

CHAIRPERSON
RYAN SEBOLT

VICE-CHAIRPERSON
CHRIS TRUBAC

VICE-CHAIRPERSON PRO-TEM
RANDY MAIVILLE

LAW & COURTS COMMITTEE
MARK POLSDOFER, CHAIR
GABRIELLE LAWRENCE
VICTOR CELENTINO
CHRIS TRUBAC
IRENE CAHILL
MYLES JOHNSON
RANDY MAIVILLE
MONICA SCHAFER

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
P.O. Box 319, Mason, Michigan 48854 Telephone (517) 676-7200 Fax (517) 676-7264

THE LAW & COURTS COMMITTEE WILL MEET ON THURSDAY, MAY 2, 2024 AT 6:00 P.M., IN CONFERENCE ROOM A, HUMAN SERVICES BUILDING, 5303 S. CEDAR, LANSING AND VIRTUALLY AT <https://ingham.zoom.us/j/81848426836>.

Agenda

Call to Order

Approval of the [April 18, 2024 Minutes](#)

Additions to the Agenda

Limited Public Comment

1. Sheriff's Office
 - a. Resolution to Allow the Ingham County Sheriff's Office to [Purchase Glock Handguns, Sights, and Accessories](#)
 - b. Resolution to Allow the Ingham County Sheriff's Office to [Purchase Six Radar Systems](#)
2. 55th District Court
 - a. Resolution to Authorize an Agreement with [Averhealth for Substance Use Testing](#) Services for the 55th District Court Mental Health Court and Sobriety Court for Fiscal Year 2024
 - b. Resolution to Authorize the [Reorganization](#) of the 55th District Court
3. Circuit Court – Resolution Recognizing the Ingham County [Specialty Court Coalition](#)
4. Circuit Court – Juvenile Division – Youth Center Security (*Presentation*)
5. Homeland Security and Emergency Management – Resolution to Authorize an Equipment Purchase Agreement with [TruckVault Inc.](#) for a Mobile Command Center Equipment Containment System
6. Facilities Department – Resolution to Authorize a Lease Agreement with [Vlahakis Family Limited Partnership](#) for the Public Defender's Office Space
7. 9-1-1 Dispatch Center – Resolution to Authorize the Renewal of a Contract for [Pre-Employment Testing](#) Services with Select Advantage for the 9-1-1 Center
8. Controller's Office – 2025 [Update of County Fees](#) for Law & Court Departments (*Discussion*)

Announcements

Public Comment

Adjournment

**PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES OR OTHER ELECTRONIC DEVICES
OR SET TO MUTE OR VIBRATE TO AVOID DISRUPTION DURING THE MEETING**

The County of Ingham will provide necessary reasonable auxiliary aids and services, such as interpreters for the hearing impaired and audio tapes of printed materials being considered at the meeting for the visually impaired, for individuals with disabilities at the meeting upon five (5) working days notice to the County of Ingham. Individuals with disabilities requiring auxiliary aids or services should contact the County of Ingham in writing or by calling the following: Ingham County Board of Commissioners, P.O. Box 319, Mason, MI 48854 Phone: (517) 676-7200. A quorum of the Board of Commissioners may be in attendance at this meeting. Meeting information is also available on line at www.ingham.org.

LAW & COURTS COMMITTEE

April 18, 2024

Draft Minutes

Members Present: Polsdofer, Celentino, Lawrence, Maiville, and Schafer.

Members Absent: Trubac, Cahill, and Johnson.

Others Present: Judge Shauna Dunnings, Ryan Buck, Steve Kwasnik, Sara Deprez, Dalton Reust, Mike Dillon, Barb Davidson, Gwenda Summers, Megan Mertens, Joshua Ramirez-Roberts, Gregg Todd, Anika Ried and others.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Polsdofer 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/81848426836>.

Approval of the March 28, 2024 Minutes

CHAIRPERSON POLSDOFER STATED, WITHOUT OBJECTION, THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 28, 2024 LAW & COURTS COMMITTEE MEETING WERE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. Absent: Commissioners Trubac, Cahill, and Johnson.

Additions to the Agenda

10. Circuit Court – Juvenile Division – Resolution to Authorize Single Placing Agreements with Various Residential Placements

Limited Public Comment

Sara Deprez, Juvenile Programs Director and Ingham County Family Center Advisory Board Chairperson, introduced Dalton Reust, Ingham County Family Center Supervisor. Deprez stated that Reust had been with the 30th Circuit Court for five years and was a face the Board of Commissioners might start to see.

Steve Kwasnik, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, stated they had another prosecutor leaving the next day, Bob Marshall, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney (APA). Kwasnik further stated that Marshall had worked in their office for five years and had come in with no experience, but they were able to see Marshall grow a lot in those five years.

Kwasnik stated that, at the five-year mark, individuals hit their stride with the office and were able to take on more complex cases, but instead they were losing Marshall to the Federal System in Detroit where they would work on immigration cases, and it was a shame they were losing them. Kwasnik further stated that Marshall was exactly the kind of person they could not have leave Ingham County.

Kwasnik stated that, after the recession, when there were many concessions, they had been in the office when they lost pensions and now they were seeing young prosecutors who did not have pensions, unlike Kwasnik who did have a pension, leave because they had other opportunities and nothing tying them to Ingham County. Kwasnik further stated it was a problem of their own making from the early 2010s which they were just now starting to see the effects of.

Kwasnik stated they were seeing the effects of the problem every day. Kwasnik further stated that Ingham County was in a sweet spot for prosecutors that loved the work because they had the level of crime that made it interesting to be there, while also not so overwhelming as a homicide coming through the door every day.

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

2. Sheriff's Office – Resolution to Authorize the Purchase of a 2024 Ford Explorer for the Ingham County Sheriff's Office
3. 55th District Court
 - b. Resolution Honoring Da'Neese Wells
4. Probate Court
 - a. Resolution to Authorize Upgrade to Courtroom Audio Processor and Other Courtroom Technology in the Probate Court
5. Community Corrections Advisory Board – Resolution to Authorize the Submission of a Grant Application and to Contract with the Michigan Department of Corrections for Ingham County/City of Lansing Community Corrections and Program Subcontracts for FY 2024-2025
6. Homeland Security and Emergency Management
 - a. Resolution to Request the Governor to Authorize a Grant from the State Disaster Contingency Funds for the August 2023 Storms
 - b. Resolution to Authorize a One-Year Agreement with Perimeter Inc.
7. Facilities Department – Resolution to Authorize an Agreement with Fishbeck for Consulting Services to Conduct a Feasibility Study for the Ingham County Youth Center
9. Controller's Office – Resolution to Approve Additional Funding Authorization for the Ingham County Justice Complex
10. Circuit Court – Juvenile Division – Resolution to Authorize Single Placing Agreements with Various Residential Placements

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioners Trubac, Cahill, and Johnson.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE ITEMS ON THE CONSENT AGENDA CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioners Trubac, Cahill, and Johnson.

1. Ingham County Family Center Advisory Board – Interviews

Megan Mertens was interviewed for the Ingham County Family Center Advisory Board.

MOVED BY COMM. LAWRENCE, SUPPORTED BY COMM. SCHAFFER, TO RECOMMEND THE APPOINTMENT OF MEGAN MERTENS TO THE COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE VACANCY OF THE INGHAM COUNTY FAMILY CENTER ADVISORY BOARD FOR THE TERM EXPIRING ON DECEMBER 31, 2026.

Commissioner Celentino proposed to remove the residency requirement from the position.

This was considered a friendly amendment.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, AS AMENDED. Absent: Commissioners Trubac, Cahill, and Johnson.

Joshua Ramirez-Roberts was interviewed for the Ingham County Family Center Advisory Board.

MOVED BY COMM. LAWRENCE TO RECOMMEND THE APPOINTMENT OF JOSHUA RAMIREZ-ROBERTS TO THE COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE VACANCY OF THE INGHAM COUNTY FAMILY CENTER ADVISORY BOARD FOR THE TERM EXPIRING ON DECEMBER 31, 2024.

Commissioner Celentino proposed that Ramirez-Roberts should be appointed to the Neighborhood Representative Vacancy of the Ingham County Family Center Advisory Board.

Commissioner Lawrence withdrew their motion.

MOVED BY COMM. CELENTINO, SUPPORTED BY COMM. LAWRENCE, TO RECOMMEND THE APPOINTMENT OF JOSHUA RAMIREZ-ROBERTS TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD REPRESENTATIVE VACANCY ON THE INGHAM COUNTY FAMILY CENTER ADVISORY BOARD FOR THE TERM EXPIRING ON DECEMBER 31, 2025.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioners Trubac, Cahill, and Johnson.

Commissioner Lawrence asked if the Recipient position on the Ingham County Family Center Advisory Board was frequently vacant.

Deprez stated that it was and they had a number of students participate in the past but the meetings were held in the evening and students did not typically want to come back. Deprez further stated they had recently started meeting in the middle of the day, which was probably better for the students and they were hoping to fill some positions and believed there were a few interested individuals.

Deprez stated they had discussed having parental involvement, but knew it could be hard to get that involvement. Deprez further stated they believed the Recipient position was an appointed position and they did not have to go through the interview process.

Discussion.

Chairperson Polsdofer stated they believed they could get the interview waived if necessary.

Deprez stated they had never had public present but wanted to get as many kids involved as they could so even if they were not appointed, kids could show up as members of the public. Deprez further stated they had a good group of kids that were getting interested in some of the programming so they saw a real opportunity to have the kids be involved.

Chairperson Polsdofer asked how the renovations were coming along at the Ingham Academy/Family Center.

Deprez stated the renovations were almost complete and provided an overview of the renovations. Deprez further stated they were hoping to host graduation in their sanctuary space.

3. 55th District Court

a. Reorganization of the 55th District Court (Discussion)

Mike Dillon, 55th District Court Administrator, provided an overview of the proposed reorganization of the 55th District Court.

Commissioner Celentino stated he appreciated that they had sought the input of the Collective Bargaining Unit and the Ingham County Employee's Association (ICEA). Commissioner Celentino further stated that it was a plan where the increase was a very small amount of only about \$10,000 and he thought that dividing it up would provide more efficiency and he was in support of the reorganization.

Commissioner Lawrence asked if they intended to hire new employees or if the positions would be filled by existing employees.

