 3,170                |
| Cooperative Extension          | 2,500                 | 0                | 2,500                |
| County Clerk                   | 569,210               | 0                | 569,210              |
| District Court                 | 2,673,298             | 0                | 2,673,298            |
| Drain Commissioner/Drain Tax   | 415,500               | 0                | 415,500              |
| Economic Development           | 63,037                | 0                | 63,037               |
| Elections                      | 66,550                | 0                | 66,550               |
| Homeland Security/Emergency Ops| 60,135                | 0                | 60,135               |
| Equalization /Tax Mapping      | 10,100                | 0                | 10,100               |
| Facilities                     | 175,647               | 0                | 175,647              |
| Financial Services             | 63,028                | 0                | 63,028               |
| Health Department              | 178,240               | 0                | 178,240              |
| Human Resources                | 43,303                | 0                | 43,303               |
| Probate Court                  | 277,178               | 0                | 277,178              |
| Prosecuting Attorney           | 632,787               | 0                | 632,787              |
| Purchasing                     | 0                     | 0                | 0                     |
| Register of Deeds              | 2,036,729             | 18,595           | 2,055,324            |
| Remonumentation Grant          | 85,000                | 0                | 85,000               |
| Sheriff                        | 4,726,457             | 56,278           | 4,782,735            |
| Treasurer                      | 4,352,133             | 0                | 4,352,133            |
**Tri-County Regional Planning** | 63,921 | 0 | 63,921  
**Veteran Affairs** | 388,682 | 0 | 388,682  
**Total General Fund Revenues** | 81,684,504 | 249,873 | 81,934,377  

### GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017 Budget – 10/2/17</th>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
<th>2017 Proposed Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of Commissioners</td>
<td>616,391</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit Court - General Trial</td>
<td>8,482,036</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Court</td>
<td>3,225,412</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit Court - Friend of the Court</td>
<td>1,520,648</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jury Board</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probate Court</td>
<td>1,547,283</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit Court - Family Division</td>
<td>5,345,993 (100,000)</td>
<td>5,245,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jury Selection</td>
<td>128,472</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections</td>
<td>259,378</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>804,032</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Attorney</td>
<td>456,219</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Clerk</td>
<td>957,514</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>959,550</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equalization/Tax Services</td>
<td>751,426</td>
<td>10,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>724,618</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecuting Attorney</td>
<td>6,622,281</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing</td>
<td>229,397</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>2,199,467</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register of Deeds</td>
<td>749,137</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remonumentation Grant</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>577,680</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Commissioner</td>
<td>1,011,396</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>137,519</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Agencies</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingham Conservation District Court</td>
<td>8,354</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunity Committee</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Commission</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Commission</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-County Regional Planning</td>
<td>113,053</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Maintenance</td>
<td>212,600</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>20,878,391</td>
<td>56,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Squad</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Corrections</td>
<td>172,899</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>1,979,188</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Budgeted</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Operations</td>
<td>222,943</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Public Works</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Tax at Large</td>
<td>460,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Department</td>
<td>5,820,200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHC</td>
<td>2,769,850</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Medical</td>
<td>1,588,527</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Examiner</td>
<td>396,575</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>717,954</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mental Health</td>
<td>1,968,872</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Human Services</td>
<td>2,213,279</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-County Aging</td>
<td>80,867</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Affairs</td>
<td>550,936</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Extension</td>
<td>454,589</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Legacy Costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>1,597,379</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Reserves</td>
<td>96,621</td>
<td>(96,621)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Aid</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1-1 Project</td>
<td>45,750</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Coalition for Youth</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvements</td>
<td>1,636,334</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General Fund Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>81,684,504</strong></td>
<td><strong>249,873</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Fund Revenues**

- **Property Tax**: Increase current year property tax adjustments $25,000 based on year to date trend.
- **Animal Control**: To set up revenues in General Fund, $200,000. This is for donations recorded in liability fund 797. This is the first time adjustment that will be done annually to set up revenue to be recognized in the General Fund at year end.
- **Sheriff**: Increase insurance proceeds $18,636 and $37,642 to replace two damaged vehicles.
- **Register of Deeds**: Increase Real Estate Transfer Tax revenue $18,595 to reflect current amount received.
General Fund Expenditures

Animal Control  To set up expenses in General Fund, $200,000. This is for donations recorded in liability fund 797. This is the first time adjustment that will be done annually to set up expenses to be recognized in the General Fund at year end.

