

CHAIRPERSON
VICTOR G. CELENTINO

VICE-CHAIRPERSON
LISA DEDDEN

VICE-CHAIRPERSON PRO-TEM
MIKE SEVERINO

COUNTY SERVICES COMMITTEE
ANDY SCHOR, CHAIR
DEBBIE DE LEON
DIANNE HOLMAN
DALE COPEDEGE
MIKE SEVERINO
DON VICKERS

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

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

THE COUNTY SERVICES COMMITTEE WILL MEET ON TUESDAY, MAY 16, 2006 AT 7:00 P.M., IN THE PERSONNEL CONFERENCE ROOM (D & E), HUMAN SERVICES BUILDING, 5303 S. CEDAR, LANSING.

Agenda

Call to Order

Approval of the [May 2, 2006 Minutes](#)

Additions to the Agenda

Limited Public Comment

1. Advisory Board Presentation - Fair Board Interviews
2. Drain Commissioner - Resolution Pledging Full Faith and Credit for the Briarwood Drain Drainage District 2006 [Drainage District Bonds](#)
3. Housing Commission - Resolution Authorizing the Ingham County Housing Commission to Enter Into a Contract with the [City of Eaton Rapids](#) to Act as a Third Party Administrator for a Downtown Rental Rehabilitation Program (*A revised resolution will be presented at the meeting.*)
4. Purchasing Department - Resolution Authorizing Entering Into a Contract with AVI Systems for Upgrades and/or Purchases for [Court Recording Equipment](#)
5. Human Resources Department
 - a. Resolution Approving the [UAW-TOPS](#) Collective Bargaining Agreement
 - b. Resolution Approving a Collective Bargaining Agreement with the Ingham County Employees' Association for the [Professional Employees](#)
 - c. Resolution Approving a Collective Bargaining Agreement with the Thirtieth Judicial Circuit Court and [55th Judicial District Court](#) and Ingham County Employees' Association for the Professional Court Employees
6. County Services Committee - Communication from the [County Services Committee](#) Regarding Review of Process for Making Appointments to Boards, Committees, and Commissions
7. Controller's Office
 - a. Discussion Item - 2007 Update on Fees: *Draft – Resolution Updating Various Fees for County Services*
 - b. Information Item - [List of Groups/Organizations](#) Using County Office Space

8. Board Referral - Letter from [Dewitt Charter Township](#) Regarding the City of East Lansing's Proposed Comprehensive Plan

Announcements **PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES OR OTHER ELECTRONIC**
Public Comment **DEVICES OR SET TO MUTE OR VIBRATE TO AVOID**
Adjournment **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.

COUNTY SERVICES

May 2, 2006

Minutes

Members Present: Andy Schor, Debbie DeLeon, Dianne Holman, Dale Copedge, Mike Severino, Don Vickers and Board Chairperson Victor Celentino

Members Absent: None

Others Present: Jared Cypher, John Neilsen, Judge Collette, Mary Sabaj, James Webster, Mike Bryanton, Stacy Sheridan, Paul Kindel, Chris Jordan-Forman, Lori Peterson and others

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Schor at 7:01 p.m. in the Personnel Conference Room of the Human Services Building, 5303 S. Cedar, Lansing.

Approval of the April 18, 2006 Minutes

MOVED BY COMM. DELEON, SUPPORTED BY COMM. HOLMAN, TO APPROVE THE APRIL 18 MINUTES AS AMENDED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Comm. Severino

Additions to the Agenda

5. Substitute Resolution
- 7b. Substitute Resolution
9. Resolution Honoring Bruce Schafer

1. Advisory Board/Commission Presentation – Agricultural Preservation Board – Annual Report and Millage Discussion

Mr. Kindel reviewed the history of the Agricultural Preservation Board. He then explained the proposed millage would be used to conserve easements on farmlands and open spaces within the County. Mr. Kindel then reviewed the four millage scenarios contained in the agenda packet.

