

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS



CHAIRPERSON
RYAN SEBOLT

VICE-CHAIRPERSON
CHRIS TRUBAC

VICE-CHAIRPERSON PRO-TEM
RANDY MAIVILLE

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

BOARD LEADERSHIP WILL MEET ON THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2024 AT 6:00 PM IN CONFERENCE ROOM A OF THE HUMAN SERVICES BUILDING, 5303 S. CEDAR, LANSING. A VIRTUAL LINK HAS BEEN PROVIDED FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AT <https://ingham.zoom.us/j/86246962326>.

Agenda

Call to Order
Approval of the [August 21, 2023](#) Minutes
Additions to the Agenda
Limited Public Comment

1. [Millages](#)
2. [Roadways Subcommittee](#)
3. Meeting Room Renovation

Public Comment
Adjournment

A QUORUM OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS WILL BE IN ATTENDANCE

BOARD LEADERSHIP MEETING

August 21, 2023

Draft Minutes

Members Present: Cahill, Celentino (Left at 6:48), Grebner, Johnson (Arrived 6:00), Lawrence (Arrived 6:04), Maiville, Morgan (Arrived 6:23), Pawar, Peña, Polsdofer, Ruest, Schafer, Sebolt, and Trubac.

Members Absent: Tennis.

Others Present: Sheriff Scott Wriggelsworth, Judge Joyce Draganchuk, Gregg Todd, Becky Bennett, Jared Cypher, Michael Townsend, Eric Smith, Madison Hughes, Deanna LaBrenz, and others.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Sebolt at 6:00 p.m. in Conference Room A of the Human Services Building, 5303 S. Cedar Street, Lansing, Michigan. Virtual Public participation was offered via Zoom at <https://ingham.zoom.us/j/89160266022>.

Chairperson Sebolt reminded those present that Board Leadership meetings were a chance for the Board of Commissioners to come together and discuss issues. Chairperson Sebolt further stated that it was an open meeting, but there would be no votes or decisions.

Approval of the May 25, 2023 Minutes

CHAIRPERSON SEBOLT STATED, WITHOUT OBJECTION, THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 25, 2023 BOARD LEADERSHIP MEETING WERE APPROVED. Absent: Commissioners Johnson, Lawrence, Morgan, and Tennis.

Additions to the Agenda

None.

Limited Public Comment

None.

Commissioner Johnson arrived at 6:00 p.m.

1. Review of Controller's Recommended Budget

Gregg Todd, Ingham County Controller, stated they wanted to introduce Eric Smith, Ingham County Finance and Budget Director. Todd further explained Ingham County's budget objective and thanked Michael Townsend, Ingham County Budget Director, and his team for the excellent job on the successful balancing of the 2024 Budget.

Todd stated when Board Leadership last met on May 25, 2023, they were roughly \$4 million short for the 2024 budget. Todd further stated that was after doing a number of practices, including raising property tax and Alan Fox, Ingham County Treasurer, was kind enough to provide \$2.5 million to offset other budget shortfalls.

Todd stated they were projecting about \$2.5 million American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) allowance in revenue replacement, and they were looking at reducing the control books to five to ten percent. Todd further stated once they had received all the departmental budgets, they were almost at a \$6 million deficit.

Todd provided an overview of the 2024 Controller's Recommended Budget. The 2024 Controller's Recommended Budget was provided in the minutes as Attachment A.

Commissioner Lawrence arrived at 6:04 p.m.

Commissioner Celentino asked for clarification on if the Controller's Office's recommendation for equipment and furniture would be \$1.8 million out of the \$2 million requested by the departments.

Todd stated confirmation.

Commissioner Celentino asked what would be included in the Other category.

Townsend stated the Other category was other funding sources from other funds and Millages that were outside of the General Fund (GF). Townsend provided some examples of other funds.

Commissioner Celentino asked if a department could come up with additional funding.

Townsend stated when the departments submitted the Cost Performance Index (CPI) request, they would dictate where they would want the fund to come from and the Budget Department would look at the fund balance to determine if there was enough existing funding. Townsend further stated they would evaluate with the experts; the Facilities Director, Information and Technology (IT), and Purchasing would then rank the projects.

Townsend stated the Budget Department would make decisions based on the ranking from the experts and the fund balance on which projects were to be included.

Commissioner Peña asked if the Public Defender's position requests on page six were covered in the \$103 million Balancing Strategies from page five.

Todd stated they were.

Commissioner Trubac asked if the Environmental Affairs Commission (EAC) would have no funding.

Todd stated confirmation, and stated their understanding was that the funding was for a one-time study, and with the addition of Morgan Feldpausch, Ingham County Environmental Sustainability Manager, a lot of that funding would be added into the Controller's Budget. Todd further stated it did not have to be in that line item.

Commissioner Trubac stated that based on appearances with having a volunteer commission where the members do not receive compensation, a new position had been added, and a change in the budget where the commission no longer had any funding, would not be a good look.

Todd stated they could take a look, but there was also the Z-List they could pull funding from.

Commissioner Ruest asked if the Social Worker position listed on page six would be going into the Public Defender's office.

Todd stated confirmation.

Commissioner Ruest asked what the Placement Trends were with the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) on page eight and what was happening with them.

Townsend stated their budget was based on the number of participants, and if the trend went up, the numbers would also go up.

Commissioner Ruest asked for further clarification regarding if more people came into the DHHS office and were in need of services, which a lot of those services were provided by the State of Michigan, what the cost to the County would be.

Jared Cypher, Ingham County Deputy Controller, stated it was a Childcare Fund match. Cypher further stated placement trends referred to an increased number of kids in foster care and institutional placements.

Commissioner Grebner stated they wanted reassurance that with the Municipal Employees' Retirement System of Michigan (MERS) adjustment, that it would be sustainable into the future.

Todd stated they worried about it year to year, and in March 2024, they would be worrying more. Todd further stated that if the County had gotten into the hole, which had happened previously from the wage scale adjustment mid-budget year in 2022, which affected the years going forward, the County had a robust Property Tax increase in 2023 and for 2024, and that personnel costs through contracts would increase by 2%.

Todd stated they were balancing it out and had good strategies to address the concern.

Commissioner Celentino asked, with the reduction of the EAC funding, if other various Commissions were being funded \$500 and if it also included the EAC.

Townsend confirmed the EAC would receive \$500 in funding.

Discussion on the amount that would be used for various Commissions.

