

CHAIRPERSON
DEBBIE DE LEON

VICE-CHAIRPERSON
VICTOR CELENTINO

VICE-CHAIRPERSON PRO-TEM
STEVE DOUGAN

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
DEB NOLAN, CHAIR
REBECCA BAHAR-COOK
LAURA DAVIS
SHELBY BUPP
RANDY SCHAFER
STEVE DOUGAN

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

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

THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE WILL MEET ON THURSDAY, JANUARY 14, 2010 AT 7:00 P.M., AT THE INGHAM COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE IN THE TRAINING CENTER'S COLE CONFERENCE ROOM, 630 N. CEDAR STREET, MASON.

(Parking in the Front Lot of the Sheriff's Office and Please Enter the Front Doors on the Far Left of the Building for the Training Center)

NOTE CHANGE IN TIME AND LOCATION

Agenda

Call to Order

Approval of the [December 3, 2009](#) Minutes

Additions to the Agenda

Limited Public Comment

1. Integrated Justice Information Systems Group (IJIGS) - Resolution to Authorize Three Year Contracts for [Westlaw Electronic Law Library](#) Access for Various Ingham County Departments, Office and Courts
2. Probate Court
 - a. Resolution to Approve Contracts for Attorney Services for Probate Court in [General Matters](#)
 - b. Resolution to Approve Contracts for Attorney Services for Probate Court Mental [Illness Matters](#) Heard at St. Lawrence Hospital
3. Family Court - Out of State [Travel](#) Request
4. Judiciary Committee - Resolution Honoring [Barbara Buck](#)

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

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
December 3, 2009
Minutes

Members Present: Rebecca Bahar-Cook, Brian McGrain, Carol Koenig, Deb Nolan, Shelby Bupp, Randy Schafer and Board Chairperson Debbie De Leon

Members Absent: None

Others Present: Janiel Valentine, Sara Deprez, Maureen Winslow, John Evans, Jim Paparella, Paul Elam, Kathy Davis and Mike Botke

The Judiciary Committee meeting was called to order by Chairperson Bahar-Cook at 7:33 p.m., in the Personnel Conference Room (D & E) of the Human Services Building, 5303 S. Cedar Street, Lansing.

Approval of the November 12, 2009 Minutes

MOVED BY COMM. MC GRAIN, SUPPORTED BY COMM. NOLAN, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 12, 2009 MINUTES AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Comm. Koenig and Comm. Bupp

Additions to the Agenda

2c. In-State Travel Notification

Limited Public Comment

None.

MOVED BY COMM. SCHAFFER, SUPPORTED BY COMM. NOLAN, TO APPROVE A CONSENT AGENDA FOR THE FOLLOWING ITEMS:

1. Judiciary Committee – Resolution Honoring Beryl Frenger
2. Circuit Court/Family Division
 - b. Out of State Travel Request
3. Controller/Administrator's Office
 - a. Resolution Approving Various Contracts for the 2010 Budget Year
 - b. Resolution Authorizing Adjustments to the 2009 Ingham County Budget and Authorizing the Controller/Administrator to Make Year End Budget Adjustments

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Comm. Koenig and Comm. Bupp

MOVED BY COMM. SCHAFFER, SUPPORTED BY COMM. NOLAN, TO APPROVE THE ITEMS ON THE CONSENT AGENDA.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Comm. Koenig and Comm. Bupp

2. Circuit Court/Family Division

- a. Presentation – John Evans, Director of Michigan Bureau of Juvenile Justice State Child Care Fund (CCF) Overview

Chairperson Bahar-Cook invited the public into the conversation after the Commissioners' conversations. Mr. Evans said please ask questions throughout my presentation.

Mr. Evans brought a handout in a power point presentation format. Mr. Evans mentioned a couple of disclaimers upfront. The presentation today relates to your money, however it is really about rules and regulations for reimbursement. It is not the intent to go to each county and tell them how to spend their money, but, if you want reimbursement then specific rules and regulations must be followed.

Board Chairperson De Leon asked if the state determines the regulations for reimbursement. Mr. Evans answered yes, not the federal government. The Child Care Fund has both county and state line items.