The Tri-County Regional Growth Study 2005 Annual Report addresses a Wise Growth model. Mr. Kindel stated there is a lot of support for Farmland and Open Space Preservation. The support is based on many reasons including economic, environmental, esthetic, cultural, financial etc. Ingham County residents will hopefully have the chance to consider their level of support this fall.

Ms. Sheridan, Consultant, distributed copies of Making the Case for Farmland and Open Space Preservation – Ingham County Board of Commissioners - to the Committee. She then began her review of that information. Voters in 17 states across the nation approved spending more than \$650 million for land conservation during the week of November 15, 2005 which brought the final 2005 total for new open space spending to \$1.7 billion. Eighty percent of the conservation ballots were approved in November 2005. This is the highest percentage since 2000.

Ms. Sheridan stated the approved ballot measures indicate a consistent trend in which voters have taken responsibility to protect land at the ballot box. Since 1994, voters have approved over 1,200 conservation measures which generated over \$30 billion in new public funds for land conservation.

Over the past decade, American voters have reacted to accelerating growth by reaching into their pockets to preserve land for public benefit. This includes land for parks and trails, as well as land that preserves local history and culture; safeguards clean water, community agriculture and forestry; and, protects the quality of life

on which economic well-being depends. Ms. Sheridan stated a divided electorate found common ground when it came to conservation as a common denominator in 2005.

(Comm. Severino arrived at 7:17 p.m.)

Ms. Sheridan stated smart, efficient development decisions save taxpayers money and allows governments to stretch their dollars further. As tough times linger for state and local governments, more and more officials are abandoning traditional subsidies for sprawl development and adopting a “Fix it First” policy. Instead of letting recession extinguish the debate about growth, many communities are taking advantage of today’s conditions to gain an upper hand over sprawl.

The Committee discussed Ms. Sheridan’s information. Chairperson Celentino read from a 2004 newspaper article which contained a story about a Barry County farmland preservation millage question which was not supported by the voters. Ms. Sheridan stated numerous factors lead to the defeat of that millage. Voters need adequate information in order to support farmland preservation efforts.

Comm. Severino stated he emailed back and forth with Ms. Sheridan regarding the millage issue. He then stated he had hoped for more from the Agricultural Preservation Board than the recommendation for a millage. The voters in this County are not ready to consider such a millage at this time. When the Board of Commissioners approved funding for a consultant, the AP Board promised it would apply for grants. More creative thinking is needed before the voters are asked to approve a farmland preservation millage.

Mr. Kindel stated Ms. Sheridan did not begin her work with the County in time to apply for the 2005 grants. The AP Board has now passed all the necessary requirements to apply for grant funds this year.

Ms. Sheridan stated she appreciates Comm. Severino’s concern about raising taxes on the residents. She then explained that people’s tax dollars are used for land development. The proposed millage would save money for the residents. Successful farmland preservation programs are a result of long-term funding mechanisms.

Comm. Severino suggested the AP Board bring lobbying groups together to place a check box on tax returns for donations to farmland preservation efforts. Mr. Kindel stated the Agricultural Preservation Board would like to accomplish that effort. The AP Board will begin working with the State to obtain their support for the preservation efforts.

Comm. Vickers stated considering the proposed millage is contrary to his belief. He then stated the average age of farmers in Ingham County is 58 years old. There aren’t many people willing to take over those farms when the farmers have to retire.

Comm. Holman stated she believed a millage would be inevitable to develop a strong farmland and open space preservation program. She stated she would support the proposed millage to sustain farmland and open spaces into the future. Comm. Holman then explained there will be a number of millage questions on the November ballot. Is the AP Board millage language flexible to allow it to be combined with other efforts? Ms. Sheridan stated the millage package will be flexible.

Chairperson Schor thanked Ms. Sheridan and Mr. Kindel for tonight’s presentation.