Commissioner Celentino stated they wanted to make sure it would be consistent. Commissioner Celentino further asked if the \$100,000 was supposed to be a one-time up-front cost.

Cypher stated it was residual from conducting an energy audit. Cypher further stated the recommendations from the energy audit were currently being implemented, but when something was added to the budget it would become a part of the base until taken out, and that this was now being taken out for the budget to balance.

Commissioner Celentino asked if the Controller's Office saw anything that might be asked for in the future monetarily.

Cypher stated there may be future projects, but the Sustainability Coordinator position was in the Controller's Office and would be part of the Controller's Office budget. Cypher further stated there was a \$200,000 grant from the State of Michigan to do a sustainability action plan.

Commissioner Morgan arrived at 6:23 p.m.

Commissioner Trubac stated they wanted to follow up on the EAC item, that there might not be an apparent need currently for the line item, but asked if it was funded for \$100,000 for the past two consecutive years.

Cypher stated it had been funded for the past two years and that the energy audit came in cheaper than originally budgeted, so there was residual money left over from the implementation of the recommendations that came from that project. Cypher further stated that Feldpausch had the idea to hold that left-over money for the implementation of recommendations that came from that.

Cypher stated they believed there was still \$64,000 that was being held for recommendations from that project.

Commissioner Trubac stated their concern was the message it was sending to members of that Commission and the public, that there were two years of \$100,000, which then was slashed to \$0, and some might question what the point was of hiring a new person for the Commission. Commissioner Trubac further stated if there was some residual funding left over from a previous year, then they would be happy with that.

Commissioner Pawar asked, regarding the reduction in the Community Mental Health (CMH), by eliminating funding of Community Youth Outreach that was an ARPA funded program on page five, what would happen to the program that was performing youth outreach.

Todd stated the money was used to hire staff, but that it would be up to the CMH to fund that service if they chose to keep it.

Cypher stated even though it was not included within the recommended budget, CMH had been requesting the Mid-State Health Network for funding to help fund the program, and they were still awaiting an answer.

Chairperson Sebolt stated they had gone over the budget with the CMH and their budget amount was currently higher than year over year, so they were still spending more money without accounting for this money.

Chairperson Sebolt further stated this was worked into the budget.

Commissioner Peña asked, regarding the Contingency of \$300,00 and Strategic Planning of \$350,000 on page seven, if there was a percentage that was associated with the \$350,000, or was it an anticipated number.

Todd stated there was not contingency in the project sense of going over funds, but the contingency was for the Commissioners to fund projects that they did not anticipate and there was no percentage to go along with it.

Commissioner Peña asked if it was based on the history of last year.

Todd confirmed.

Commissioner Peña asked what the Contingency and Strategic Planning might entail.

Chairperson Sebolt stated that the Board of Commissioners referred to the Contingency and Strategic Planning as the Z-List. Chairperson Sebolt further explained how the Z-List worked and allowed Commissioners financial leeway to make decisions for the County.

Commissioner Grebner provided an overview of the history of the Z-List.

Commissioner Ruest stated there was no money set aside within the budget, other than attrition, for reclassifications.

Todd confirmed.

Commissioner Grebner stated they now had to budget in the attrition amount and asked if it was the Controller's best estimate. Commissioner Grebner further stated there were many ways to spend attrition money.

Todd stated it was a little bit of both, but it was based on the previous year.

Townsend stated it was \$2.5 million last year, and that it was tracked each year to make sure it would fit in based on the number of open positions taken into consideration.

Commissioner Grebner stated the budget was \$1.5 million and asked if \$1 million was spent for hiring temporary personnel and overtime.

Todd stated confirmation, and to think about how a fully funded personnel budget for a year would never be fully spent, as there was the assumption that there were a certain number of positions that would not be filled for a variety of reasons. Todd further stated that number helped the overall budget, as it helped offset additional items adjustments to the budget.

Commissioner Celentino stated in reference to the County Services Committee meeting on August 15, 2023 about the reclassifications, they had decided any changes would come when the contracts were up and would not be pausing reclassifications in 2024. Commissioner Celentino further asked how the County would pay for the reclassifications.

Todd stated they had no idea what the number would look like at that time as it was almost impossible to budget for, but that they did leave numbers higher than what they thought they would be as it allowed for more flexibility. Todd further stated if other budgets had come in less than projected, it would balance out.

Commissioner Grebner provided a further, in depth explanation of budgeting for reclassifications.

2. Millages –

Todd stated they wanted to list all of the renewal dates so that the Commissioners knew what renewals were coming up, including rate and levy received, as well as the verbiage that was on the ballots for the respective Millages. Todd stated the Health Care Services Millage was not assessed in 2022 or 2023, as there was enough that it did not need to be allocated.

Cypher stated in 2022 year end, there had been an allocation of \$8.8 million, and in 2023 it was projected to be about \$7 million at the end of the year.

Todd stated that the language was restrictive, and that the reason for the fund balance was due to the COVID-19 Pandemic as the Medicaid rules dissipated at a Federal level. Todd further stated it was coming back into place.

Todd stated they knew there was discussion with some Commissioners that the verbiage might be too restrictive, and that it was something to think about going forward. Todd further stated the Elder Persons Millage was looking into doing an allocation.

Todd stated they did not want to speak for the Commissioners, but that everyone should be made aware they were coming up. Todd further stated there were additional Millages coming up in 2024, such as a Housing Trust Fund (HTF) Millage and a possible Millage for a land acquisition for the Ingham Academy, which was dependent on State of Michigan funding so it was not a set-in stone request.

Todd stated there was a Fair Millage being discussed as well.

Commissioner Celentino asked if there were any Millages for 2023.

Todd stated that nothing was due this year.

Chairperson Sebolt stated it depended on when the 2024 Presidential Primary occurred, which was dependent on when Legislature adjourned, as the new date was not given immediate effect. Chairperson Sebolt stated there was a chance the Primary date would come and pass before the law would take effect.

Chairperson Sebolt stated they had been in discussion with Barb Byrum, Ingham County Clerk, and that the Board of Commissioners would need to approve language by sometime in November of 2023 if the Primary would be in February of 2024.

Commissioner Morgan stated they did not believe it would be a good idea to put a Millage renewal on the February Presidential Primary ballot.