Dillon stated they would be existing employees who were already identified.

4. Probate Court

b. Probate Court Update (Presentation)

Shauna Dunnings, Chief Probate Judge, and Ryan Buck, Probate Court Administrator and Register, provided the Probate Court Update, which was included in the Minutes as Attachment A.

Chairperson Polsdofer asked what the 14 Trusts were.

Judge Dunnings explained the 14 Trusts were any matters involving a trust where a trustee or beneficiary believed court intervention was needed. Judge Dunnings further stated that typically, individuals created trusts so they did not have to come to court, which was the goal, but sometimes there were occasions where the beneficiaries did not agree upon how the trustee conducted business or other issues related to the operation of the trust.

Judge Dunnings explained that the Probate Court would assist in resolving questions or providing instructions on how to deal with trust assets.

Discussion.

Judge Dunnings and Buck continued to present the Probate Court Update.

Discussion ensued regarding Decedent Estates.

Judge Dunnings and Buck continued to present the Probate Court Update.

Commissioner Lawrence asked how frequently wills were brought into the Probate Court for safekeeping.

Buck stated they were brought in daily and they were brought in when an individual had passed away and a law firm had it on file or someone just wanted it kept for safekeeping. Buck further stated their office had wills going back more than 100 years.

Discussion ensued regarding wills.

Commissioner Lawrence asked when the Court received a Persons Requiring Treatment (PRT) petition, if those individuals only received an evaluation or if the Court could order them to be admitted for treatment.

Judge Dunnings stated they could issue an order for an evaluation, but a medical decision needed to be made about the appropriate treatment for their condition.

Commissioner Lawrence asked if PRTs were more frequent depending on the time of year.

Judge Dunnings stated it varied throughout the month and that it appeared to follow the lunar cycle, however they stated there was only anecdotal evidence for that.

Discussion ensued regarding the frequency of PRTs.

Judge Dunnings stated that PRTs had increased and it was actually better as they had more social workers working with law enforcement and that individuals were receiving treatment rather than being incarcerated. Judge Dunnings further stated they thought it was a wonderful thing that they were able to get individuals help.

Commissioner Lawrence asked who the contract attorney that performed guardianship reviews was.

Buck stated it was Elias Kafantaris.

8. 9-1-1 Dispatch Center
 - a. Call Diversion Program Proposal (Presentation)

Barb Davidson, 9-1-1 Center Director, and Gwenda Summers, Community Mental Health Authority of Clinton, Eaton, and Ingham Counties (CMHA-CEI) Children's Mental Health Services Director, provided an overview of the Call Diversion Program Proposal, which was included in the Agenda Packet.

Gregg Todd, Controller, stated it was on the Human Services Committee Agenda to review the revised language for the Health Services Millage with the intent to broaden funding for those who were at risk which would create the leeway needed to allow this proposal if the Millage was renewed on the August 2024 ballot. Todd further stated they were not looking to use General Funds or 9-1-1 Funds and they had asked Davidson to show the funding pending to CMHA-CEI in their 2025 budget.

Commissioner Maiville stated he thought it was a fantastic program and had recently witnessed a new transport agency in the Out-County area who were frustrated that a Law Enforcement Officer did not take a person in. Commissioner Maiville further stated he felt it was better for that individual to be transported in ambulance rather than police car and that perhaps the transport agency needed some background or instruction to better understand how they were going to operate in Ingham County.

Davidson stated there was always a feeling of concern for non-traditional responses, but they had mobile crisis units that would go out. Davidson further stated that concern regarding the safety of social workers was valid, but if they did not send social workers out without law enforcement, it did not mean that the imbedded clinician could not be on the phone talking to an individual and deescalating the situation.

Davidson stated the proposed position would fit the niche of an expert who was trained and had the time to be able to handle those situations.

Commissioner Lawrence asked if the clinician would ever be physically in the field.

Davidson stated they would not be and that they would be located at the 9-1-1 Call Center. Davidson further stated they discussed the possibility of the position being remote, though they were not sure how the hiring would go and that could attract more people, but the position might lose out if it was remote and not in the 9-1-1 Call Center.

Commissioner Lawrence asked if they had any idea what the schedule would be for the position.

Davidson stated they had partnered with Wayne State University, who had done the crisis mapping, and they came to the conclusion that the most calls came in starting around lunch time and going until nine to ten o'clock at night.

Discussion.

Davidson stated they had a place to start and they would certainly look at it more when they found a person.

Commissioner Maiville stated the need seemed to be 24/7.

Davidson stated that the need was certainly 24/7, but they had been able to identify for this first position when the need seemed to spike.

Commissioner Schafer asked what the expected funding for the position was.

Davidson stated it was \$154,000 for one position.

Todd stated that it would be a CMHA-CEI position that would be added to the contract with CMHA-CEI. Todd further clarified that the County did not have the expertise and that the County partnered with CMHA-CEI on other things as well.

Commissioner Maiville stated the Elder Services Millage had income level caps, but if they expanded that, they would be able to capture most of the people. Commissioner Maiville further stated there was some assumption those in need of mental health services were potentially lower on the income scale.

Commissioner Maiville stated there was talk about expanding the income level caps and their concern was, if this was funded through the Millage, then the services that were provided should be to those within the proper income guidelines.

Commissioner Lawrence clarified that Commissioner Maiville was asking about recipients of Elder Services Millage funded programs had a restricted income level.

Todd clarified that this would fall under the Health Services Millage, which they would expand to include those at risk receiving mental health services.

8. 9-1-1 Dispatch Center
 - b. 9-1-1 Center Update (Presentation)

Davidson provided an overview of the 9-1-1 Center update, which was included in the Agenda Packet.

Chairperson Polsdofer asked if Artificial Intelligence (AI) would need in-house servers and noted that they were very expensive.

Davidson stated the support of the Ingham County Innovation and Technology (IT) Department would be critical and they would have to look down the road at the abilities of the County and the setup of the 9-1-1 Center and who could manage potential challenges. Davidson further stated there were 9-1-1 Centers that were using AI on the front side of non-emergency calls and from a customer service standpoint they understood, but they did not necessarily like it.

Davidson stated they had heard presentations about the various abilities of AI in supporting 9-1-1 Operators.

Commissioner Maiville stated, looking at the call statistics, it was amazing the number of non-emergency calls they received.

Davidson stated it was because people called knowing someone would answer, and that was the role they filled. Davidson further stated people did not want to go through a phone tree or listen to a bot.

Discussion.

Announcements

None.

Public Comment:

None.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:34 p.m.

**MAY 2, 2024 LAW & COURTS AGENDA
STAFF REVIEW SUMMARY**

RESOLUTION ACTION ITEMS:

The Controller recommends approval of the following resolutions:

1a. Sheriff's Office – Resolution to Allow the Ingham County Sheriff's Office to Purchase Glock Handguns, Sights, and Accessories

This resolution authorizes the purchase of 16 Glock handguns and accessories including 14 Trijicon sights, 14 AmeriGlo sights, 14 Safariland holsters, 14 Streamlight lights, and 14 mounting plates is \$17,249.60 utilizing \$16,704 in 2023 Local JAG grant funds and \$545.60 from the Sheriff's Office Field Services Uniforms and Accessories budget.

See memo for details.

1b. Sheriff's Office – Resolution to Allow the Ingham County Sheriff's Office to Purchase 6 Radar Systems

This resolution authorizes the purchase of six Radar systems from Stalker Radar for Sheriff's Office patrol cars. The cost of the six radar systems is \$12,450 and would be paid for through the Sheriff's Office Admin Other-Supplies Account.

See memo for details.

2a. 55th District Court – Resolution to Authorize an Agreement with Averhealth for Substance Use Testing Services for the 55th District Court Mental Health Court and Sobriety Court for Fiscal Year 2024

This resolution authorizes an agreement with Averhealth for the following substance use testing:

- Mental Health Court - Substance Use Testing with Averhealth not to exceed \$43,832.
- Sobriety Court - Substance Use Testing with Averhealth not to exceed \$107,808, of which \$34,000 are SCAO-OHSP funds.

See memo for details.

2b. 55th District Court – Resolution to Authorize the Reorganization of the 55th District Court

This resolution authorizes the reorganization request from the 55th District Court that was reviewed at the last L&C meeting. The reorganization consists of:

<u>Position Title</u>	<u>Current Grade, Step 5</u>	<u>Proposed Grade, Step 5</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Chief Probation Officer	ICEA Court: 12: \$194,441	ICEA Court: 12: \$194,441	\$0
Sobriety Court Coordinator	ICEA Court: 09: \$161,375	ICEA Court: 10: \$172,373	\$10,998

See memo for details.

3. Circuit Court – Resolution Recognizing the Ingham County Specialty Court Coalition

This resolution recognizes the recently established Ingham County Specialty Court Coalition, which has been established by Judge Lisa McCormick to increase cooperation, resource sharing, and unified advancement in the functionality of these courts. The specialty courts represented in the coalition include Felony Sobriety Court, Domestic Violence Court, Sobriety Courts, Drug Recovery Court, Veterans Treatment Court, Mental Health Courts, Weapons Court, Swift and Sure Sanctions Court, Business Court, Phoenix Court, Truancy Court, and Family Recovery Court.

Judge McCormick will be in attendance and would like to address the coalition, so if this resolution could be pulled from the consent agenda, it would be appreciated.

See memo for details.

5. Homeland Security and Emergency Management – Resolution to Authorize an Equipment Purchase Agreement with TruckVault Inc. for a Mobile Command Center Equipment Containment System

This resolution authorizes a purchase agreement with TruckVault Inc., for a mobile command center equipment containment system utilizing FY2021 Homeland Security Grant Program funds in the amount of \$5,261.75. This system offers a mobile Command and Control unit with power, storage, communications, and drone response integration solutions to effectively enhance mobile Emergency Management capabilities across a variety of applications.

See memo for details.

6. Facilities Department – Resolution to Authorize a Lease Agreement with Vlahakis Family Limited Partnership for the Public Defender’s Office Space

This resolution authorizes a lease agreement for new Public Defender’s Office Space at 2025 S. Washington Ave. in Lansing, which will be funded through the DIDC yearly compliance plan, for the following terms:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Lease Rate/Sq. Ft.</u>	<u>Monthly Payment</u>	<u>Annual</u>
Years 1 - 10	\$26.75	\$41,667.59	\$500,011
Years 11 - 15	\$27.55	\$42,917.62	\$515,011.44
Years 16 - 20	\$28.38	\$44,205.15	\$530,461.80

Total 10-year cost is \$5,000,110.