2. Housing Commission

- a. Resolution Authorizing the Ingham County Housing Commission to Enter into a Contract with

the City of Eaton Rapids to Act as a Third Party Administrator for a Downtown Rental Rehabilitation Program

MOVED BY COMM. SEVERINO, SUPPORTED BY COMM. DELEON, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE INGHAM COUNTY HOUSING COMMISSION TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH THE CITY OF EATON RAPIDS TO ACT AS A THIRD PARTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR A DOWNTOWN RENTAL REHABILITATION PROGRAM.

Chairperson Schor asked what Mr. Johnston would be doing for Eaton Rapids that they cannot do for themselves. Mr. Johnston explained Eaton Rapids does not have the necessary personnel to administer the Program. He then stated 100% of the costs will go toward the Ingham County Housing Commission.

Comm. Severino stated he would like someone to investigate the possibility of relocating the Housing Commission in the current Project Sentry facility. (This statement refers to agenda item 2b.)

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

b. Office Space Request

MOVED BY COMM. VICKERS, SUPPORTED BY COMM. DELEON, TO APPROVE THE OFFICE SPACE REQUEST FROM THE HOUSING COMMISSION.

Chairperson Schor stated concerns were expressed at the Democratic caucus meeting regarding this matter. All County departments should be made aware of vacant County space when it is available. This Committee will hold a discussion regarding an actual notification process at a future meeting.

Mr. Neilsen stated he would put together information regarding County facilities. Normally, additional office space requests are submitted through the normal committee process. This current case is a quasi-County operation. The Housing Commission requested office space within Mason for the operation of the Community Development Block Grant Program which services residents of the County and the City of Mason's Downtown Rental Rehabilitation Program.

The Hilliard Building in Mason has vacant space which is currently being used for storage. This storage would be relocated.

Comm. Severino expressed his wish that the County will find another way to use the Project Sentry facility if it has to close at the end of this year.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

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

3. Treasurer
 - a. Resolution Honoring Mary Ruttan
 - b. Information Item – Dog Licensing Amnesty Program
4. Ingham County Clerk/Elections – Resolution Authorizing Special Election Expenses

7a. Controller's Office – Resolution Authorizing Adjustments to the 2006 Ingham County Budget

9. Resolution Honoring Bruce Schafer

Mr. Bryanton explained agenda item 4 is necessary because funds for the Special Elections were not previously included in the Clerk's Elections budget. The Clerk will need these funds replenished in order to conduct the normal elections scheduled for the remainder of the year.

Chairperson Schor commended Mr. Bryanton on the great job his Office did regarding the recent elections. Mr. Bryanton stated the clerks at the local jurisdictions also did a great job.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOVED BY COMM. SEVERINO, SUPPORTED BY COMM. DELEON, TO APPROVE THE ITEMS ON THE CONSENT AGENDA. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Community Correction Advisory Board – Substitute Resolution to Authorize a Reorganization at Project Sentry and Amending the 2006 Budget

MOVED BY COMM. DELEON, SUPPORTED BY COMM. VICKERS, TO APPROVE THE SUBSTITUTE RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE A REORGANIZATION AT PROJECT SENTRY AND AMENDING THE 2006 BUDGET.

Ms. Sabaj reviewed the history of Project Sentry. She stated she had hoped she wouldn't need to request additional funding for Project Sentry. Efforts have been made to increase revenues in order to reduce the funding request.

Comm. DeLeon stated the Law Enforcement Committee held a number of very long discussions regarding this matter. The Substitute Resolution is a result of those discussions. A County standard will be developed by the Circuit and District Courts and the Prosecutor's Office regarding testing criteria.

Mr. Neilsen explained Project Sentry had operated since 1993 without a County subsidy. Project Sentry lost its grant funding and has nearly depleted the program's surplus funds. Program revenue has decreased for a number of reasons. To minimize the amount of the subsidy, the Project Sentry Manager is retiring effective April 15, 2006, and this Resolution proposes a re-organization for the balance of the year. Project Sentry will still need approximately \$109,496 from the 2006 Contingency Fund to continue the program through 2006.

The CCAB was challenged during the budget process to seek other funds and/or to reduce their costs for the 2007 budget. It is not realistic that Project Sentry could operate without any County subsidy. Ms. Sabaj stated she would try to work out a consultant arrangement with Dr. Gallagher.