Chairperson Sebolt reiterated that would be the soonest they would have to approve the language would be in November if they used the existing date, and that they still had a bit of time. Chairperson Sebolt stated with the Health Services Millage and the Elder Millage, it had taken a few months to work out the language in Committee, and if they would be tweaking the language going into 2024, it should be thought of now to be approved for the ballot.

Commissioner Peña asked why the Justice Millage did not reflect the acquisition of new property.

Todd clarified the difference between the Justice Millage and the Juvenile Justice Millage.

Chairperson Sebolt stated this language had already been voted on and approved.

Commissioner Peña asked if this would then go to voters.

Chairperson Sebolt stated this had already been approved by voters, and that if it was up for renewal, the same language would be submitted or tweaked to reflect the renewal.

Commissioner Trubac clarified if the language was changed, that it was no longer a renewal.

Commissioner Grebner stated they had written many renewals, and that one would be amazed how far one could go. Commissioner Grebner stated the law stated it had to be a clear statement of the question, and that they thought they were correct in saying no court had ever declared any question placed before the voters of Michigan to have not been a fair statement of the question.

Commissioner Grebner stated there was a lot of flexibility with the language that would be provided on the ballot for a Millage renewal. Commissioner Grebner stated County attorneys would provide exactly what was required for the ballot, and then if they were ignored, they could pass a Millage.

Commissioner Morgan asked Commissioner Trubac to recall that they had changed quite a bit of the language for the Health Services Millage to include mental health services amongst other things. Commissioner Morgan further stated they would be updating the language and that it would still be called a renewal.

Chairperson Sebolt stated technically it would be called a reauthorization.

Commissioner Lawrence stated in their experience of dealing with it within the school system, the bigger issue was not letting it lapse, as it was then not able to be levied and would need to go back to the voters.

Commissioner Lawrence further stated that was potentially trickier to navigate than language issues.

Commissioner Schafer asked if they were to do a Health Services Millage renewal and the language was tweaked, it would be kept at the same rate.

Chairperson Sebolt stated it was possible that the rate would be decreased if the fund balance was large and the rate would be a part of that question. Chairperson Sebolt further stated there were a couple of proposals that were upcoming.

Chairperson Sebolt stated there had been conversations that there might be a Fair Millage and that the HTF would like a millage as well. Chairperson Sebolt further stated they were unsure of the exact amount, but that the HTF would be asking for approximately \$3 million.

Chairperson Sebolt stated they had been approached by the City of Lansing and other organizations that were interested in housing, including homelessness and the unhoused, and it could be in the same fund as the HTF Millage, but that it would allow for the construction of housing and placement of unhoused individuals to supplement current shelters. Chairperson Sebolt stated this would further open up additional space for unhoused families, as that was a big need.

Chairperson Sebolt stated the HTF would take as much as they could get, and any additional would be helpful. Chairperson Sebolt stated if they were to move forward with adding another millage or tweaking the Health Services Millage to expand mental health spending would go a long way to make people's lives better in the County.

Chairperson Sebolt stated this potential renewal or reauthorization would take place before the next calendar year.

Commissioner Cahill left at 6:48 p.m.

3. Long Term Ingham County Justice System

Scott Wriggelsworth, Ingham County Sheriff, stated they were happy to set the stage as they were the first person to bring this issue to light and they appreciated being given the time to be in front of the Board of Commissioners.

Commissioner Johnson left at 6:48 p.m.

Commissioner Cahill returned at 6:48 p.m.

Commissioner Celentino left at 6:48 p.m.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated the jail currently had the capacity to house 429 inmates, and when there was a Justice Millage set into place in 2018, there was no interest in going to the County to build a bigger jail. Sheriff Wriggelsworth further stated, at the time, they were a 444 bed jail but were more accurately around 400 beds between male and female inmates.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated as 2022 ended and they were getting to move into a new facility, the County had received a grant to open up the Annex in September of 2022 to catch up from the COVID-19 Pandemic holdover. Sheriff Wriggelsworth further stated that while they were getting ready to lose a General Trial Judge when the Honorable Clinton Canady, former Ingham County Circuit Court judge, retired and the Honorable Morgan Cole, Ingham County Circuit Court judge, transferred to the Family Division.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated, as of August 21, 2023, there were three General Trial judges that performed in-Custody Trials, one visiting judge in the Annex that only performed non in-custody hearings and trials, and on January 3, 2023, they had lost about a quarter of the docket, which were Sheriff Wriggelsworth's words and might not be the Honorable Joyce Draganchuk's, Ingham County Chief Circuit Court Judge, words. Sheriff

Wrigglesworth further stated they had three different Circuit Court locations operating in Ingham County at the Veterans Memorial Courthouse (VMC), the Annex and the Civil docket in Mason.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated it was their opinion, that it was ineffective when it came to operations due to the number of locations for the Circuit Court. Sheriff Wriggelsworth further stated between the Courts, Prosecutor's Office, Public Defender's system, and private attorneys which varied in effectiveness, it landed in their lap every day with respect to housing in-custody, pretrial inmates.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated when they had started to creep into 2023 after losing the General Trial judge, they had started to track the effectiveness, and they noticed that the inmate population had started to grow exponentially. Sheriff Wriggelsworth further stated they were at 348 inmates at the beginning of January of 2023, and continued to experience a steady increase to 397 by May of 2023.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated they had several meetings with the Court, Judge Draganchuk, and the Prosecutor's Office about this issue and that four months after moving facilities, the inmate population was at 397, with the maximum capacity being 417 inmates. Sheriff Wriggelsworth further stated they had then talked about losing a judge and moving cases faster.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated the population was as high as 408 inmates in 2023, and the maximum capacity was 417 inmates when the jail was built, but would grow to a maximum of 429 inmates when a new dorm had been built. Sheriff Wriggelsworth further stated they had been in constant contact with Judge Draganchuk and the Prosecutor's Office about case movement, and Sheriff Wriggelsworth had been tracking data regarding inmate population and how long people were in jail predisposition until their case had been disposed of.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated it might take six to eight weeks before an inmate went before a judge for sentencing and predisposition, which meant their case had been completed. Sheriff Wriggelsworth further stated 193 days was the average time one might spend in jail in pretrial, in respect to Circuit Court cases.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth provided an explanation as to the formula they had used to figure out this number, but that this was not a scientific conclusion.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated in early March, they were at 25 inmates that had been in the Ingham County Jail over one year pretrial, 10 inmates that had been in jail for two years, and three inmates that had been in jail for up to 1,000 days predisposition. Sheriff Wriggelsworth further quoted the numbers within the following months as referenced by their provided notes, which were provided in the minutes as Attachment B.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated the other interesting number that was out of whack from previous years was that 80% of inmates were Pretrial, awaiting adjudication, and in custody in the jail to the 20% that had been sentenced. Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated they had seen some good movement within the last month or so, and they went from 195 days as the average length of stay down to 180 average days for the year, which was about a 6 month stay.