Mr. Evans began his presentation:

The Child Care Fund started in the 50's being a cost share between the state and county. The state paid for a juvenile officer for each county and since then there have been several changes in regards to participation.

In the 70's the legislator decided to reimburse 50% of eligible expenditures, and was limited to out of home care and foster care. Then the Hedley Amendment was passed and shortly after that the legislator decided to reimburse 50% of the up to the amount appropriated. This was known as the cap. A lawsuit was filed and the final determination was the cap was illegal and thus removed in 1997-98, after approximately 17 years. Over the past 10 or 11 years the fund has grown from 32 million to over 250 million of state money. The out of home portion is set with licensed facilities with a state established rate. The part you will be interested in is the in-home care portion not the out of home portion.

The child care fund does not act in a vacuum it is part of a larger funding system including: Title IV-E, State Ward Board and Care (SWBC), the Child Care Fund (CCF) and others that are smaller. When placing children it is typically the three listed. The Child Care Fund is different because the counties control the money. In the case of delinquents the courts make the decisions.

Title IV-E is a cost share between the state and federal, the state pays the bill then submits it to the federal for of reimbursement (50% +/-). The reimbursement is only for out of home care costs unless there is a waiver; there are none right now.

The State Ward Board and Care is for state ward children committed by the courts. To be a state ward there is neglect and abuse where parental rights have been terminated, or delinquency.

(Comm. Koenig arrived at 7:40 p.m.)

The Child Care Fund: The County will pay the bill on behalf of DHS or the court and then submit for eligible reimbursement from the state. Checks are offset at central office so if we owe you more from the Child Care Fund then you owe us from State Ward and Care we give you a check if you owe us more an invoice is sent. The primary reason for the child care fund is to help pay for the foster care children; foster care is out of home placement that could be residential, group home or foster care.

Of the three funds Title IV-E, SWBC and Child Care Fund the Child Care Fund is the largest with over half of the money, larger than both the Title IV-E and SWBC together. The courts spend the largest majority from the Child Care Fund. That mostly has to do with the cost of services the courts buy.

Just a note:

- a. 36 counties do not have a DHS subaccount almost half of the counties have determined that the court from its county will report the days of care and pay the bills for DHS. This is problematic because often the information is reported on a court form and it is difficult and costly to collect base care data to obtain state totals of abuse and neglect, the numbers are understated. Electronic submission has helped in receiving some data.
- b. 27 counties report expenditures for court operated facilities which represents almost half of the court expenses (46% +/-). The word facility is used rather than detention or treatment homes because the counties define things differently.

IN HOME CARE:

In the 70's the legislator agreed to use some of the money for diversion programs as long as the program is an alternative to out of home care. An "alternative to out of home care" must be taken literally because if we start talking about diversion and prevention there are different meanings to people. You can use those words if you are diverting them from out of home care or prevent them from going to out of home care. It also means you can pay for a program that provides an early return from out of home care. It has to be an alternative to out of home care. Eligibility is for delinquent, neglected or abused youth, and if a petition has been accepted by the court. The petition must be filed, not dropped off at the reception desk and may not require adjudicating.

(Comm. Shelby Bupp arrived at 7:51 p.m.)

Chairperson Bahar-Cook asked to clarify a diversion program, does the alternative to in home care need to be this step or the next step or can it be a program that shows a number of the people involved are not having a reoccurrence and keeps them out of the judiciary system later, or is it a straight line requirement. Mr. Evans answered more of a straight line requirement because of what the law says "alternative to out of home care".

There is a fund source which is called “The Basic Grant for Small Counties”. It is a very small grant (\$15,000) that has more liberal uses for small counties that don’t have funds. This grant is used to help divert from court involvement and can be used in a very early stage.

Sometimes the straight line is hard to determine. If a judge says this child is at risk of out of home placement the child is already at risk because he/she is already there in front of the judge. At this time you have to accept the judge’s decision. One of the litmus test used is to see the case files and truancy. If there is only truancy will the child be locked up for that? Some counties say yes others say no.