See memo for details.

7. 9-1-1 Dispatch Center – Resolution to Authorize the Renewal of a Contract for Pre-Employment Testing Services with Select Advantage for the 9-1-1 Center

This resolution authorizes the renewal of the contract for pre-employment testing services with Select Advantage for the 9-1-1 Center for a two-year contract of \$7,600. Funding is available in the 9-1-1 Emergency Telephone Dispatch Services 9-1-1 fund.

See memo for details.

Additional Items:

4. *Circuit Court – Juvenile Division – Youth Center Security (Presentation)*
8. *Controller’s Office – 2025 Update of County Fees for Law & Court Departments (Discussion)*

TO: Board of Commissioners Law & Courts and Finance Committees
FROM: Captain Andrew Daenzer
DATE: April 20, 2024
SUBJECT: 2023 Local JAG Grant Expenditure/ Handguns

BACKGROUND

The Sheriff's Office has been allocated \$16,704 from a \$158,406 JAG Grant award, leaving the Lansing Police Department \$141,702 as their allocated portion. The intended purpose of the grant is to purchase 16 new Glock handguns, Trijicon sights, holsters, and accessories for Ingham County Deputies.

The Sheriff's Office is recommending CMP Distributors since they are a trusted vendor, and we can trade in older model handguns for a credit towards this purchase.

ALTERNATIVES

There are no viable alternatives.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The 2023 awarded grant funds total \$16,704. The total cost of 16 handguns, 14 Trijicon sights, 14 holsters, 14 AmeriGlo backup sights, 14 lights, and 14 mounting plates is \$17,249.60, including the trade-in of 11 older model handguns. The remaining balance of \$545.60 would be deducted from the Sheriff's Office budgeted line item Field Services Uniforms and Accessories 10130102-745000.

STRATEGIC PLANNING IMPACT

The purchase of the handguns, sights, holsters, and accessories allows the Sheriff's Office to utilize grant money to provide better equipment for our deputies.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

We currently use Glock handguns with iron sights. The trend in law enforcement nationwide is to carry handguns with red dot sights. These modern sights increase training ability and accuracy. The sights require a newer Glock platform.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information contained herein, I respectfully recommend the approval of the purchasing of 16 Glock handguns, sights, and associated equipment.

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

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO ALLOW THE INGHAM COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE TO PURCHASE GLOCK HANDGUNS, SIGHTS, AND ACCESSORIES

WHEREAS, the City of Lansing Police Department and the Ingham County Sheriff's Office were allocated \$158,406 from the 2023 Local JAG grant from the Department of Justice; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Sheriff's Office portion allocated from this grant is \$16,704; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Sheriff's Office currently uses Glock handguns; and

WHEREAS, the Sheriff's Office would like to upgrade handguns along with new sights, lights, and accessories; and

WHEREAS, CMP Distributors is the preferred vendor; and

WHEREAS, CMP Distributors will credit the Sheriff's Office \$3,025 for trading in 11 older model Glock handguns; and

WHEREAS, the total expense for 16 Glock Handguns, 14 Trijicon sights, 14 AmeriGlo sights, 14 Safariland holsters, 14 Streamlight lights, and 14 mounting plates is \$17,249.60; and

WHEREAS, the remaining amount of \$545.60 shall be deducted from the Sheriff's Office budgeted line item Field Services Uniforms and Accessories 10130102-745000.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the purchase of 16 Glock handguns, sights, holsters, and accessories in an amount not to exceed \$17,249.60 from CMP Distributors utilizing \$16,704 from the 2023 Local JAG grant and \$545.60 from the Sheriff's Office Field Services Uniforms and Accessories budget.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Board of Commissioners is hereby authorized to sign any necessary contract documents on behalf of the County after approval as to form by the County Attorney.

TO: Board of Commissioners Law & Courts and Finance Committees
FROM: Captain Andrew Daenzer
DATE: April 22, 2024
SUBJECT: Purchase 6 Radar Systems

BACKGROUND

The Sheriff's Office is tasked with traffic enforcement on roadways throughout Ingham County. Each patrol car is equipped with a radar system for speed enforcement. Radar systems are essential for measuring accurate speed for traffic safety. The Sheriff's Office would like to purchase 6 new radar systems to replace old systems that have reached the end of their service life.

ALTERNATIVES

The Sheriff's Office would use older radar systems that may require repair. These systems are old and not reliable and will continue to cost money to repair. Some vehicles may not be equipped with a radar. This would limit our deputies' ability to enforce posted speed limits.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The cost of 6 new radar systems is \$12, 450. The purchase would be paid for with Ingham County Sheriff's Office Admin Other-Supplies Account number 10130101-743000. We would like to purchase the radar systems direct from Stalker Radar which is also the lowest cost.

STRATEGIC PLANNING IMPACT

The purchase of the radar systems will assist with speed enforcement in Ingham County which is in line to with the Sheriff's Office mission to provide excellent public safety services.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

We do reuse radars when they are in good condition, and we are changing cars over. We will continue this practice to reduce costs.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information contained herein, I respectfully recommend the approval of the purchasing 6 Stalker radar systems.

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

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

**RESOLUTION TO ALLOW THE INGHAM COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE TO PURCHASE SIX
RADAR SYSTEMS**

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Sheriff's Office has radar systems for speed measurement, traffic enforcement, and overall public safety in all marked patrol cars; and

WHEREAS, the radar systems being replaced have reached the end of their service life and would require repair; and

WHEREAS, the Sheriffs' Office would like to replace six older radar systems; and

WHEREAS, the radar systems will be purchased from Stalker Radar Applied Concepts Inc. 855 E. Collins Blvd. Richardson, TX; and

WHEREAS, the purchase of the radars is necessary to maintain modern and accurate speed measurement.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the purchase of six Stalker radar systems from Stalker Radar Applied Concepts Inc. in an amount not to exceed \$12,450 using Sheriff's Office budget Admin Other-Supplies 10130101-743000.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Board of Commissioners is hereby authorized to sign any necessary contract documents on behalf of the County after approval as to form by the County Attorney.

To: Ingham County Law & Courts and Finance Committees
From: Da'Neese Wells
Date: April 22, 2024
Subject: 55th District Court 2024 Substance Testing Resolution

Attached please find a Resolution requesting authorization to select Averhealth as the successful vendor for Request for Proposal (RFP) #20-24.

In summary, the 55th District Court was previously authorized by Resolution #23-553 to accept a grant from the State Court Administrative Office - Michigan Mental Health Court Grant Program (SCAO-MMHCGP) in the amount of \$459,900 to continue a Mental Health Court at the 55th District Court and enter into a subcontract for substance testing. The 55th District Court was also previously authorized by Resolution #23-554 to accept \$150,199 in grant funding from the Michigan Drug Court Grant Program (MDCGP), administered by the State Court Administrative Office (SCAO) and \$34,000 in grant funding from the Office of Highway Safety Planning, also administered by the SCAO and enter into a subcontract for substance testing.

However, the Office of Highway Safety Planning requires a competitive bidding process for expending the \$34,000 funding for services subcontracted to a vendor. Therefore, we coordinated with the Purchasing Department to issue RFP #20-24 and Averhealth has been recommended as the successful vendor.

This resolution, if authorized, would allow us to enter into the subcontracts for both programs consistent with the previously authorized resolutions.

Thank you for your consideration.

TO: Da'Neese Wells, Chief Probation Office

FROM: Gregg Todd, Controller

DATE: April 3, 2024

RE: Memorandum of performance for RFP No. 20-24 Substance Testing Services.

Per your request, the Purchasing Department sought proposals from interested, qualified and experienced vendors to provide substance use testing services for the 55th District Court Mental Health Court (MHC) and Sobriety Court (SC) through September 30, 2024, with possible renewal based on grant funding.

The Purchasing Department can confirm the following:

Function	Overall Number of Vendors	Number of Local Vendors
Vendors invited to propose	31	10
Vendors responding	4	1
Vendors unresponsive – missing forms	1	0

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.

SUMMARY OF VENDORS' COSTS

Vendor Name	Local Preference	Proposed Cost
WAI-HAM Inc and RISE Recovery Community	Yes, Lansing MI	See Packet
JSG Testing	Nonresponsive, missing forms	
D'n'A Drug & Alcohol Testing Centers	No, Howell MI	See Packet
Averhealth	No, Richmond VA	See Packet
Cognitive Consultants	No, Lansing MI (Eaton County)	See Packet

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

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

**RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE AN AGREEMENT WITH AVERHEALTH FOR
SUBSTANCE USE TESTING SERVICES FOR THE 55TH DISTRICT COURT MENTAL HEALTH
COURT AND SOBRIETY COURT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024**

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners previously authorized Resolution #23-553 to allow the 55th District Court Mental Health Court to accept a grant from the State Court Administrative Office - Michigan Mental Health Court Grant Program (SCAO-MMHCGP) in the amount of \$459,900 to continue a Mental Health Court at the 55th District Court; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners previously authorized Resolution #23-554 to allow the 55th District Court Sobriety Court to accept a grant from the State Court Administrative Office - Michigan Drug Court Grant Program (SCAO-MDCGP) in the amount of \$150,199 and from the State Court Administrative Office – Office of Highway Safety Program (SCAO-OHSP) in the amount of \$34,000 to continue a Sobriety Court at the 55th District Court; and

WHEREAS, the Office of Highway Safety Planning requires a competitive bidding process for expending the \$34,000 funding for services subcontracted to a vendor; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Purchasing Department coordinated with the 55th District Court to issue RFP #20-24; and

WHEREAS, Averhealth submitted a proposal for RFP #20-24; and

WHEREAS, the 55th District Court recommends Averhealth for substance testing services for the Mental Health Court and Sobriety Court for fiscal year 2024.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes an agreement with Averhealth for substance testing services as detailed in RFP #20-24 and Resolutions #23-553 and #23-554.

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

- Mental Health Court - Substance Use Testing with Averhealth not to exceed \$43,832.
- Sobriety Court - Substance Use Testing with Averhealth not to exceed \$107,808, of which \$34,000 are SCAO-OHSP funds.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Board of Commissioners is hereby authorized to sign any necessary contract documents on behalf of the County after approval as to form by the County Attorney.