Commissioner Johnson returned at 6:54 p.m.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated the jail population on August 21, 2023 was at 360, and to go from 408 to 360 was huge for them, as it showed that cases were moving quicker through the court system. Sheriff Wriggelsworth further asked what the long term options were.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated the Annex that was being funded by a grant for the next three years, which was being staffed by overtime Sheriff's Officers each day. Sheriff Wriggelsworth further stated that if the Annex was to be purchased, there would be a court room in existence there, but would need to be funded and staffed accordingly.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated they believed State Court Administrative Office (SCAO) was to provide an analysis of courts around Michigan in 2024. Sheriff Wriggelsworth further stated the Legislature would then decide which counties would receive an additional judge and supporting staff, which SCAO would fund.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated that if the Annex went away, there was no longer any funding through the grant, and they did not get an additional judge, then there would be three General Trial judges hearing felony cases in Ingham County, with a population of almost 300,000. Sheriff Wriggelsworth further stated it would almost surely increase the jail population exponentially and would reach capacity relatively quickly.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated the grant was to aid in court-related backup from the COVID-19 Pandemic, but was then followed up by losing a judge. Sheriff Wriggelsworth further stated if SCAO provided their analysis, Ingham County would not have anywhere to put the additional judge.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated they were unsure where this judge would go as of right now, as there was no physical space when the grant for the Annex expired. Sheriff Wriggelsworth further stated they had met with Granger Construction and were provided with rough numbers in regards to the cost of building out of or inside of the Annex, with building out being the preferred option.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated the Mason Historical Courthouse was not an option as it was a historical Courthouse and would be even more costly. Sheriff Wriggelsworth further stated another option would be to build inside the VMC, as they already had the proper facilities and staff available, but that it would be complicated and costly.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated other options they would suggest would be to have a non-General Trial judge temporarily move into the Annex for 18 months and have the visiting judge move into VMC to hear in-custody trials, potentially move a judge back to General Trial, or have a judge with a split docket. Sheriff Wriggelsworth further stated, with the 360 inmates as of August 21, 2023, and the movement seen in the courts where the cases were starting to decline, it was Sheriff Wriggelsworth's suggestion that maybe three months down the road, there should be a plan on paper and they would come in front of the Board of Commissioners to discuss the matter with them.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated they had been discussing the matter with Scott LeRoy, Ingham County Circuit Court Administrator, and Sheriff Wriggelsworth thought the court predicted that there would be more Circuit Court cases than what would be adjudicated out, and they would have more people going into the system than coming out. Sheriff Wriggelsworth further stated the last option would be to do nothing, which was not a good option.

Commissioner Ruest left at 7:01 p.m.

Judge Draganchuk stated they did not dispute much of what Sheriff Wriggelsworth had said, and that everyone should be concerned about the jail population, and others should be brought into the conversation to analyze what was needed to do in order to control the jail population. Judge Draganchuk further stated some of it was their fault, as when Judge Canady's seat had been converted to a Family Division docket without properly discussing with stakeholders how and why it should be done and without transparency, which Judge Draganchuk apologized for.

Judge Draganchuk stated in retrospect, it would impact the population going forward to address the existing backlog and they were open to tweaking it. Judge Draganchuk further stated that they wanted to discuss why the decision was made and how the 30th Circuit Court had addressed the issues.

Commissioner Ruest returned at 7:03 p.m.

Judge Draganchuk stated anytime the Court needed support, it had received support and further apologized to the stakeholders as well. Judge Draganchuk further stated the 2022 SCAO docket analysis provided a range of judge needs and in the felony case load, the Circuit Court needed 1.4 to 2.87 judges.

Judge Draganchuk stated the Circuit Court needed 3.12 to 3.84 judges to handle the Family Division caseload. Judge Draganchuk further stated with three General Trial Division judges doing Criminal cases, they lacked the number of judges needed for the caseload.

Judge Draganchuk stated no judge had only one caseload assignment and all of them have many different types of dockets they are responsible for. Judge Draganchuk further stated looking at the provided chart, it would appear that SCAO had decided the County needed 10 to 14 judges, and they currently had nine.

Judge Draganchuk stated at the beginning of the year when Judge Draganchuk became Chief Judge, they had started to discuss rebalancing cases so there was a more even distribution of caseload. Judge Draganchuk further stated one judge was taking on the workload of two and a half judges, which was not fair, overburdened the judges, and was not serving the citizens.

Judge Draganchuk stated they had worked with SCAO to come up with different proposals before selecting which would be the best option; however, that option was never completely balanced close enough for their liking.

Judge Draganchuk further stated the final decision was to turn Judge Canady's seat that Judge Cole had taken post-election, to a Family Division seat.

Judge Draganchuk stated the judges were still overloaded, but more equally so that they were better able to serve citizens. Judge Draganchuk further stated that even though this was more balanced, they still were in need of an additional judge.

Judge Draganchuk explained how each judge's docket was split upon the departure of Judge Canady. Judge Draganchuk further stated, upon the completion of some of Judge Canady's docket, there were a total of six people sitting in jail ready to go to trial.

Judge Draganchuk stated the question was that if it did not impact the current jail population, but if this change it would impact the jail population going forward to have done away with a Criminal docket. Judge Draganchuk further stated before rebalancing, there would be about 1,000 new arraignments each year, which meant that every week, the Honorable Rosemarie Aquilina, Ingham County 30th Circuit Court Judge, was receiving twice the amount of arraignments than the Honorable James Jamo, Ingham County 30th Circuit Court Judge, Judge Canady, and Judge Draganchuk had received.

Judge Draganchuk stated this meant that Judge Aquilina would receive 400 new cases each year, and the rest would receive 200 each year. Judge Draganchuk further detailed how it was not sustainable and would create a backlog to take on 400 cases per year, but that it was sustainable to take on 200 cases per year.