Comm. Nolan asked if that is a specific auditing process. Mr. Evans answered yes, because the CCF is an entitlement. The only avenue the legislator has is to go out and make sure it is being spent on the right things. They have appropriated a staff to audit all the county files. One of the consequences could be to reimburse the money paid to you because a program or the child(ren) is not eligible. This does not happen often because typically the counties have spent their money wisely.

SAVINGS:

There is no savings when you are spending \$1.00 to get \$0.50 back from us. The real savings is what you are accomplishing with the money you are spending, and we help you do that while saving our money at the same time.

In home care is just the name, and it is a very literal name and is used in the laws. There is no limit on the money it is not an appropriation line. The counties are using the fund in creative ways, some are too creative, and not in programming necessarily. Programs are easy to talk about in cost allocation plans and judicial costs, things like that. The tough ones are for example are the costs of an employee because general accounting practice considers the cost of an employee to be more than the wage.

Chairperson Bahar-Cook asked for an example of what an allowed expenditure is. Mr. Evans answered what the accounts said is to accept the county wide cost allocation plans. If you use it for all your employees, it is good for our employees. The problem is that there are counties changing the county wide plan and that is not acceptable or within the intent of the program. This is the only place where the legislator has let us do alternative programs so we have become very protective of the program.

In Home Care is the only fund source that allows, if eligible, for state assistance of the cost. Some examples of the programs are: Wraparound, Home Detention, Counseling and Intensive Probation.

For your information, Ingham County had one of the first in “In Home Detention”. That particular program is a good example of alternative in home care, the purest is tethering. Not really a treatment program but is an alternative to detention.

Some of the outcomes we look for are a reduction of: out of home care placements, length of stay in placements, repeat placements, length of time to reunification (out of placement early), protective service substantiated referrals and delinquent behavior. We don't have a good way to measure the outcomes because of the data systems discussed earlier. There are 83 counties that do things 83 different ways. So, if something is not eligible there is a charge back or adjustment.

What all the courts are going through now is submitting a budget, describing a program and checking on eligibility. This budget must be in by December 15, 2009 and approved by February 15, 2009. Budget approval is only part of the program. The program submitted and approved must be followed.

Comm. Nolan asked about tethering and drops do those work also. Mr. Evans answered yes as part of an intensive probation and part of home detention. Comm. Nolan asked what other things would be eligible. Mr. Evans answered many approximately 360 different programs. Comm. Koenig asked if Mr. Evans could say which of the 360 programs work. Mr. Evans answered no there is not a collective answer to which program works specifically. There could be a judge, group of probation officers or county director who chooses to not lock people up this year or tries other things. The cause and effect would make analyzing the data more difficult and as a result would only be an opinion. Some counties are buying evidence based programs that are expensive. Wraparound is expensive. However, out of home care does work and produces the results the state would like to see.

Chairperson Bahar-Cook asked can you give an opinion before something is applied for. Mr. Evans answered yes. We can tell you whether a program will be approved so you do not have any surprises and we prefer that.

Comm. Koenig asked if a program could be suggested based on what you have seen or patterns. Mr. Evans answered yes, that is why the programs on list are there because they work. If resources were available to hire a consultant we could determine what programs are better than others. Comm. Koenig stated we have started gathering specific data over the past 5 years or so. If others are doing that as well we could get together. Mr. Evans stated that Wayne County and Berrien County have been doing collection of data as well. Wayne County has many programs in place that have saved everyone money. Some counties do nothing. Counties make decisions on what works for them.

Examples of a community based program cost would be Ingham Academy at about \$47.00 per day per child in the budget. Comm. Schafer asked how \$47.00 per child was calculated does it consider building and transportation. Mr. Evans answered divided the total cost of the program by the projected number of children that would go into the program. Comm. Schafer noted there are expenses for the teachers, the building and utilities. Mr. Evans answered that presumably these kids would be somewhere anyway and that is figured in the budget. Costs of out of home care also have costs that may not be a direct cost as well. In home care is still less expensive than out of home care.