Elections  Increase budget $180,000 for special November election.

Sheriff  Increase due to replacement of two vehicles involved in accidents, $18,636 and $37,642.

Fam. Div. Child Care Fund  Decrease transfer to the Child Care Fund $100,000. An appropriation of $303,000 was received in 2017 from State of Michigan for the 2015-2016 year. The remaining $203,000 will be used to decrease transfer from the Juvenile Justice Millage Fund to the Child Care Fund.


Contingency  Decrease contingency $96,621 to partially offset cost for Special Election.

Health Department  Transfer to reflect change in the pension expense accounting treatment started in 2015 per GASB 68 for the Community Health Network Fund to increase pension expenses and decrease transfer out totaling $1,431,831. The GASB change requires General Fund to pay for CHN employees’ pension directly.

Non-General Fund Adjustments

Zoo  Increase budget $5,420 to recognize donations received and set up expense.
(F258)

Juvenile Justice Millage  Decrease transfer to the Child Care Fund $203,000. An appropriation of $303,000 was received in 2017 from State of Michigan for the 2015-2016 year. The remaining $100,000 will be used to decrease transfer from the General Fund.
(F264)

Fam. Div. Child Care Fund  Decrease transfer from the General Fund $100,000 and transfer from the Juvenile Millage fund $203,000 to reflect $303,000 in excess funds received from State of Michigan.
(F292)

CMH Debt Fund  To set up Bond principal and interest requirements for the CMH bond, $140,099.
(F398)
To set up budget for capital project fund for CMH building, $10,065,000. Expenditures were authorized by Board when bond issuance was approved but never formally an adopted budget.

Transfer to reflect change in the pension expense accounting treatment started in 2015 per GASB 68 for the Community Health Network Fund to increase pension expenses and decrease transfer out totaling $1,431,831. The GASB change requires General Fund to pay for CHN employees’ pension directly.

Transfer $9,081 from unreserved fund balance to accommodate Sheriff PC replacement needs in 2017 scheduled on 2018 replacement.
Dear Family Court Judges, Family Court Administrators and County Treasurers:

Please find attached the state ward chargeback rates for calendar year 2018.

The Youth Rehabilitation Services Act, MCL 803.301 et seq., requires that the Department "prescribe the liability of counties for the cost of services for state wards." The Department has determined that the attached rates will be effective for calendar year 2018, effective January 1, 2018. These rates shall remain in effect until the next scheduled revision in 2019.

Each county will continue to be charged one-half of the appropriate per diem costs for care provided to a state ward. There is no chargeback for Title IV-E funded youth placements.

The Department is making every effort to contain the cost of care for youth placed in State facilities. We are making every effort to keep the chargeback rate as low as possible, including aggressive cost containment; consolidation of administrative functions, cost effective tangible goods contracts and reduction in fixed costs.

Medical costs incurred for individual youth that are over and above routine medical care will continue to be billed directly and are not included in the per diem cost. Routine medical care consists of services such as routine physical exams, dental exams, first aid and over the counter medications for common ailments. Any non-routine medical costs for an individual youth will be billed to the county with Court jurisdiction over the youth resulting in commitment to MDHHS under the Youth Rehabilitation Services Act. This change is in keeping with MCL 803.305(1), which requires that "the county from which the public ward is committed is liable to the state for 50% of the cost of his or her care". Attributing non-routine medical costs to the county of commitment will help lower the daily cost for all youth and assign additional medical costs only to the youth in need of such services.
If you have any questions regarding the chargeback rates, please contact Lawana Jarrett, Juvenile Justice Programs and Technical Assistance Manager, at (517) 335-3489.

Sincerely,

Herman McCall, Executive Director
Children's Services Agency

Attachment
cc: MDHHS Local Office Directors
STATE WARD CHARGEBACK RATE
Calendar Year 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>COST PER CHILD PER DAY</th>
<th>CHARGEBACK RATE NON-TITLE IV-E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shawono</td>
<td>$311.15</td>
<td>$155.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Pines</td>
<td>$301.09</td>
<td>$150.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Family Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Care for state wards placed in private child care institutions and county detention facilities will be charged at one-half the actual amount paid.