Comm. Severino stated market forces have contributed to Project Sentry's financial situation. The Courts have the ability to direct their staff to have tests conducted at Project Sentry, not another agency.

Judge Collette stated the District Court wants to use its own testing process. He believes, however, that County agencies should be used whenever possible. Project Sentry provides reputable and reliable testing services. Judge Collette stated his concern that the District Court may have appeals problems due to inadequate testing procedures at other testing agencies.

Comm. Severino stated the Board of Commissioners could address the District Court regarding its decision to use other testing agencies. Comm. DeLeon explained the District Court was invited to a Law Enforcement meeting to discuss this matter. The 55th District Court appeared and explained their reasons for not using Project Sentry's services. Their main reason for using other vendors is transportation concerns regarding their defendants. It is the Law Enforcement Committee's hope that the District Court will become a regular part of this process during the upcoming budget discussions.

Comm. Vickers stated it is the Law Enforcement Committee's intent to continue working with Project Sentry in order to continue its services. The Substitute Resolution would give people six months to work out a funding arrangement. He stated his belief that Project Sentry will continue for years with the proper support.

Comm. Holman stated the last paragraph of the Resolution seems stark. Comm. DeLeon stated the paragraph was added as a result of discussions within the Law Enforcement Committee. She further stated there some Commissioners who would rather close the Project Sentry program. Comm. Holman expressed her wish that Project Sentry is able to continue.

The Committee consented to a Friendly Amendment, suggested by Comm. Holman, to amend the last BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED paragraph as follows:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that if the program is not funded in the 2007 budget process, *or an alternate use for the facility has not been specified*, the Controller is authorized to terminate the lease at a cost of \$69,092 to come from the 2006 Contingency Fund and end the program as of December 31, 2006.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. County Services Committee

- a. Communication from the County Services Committee Regarding Review of Process for Making Appointments to Boards, Committee, and Commissions

Comm. Severino suggested the Committee deal with this item tonight. Comm. Holman explained that she suggested this review. Specific committees may have specific questions to ask applicants; however, there are also privacy issues concerning some questions.

Chairperson Schor suggested this issue be placed on the next agenda when information regarding all of the County Services' committees and boards is available. This Committee will vote on suggested questions at the next meeting.

Comm. DeLeon stated the applications are currently the same. Chairperson Schor stated a supplemental page may be added for some commissions and boards. Comm. Severino stated the Board staff already has a lot of work to do without adding this extra burden. He stated the applications should be uniform. Comm. DeLeon stated the questions could be universal for the boards and commissions. Chairperson Schor asked that Mr. Neilsen speak with Ms. Bennett regarding this issue.

Comm. Holman stated more people should be aware of board and commission vacancies. The vacancies should be on the County's webpage.

Mr. Neilsen stated he would speak with Ms. Bennett regarding this Committee's concerns. Comm. Vickers stated Ms. Bennett does a good job placing vacancy information in the Ingham County News.

- b. Resolution to Establish a Policy on the County Orientation of County Appointees to Certain Boards, Committees and Commissions

MOVED BY COMM. COPELGE, SUPPORTED BY COMM. HOLMAN, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A POLICY ON THE COUNTY ORIENTATION OF COUNTY APPOINTEES TO CERTAIN BOARDS, COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS.

Comm. DeLeon stated that not all of the boards, committees and commissions are listed in the Resolution. Mr. Cypher explained the third BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED paragraph is a blanket statement which addresses Comm. DeLeon's concern.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- 7b. Controller's Office – Substitute Resolution Establishing Areas of Priority Emphasis Guiding 2007 Activities and Budget Process

MOVED BY COMM. DELEON, SUPPORTED BY COMM. COPELGE, TO APPROVE THE SUBSTITUTE RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING AREAS OF PRIORITY EMPHASIS GUIDING 2007 ACTIVITIES AND BUDGET PROCESS.