Judge Draganchuk stated after the rebalancing of cases, Judge Aquilina was no longer drowning in cases. Judge Draganchuk further questioned if it would be sustainable over an entire year.

Judge Draganchuk stated they were open to tweaking the plan or creating another docket that handled criminal cases, but that it was not out of the question that someone could remain even. Judge Draganchuk further stated that they had to push back on the notion that this docket change would create a worse backlog, but that it was not the case.

Judge Draganchuk stated the next thing to discuss was what had been done to reduce the existing backlog that had existed after COVID-19 and with Jury Trials reopening. Judge Draganchuk further stated they had discovered a human error which had started on January 1, 2023, that resulted in Judge Jamo drawing all the Civil cases but not Business Court.

Judge Draganchuk stated it was taking away from criminal jury time and that it was a mistake as the Honorable Wanda Stokes, Ingham County 30th Circuit Court Judge, should have been drawing Civil cases as well, which was not happening. Judge Draganchuk further stated in order to rectify, they had to discuss different solutions, one of which would be to fix the apportionment problem and let it fix itself going forward, but that would take too long to correct itself.

Judge Draganchuk stated the Honorable Richard J. Garcia, Ingham County Probate Court Judge, volunteered to take a huge chunk of Civil cases from Judge Jamo that were assigned in error to allow Judge Jamo some relief and more of an ability to devote time to his Criminal docket. Judge Draganchuk further stated they had instituted a Virtual Visiting Judge Program, which was a SCAO Grant, and that the virtual judge had already held 22 proceedings that were taking away from their need to do those cases and left others more time to proceed with other cases.

Commissioner Grebner left at 7:17 p.m.

Judge Draganchuk stated the Visiting Judge program at the Annex had started in September of 2022, and they had already completed 13 Jury Trials in less than a year and had disposed of 65 cases. Judge Draganchuk further stated that the virtual judge was like having another Criminal docket, even if they were unable to do Custody, it had still helped with their backlog.

Judge Draganchuk stated from June of 2021, when the Supreme Court gave the go-ahead to do jury trials again after the COVID-19 Pandemic, they had completed 90 Jury Trials during that time. Judge Draganchuk further asked how the conversation would continue to ensure there was not a jail population problem going forward.

Commissioner Grebner returned at 7:19 p.m.

Judge Draganchuk stated they were receiving a bed allocation report each week, which broke down who was in jail for every judge within the County, which broke down further into two categories; one of which was sentenced people. Judge Draganchuk further stated that Ingham County judges had done a wonderful job of exploring other options outside of imprisonment, they had worked double and triple time to ensure that only the people who needed to be in jail were there, and those who were there now were there due to safety concerns for the community.

Judge Draganchuk stated the other category was people who were awaiting trial, which was a population of people that needed to be broken down into further categories. Judge Draganchuk further stated they did not include those who had already pled guilty and were awaiting sentencing as their cases had already been disposed of in the backlog problem.

Judge Draganchuk stated a sentencing trial would be a 20 to 30 minute proceeding, depending on various factors.

Commissioner Morgan left at 7:21 p.m.

Judge Draganchuk stated then there were probation violation bench warrants, in which the court rules required that when a warrant was issued for violation, the person would be arraigned promptly. Judge Draganchuk further stated that they had worked for Ingham County for 35 years, and that the word promptly was interpreted as the next motion day for Circuit Court judges.

Judge Draganchuk detailed how someone was added to a docket under this interpretation. Judge Draganchuk further stated those people did not sit in jail for a long time, and that they were quick turnovers.

Judge Draganchuk stated if someone had requested a contested hearing, those people would have to be set up for a trial within two weeks, otherwise they had to be given bond and released from the jail. Judge Draganchuk further stated the probation violations were a part of the group that was awaiting trial, but they were not long-term.

Judge Draganchuk stated that when the Defense Attorney petitioned someone for a need for an evaluation for competency, all proceedings had to stop in order for competency to be established. Judge Draganchuk further stated those who were found incompetent to stand trial and were awaiting treatment at the Center for Forensic Psychology could be waiting several months before a placement and the trial could not proceed until treatment.

Judge Draganchuk stated that this accounted for at least one person on each judge's docket and if there were two people from each judge's docket in this category, that would be six people sitting in jail waiting for placement to a Specialty Court. Judge Draganchuk further stated that we should be worried about that and discussing the matter as to how to get someone into a Specialty Court faster.

Judge Draganchuk stated another reason was that inmates stayed from further proceedings pending interlocutory review by the Michigan Court of Appeals. Judge Draganchuk further stated that if a ruling was made on the admissibility of evidence, but the defendant or the Prosecutor filed an interlocutory application with the Court of Appeals to reverse the decision, they must stay proceedings, pending the resolution of that application, unless there was a finding that proved the evidence was clearly cumulative, or that it could be found that the appeal was frivolous due to the legal precedent was clearly against the party's position.

Commissioner Morgan returned at 7:25 p.m.

Judge Draganchuk stated what would happen would be that there was a ruling on the admissibility of evidence, which Judge Draganchuk thought was a delay tactic, that the Defense Attorney filed the Interlocutory Appeal while the person sat in jail. Judge Draganchuk further provided an example within their own experience with Defense Attorney filing an interlocutory appeal.

Judge Draganchuk stated a list of reasons why there might be a backlog, in points one through five of their presentation. The reasons were provided in the minutes as Attachment C.

Judge Draganchuk stated that attorney unavailability was a major problem that kept people in jail for too long, as they had decided to keep from September of 2023 to mid-December of 2023 open for in-custody jury trials, but that the Vertical Prosecutor in the Prosecutor's Office that would handle Judge Draganchuk's cases could not be in multiple places at once. Judge Draganchuk further stated that the grant-funded Prosecutor, who was the sole prosecutor on domestic violence trials, was unavailable as they were busy with other trials or personal reasons.

Judge Draganchuk stated they had all finally been set, but that there was little confidence that they would be going through due to the conflicts with other judges, but that the proposal was that the Prosecutor and Public Defender's Office were included in this conversation, as one person could not have such a heavy caseload. Judge Draganchuk further stated there should be a backup prosecutor that worked with that specialized prosecutor, so more cases could be completed.

Judge Draganchuk stated this same situation was happening with the grant funded Domestic Violence Prosecutor with the same judge. Judge Draganchuk further stated they told the Prosecutor to send someone else in the office to cover for the trial, as even though it was a grant funded position, someone else could try the case.