TO: Law & Courts Committee
County Services Committee
Finance Committee

FROM: Michael J. Dillon, Court Administrator

DATE: April 5, 2024

SUBJECT: Reorganization Plan – 55th District Court Probation Department

NEED FOR THE REORGANIZATION PLAN

Change is necessary for organizations to succeed and grow. Sometimes, change occurs due to a transformational event, like navigating a pandemic or moving an organization into a new justice complex. Change is most often adaptive, with minor incremental changes that organizations adopt to address evolving operational needs. An example of adaptive change is changes in job duties and responsibilities. Over the past 15 years, we have adapted to numerous changes by implementing strategies to adjust to changes in the law, court rules, work culture, and operational needs. Cumulatively, the changes have significantly changed how our jobs look and how we perform them.

As a result of the adaptive changes we have made, there is a significant need to reorganize our probation department. With legislative and cultural changes, the demands and responsibilities of specialty court programs have significantly increased. The court instituted its first specialty court program, sobriety court, in 2004. With the inception of a mental health court in 2014, the chief probation officer/specialty court coordinator became responsible as program director for both sobriety and mental health courts.

Over the years, the numerous changes in the probation field and the changing dynamics of specialty court programs have made it evident that the chief probation officer/sobriety court coordinator does not have the time to serve both the general probation and specialty court systems adequately. If anything, the demands, and the complexity of the job of chief probation officer/sobriety court coordinator will continue to increase and broaden. Moreover, specialty courts are here to stay and will continue to expand their perspective and depth.

REORGANIZATION PLAN

Creation of Specialty Courts Coordinator Position

The reorganization plan splits the chief probation officer/specialty court coordinator position into two positions: chief probation officer and a newly created specialty court coordinator position. The splitting of the position does not increase the number of FTEs, as the positions will be filled with existing employees.

Currently, the chief probation officer/specialty court coordinator (CPO/SCC) supervises all probation department activities, which include but are not limited to training and mentoring new probation staff, developing, and implementing probation department policies and procedures, evaluating, and improving probation department functions, and serving as a backup probation officer when needed. In addition to the chief probation officer duties, the CPO/SCC serves as project director for both the Sobriety Court and Mental Health Court. As project director, the CPO/SCC oversees all aspects of our specialty court programs, serves on both teams, and attends all program events.

We are incredibly proud of our highly successful specialty court programs and the work of our probation officers who supervise individuals on general probation (nonspecialty court cases). Today, it is not possible for our CPO/SCC to give the time and attention needed to both systems. Hence, the leadership in the probation department needs to be bifurcated. Therefore, we propose splitting the CPO/SCC position into two positions.

The probation field has changed considerably. The probation department plays a vital and active role in rehabilitating offenders. Although our goal of rehabilitating offenders hasn't changed over the years, how a probation officer accomplishes that goal has changed significantly. Over the past 25 years, courts have increasingly been relied upon to serve as the community's social safety net. The burden of carrying out that responsibility rests with our probation department. Besides monitoring compliance, our probation officers must identify a defendant's physical, mental, domestic, and social needs and know the available resources. More importantly, they are tasked with getting a person who is often resistant to understand the need for lifestyle changes and inspire them to take advantage of the recommended resources needed to make a change. Previously, the chief probation officer was assigned a probation supervision caseload. That is no longer feasible because of the increased duties and responsibilities of the specialty court programs. Maintaining a limited caseload allows the chief probation officer to stay abreast of the available resources for clients and their changing needs.

The reorganization of the probation department affects ICEA Court Professionals bargaining unit and calls for the following:

- Amend the job description for the chief probation officer/specialty court coordinator and rename the position to chief probation officer.
- Change Position 137011 (probation officer – Grade Level 9) to a newly created specialty court coordinator position and establish the position at Grade Level 10.

FISCAL IMPACT

The cost of the reorganization plan is \$10,998. The cost increase results from the difference between the wages and fringes in the ICEA grade levels. Wages and fringes were calculated using the highest pay step for the affected positions. Ingham County's Budget Office provided the financial data.

CURRENT ORGANIZATION

<u>Position #</u>	<u>Job Title</u>	<u>Unit</u> <u>Court Prof</u>	<u>Wage/Fringes</u>
137009	Chief Probation Officer/Specialty Court Coordinator	ICEA 12	\$ 194,441
137011	Probation Officer	ICEA 9	\$ 161,375
		TOTAL	\$ 355,816

REORGANIZATION PLAN

<u>Position #</u>	<u>Job Title</u>	<u>Unit</u> <u>Court Prof</u>	<u>Wage/Fringes</u>
137009	Chief Probation Officer/	ICEA 12	\$ 194,441
137011	Special Court Coordinator	ICEA 10	\$ 172,373
		TOTAL	\$ 366,814

REORGANIZATION COSTS \$ 10,998

HUMAN RESOURCES ANALYSIS & SUPPORT OF REORGANIZATION

The Ingham County Human Resources Department (ICHRD) analyzed the proposed reorganization. Their April 2, 2024 memorandum, Support for Reorganization of the District Court Office, is attached.

ICEA COURT PROFESSIONALS SUPPORT OF REORGANIZATION

On April 2, 2024, the ICEA Court Professionals bargaining unit advised the ICHRD of their support of the reorganization.

REORGANIZATION REQUEST

We respectfully request that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners adopt our reorganization, which will create more effective leadership in our general probation and specialty court systems and provide better probation services to the people of Ingham County.

From: [Luke Cloud](#)
To: [Elisabeth Bliesener](#)
Cc: [Joan Clous](#)
Subject: RE: District Court - Probation Department Reorganization
Date: Tuesday, April 02, 2024 11:24:53 AM

Hello Elisabeth and Joan:

The ICEA Court Professional Union supports the Re-Organization. Thank you.

From: Elisabeth Bliesener <EBliesener@ingham.org>
Sent: Tuesday, April 2, 2024 10:59 AM
To: Luke Cloud <LCloud@ingham.org>
Cc: Joan Clous <JClous@ingham.org>
Subject: District Court - Probation Department Reorganization

Luke,

Ms. Wells will be retiring from the Court on May 1, 2024. District Court would like to change her job description from Chief Probation Officer / Specialty Court Coordinator to Chief Probation Office which would remain an ICEA Court Pro 12 from the most recent re-class. They then would like to change position number 137011 Probation Officer Grade level 9 to a newly created position titled Specialty Court Coordinator which would be a ICEA Court Pro 10. I have attached the Job Descriptions for your review.

Does the Union support this Re-organization?

Please let us know if you have any questions.

Thanks
Beth and Joan

Transmission is Privileged and Confidential.

Confidentiality Notice: The information contained in this electronic mail message and any attachments is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain legally privileged, confidential information or work product. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution, or forwarding of this e-mail message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify me by e-mail reply and delete the original message from your system.

Introduced by the Law & Courts, County Services, and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

**RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE REORGANIZATION OF
THE 55th DISTRICT COURT**

WHEREAS, the proposed reorganization affects the Chief Probation Officer/Specialty Court Coordinator position and a Probation Officer position within the 55th District Court; and

WHEREAS, the two positions are within the Ingham County Employees Association – Court Professionals bargaining unit; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Human Resources Department and the ICEA – Court Professionals bargaining unit both support this reorganization.

WHEREAS, the Chief Probation Officer/Specialty Court Coordinator supervises all probation department activities, which include supervising probation officers, developing and implementing probation department policies and procedures, evaluating, and improving probation department functions; and

WHEREAS, the Chief Probation Officer/Specialty Court Coordinator serves as project director for both sobriety court and mental health court; and

WHEREAS, as the project director, the Chief Probation Officer/Specialty Court Coordinator oversees all aspects specialty court programs, serves on both specialty court teams, and attends all program events; and

WHEREAS, the numerous changes in the probation field and the changing dynamics of specialty court programs have made it evident that the Chief Probation Officer/Sobriety Court Coordinator does not have the time to serve both the general probation and specialty court systems adequately.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby approves the proposed reorganization of the 55th District Court with the following changes:

<u>Position Number</u>	<u>Position Title</u>	<u>Action</u>
137009	Chief Probation Officer/ Sobriety Court Coordinator	Change position title to Chief Probation Officer
137011	Probation Officer	Change position title to Sobriety Court Coordinator; Move from ICEA 09 to ICEA 10

The financial impact associated with the proposed reorganization is as follows:

<u>Position Title</u>	2024 <u>Current Grade, Step 5</u>	2024 <u>Proposed Grade, Step 5</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Chief Probation Officer	ICEA Court: 12: \$194,441	ICEA Court: 12: \$194,441	\$0
Sobriety Court Coordinator	ICEA Court: 09: \$161,375	ICEA Court: 10: \$172,373	\$10,998
TOTAL			\$10,998

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Controller/Administrator is authorized to make any necessary adjustments to the budget and the position allocation list.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the reorganization shall be effective the date the reorganization request was submitted to the Human Resources Department.

TO: Law & Courts and Finance Committees
FROM: Scott LeRoy, Circuit Court
DATE: April 23, 2024
SUBJECT: Memo and Resolution Recognizing the Ingham County Specialty Court Coalition
For the meeting agendas: Law and Courts Committee, May 2, 2024

BACKGROUND

In accordance to an ongoing commitment to enhance judicial efficiency and public welfare, a proposed resolution recognizing the Ingham County Specialty Court Coalition has been prepared and is included for your review and approval.

Ingham County operates multiple specialty courts designed to address specific issues such as substance abuse, domestic violence, mental health, veterans’ issues, and family recovery. While these courts have individually shown success in addressing societal challenges, there is an identifiable need to enhance their effectiveness through structured collaboration and resource sharing.

Each court is represented by its respective judge to ensure each court’s uniqueness and needs are communicated and addressed. The membership of the Coalition will include judges and administrative representatives from the following Circuit Court, Probate Court, and various District Court specialty courts: Felony Sobriety Court, Domestic Violence Court, Sobriety Courts, Drug Recovery Court, Veterans Treatment Court, Mental Health Courts, Weapons Court, Swift and Sure Sanctions Court, Business Court, Phoenix Court, Truancy Court, and Family Recovery Court.