Comm. DeLeon stated the list of priorities should include an emphasis on regionalization. Chairperson Schor supported this suggestion. Comm. DeLeon asked when the evaluation which is referred to in item one of the Resolution is conducted. Mr. Neilsen explained that staff tries to do this evaluation through the annual budget process. Comm. DeLeon stated she believes the evaluations should be conducted separately from the budget process.

Chairperson Celentino stated evaluations are also conducted when the Board of Commissioners reviews funding allocations. Comm. DeLeon stated evaluations should be done prior to the budget process. Comm. Severino stated people will still apply for funding even when they realize their services do not meet with the County's established priorities or that their services would duplicate services already provided.

Chairperson Schor stated the Finance Committee reviewed the Community Agency process a few years ago. They were not able to improve the system. Mr. Neilsen explained the Community Agency ad hoc committee did determine to focus on Community Agency services that meet basic needs.

Comm. DeLeon expressed her concern that the County should step up and be a safety net for residents who did not qualify for some services.

MOVED BY COMM. DELEON, SUPPORTED BY COMM. COPELGE, TO AMEND THE RESOLUTION BY ADDING THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT THE INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS SUPPORTS THE EFFORTS TO PRIORITIZE COMMUNITY AGENCY FUNDING AWARDS THAT WILL ASSIST IN MEETING BASIC NEEDS SUCH AS SHELTER, HOUSING, UTILITIES AND/OR FOOD.

The Committee held a general discussion regarding the priority of meeting basic needs. Mr. Neilsen explained that this Resolution should be adopted tonight to remain on schedule with the budget calendar. The priority of meeting basic needs has always been the province of the Human Services Committee. Chairperson Schor stated Comm. DeLeon could draft a resolution which is specific to Community Agencies and the priority of meeting basic needs.

Comm. Vickers stated tonight's resolution could be approved and then amended at a later date. He then explained that he would not vote in support of the Resolution because it does not address law enforcement needs.

Comm. DeLeon withdrew her motion to amend.

MOVED BY COMM. DELEON, SUPPORTED BY COMM. HOLMAN, TO AMEND THE RESOLUTION BY ADDING THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT IN THE COMMUNITY AGENCY APPLICATION PROCESS, PRIORITY CONSIDERATION IS TO BE GIVEN TO PROPOSALS WHICH ENHANCE SERVICES IN MEETING BASIC NEEDS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairperson Schor stated promoting smart growth should be added to the Resolution under "Promote Environmental Protection."

MOVED BY COMM. DELEON, SUPPORTED BY COMM. HOLMAN, TO ADD "PROMOTING SMART GROWTH" TO THE LIST OF LONG TERM OBJECTIVES ON THE FIRST PAGE OF THE RESOLUTION.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOVED BY COMM. DELEON, SUPPORTED BY COMM. HOLMAN, TO AMEND THE RESOLUTION BY ADDING THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE UNDER THE "PROMOTING SMART GROWTH" SECTION OF THE RESOLUTION (to be placed under Promote Environmental Health section of the Resolution):

Promoting initiatives that will encourage urban development and will protect agriculture in rural areas.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOVED BY COMM. DELEON, SUPPORTED BY COMM. VICKERS, TO AMEND THE "PROMOTE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION" LANGUAGE TO REMOVE REFERENCES TO THE "AGRICULTURAL PRESERVATION BOARD AND THE TRI-COUNTY GROWTH STUDY. THIS LANGUAGE WILL BE ADDED TO THE NEW "PROMOTING SMART GROWTH" SECTION OF THE RESOLUTION.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOVED BY COMM. DELEON, SUPPORTED BY COMM. VICKERS, TO AMEND THE RESOLUTION TO ADD THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT THE INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS WILL EXPLORE EFFICIENCIES THROUGH REGIONAL COOPERATION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairperson Schor stated Comm. Bahar-Cook would like this Committee to amend the "Supporting Recreational Opportunities" section of the Resolution to include language to promote environments that support physical activity for the health and well being of Ingham County residents."