Judge Draganchuk stated sometimes people did not know they were a part of the issue until the conversation had been started. Judge Draganchuk continued their overview of the list of reasons why a person might be awaiting trial.

Judge Draganchuk stated if the transcript from the preliminary examination was not available, then one could not go to trial, as the defense attorney had to be able to impeach the witness from the preliminary examination transcript, and that if it was not prepared, a witness was inadequately impeached, ineffective assistance of counsel would be reversed on appeal. Judge Draganchuk further stated if a victim did not show up, the testimony would need to be read from the transcript in order to proceed to trial.

Judge Draganchuk stated they spoke with the 54-A District Court, as they were the prime offender, in regards to a case Judge Draganchuk would be pushed to adjourn due to the transcripts not being prepared. Judge Draganchuk further stated they had spoken with the Chief Judge and had come to an agreement of 100 days, but that Judge Draganchuk's trial was way beyond 100 days.

Judge Draganchuk stated that they understood that the 54-A District Court had a lot of preliminary trials and had problems, but that all the time was getting used up doing the preliminary trials and there was no time to prepare the transcripts, which was part of the problem. Judge Draganchuk further stated there was a delay in getting the pre-sentencing reports of seven to eight weeks, but that after the last time they had spoken with the Board of Commissioners, the Probation Department could now deliver presentencing reports within four to five weeks.

Judge Draganchuk stated this was great, but that they did not have a time slot because they could only do so many sentencing hearings on Monday. Judge Draganchuk further stated they could only set 17 to 18 hearings and that was the limit, and that if they did not have a timeslot available within those four to five weeks, they would not be available to take advantage of the shorter time period.

Judge Draganchuk continued the overview on the list of reasons why a person might be awaiting trial.

Judge Draganchuk stated they found over the years that judges were not complying with the court rule regarding probation violations and contested hearings and would keep individuals in jail for too long waiting to be arraigned. Judge Draganchuk further stated this was a judge problem that they needed to deal with.

Judge Draganchuk expressed their frustration with being told a person that was sitting in jail would be going to Mental Health Court, but that the person would be sitting in jail for months on end. Judge Draganchuk further stated the reason why the County offered Mental Health Court was to offer people the services and treatment they needed and to not have them sit in jail.

Judge Draganchuk provided examples of reasons why people were not going to Specialty Court, which was also provided in the handout. Judge Draganchuk further stated that all of the people who provided these excuses needed to be included in the conversation so they could receive encouragement to fix the delays.

Judge Draganchuk continued the overview on the list of reasons why a person might be awaiting trial. Judge Draganchuk further stated the Court of Appeals could have a fast track for interlocutory appeal, they should be more careful about the cases they take, or should change the Court Rule to make it easier for the Trial Court to assess the merits of the appeal.

Judge Draganchuk stated that if someone was found incompetent to stand trial, and they were deemed to need treatment where they could regain competency, they would sit in jail while they waited for a bed in the facility. Judge Draganchuk further stated the law said they must be treated and returned to competency within 15 months to stand trial, but they often sat in jail for 14 months, which meant they only had one month to receive treatment.

Judge Draganchuk stated that was a breakdown of what some of the issues were, and that it was not as simple as it being a single problem of inmates awaiting trial.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated Judge Draganchuk referred to their fourth bullet point of effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the system had a cumulative effect on the Sheriff and the Sheriff's Office every day. Sheriff Wriggelsworth further stated that these people were there every single day, 24 hours a day, seven days a week until things got fixed that needed to be fixed, and that one of the fixes would be to have another Judge long term to help with the dockets.

Commissioner Polsdofer asked if the County had to wait for SCAO to issue their findings, given the data and the fact that both chairs of the Appropriations Committees in the Legislature lived within 15 miles of the Human Services Building, if the Legislature this fall could decide to fund an additional Judge and move forward.

Judge Draganchuk stated they believed so, and that they believed Muskegon and Ottawa County had done so in 2022, as there was no set time frame. Judge Draganchuk further stated that Sheriff Wriggelsworth was referring to the SCAO time study, in which all of the judges filled out timecards accounting for what was being done every minute, but that the Board of Commissioners did not need to wait for that.

Judge Draganchuk stated they had sat next to the Muskegon County Judge at a conference and they had proceeded ahead without waiting for the SCAO time study and they had obtained another judicial position, but that it would have to go to the Legislature.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated they would not have anywhere to put the additional judge.

Judge Draganchuk stated disagreement, and that they would be running out of funding for the visiting judge, and that the new judge could go into the Annex once they were done.

Commissioner Lawrence asked if there was another judge to handle a Criminal docket, could a Probate docket be heard in the Mason Historical Courthouse or in the Annex so the Criminal docket occurred in VMC, which was already equipped to handle the docket.

Judge Draganchuk confirmed and that everything was hypothetical at that point, but that it was possible to have a Probate Judge in Mason, as it would free up the Honorable Morgan Cole, Ingham County 30th Circuit Court Judge, to do the Family Court docket on the second floor, and then there would be an open courtroom on the third floor that could handle Criminal cases.

Commissioner Lawrence stated there was space to have some things shifted around and out in the Annex.

Judge Draganchuk stated confirmation, and that it could potentially happen without an additional judge or the visiting judge.

Commissioner Lawrence asked if Criminal cases could be reassigned to a fourth judge.

Judge Draganchuk stated confirmation.

Commissioner Lawrence asked what would happen if the jail was at capacity.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated there was a Jail Population Management Plan and there was a list of the pecking order of who would be released early, and generally the District Court would take a hit, as the first ones to leave would be the Friend of the Court (FOC) cases. Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated no one was in jail for FOC cases at this present time, so they would then proceed down the pecking order until they were back at their population capacity.

Judge Draganchuk stated it used to happen all the time.

Commissioner Grebner stated there had not been overcrowding within the last five to 10 years.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated there had been no overcrowding since 2017.

Commissioner Grebner stated overcrowding used to be chronic and it caused all sorts of inefficiencies. Commissioner Grebner further stated overcrowding happens and would mean any sentence one might get was discounted a little bit.

Commissioner Grebner stated they had grave doubts about the SCAO analysis of judicial requirements and grave doubts about the general need for an additional judge, but that it would be discussed in committees.

Judge Draganchuk stated it was not a slam dunk.