The Coalition plans to hold quarterly meetings, with additional meetings scheduled as necessary. An annual chairperson will be elected by members to organize and lead meetings, set agendas, and represent the Coalition in communications with external parties including the Board of Commissioners.

The Coalition hopes to advance the operational efficiencies of the respective specialty courts, improve the rehabilitation and treatment outcomes for individuals serves and increase access to specialized training and continuing professional development.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

There is no added expense to the county for the Coalition. Additionally, many of the specialty courts are funded by the State Court Administrative Office.

STRATEGIC PLANNING IMPACT

Provide fair and efficient judicial processing.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

None.

RECOMMENDATION

Authorize the resolution recognizing the establishment of the Specialty Court Coalition.

Introduced by the Law & Courts Committee of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING THE INGHAM COUNTY SPECIALTY COURT COALITION

WHEREAS, Ingham County operates a number of specialty courts addressing various significant societal issues such as addiction, domestic violence, mental health, and veterans' affairs; and

WHEREAS, these courts have demonstrated profound impacts on rehabilitation and recidivism, providing substantial benefits to both participants and the community at large; and

WHEREAS, there is a recognized need for enhanced coordination and support amongst these courts to further increase their effectiveness; and

WHEREAS, the establishment of the Ingham County Specialty Court Coalition will promote increased cooperation, resource sharing, and unified advancements in the functionality of these courts; and

WHEREAS, the creation of the Ingham County Specialty Court Coalition would serve as a formal organization to support these objectives and further improve the efficacy and reach of the specialty courts.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby recognizes the establishment of the Ingham County Specialty Court Coalition.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the formation of the Ingham County Specialty Court Coalition underscores the County's commitment to sophisticated, humane judicial practices that address critical community needs and advance public safety and rehabilitation.

TO: Board of Commissioners: Law & Courts Committee and Finance Committee

FROM: Sergeant Bob Boerkoel, Office of Emergency Management

DATE: April 23, 2024

SUBJECT: Resolution to authorize an Equipment Purchase agreement with TruckVault Inc. for a mobile Command Center Equipment Containment System.

For the meeting agendas of *May 2, 2024* and *May 8, 2024*

BACKGROUND

This resolution is for the approval to utilize previously accepted Region 1 FY2021 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) Funding to purchase a vehicle equipment containment system and command center console from TruckVault Inc. The Emergency Management Ford Explorer is being replaced with a current model year Explorer. As a response vehicle with an equipment build design specialized for mobile Emergency Management command and control response, the TruckVault Drone Responder 7 equipment containment system was identified as the optimal solution to fulfill the specialized needs. Specifically, this system offers a mobile Command and Control unit with power, storage, communications, and drone response integration solutions to effectively enhance mobile Emergency Management capabilities across a variety of applications.

ALTERNATIVES

Multiple containment systems were reviewed; the TruckVault Drone Responder 7 console was determined to be the most effective solution to optimize equipment and storage needs while still achieving compatibility with the new Ford Explorer. TruckVault Inc. is the sole source vendor in Michigan for this solution.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

TruckVault Inc. extended a public safety discount (\$1,062.25), reducing the price to \$5,261.75.

The Michigan State Police Emergency Management and Homeland Security Division has approved the funding proposal using FY2021 HSGP grant funds. The FY2021 HSGP grant funds were previously accepted by the Board of Commissioners via Resolution #21-645.

STRATEGIC PLANNING IMPACT

This project fits with Ingham County’s strategic plan of quality Service to Residents as it enhances response capabilities across a variety of applications in Emergency Management and first responder related functions, promotes broader Community Engagement with our residents and expands collaboration opportunities with numerous response partners across the county, and strengthens Public Safety in our community through optimizing resources during a variety of responses.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information presented, I respectfully recommend approval of the attached resolution to authorize an equipment purchase with TruckVault Inc for a mobile Command Center and Equipment Containment System.

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

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE AN EQUIPMENT PURCHASE AGREEMENT WITH TRUCKVAULT INC. FOR A MOBILE COMMAND CENTER EQUIPMENT CONTAINMENT SYSTEM

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Office of Homeland Security & Emergency Management received pass through grant funds from the FY2021 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP); and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners previously accepted the FY21 HSGP grant funds via Resolution #21-645; and

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

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Sheriff's Office, Office of Emergency Management is replacing an aging Emergency Management vehicle to maintain a reliable fleet; and

WHEREAS, the vehicle is intentionally designed for Emergency Management response to a variety of non-emergent, emergent, and disaster events; and

WHEREAS, TruckVault Inc. offers the Drone Responder 7 system, a mobile Command Center Equipment Containment System that meets compatibility and functionality needs identified for this specialty vehicle; and

WHEREAS, TruckVault Inc. is a sole source vendor in the State of Michigan; and

WHEREAS, the Michigan State Police Emergency Management and Homeland Security Division has approved the funding proposal; and

WHEREAS, the total expenditure for this proposal is \$5,261.75.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the purchase of a Drone Responder 7 mobile Command Center equipment containment system from TruckVault Inc. for \$5,261.75 utilizing funding from the FY2021 Homeland Security Grant Program Funding.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Board of Commissioners is hereby authorized to sign any necessary contract documents or purchase documents on behalf of the County after approval as to form by the County Attorney.

TO: Board of Commissioners, Law & Courts, County Services, and Finance Committees
FROM: Glenn Canning, Facilities Director
DATE: April 23, 2024
RE: Resolution to Authorize a Lease Agreement with Vlahakis Family Limited Partnership for the Public Defender’s Office Space

For the meeting agendas of: May 2, 7 & 8

BACKGROUND

The Public Defender’s Office has outgrown the current office space with the need to expand their office due to the increase in the caseload to include juvenile cases.

Vlahakis Family Limited Partnership owns the building located at 2025 S. Washington Ave. in Lansing and is a stand-alone building with adequate space and 100 parking spaces to meet the needs of staff and clients. The lease term will be for ten years for 18,692 square feet of space with two extension options that would be in two terms of five years with a 3% increase for each term.

ALTERNATIVES

The alternative would be to not approve further delaying the needs of the staff and community to be met.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The lease rate per square foot is \$26.75 annually for the ten-year term with two extension options. The grand total for the ten-year term will be \$5,000,110.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Lease Rate/Sq. Ft.</u>	<u>Monthly Payment</u>	<u>Annual</u>
Years 1 - 10	\$26.75	\$41,667.59	\$500,011
Years 11 - 15	\$27.55	\$42,917.62	\$515,011.44
Years 16 - 20	\$28.38	\$44,205.15	\$530,461.80

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

There are no other considerations that we are aware of at this time.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information presented, the Facilities Department respectfully recommends approval of the attached resolution to support a lease agreement with Vlahakis Family Limited Partnership and Ingham County for the Public Defender’s Office space.

Introduced by the Law & Courts, County Services, and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE A LEASE AGREEMENT WITH VLAHAKIS FAMILY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP FOR THE PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE SPACE

WHEREAS, the Public Defender's Office has outgrown the current office space with the need to expand their office due to the increase in the caseload to include juvenile cases; and

WHEREAS, Vlahaskis Family Limited Partnership owns the building and is located at 2025 S. Washington Ave. in Lansing, which is a stand-alone building with adequate space and 100 parking spaces to meet the needs of staff and clients; and

WHEREAS, the Facilities Department recommends a lease agreement with Vlahakis Family Limited Partnership for the 18,692 square feet of space for the Public Defender's Office; and

WHEREAS, the lease rate per square foot is \$26.75 annually for the ten-year term with two extension options with the grand total for the ten-year term will be \$5,000,110.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes a lease agreement with Vlahakis Family Limited Partnership, 333 Albert Avenue, Suite 202, East Lansing, Michigan 48823 for 18,692 square feet of space at 2025 S. Washington Ave. in Lansing, beginning November 1, 2024.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the length of the lease would be for ten (10) years for a total cost of \$5,000,110, which will be funded through the Michigan Indigent Defense Commission yearly compliance plan, with two extension options as follows:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Lease Rate/Sq. Ft.</u>	<u>Monthly Payment</u>	<u>Annual</u>
Years 1 - 10	\$26.75	\$41,667.59	\$500,011
Years 11 - 15	\$27.55	\$42,917.62	\$515,011.44
Years 16 - 20	\$28.38	\$44,205.15	\$530,461.80

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this agreement will also include 100 parking spaces at no extra cost.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that 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: Board of Commissioners Law & Courts and Finance Committees
FROM: Barb Davidson, Director 9-1-1
DATE: April 22, 2024
SUBJECT: Renewal of the contract for pre-employment testing with Select Advantage for the 911 Center
For the meeting agenda of Law & Courts May 2, 2024, and Finance May 8, 2024

BACKGROUND

The Board approved the purchase and contract with Select Advantage in September 2022. We have continued to evaluate their product and support of their pre-employment testing. We are very satisfied. Their product offers us ease of use, responsiveness to problems, an option to test remotely if needed, and predictable fees that can be confidently budgeted for. Pre-employment testing is a valuable part of the hiring process used by the 9-1-1 Center.

ALTERNATIVES

We can continue to seek other options. Others were rejected because they came at a higher price, and we lost the ability to continue to test remotely if needed.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

We explored a multi-year quote with Select Advantage. Please see the attached quote. The annual cost for Select Advantage testing we were paying is \$3,900. If we enter into a two-year contract, the annual cost would be reduced to \$3,800 annually and the total contract cost would be \$7,600 which includes support and unlimited applicant testing for both supervisor and dispatcher/telecommunicator. With the changing landscape of recruiting and hiring, we believe this two-year contract will give us a cost advantage but also the ability to reevaluate our needs without being tied to a longer contract. Please see the attached quote.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

None.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information presented, I respectfully recommend approval of the attached resolution to utilize Select Advantage for our pre-employment testing.