MOVED BY COMM. DELEON, SUPPORTED BY COMM. HOLMAN, TO AMEND THE "SUPPORTING RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES" SPECIFIC ENHANCEMENT LANGUAGE AS FOLLOWS:

SPECIFIC ENHANCEMENT: INCLUDE A FINANCING PLAN WHICH WILL ENABLE THE CONNECTION OF THE COUNTY'S MAJOR COUNTY PARKS (LAKE LANSING, HAWK ISLAND, HOPE SOCCER, AND BURCHFIELD: BY MEANS OF NON-MOTORIZED PATHWAYS WHICH PROMOTE ENVIRONMENTS THAT SUPPORT PHYSICAL ACTIVITY FOR THE HEALTH AND WELL BEING OF INGHAM COUNTY RESIDENTS NO LATER THAN 2016.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED: MOTION CARRIED with Comm. Vickers voting NO.

8. Board Referrals
 - a. Letter from Leslie Township Announcing Plans to Amend the Township's Master Plan
 - b. Letter from Williamstown Township Transmitting the Township's Master Plan Update (Attachments on File in the Clerk's Office)

The Board Referrals were received and placed on file.

Announcements: None

Public Comment: None

The meeting adjourned at 8:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Neff

Agenda Item 2

RESOLUTION STAFF REVIEW

DATE May 5, 2006

Agenda Item Title: Resolution Pledging Full Faith and Credit for the Briarwood Drain Drainage District
2006 Drainage District Bonds

Submitted by: Ingham County Drain Commissioner

Committees: LE ____, JD ____, HS ____, CS __*, Finance __*

Summary of Proposed Action: This resolution authorizes the issuance of Briarwood Drainage District Bonds, pursuant to the Drain Code of 1956 as amended, which will finance storm drain improvements made within the Briarwood Drainage District.

It is customary to obtain the County's full faith and credit pledge when issuing drain bonds. Without the County's pledge, the bonds would be payable only from special assessments on the benefited properties in the drainage district and from assessments on various governmental units. The County's pledge is also needed in order to provide the secondary security that makes it feasible to sell the drain bonds based on the County's credit rating.

Financial Implications: The Bonds will be issued in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed \$3,000,000, the amount of the total estimated financed share cost of the project, which assessments are payable in annual installments over a period of twenty (20) years, commencing in 2006, by the Charter Township of Meridian, the Board of County Road Commissioners of the County of Ingham, and benefited lands, according to apportionments to be duly determined by the Drain Commissioner acting pursuant to Section 262 of the Drain Code.

Other Implications: None.

Staff Recommendation: JN __ H H __ T M __ J C X
Staff recommends approval of this resolution.

May 4, 2006

Mr. John Neilsen
Interim Controller, Ingham County
315 South Jefferson
PO Box 319
Mason, MI 48854

Re: County Full Faith and Credit Resolution for Briarwood Drain Bonds

Dear John:

Please find attached a resolution pledging the full faith and credit of the County for the Briarwood Drain Drainage District 2006 Drainage District Bonds. The not to exceed amount for the bonds is \$3,000,000.

These resolutions record the County's commitment to back the drain bonds with the County's limited tax full faith and credit. As you know, it is customary to obtain the County's full faith and credit pledge when issuing drain bonds. Without the County's pledge, the bonds would be payable only from special assessments on the benefited properties in the drainage district and from assessments on various governmental units. The County's pledge is also needed in order to provide the secondary security that makes it feasible to sell the drain bonds based on the County's credit rating.

In addition, this resolution contains the County's commitment to enter into a Continuing Disclosure Undertaking, which requires the County to annually update financial information pertinent to the County and contained in the official statement for the Bonds.

Very truly yours,

MILLER, CANFIELD, PADDOCK AND STONE, P.L.C.