CHILD CARE FUND – BLENDING FUNDS:

Blending funding is a way to use other funds with the CCF. Below is an excerpt from the Social Welfare Act:

Social Welfare Act (EXCERPT) 400.117c

County treasurer as custodian of money; creation and maintenance of child care fund; deposits in fund; use of fund; separate account for fund; subaccounts; plan and budget for funding foster care services; records of juvenile services and expenditures; applicability of section to county juvenile agency.

(f) All funds made available to the county for the foster care of children from any other source, except gifts that are conditioned on a different disposition or reimbursement of the general fund.

Chairperson Bahar-Cook asked is this what defines a fund. Mr. Evans answered no it is what you put into your fund. In fact we can only answer those questions that are obvious. You need to find out what is legal to put in your child care fund.

Donated money from a rich benefactor it is not attached to anything and can be used. However an example of a gift that is conditioned would be a grant from the state, and that can not be used. The money must have no strings attached for example local contributions or interagency contracts.

Chairperson Bahar-Cook asked could you please explain local contribution monies. Mr. Evans answered that if there is a service you want and don't have the funds or capacity you can accept donations from citizens to the County Commissioners and they can put in the Child Care Fund. It is possible that the 50% reimbursement or portion of the 50% reimbursement money be returned to the donor after the programs use. However, once the donation is made it is Child Care money. It is no longer the donor's money and the donor has no say over the money. This is a court program of DHS children. Attorneys and accounts should be involved and a contract written. Also note the rules of child care and its reimbursement do not change there is just more money in the fund. The reason for this blending most of the time is because there is a need. This gets kids out of detention but the home is still being paid for, that does not mean it is not good or not working.

(Board Chairperson De Leon left at 8:30 p.m.)

BRAIDED FUNDS:

Braided funds: single local fiduciary with collaborative oversight, finances support "community child" philosophy, full array of services and supports for each child enrolled in spite of eligibility, overall "savings" between 50% and 56% and depends on percentage of Medicaid and CCF children served. This does not get you more Child Care Funds but gets a service you may not have the capacity for where you may not have enough children for a coordinator. An example is the wraparound program. You still need an account and attorney for this. There is an agreement between the interagency for the Child Care Fund but be careful of double dipping.

Shared funding is pure money together, there is no reimbursement, and therefore do not have to follow the state rules.

There was a discussion whether teen court is a diversion program and eligible for funding. Mr. Evans stated that teen courts and drug courts are wonderful services but often are not a diversion of out of home placement. However, if a judge uses one of those programs saying you will go there, follow their sentence and you don't you will be back here before me and I am going to send you to detention. So it really depends on how it is used.

The teen court representative stated that most come straight from the prosecutor's. Over the last couple of years 20% to 25% come from the intake referee's the rest from the prosecutor's office. Not all low risk children are low risk there is potential for failure in school, a need for mental services and there could be substance abuse underlying for the reason they are in the program.

Mr. Evans stated we sometimes come across as judge and jury of the money and don't want to come across as the value of a program. There is more pressure now to keep a handle on this entitlement so see if your program is eligible. Don't spend a dollar to save fifty-cents. Ask will this program accomplish what is needed.

Comm. Nolan asked if we should do a presentation with the judges. Mr. Evans replied that he would be happy to have them come in. Chairperson Bahar-Cook stated the judges do have an understanding of this, but maybe information on the donor money would be helpful.

Comm. Schafer asked what happens to the closed properties. Mr. Evans answered they become surplus state property.

Mr. Evans stated lastly, it is very important to remember if a private donor gives clean money and you send it to the state to double the money and you pay us more. That is laundering money, so be cautious and always feel free to call.

(Comm. Koenig left at 8:46 p.m.)

Chairperson Bahar-Cook thanked Mr. Evans for his presentation.

Public Comments:

Mr. Paparella stated he saw a sample agreement between an agency and a county. 1. Purchase this service. 2. for this amount of money. 3. You the program will relinquish control of this amount of monies. Mr. Evans replied, I can not tell how to do your agreements and the attorney's do not want this type of questions answered. The office would help you with what we know but are not accountants or auditors.