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

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE RENEWAL OF A CONTRACT FOR PRE-EMPLOYMENT TESTING SERVICES WITH SELECT ADVANTAGE FOR THE 9-1-1 CENTER

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners operates the 9-1-1 Emergency Telephone Dispatch System through the Ingham County 9-1-1 Central Dispatch Center; and

WHEREAS, pre-employment testing is a valuable part of the hiring process used by the 9-1-1 Center; and

WHEREAS, Ingham County Central Dispatch has seen the benefit to continuing to have the option to test dispatcher applicants virtually while doing so with a process that is not cumbersome, and is a tool that can be used to evaluate candidates for possible employment with our agency; and

WHEREAS, Ingham County Central Dispatch is satisfied with the pre-employment services Select Advantage is providing; and

WHEREAS, to reduce costs, the option of entering into a multi-year agreement was explored; and

WHEREAS, the cost for this testing service for a two-year contract is \$7,600, which is a reduction of \$100 per year from the current cost and includes an unlimited number of applicants and online support; and

WHEREAS, the 9-1-1 Director is recommending that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners fund this request from the 9-1-1 Emergency Telephone Dispatch Services 9-1-1 fund.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes an expenditure not to exceed \$7,600 from the 9-1-1 Emergency Telephone Dispatch Services 9-1-1 fund for testing of dispatch applicants with Select Advantage for the term of September 23, 2024 to September 23, 2026.

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

TO: Law & Courts and Finance Committees
FROM: Ryan Chesney, Budget Analyst
DATE: April 22, 2024
SUBJECT: 2025 Update of County Fees for Law & Court Departments

When the Board of Commissioners adopted Resolution #02-155, setting various fees for county services, the Controller's Office was directed to annually review the fees and to recommend adjustments. We have completed our review for fiscal year 2025 for the Law & Courts Committee consistent with the standing directive and offer a few adjustments for your consideration. This information will appear as a discussion item on the current round of Law & Courts and Finance meetings. We anticipate presentation of a resolution at the next round of meetings to recommend increases to certain fees.

Attached spreadsheets provide details of recommended fee adjustments to be effective for the Friend of the Court on October 1, 2024 and all other departments on January 1, 2025.

The first attachment (Attachment A) offers analysis of proposed fees for 2025. The annual average United States' consumer price index was used to do the calculation. This rate of 5.1% was also used by the State of Michigan for the inflation rate multiplier.

The following information is included for each fee:

1. Location of Service
2. Fee Description
3. The 2024 cost as calculated in last year's fee update process.
4. The 2025 cost, which was calculated by multiplying the 2024 cost by the consumer price index.
5. As identified by the Board of Commissioners, the target percent was determined by the percentage of cost to be recovered by the fee for service. The target percent for each fee was initially passed by Resolution #02-155. For other fees added after the passage of Resolution #02-155, in most cases, it was assumed that the fee as passed is charged at the appropriate cost with a target recovery of 100%.
6. The 2025 calculated fee is based on the 2024 cost multiplied by the target percent.
7. Although many fees have be proposed to remain unchanged in 2025, the initial proposed fees were determined by rounding down the calculated fee to the full dollar amount and, in the case of some larger fees, rounded to the lower \$5 or \$10 increments. In some cases, the cost multiplied by the target percent is much greater than the current fee, so only an incremental increase was proposed in anticipation of further upward adjustments over several years. Fees that are proposed to increase are presented in **bold type**.
8. Units. This variable was used to calculate anticipated revenue generated by a proposed fee. Initial information was provided in the Maximus study, and in some cases has been updated by the departments.

9. Department/Controller Recommendation. Department heads agreed with the initial proposed fees in most cases. In some situations, the fees that were proposed have been changed by the department heads and they have provided supporting information which is included and referenced below. In all cases, the Budget Office agreed with recommendations of the department head as follows:
- a. The Animal Control has a memo that has been attached below explaining proposed changes. SEE ATTACHED MEMO.
 - b. The Prosecuting Attorney has agreed to fee increases as proposed.
 - c. The Sheriff Department has a memo that has been attached below explaining proposed changes. SEE ATTACHED MEMO.
 - d. The District Court has a memo that has been attached below explaining proposed changes. SEE ATTACHED MEMO.
 - e. The Circuit Court, Family Division, and Friend of the Court have a memo that has been attached below explaining proposed changes. The following memo explains the changes to lines 72 and 73. SEE ATTACHED MEMO for explanation of line 82.

Legislative Changes to the State's Child Care Fund: The task force recommended enhancing the Child Care Fund (CCF) to focus on establishing a minimum framework of juvenile justice best practices statewide. Best practices will be supported by an increase in the community-based services/supervision reimbursement rate for counties in order to incentivize and support the development, expansion, and strengthening of community-based services and formal alternatives to detention and incarceration.

The current iteration of proposed legislation would increase the state reimbursement rate from 50 percent to 75 percent for community-based supervision and services while maintaining a 50 percent state reimbursement rate for detention and residential. The increased rate incorporates costs related to Raise the Age and the CCF would become an integrated source of funding. With Ingham County prioritizing best practice in-home care programming, the Juvenile Division would be immediately eligible for 75 percent reimbursement of in-home care programming costs.

Should the legislation go into effect October 1, 2023, the Juvenile Division would expect roughly \$1.7 million (see exhibit A) of additional Child Care Fund reimbursement. Of this total amount, \$502,005 would be General Fund dollars and over \$1.2 million would be Juvenile Justice Millage dollars. Receiving additional reimbursement from the state, would reduce the amount of funds transferred in to support the Juvenile Division's operating budget. The attached analysis factors in the additional Raise the Age funding received by the Juvenile Division when the court exercises jurisdiction after the juvenile's 17th birthday. See Exhibit A.

Legislative Change to Eliminate Non-Restitution Fees and Costs Associated with Juvenile Justice System Involvement: The task force recommended the elimination of court and probation fees except for restitution and crime victim assessment fees. The current iteration of proposed legislation would limit the Juvenile Division's ability to collect childcare costs associated with out of home placement. The Juvenile Division currently charges for out of home placement costs mandated by MCL 712A.18(2). The amount ordered for reimbursement is based on the juvenile and parent's ability to pay.

On average, the past five years, the Juvenile Division has ordered parties to pay \$227,600 in costs of which roughly 32% is restitution costs and crime victim assessment costs (\$73,000). Of the non-restitution ordered, the court only collects about a quarter of what has been ordered. Therefore, should the legislation eliminating non-

restitution fees and costs be enacted, the Juvenile Division would see a loss in revenue of around \$40,000 ($\$227,600 - \$73,000 * .25 = \$38,650$). See Exhibit B.

10. Additional revenue is projected from the department head/Controller recommended increase in fees multiplied by the units.

A summary of proposed fee increases for 2025 is presented in the attached spreadsheet (Attachment B). The spreadsheet simply lists the 2022 fee, department head and Controller recommendations, and projected revenue for each fee where an increase was proposed. **Fees that are highlighted are the ones that are different than what the budget office suggested.**

Fee increases recommended by the Controller/Budget Office would generate approximately \$93,252 in additional revenue in 2025.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions regarding this information.

Attachments



MEMO

TO: Ryan Chesney

FROM: Holly Guild

DATE: 3/14/24

RE: Proposed 2025 Animal Control Fees

We are submitting for your consideration the following changes to the proposed 2025 animal control fees:

Adoption Fees Lines 10-15: Beginning next year we would like to combine all costs into an adoption “package” to include the adoption fee, all medical care/vaccines and a microchip. Our proposed amounts will result in an overall increase of revenue in comparison to your proposed numbers. We are requesting the following:

Puppy Adoption: 175.00

Kitten Adoption: 100.00 **NEW ITEM**

Dog Adoption: 125.00

Cat Adoption: 70.00

Senior Dog Adoption: 75.00

Senior Cat Adoption: 30.00

Euthanasia Fee Line 28

We would like to keep this fee at its current amount of 150.00 with no increase. Many people already struggle to pay this amount and we don’t ever want a pet to suffer unnecessarily because their family can’t afford to have them euthanized.

Rabies and Bordetella Vaccines Lines 35 & 36

We would like to decrease the amount for a rabies vaccine for a redeemed pet to 15.00 and for a bordetella vaccine for a redeemed pet to 20.00. These vaccines are currently offered at no cost to the general public through our vaccine clinics and are grant funded.



Scott Wriggelsworth

Sheriff

Andrew Bouck
Undersheriff

Darin Southworth
Chief Deputy

INGHAM COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

TO: Ryan Chesney

FROM: Undersheriff Andrew R. Bouck

DATE: April 3, 2024

RE: 2025 County Fees (ICSO proposed changes)

Proposed changes by Line:

48 Day Rate: Day Rate / "Pay to Stay" rate lowered to \$8 a day as of May 1, 2019 by Judge approval. Documentation available in the Ingham County Correctional Facility Inmate Guide

NO changes to lines 49 through 54

55 Pistol Entry database verification: NO Charge / \$0 Drop Box item, NO human contact

NO changes to lines 56 and 57

58 False Alarm fee – third offense: NO Charge / \$0, NO mechanism or staff to track, bill and collect

NO changes to lines 59 and 60

61 False Alarm fee – forth offense: NO Charge / \$0 NO mechanism or staff to track, bill and collect

MEMORANDUM OF REORGANIZATION

TO: Financial Services
FROM: Michael J. Dillon, Court Administrator
DATE: March 25, 2024
SUBJECT: 2025 Budget - Decrease in Fees

We are proposing a decrease in the fee amounts for presentence investigation and probation oversight. I'm not sure of why the oversight but we have been charging \$35 for probation oversight fees and \$100 for presentence fees since 2022.

TO: Ingham County Budget Office
FROM: Scott LeRoy, Circuit Court Administrator
CC: Nick Hefty, Deputy Court Administrator
Annette Ellison, Deputy Court Administrator
Helen Walker, Deputy Court Administrator
DATE: March 20, 2023
SUBJECT: 2025 County Fee Analysis

Concerning the **Family Division Court Costs and Truancy Court Costs**, it is essential to note recent legislative changes. According to PA 301 and PA 302 of 2023, beginning October 1, 2024, juvenile courts will no longer have the authority to assess and collect fines, fees, costs, and assessments, including DNA fees. Only restitution and Crime Victims Assessment fees are able to be assessed and collected.

Addressing the issue of **FOC Bench Warrants**, the Circuit Court expresses strong opposition to the proposed increase in the FOC Bench Warrant fee from \$275 to \$300. Notably, our current fee is already the highest in the state, with our office collecting more bench warrant fees than any other FOC office statewide. Attached for your reference is a comprehensive report on 2022 Annual FOC bench warrant fee collections across Michigan as reported in the 2022 Annual SCAO-41 Report. Of the 77 FOC offices that reported, only 24 collect such fees, and Ingham County alone accounted for a significant portion of the statewide collections.