Commissioner Polsdofer asked if there was a rough timeline for when the potential changes might occur to VMC.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated the changes to infrastructure was just an idea, but it was two to three times the cost of building out the Annex, as well as a question of reorganizing staff and departments. Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated they did not have any information on that at this time.

Commissioner Polsdofer asked if an additional judge was to be added, that would affect the need to adjust the budget for the Prosecutor's Office for more attorneys.

Judge Draganchuk stated they were unsure.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated they believed the State of Michigan funded the cost of the judge and Judicial Assistant.

Judge Draganchuk stated the State of Michigan funded the judge but not the Judicial Assistant, and the rest of the funding was up to the County, but as far as it impacted the Prosecutor's staffing needs, only the Prosecutor could answer.

Commissioner Cahill stated when people were arrested and they went to Specialty Court, that they might lose everything while they were sitting in jail, and that it had many implications.

Judge Draganchuk agreed that it was annoying and sad as well as a contradiction with what the courts were trying to do for someone with mental illness or addiction if that person was sitting in jail. Judge Draganchuk further stated that was why more people needed to be included on the conversation in order to address the situation.

Judge Draganchuk stated that those who were in jail were not in jail for being mentally ill or for substance abuse, that they had done something serious enough to be keep them in jail on the bond that had been set and they could not make. Judge Draganchuk further stated that treatment was wanted as soon as possible for those people.

Commissioner Schafer stated they understood there was potential for a new Specialty Gun Court, and asked if that would that be positive or negative for judges.

Judge Draganchuk stated that it was a good question, and that Judge Aquilina was making plans for a Juvenile Gun Court, which was limited to juvenile offenders who had committed nonviolent weapons offences. Judge Draganchuk further stated it had needed approval by the SCAO, but that they needed more information and the plans were currently at a stand-still.

Judge Draganchuk stated if Commissioner Schafer looked back on the judicial workload before and after balancing, they had taken away Judge Aquilina's double docket, and she also had no other assignments. Judge Draganchuk further stated there was a dual obligation to make sure they were not only addressing the community and jail concerns, but that caseloads were balanced as well.

Judge Draganchuk stated there had been a compromise as Judge Aquilina wanted a Juvenile Gun Court, so her caseload would be at a higher level after rebalancing, but still much below the other judges with a Civil docket. Judge Draganchuk further stated that it would allow Judge Aquilina to do what she wanted to do with the Gun Court and to serve the community.

Judge Draganchuk applauded Judge Aquilina for having the idea for this and wanting to do it. Judge Draganchuk further stated it helped to balance things out on the low end.

Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated the Juvenile Gun Court would take up some of Judge Aquilina's General Trial In-Custody docket time to do so.

Judge Draganchuk stated Judge Aquilina had set aside two hours, once a week.

Chairperson Sebolt stated from their perspective, the rearranging of VMC would be the preferable solution to building out any additional infrastructure, since that was already designed to do such things. Chairperson Sebolt further thanked Judge Draganchuk and Sheriff Wriggelsworth for the information.

Public Comment

Chairperson Sebolt stated they wanted to remind the Commissioners they would be taking a group photo at 5:45 p.m. at the Mason Courthouse tomorrow, and that they authorized Director Bennett to change all of their County passwords if they were not ready at that time.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:54 p.m.

Millages

Renewal Dates:

2024 – Health Services, Elder Persons

2026 – Trails and Parks, Potter Park Zoo, Public Transportation

2028 – Farmland & Open Space

2030 – Animal Control, Juvenile Justice, 911

2038 – Justice

| MILLAGE | Rate | Levy |
|---------------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| General Fund Operating | 6.7479 | \$64,597,052 |
| Indigent Veterans Support | 0.0328 | \$314,319 |
| 911 System | 0.8483 | \$7,661,968 |
| Transportation (CATA) | 0.5988 | \$5,408,448 |
| Elder Person | 0.2994 | \$2,704,224 |
| Juvenile Justice | 0.6000 | \$5,419,286 |
| Potter Park Zoo | 0.4986 | \$4,503,427 |
| Farmland/Open Space | 0.1395 | \$1,260,168 |
| Health Care Service | 0.0000 | \$0 |
| Trails and Parks | 0.4986 | \$4,503,434 |
| Animal Shelter | 0.2000 | \$1,806,429 |
| Justice Millage | <u>0.8476</u> | <u>\$7,655,658</u> |
| TOTAL | 11.3116 | \$105,834,413 |

Animal Control Renewal (2022-2029) - For the sole purpose of maintaining funding support for county animal control program services and operations, including equipping, financing, and operation of the county animal shelter and animal control program services, which will replace an expired millage of 0.24 mills that included the construction of a new animal shelter, shall the Constitutional limitation upon the total amount of taxes which may be assessed in one (1) year upon all property within the County of Ingham, Michigan be increased by up to 20/100 (0.20) of one (1) mill, \$0.20 per thousand dollars of state taxable valuation, for a period of eight (8) years (2022-2029) inclusive? If approved and levied in full, this millage will raise an estimated \$1,685,500 in the first calendar year of the levy, based on state taxable valuation.

Juvenile Justice Renewal (2022-2029) - For the purpose of funding the continuing operation and enhancement of Ingham County's capacity to detain and house juveniles who are delinquent or disturbed, and to operate new and existing programs for the treatment of such juveniles, at the same millage level previously approved by the voters in 2002, 2006, 2012 and in 2016 shall the constitutional limitation upon the total amount of taxes which may be assessed in one (1) year upon all property within the County of Ingham, Michigan, be renewed at 0.5983 of one (1) mill, and shall the previously authorized reduced millage of 0.0017 of one (1) mill be restored, for a return to the previously voted total limitation increase of up to 0.6000 of one (1) mill (\$0.6000 per \$1,000 of taxable value) for a period of eight (8) years, 2022 through 2029, inclusive? If approved and levied in full, this millage will raise an estimated \$5,057,350 for juvenile housing and programming purposes in the first calendar year of the levy based on taxable value.

Elder Persons (2020-2023) - For the purpose of authorizing funding to eliminate wait lists and expanding critical services such as in-home care, meals on wheels and crisis services to support the growing population of persons age sixty (60) and older residing in Ingham County, shall the Constitutional limitation upon the total amount of taxes which may be assessed in one (1) year upon all property within the County of Ingham, Michigan be increased by up to 30/100 (0.3000) of one (1) mill, \$0.30 per thousand dollars of state taxable valuation, for a period of four (4) years (2020-2023) inclusive? If approved and levied in full, this Millage will raise an estimated \$2,304,866 in the first calendar year of the levy, based on state taxable valuation.