Mr. Elam, resident in the City of Lansing and Public Policy Associates. said I have had the opportunity to work with juvenile issues across the state some work is directly for Mr. Evans's office. Please look further at this issue it is complex but there are many existing precedence out there. I have a report from the state that shows the diversion programs being funded by the child care fund in other counties. This county does have a diversion program being funded by the state and requires a relationship between the prosecutor and the judge. The prosecutor will have to be involved in this discussion. If you have referrals coming from the prosecutor and they are not touching the court system it will not meet the threshold. As a taxpayer we should look at these opportunities because others are doing it.

You spoke about risk level and judges being involved at intake, but no mention of meeting the threshold, I heard petitions and petitions have to be defined county by county. We see millions of dollars drawn down by other counties we are allowing the state to come in and absorb some cost. I appreciate Mr. Evans for clarification. We are working with state to do a state wide child welfare reform report, and specifically blended funding making sure state, local and counties are taking advantage of that.

Comm. Nolan asked can you sit down with us and lead us down the path? Do you know what we are not capturing? Ms. Winslow answered no, everything we have put in there is very little of the general funds with Ingham County. We have done very well using the fund in terms of donors and it has worked as well.

Mr. Evans mentioned, when I do these talks I use Ingham County as an example. You do not leave very much money on the table. Could you do more, sure always, do something differently maybe. Could you get a private donor, could that translate to more, maybe? You need to consider would you really spend more or spending what it actually costs to run the program. Using a private donor would not change the program.

Mr. Nielson stated we now have new opportunities to expand the programs if we can identify the specifics, it melds with the courts and are eligible.

Mr. Paparella asked a question regarding abused and neglected children is this activity to explore. There are unmet needs in the foster care system and that is the other half of the child care eligibility. Mr. Evans answered that it is an opportunity for private dollars and agreed they are at risk of out of home care.

The Committee thanked Mr. Evans for his presentation.

2. Circuit Court/Family Division
 - c. Out of State Travel Request

Chairperson Bahar-Cook stated the above item is for informational purposes only.

Announcements

Comm. Schafer commended Chairperson Bahar-Cook on a job well done as Chairperson.

Comm. Nolan echoed Comm. Schafer's comments.

Public Comment

None.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie Buckmaster

RESOLUTION STAFF REVIEW

DATE January 8, 2010

Agenda Item Title: Resolution to Approve Contracts for Attorney Services for Probate Court in General Matters

Submitted by: Ingham County Probate Court

Committees: LE____, JD__X__, HS____, CS____, Finance__X__

Summary of Proposed Action:

This resolution would authorize legal counsel service contracts in guardianship, conservatorship, and other matters for the 2010 fiscal year.

Financial Implications:

The funds are within the existing Probate Court 2010 Budget:

1. Attorney Robert Refior - not to exceed \$8,500; and
2. Attorney Louis Kafantaris - not to exceed \$8,500.

Total \$17,000.

Other Implications:

The Probate Court, by statute, must in certain circumstances provide legal counsel to respondents in guardianship, conservatorship, and other matters.

Staff Recommendation: MJM__ JN__X__ TL__ TM__ JC__

Staff recommends approval of the resolution.

Introduced by the Judiciary and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CONTRACTS FOR ATTORNEY SERVICES
FOR PROBATE COURT IN GENERAL MATTERS**

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Probate Court, in response to recent budget difficulties, seeks to reduce expenses wherever possible while maintaining services; and

WHEREAS, the Probate Court, by statute, must in certain circumstances provide legal counsel to respondents in guardianship, conservatorship, and other matters; and

WHEREAS, the Probate Court has for some time entered into cost-saving contractual relationships with a few local attorneys to provide said required attorney services; and

WHEREAS, the amount of \$17,000 is a fair and appropriate amount for the provision of said services for an entire year; and

WHEREAS, the attorneys Robert Refior and Louis Kafantaris have provided these services in the past, have rendered good services, are willing to continue for the 2010 year, and this Court is willing to have them so continue; and

WHEREAS, it is appropriate for each of said attorneys to be compensated one-half of the total contract (i.e., \$8,500 each).