It is crucial to consider that a considerable number of individuals with outstanding bench warrants lack the financial means to pay, as evidenced by their failure to meet child support obligations. Consequently, the FOC routinely ends up waiving substantial amounts in bench warrant fees owed by indigent and low-income individuals since these fees are often uncollectible.

This analysis underscores the complexities and inequities involved in imposing additional financial burdens on individuals already struggling to meet their obligations. As such, the Circuit Court advocates for a more cautious approach in reconsidering the proposed increase in FOC Bench Warrant fees.

Should you require further information or clarification on these matters, please do not hesitate to reach out.

STATS from 2022 Annual SCAO-41

Year	County	Sec2e
Calendar Year	County(ies)	Support Bench Warrant Fees
2022	Alcona	\$ -
2022	Alger	\$ -
2022	Allegan	\$ 5,105.00
2022	Alpena and M	\$ -
2022	Antrim, Grand	\$ 21,800.00
2022	Arenac	\$ -
2022	Baraga, Houghton	\$ -
2022	Barry	\$ 2,830.72
2022	Bay	\$ -
2022	Benzie	\$ -
2022	Berrien	\$ 2,850.00
2022	Branch	\$ 1,074.62
2022	Calhoun	\$ 7,964.00
2022	Cass	\$ -
2022	Charlevoix	\$ 770.00
2022	Cheboygan	\$ -
2022	Chippewa	\$ -
2022	Clare	\$ -
2022	Clinton	\$ -
2022	Crawford	\$ -
2022	Delta	\$ -
2022	Dickinson	\$ -
2022	Eaton	\$ -
2022	Emmet	\$ -
2022	Genesee	\$ -
2022	Gladwin	\$ -
2022	Gogebic	\$ -
2022	Gratiot	\$ -
2022	Hillsdale	\$ -
2022	Huron	\$ -
2022	Ingham	\$ 122,455.50
2022	Ionia	\$ 7,196.84
2022	Iosco	\$ -
2022	Iron	\$ -
2022	Isabella	\$ 17.24
2022	Jackson	\$ 23,518.86
2022	Kalamazoo	\$ -
2022	Kalkaska	\$ 2,690.08
2022	Kent	\$ 57,874.60
2022	Lake	\$ -
2022	Lapeer	\$ 3,667.50
2022	Lenawee	\$ -

2022 Livingston	\$	900.00
2022 Luce	\$	-
2022 Mackinac	\$	322.96
2022 Macomb	\$	-
2022 Manistee	\$	-
2022 Marquette	\$	-
2022 Mason	\$	-
2022 Mecosta	\$	-
2022 Menominee	\$	-
2022 Midland	\$	-
2022 Missaukee and	\$	-
2022 Monroe	\$	-
2022 Montcalm	\$	-
2022 Muskegon	\$	2,071.78
2022 Newaygo	\$	8,384.75
2022 Oakland	\$	92,302.80
2022 Oceana	\$	7,250.00
2022 Ogemaw	\$	-
2022 Ontonagon	\$	-
2022 Osceola	\$	-
2022 Oscoda	\$	-
2022 Otsego	\$	-
2022 Ottawa	\$	10,115.29
2022 Presque Isle	\$	-
2022 Roscommon	\$	-
2022 Saginaw	\$	798.52
2022 Sanilac	\$	-
2022 Saint Joseph	\$	-
2022 Schoolcraft	\$	200.41
2022 Shiawassee	\$	7,066.05
2022 Saint Clair	\$	-
2022 Tuscola	\$	-
2022 VanBuren	\$	-
2022 Washtenaw	\$	-
2022 Wayne	\$	-
Statewide Tot		\$389,227.52

Attachment A

2025 County Fees Analysis
Law and Courts Committee

	Location of Service	Fee Description	2024 Cost	2025 Cost Increase Factor	2025 Cost	Target Percent	2022 Fee	2025 Calc. Fee	2025 Initial Prop. Fee	Units	Controller/ Department Recommended	Additional Revenue
1	Animal Control	Enforcement/Dog License Fees										
2	Animal Control	Sterilized	\$74.08	5.1%	\$77.86	25.0%	\$16.00	\$19.46	\$18.00	15,000	\$18.00	\$30,000
3	Animal Control	Sterilized - Delinquent	\$238.93	5.1%	\$251.12	25.0%	\$31.00	\$62.78	\$36.00	3,916	\$36.00	\$19,580
4	Animal Control	Sterilized - 3 year License	\$168.95	5.1%	\$177.57	25.0%	\$36.00	\$44.39	\$40.00	3,000	\$40.00	\$12,000
5	Animal Control	Un-Sterilized	\$233.92	5.1%	\$245.85	75.0%	\$46.00	\$184.39	\$48.00	6,311	\$48.00	\$12,622
6	Animal Control	Un-Sterilized - Delinquent	\$467.85	5.1%	\$491.71	75.0%	\$91.00	\$368.78	\$96.00	805	\$96.00	\$4,025
7	Animal Control	Un-Sterilized - 3 year License	\$563.18	5.1%	\$591.90	75.0%	\$135.00	\$443.92	\$140.00	320	\$140.00	\$1,600
8	Animal Control	Boarding Fee-Dangerous Animals	\$114.36	5.1%	\$120.20	100.0%	\$80.00	\$120.20	\$90.00	300	\$90.00	\$3,000
9	Animal Control	Boarding Fee per day-others	\$56.32	5.1%	\$59.19	75.0%	\$37.00	\$44.39	\$40.00	1,900	\$40.00	\$5,700
10	Animal Control	Adoption Fee										
11	Animal Control	Dogs (under six years of age) -	\$120.60	5.1%	\$126.84	75.0%	\$77.00	\$95.13	\$80.00	550	\$0.00	(\$42,350)
12	Animal Control	Dogs (six years or older) -	\$31.19	5.1%	\$32.78	75.0%	\$20.00	\$24.50	\$22.00	400	\$0.00	(\$2,000)
13	Animal Control	Puppies (age four months or less) -	\$181.03	5.1%	\$190.26	75.0%	\$120.00	\$142.70	\$130.00	400	\$0.00	(\$22,800)
14	Animal Control	Cats (under six years of age) -	\$403.97	5.1%	\$400.27	75.0%	\$66.00	\$81.95	\$70.00	450	\$0.00	(\$29,700)
15	Animal Control	Cats (six years or older) -	\$41.50	5.1%	\$43.71	75.0%	\$27.00	\$32.78	\$30.00	50	\$0.00	(\$1,350)
16	Animal Control	Adoption Package Fee NEW(12)										
17	Animal Control	Puppies (age four months or less) NEW			\$175.00	100.0%		\$175.00	\$175.00	190	\$175.00	\$33,250
18	Animal Control	Dogs (under six years old) NEW			\$125.00	100.0%		\$125.00	\$125.00	550	\$125.00	\$68,750
19	Animal Control	Senior Dogs (six years or older) NEW			\$75.00	100.0%		\$75.00	\$75.00	100	\$75.00	\$7,500
20	Animal Control	Kittens (age four months or less) NEW			\$100.00	100.0%		\$100.00	\$100.00	220	\$100.00	\$22,000
21	Animal Control	Cats (under six years of age) NEW			\$70.00	100.0%		\$70.00	\$70.00	230	\$70.00	\$16,100
22	Animal Control	Cats (six years or older) NEW			\$30.00	100.0%		\$30.00	\$30.00	50	\$30.00	\$1,500
23	Animal Control	Animal Redemption										
24	Animal Control	Animal Redemption - 1st offense	\$51.89	5.1%	\$54.54	60.0%	\$27.00	\$32.72	\$30.00	350	\$30.00	\$1,050
25	Animal Control	Animal Redemption - 2nd offense	\$62.38	5.1%	\$65.56	100.0%	\$54.00	\$65.56	\$60.00	50	\$60.00	\$300
26	Animal Control	Animal Redemption - 3rd offense	\$119.47	5.1%	\$125.56	100.0%	\$105.00	\$125.56	\$110.00	20	\$110.00	\$100
27	Animal Control	Animal Redemption - after 3rd offense	\$187.14	5.1%	\$196.68	100.0%	\$165.00	\$196.68	\$175.00	3	\$175.00	\$30
28	Animal Control	Euthanasia Fee	\$222.38	5.1%	\$233.72	100.0%	\$150.00	\$233.72	\$160.00	50	\$150.00	\$0
29	Animal Control	Ten Dog Kennel Inspection Fee	\$190.61	5.1%	\$200.34	100.0%	\$170.00	\$200.34	\$180.00	10	\$180.00	\$100
30	Animal Control	Over Ten Dog Kennel Inspection Fee	\$222.38	5.1%	\$233.72	100.0%	\$195.00	\$233.72	\$200.00	10	\$200.00	\$50
31	Animal Control	Owner Surrender	\$56.32	5.1%	\$59.19	100.0%	\$48.00	\$59.19	\$50.00	1,100	\$50.00	\$2,200
32	Animal Control	Owner Pick-up Fee	\$56.32	5.1%	\$59.19	100.0%	\$49.00	\$59.19	\$50.00	40	\$50.00	\$40
33	Animal Control	Rabies Decap	\$57.50	5.1%	\$60.44	100.0%	\$51.00	\$60.44	\$55.00	20	\$55.00	\$80
34	Animal Control	Tranq. At-Large Fee	\$56.32	5.1%	\$59.19	100.0%	\$49.00	\$59.19	\$50.00	40	\$50.00	\$40
35	Animal Control	Rabies vaccination on redeemed dogs	\$25.42	5.1%	\$26.71	100.0%	\$22.00	\$26.71	\$25.00	350	\$15.00	(\$2,450)
36	Animal Control	Bordatella Vaccination-redeemed dogs	\$24.01	5.1%	\$25.23	100.0%	\$21.00	\$25.23	\$25.00	490	\$20.00	(\$490)
37	Animal Control	Spay/neuter deposit-Owners redeeming pet	\$99.21	5.1%	\$104.27	100.0%	\$84.00	\$104.27	\$90.00	212	\$90.00	\$1,272
38	Animal Control	Spay & Neuter Program Fees - Vouchers										
39	Animal Control	Dogs-Male	\$62.16	5.1%	\$65.33	100.0%	\$55.00	\$65.33	\$57.00	173	\$60.00	\$865
40	Animal Control	Dogs-Female	\$67.81	5.1%	\$71.27	100.0%	\$60.00	\$71.27	\$62.00	165	\$65.00	\$825
41	Animal Control	Cats-Male	\$33.91	5.1%	\$35.64	100.0%	\$30.00	\$35.64	\$32.00	151	\$35.00	\$755
42	Animal Control	Cats-Female	\$45.21	5.1%	\$47.51	100.0%	\$40.00	\$47.51	\$42.00	231	\$45.00	\$1,155
43	Pros Atty	Diversion - Initial Interview	\$86.80	5.1%	\$91.22	50.0%	\$38.00	\$45.61	\$40.00	450	\$40.00	\$900
44	Pros Atty	Diversion - Misdemeanor Offender	\$1,134.05	5.1%	\$1,191.88	50.0%	\$490.00	\$595.94	\$500.00	488	\$500.00	\$4,880
45	Pros Atty	Diversion - Felony Offender	\$2,041.28	5.1%	\$2,145.39	50.0%	\$850.00	\$1,072.69	\$870.00	112	\$870.00	\$2,240
46	Pros Atty	Costs-eligible convictions - Guilty Plea	\$179.42	5.1%	\$188.57	75.0%	\$120.00	\$141.42	\$125.00	600	\$125.00	\$3,000
47	Pros Atty	Costs for eligible convictions - Trial	\$2,871.01	5.1%	\$3,017.43	10.0%	\$255.00	\$301.74	\$260.00	11	\$260.00	\$55