911 Renewal (2020-2029) - For the purpose of renewing funding for a comprehensive countywide 911 Emergency Telephone and Dispatch System at the same millage level previously approved by the voters in 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012 and in 2016, shall the Constitutional limitation upon the total amount of taxes which may be assessed in one (1) year upon all property within the County of Ingham, Michigan, previously increased by up to 0.8500 mills, \$0.85 per \$1,000 of taxable value, be continued and renewed for a period of ten (10) years (2020-2029) inclusive? If approved and levied in full, this millage will raise an estimated \$6,530,454 for the countywide 911 Emergency Telephone and Dispatch System in the first calendar year of the levy based on taxable value.

Justice Millage (2018-2037) - For the purpose of constructing, equipping, and financing a new combined justice complex facility and expanding correctional programming, to include a new county jail, Sheriff's department offices, and court facilities, which would replace the existing facilities and will be safer for the public, staff and inmates, and allow for more efficient operations; and including programming for the treatment of substance addictions, treatment of mental illness, and reduction of re-incarceration among arrested persons, shall the Constitutional limitation upon the total amount of taxes which may be assessed in one (1) year upon all property within the County of Ingham, Michigan be increased by up to 85/100 (0.8500) of one (1) mill, \$0.85 per thousand dollars of state taxable valuation, for a period of twenty (20) years (2018-2037) inclusive? If approved and levied in full, this Millage will raise an estimated \$6,207,147 in the first calendar year of the levy, based on state taxable valuation.

Public Transportation Millage Renewal (2021-2026) - For the purpose of renewing funding at the same millage level previously approved by the voters in 2016 for a transportation system to be used primarily by elderly and disabled persons in Ingham County, shall the constitutional limitation upon the total amount of taxes which may be assessed in one (1) year upon all property within the County of Ingham, Michigan, previously increased by up to 0.6000 mills, \$0.60 per \$1,000 of taxable value, be continued and renewed for a period of six (6) years (2021-2026) inclusive? If approved and levied in full, this Millage will raise an estimated additional \$4,609,732 for the transportation system in the first calendar year of the levy based on state taxable valuation.

Potter Park Zoo Renewal (2021-2026) - For the purpose of reauthorizing funding for the operation of the Potter Park Zoo and Potter Park, including funding for operations, maintenance, and improvements, shall the Constitutional limitation upon the total amount of taxes which may be assessed in one (1) year upon all property within the County of Ingham, Michigan be increased by up to 50/100 (0.5000) of one (1) mill, \$0.50 per thousand dollars of state taxable valuation, for a period of six (6) years (2021-2026) inclusive? If approved and levied in full, this Millage will raise an estimated \$3,841,444 in the first calendar year of the levy, based on state taxable valuation.

Trails and Parks Renewal (2020-2025) - For the purpose of renewing funding at the same millage level previously approved by the voters in 2014 for the creation and maintenance of a countywide system of recreational trails and adjacent parks, which may incorporate trails or parks created by local units of government, including Lansing's River Trail, and may acquire rights of way to connect and extend existing trails, shall the Constitutional limitation upon the total amount of taxes which may be assessed in one (1) year upon all property within the County of Ingham, Michigan, previously increased by up to 0.5000 mills, \$0.50 per \$1,000 of taxable value, be continued and renewed for a period of six (6) years (2020-2025) inclusive? If approved and levied in full, this millage will raise an estimated \$3,841,444.00 for the system of recreational trails and adjacent parks in the first calendar year of the levy based on taxable valuation.

Health Services Millage Renewal (2020-2023) - For the purpose of reauthorizing funding for providing basic health care and mental health services to low-income Ingham County residents who are not eligible for Medicaid under the Federal Affordable Care Act, and who do not have medical insurance, including use of these funds to help pay for access to doctor visits, generic medications, mental health services and essential care such as preventive testing and treatment for cancer, diabetes, heart disease and other serious illnesses, shall the Constitutional limitation upon the total amount of taxes which may be assessed in one (1) year upon all property within the County of Ingham, Michigan be increased by up to 63/100 (0.6300) of one (1) mill, \$0.63 per thousand dollars of state taxable valuation, for a period of four (4) years (2020-2023) inclusive? If approved and levied in full, this Millage will raise an estimated \$4,840,219 in the first calendar year of the levy, based on state taxable valuation.

Farmland and Open Space (2018-2027) - For the purpose of protecting farmland and other open space lands, including waterways, wildlife habitat, wetlands, and other natural lands, and to encourage urban development, at the same millage level previously approved by the voters in 2008, shall the constitutional limitation upon the total amount of taxes which may be assessed in one (1) year upon all property within the County of Ingham, Michigan, previously increased by up to 14/100 (0.1400 of one mill, \$0.14 per thousand dollars of state taxable valuation, be continued and renewed for a period of ten (10) years (2018-2027) inclusive? (If approved and levied in full, this Millage will raise an estimated additional \$1,036,059 for farmland and open space preservation in the first calendar year of the levy based on state taxable valuation.)

Introduced by the County Services Committee of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION RE-ESTABLISHING A ROADWAYS SUBCOMMITTEE

RESOLUTION #24 –

WHEREAS, Resolution #19-078 established a Roadways Subcommittee which was later dissolved per Resolution #20-006; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Road Department has an annual budget expenditure of over \$38 million and maintain approximately 1,250 miles of roads and 68 bridges within the County; and

WHEREAS, to better serve the residents of Ingham County, the Board of Commissioners would like to re-establish a permanent Roadways Subcommittee, to closely review road projects, funding and potential road issues or concerns within the Road Department service area; and

WHEREAS, the Roadways Subcommittee, will be a subcommittee of the County Services Committee and shall be appointed on an annual basis; and

WHEREAS, the Roadways Subcommittee will meet as needed and will forward their recommendations to the County Services Committee.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby re-establishes a Roadways Subcommittee consisting of up to 5 members of the County Services Committee.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that additional, County Commissioners may be appointed to the Roadways Subcommittee as non-voting members.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that appointments to the Roadways Subcommittee shall be made annually.

COUNTY SERVICES: Yeas: Peña, Celentino, Grebner, Sebolt, Pawar, Ruest, Schafer
Nays: None **Absent:** None **Approved 01/16/2024**