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby approves Probate Court's legal counsel service contracts in guardianship, conservatorship, and other matters in an amount not to exceed \$17,000 for the 2010 Fiscal Year from the existing Probate Court Budget as follows:

1. Attorney Robert Refior - not to exceed \$8,500; and
2. Attorney Louis Kafantaris - not to exceed \$8,500.

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

RESOLUTION STAFF REVIEW **DATE:** January 8, 2010

Agenda Item Title: Resolution to Approve Contracts for Attorney Services for Probate Court Mental Illness Matters Heard at St. Lawrence Hospital

Submitted by: Ingham County Probate Court

Committees: LE ____, JD X, HS ____, CS ____, Finance X

Summary of Proposed Action:
This resolution would authorize legal counsel service contracts to represent respondents in involuntary mental illness matters at St. Lawrence Hospital for the 2010 fiscal year.

Financial Implications:
The funds are within the existing Probate Court 2010 budget:

- 1. Attorney Michael Staake for 25 weeks - not to exceed \$6,756.75; and
- 2. Attorney William Metros for 12 weeks - not to exceed \$3,243.25.

Total \$10,000.

Other Implications:
The Probate Court, by statute, must provide legal counsel to respondents in involuntary mental illness matters.

Staff Recommendation: MJM __ JN X TL __ TM __ JC __
Staff recommends approval of the resolution.

Introduced by the Judiciary and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CONTRACTS FOR ATTORNEY SERVICES FOR PROBATE COURT
MENTAL ILLNESS MATTERS HEARD AT ST. LAWRENCE HOSPITAL**

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Probate Court, in response to recent budget difficulties, seeks to reduce expenses wherever possible while maintaining services; and

WHEREAS, the Probate Court, by statute, must provide legal counsel to respondents in involuntary mental illness matters; and

WHEREAS, the Probate Court has for some time entered into cost-saving contractual relationships with a few local attorneys to provide mental-illness-related legal counsel services at St. Lawrence Hospital as part of a tri-county coverage of local mental illness cases; and

WHEREAS, the amount of \$10,000 is a fair and appropriate amount for the provision of said services for an entire year, which for Ingham County represents 37 out of 52 weeks of St. Lawrence hearings; and

WHEREAS, the attorneys Michael Staake and William Metros have provided these services in the past, have rendered good services, are willing to continue for the 2010 year, and this Court is willing to have them so continue; and

WHEREAS, attorney Michael Staake is willing to provide said services for 25 of the 37 relevant weeks, for a prorated compensation of \$6,756.75, and attorney William Metros is willing to provide said services for the remaining 12 weeks, for a prorated compensation of \$3,243.25.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby approves Probate Court's legal counsel service contracts to represent respondents in involuntary mental illness matters at St. Lawrence Hospital for an amount not to exceed \$10,000 for the 2010 Fiscal Year from the existing Probate Court Budget as follows:

1. Attorney Michael Staake for 25 weeks - not to exceed \$6,756.75; and
2. Attorney William Metros for 12 weeks - not to exceed \$3,243.25.

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

Agenda Item 4

Introduced by the Judiciary Committee of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION HONORING BARBARA BUCK

WHEREAS, Barbara Buck began her career with the Ingham County Probate Court on February 4, 1980; and

WHEREAS, Barbara Buck has been the court reporter for three judges – Hon. Robert L. Drake, Hon. Donald S. Owens, and Hon. R. George Economy; and

WHEREAS, Barbara Buck has served as a monitor for court reporting classes at Lansing Community College; and

WHEREAS, Barbara Buck has served as a volunteer in scoring statewide tests for the certification of court reporters; and

WHEREAS, Barbara Buck has produced hundreds of transcripts of court hearings; and

WHEREAS, Barbara Buck has reported thousands of hearings, producing accurate records of the proceedings; and

WHEREAS, Barbara Buck has always provided professional and courteous service.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby honors Barbara Buck for her years of dedicated service to the County of Ingham and for the contributions she has made to the Ingham County Probate Court.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board wishes her continued success in all of her future endeavors.