	Location of Service	Fee Description	2024 Cost	2025 Cost Increase Factor	2025 Cost	Target Percent	2022 Fee	2025 Calc. Fee	2025 Initial Prop. Fee	Units	Controller/ Department Recommended	Additional Revenue
48	Jail	Day Rate (1)	\$66.43	5.1%	\$69.82	100.0%	\$9.00	\$69.82	\$10.00	20,112	\$8.00	(\$20,112)
49	Sheriff	Accident/Incident Report *	\$6.22	5.1%	\$6.54	100.0%	\$5.00	\$6.54	\$5.00	670	\$5.00	\$0
50	Sheriff	OWI arrest resulting in conviction	\$307.22	5.1%	\$322.89	100.0%	Varies	\$322.89	Varies	80	Varies	\$0
51	Sheriff	Fingerprinting and/or Palm Printing (13)	\$19.49	5.1%	\$20.48	100.0%	\$20.00	\$20.48	\$20.00	711	\$20.00	\$0
52	Sheriff	Public Notary Fee for gun permits (2)	\$12.23	5.1%	\$12.85	100.0%	\$10.00	\$12.85	\$10.00	421	\$10.00	\$0
53	Sheriff	Costs for Command per hour	\$78.99	5.1%	\$83.01	100.0%	\$70.86	\$83.01	\$83.01	0	\$83.01	\$0
54	Sheriff	Costs for Deputy per hour	\$70.84	5.1%	\$74.46	100.0%	\$63.56	\$74.46	\$74.46	0	\$74.46	\$0
55	Sheriff	Pistol Entry database verification (3)	\$1.23	5.1%	\$1.29	100.0%	\$1.00	\$1.29	\$1.00	0	\$0.00	\$0
56	Sheriff	Cert. of Reg for Precious Metal/Gem Dealer License (5)	\$66.14	5.1%	\$69.52	100.0%	\$50.00	\$69.52	\$50.00	1	\$50.00	\$0
57	Sheriff	Road Bonds per Warrant	\$11.79	5.1%	\$12.39	100.0%	\$10.00	\$12.39	\$12.00	65	\$12.00	\$130
58	Sheriff	False Alarm Fee - third offense	\$52.04	5.1%	\$55.64	100.0%	\$47.00	\$55.64	\$50.00	0	\$0.00	\$0
59	Sheriff/Em Mgt.	Cost Recovery Fee flat rate per indiv.	\$37.74	5.1%	\$39.66	100.0%	\$33.00	\$39.66	\$35.00	0	\$35.00	\$0
60	Sheriff/Em Mgt.	Cost Recov. Fee flat rate per/hr per vehicle	\$347.90	5.1%	\$365.64	100.0%	\$305.00	\$365.64	\$315.00	0	\$315.00	\$0
61	Sheriff	False Alarm Fee - fourth offense & subsequent each yr	\$132.28	5.1%	\$139.03	100.0%	\$115.00	\$139.03	\$125.00	0	\$0.00	\$0
62	All Courts	Work Release (4)	\$64.10	5.1%	\$67.37	50.0%	\$25.00	\$33.68	\$25.00	5,250	\$25.00	\$0
63	District Court	Civil **	141.57	5.1%	\$148.79	50.0%	varies	\$74.40	varies	4,264	74.40	\$0
64	District Court	Pre-Sentence Reports	\$274.50	5.1%	\$288.50	100.0%	\$100.00	\$288.50	\$125.00	75	\$100.00	\$0
65	District Court	Probation Oversight (per month)	\$144.55	5.1%	\$151.93	100.0%	\$35.00	\$151.93	\$40.00	5,220	\$35.00	\$0
66	District Court	Criminal ***	\$334.11	5.1%	\$351.14	100.0%	\$275.00	\$351.14	\$275.00	1,579	\$275.00	\$0
67	District Court	Traffic ****	321.48	5.1%	\$337.88	50.0%	varies	\$168.94	varies	17,861	Varies	\$0
68	Circuit Court	Copies (11)	\$4.68	5.1%	\$4.92	36.0%	\$1.50	\$1.50	\$1.50	25,000	\$1.50	\$0
69	Circuit Court	Felony Case Costs (10)	\$913.09	5.1%	\$959.65	100.0%	\$1,470.00	\$959.65	\$1,470.00	650	\$1,470.00	\$0
70	Circuit Court	Show Cause - Probation	\$575.74	5.1%	\$605.10	100.0%	\$210.00	\$605.10	\$225.00	130	\$225.00	\$1,950
71	Circuit Court	GTD Bench Warrants (8)	\$182.79	5.1%	\$192.11	100.0%	\$160.00	\$192.11	\$150.00	50	\$150.00	(\$500)
72	Family Division	Delinquency Court Costs	\$502.32	5.1%	\$527.94	100.0%	\$320.00	\$527.94	\$340.00	137	\$0.00	(\$43,840)
73	Family Division	Truancy Court Cost	\$117.93	5.1%	\$123.95	100.0%	\$105.00	\$123.95	\$120.00	11	\$0.00	(\$1,155)
74	Family Division	Residential Placement (7)	\$0.00	5.1%	\$0.00	0.0%	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	6,092	\$0.00	\$0
75	Family Division	Youth Center (7)	\$0.00	5.1%	\$0.00	0.0%	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	9,192	\$0.00	\$0
76	Family Division	In-Home Detention (7)	\$49.11	5.1%	\$51.61	0.0%	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	17,657	\$0.00	\$0
77	Family Division	Intensive Probation	\$1,161.42	5.1%	\$1,220.66	0.0%	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	970	\$0.00	\$0
78	Family Division	Regular Probation	\$192.41	5.1%	\$202.22	0.0%	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	5,292	\$0.00	\$0
79	Family Division	Tether (7)	\$0.00	5.1%	\$0.00	0.0%	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	2,625	\$0.00	\$0
80	Family Division	Traffic	\$275.20	5.1%	\$289.24	50.0%	Ticket fee schedule	\$144.62	Ticket fee schedule	1,775	Ticket fee schedule	\$0
81	Family Division	Traffic - Fail to Appear	\$129.43	5.1%	\$136.03	25.0%	\$29.00	\$34.01	\$30.00	355	\$30.00	\$355
82	FOC	FOC Bench Warrants (9)	\$831.12	5.1%	\$873.51	100.0%	\$275.00	\$873.51	\$300.00	1,000	\$275.00	\$0
	TOTALS											\$93,252

* - Part of FOIA varies - \$5.00 per page for first two pages, \$1.00 per additional page after the first two pages (this includes Accident & Incident Reports, Proof of Incarceration, and Background Checks)

** Civil Fees are set by various State statutes

*** Criminal Court costs set at \$275/case (MCL 769.1k for authority to assess court costs)

**** Traffic Court costs cannot exceed \$100 (MCL 257.907)

(1) The Prisoner Reimbursement to the County Act was increased from a maximum of \$30 per day, to \$60 per day, as currently set forth in MCL 801.63. The reimbursement rate for the contracted beds with the Michigan Department of Corrections is currently set at \$36.00. The rate was changed to \$8/day per Judge approval May 1, 2019.

(2) As stated in MCL 55.265, the fee charged for performing a notarial act shall not be more than \$10.00 for an individual transaction or notarial act.

(3) As stated in MCL 28.422a, a local police or sheriff may charge up to \$1.00 for the cost of providing, to the owner, a copy of information that was entered in the pistol entry database.

(4) Courts ordering work release are encouraged to recognize that the cost of administering work release at the jail has been calculated at \$50.00 per day, but is charged at 50% of that amount, \$25/day, if paid in certain time. Sometimes, the Judge will order a different amount.

(5) As stated in MCL 445.483 (4) the fee cannot exceed \$50.00

(7) Cost based on US Dept of Health and Human Services Federal Poverty Guidelines for 2015

(8) The Circuit Court has adopted a bench warrant fee of \$150.

(9) Please see the attached memo from Harry Moxley.

(10) Pursuant to the amendment of MCL 769.1k, the Court requested that the SCAO calculate the average costs of a criminal case. Based on three years of budget data, and the assumption that we would continue to assess attorney fees separately, the SCAO has calculated our average cost of a criminal case at \$1,471. The Circuit Court Judges have agreed that they will assess up to \$1,470 in court costs based on the specifics of each case. The additional revenue of \$533,000 will only be realized if the Judges assess the highest amount of \$1,470 on each case, which is unlikely.

(11) The Circuit Court raised the per page copy cost to \$1.50 per page. This increase, which has been approved by the SCAO, was made to keep abreast of increased supply costs and to mitigate the loss of revenue we would experience by no longer being able to charge for online access to Register of Actions and name searches.

(12) Adoption package includes adoption fee, medical care, vaccines, and a microchip.

(13) On top of this fee, \$43.25 is charged and paid to the State of Michigan.