By: _____
Bree Popp Woodruff

Enclosures

cc: Cecelia Kramer
Donald W. Keim

Introduced by the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

**RESOLUTION PLEDGING FULL FAITH AND CREDIT FOR THE BRIARWOOD DRAIN
DRAINAGE DISTRICT 2006 DRAINAGE DISTRICT BONDS**

WHEREAS, Act 40, Public Acts of Michigan, 1956, as amended (the “Drain Code”), authorizes any county to pledge its full faith and credit for the payment of obligations issued thereunder, if the Board of Commissioners of the county has adopted a resolution by a majority vote of its members-elect to that effect; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Drain Code proceedings are being undertaken by the Ingham County Drain Commissioner for the construction and financing of an intracounty drainage project designated as BRIARWOOD DRAIN, said project having been determined to be necessary for the public health; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to said proceedings, a special assessment roll has been or will be prepared and duly confirmed by the Drain Commissioner in the aggregate principal amount of not to exceed \$3,000,000, being the amount of total estimated financed share cost of the project, which assessments are payable in annual installments over a period of twenty (20) years, commencing 2006, by the Charter Township of Meridian, the Board of County Road Commissioners of the County of Ingham, and benefited lands, according to apportionments to be duly determined by the Drain Commissioner acting pursuant to Section 262 of the Drain Code, said installments bearing interest at such rate of interest as may be necessary to pay interest on obligations payable therefrom; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the authorization provided in the Drain Code, the Drain Commissioner, by order, will authorize and provide for the issuance of bonds by the Briarwood Drain Drainage District payable from the collection of said special assessments against the Charter Township of Meridian, the Board of County Road Commissioners of the County of Ingham, and the benefited lands on said Roll, said bonds being designated 2006 DRAINAGE DISTRICT BONDS (GENERAL OBLIGATION LIMITED TAX) (the “Bonds”), in the aggregate principal amount of not to exceed \$3,000,000, to provide funds to pay part of the costs of the project; and

WHEREAS, the said drainage project is immediately necessary to protect and preserve the public health, and it is to the best interest of the County of Ingham (the “County”) that the Bonds, in order to be sold at the lowest and most favorable interest cost possible to obtain, be secured by a pledge of the full faith and credit of the County as authorized by the Section 276 of the Drain Code.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners:

1. That pursuant to the authorization provided in the Drain Code the Board of Commissioners of the County does hereby irrevocably pledge the full faith and credit of the County for the prompt payment of the principal of and interest on the Bonds when due, and pursuant to said pledge, in the event that the collection of special assessments on said roll is insufficient to pay the Bonds or interest thereon when due, the amount unpaid shall be promptly advanced from County funds as a first budget obligation, and the County Treasurer is directed to immediately make such advancement to the extent necessary.

2. That in the event that pursuant to said pledge of its full faith and credit the County advances out of County funds all or any part of said installments and interest, it shall be the duty of the County Treasurer, for and on behalf of the County, to take all actions and proceedings and pursue all remedies permitted or authorized by law for the reimbursement of such sums so paid, including without limitation the reassessment by the Drain Commissioner of the special assessment roll as provided in Section 276 of the Drain Code.

3. That to the extent required pursuant to Rule 15c2-12(b)(5) adopted by the Securities and Exchange Commission under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the "Rule"), the County shall enter into an undertaking (the "Undertaking") substantially in the form attached as Exhibit A for the benefit of the holders and beneficial owners of the Bonds to send certain information annually and to provide notice of certain events to certain information repositories pursuant to the requirements of the Rule. The County Controller and the Treasurer each is authorized to execute and deliver the Undertaking in such form as is required pursuant to the Rule.

4. That, to the extent permitted by law, it shall take all actions within its control necessary to maintain the exclusion of the interest on the Bonds from adjusted gross income for general federal income tax purposes under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the "Code"), including but not limited to, actions relating to the rebate of arbitrage earnings, if applicable, and the expenditure of Bond proceeds and moneys deemed to be Bond proceeds.

5. That all resolutions and parts of resolution insofar as they conflict with the provisions of this resolution be and the same hereby are rescinded.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and complete copy of a resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the County of Ingham, Michigan, at its regular meeting held on May 23, 2006, at 7:30 p.m., Eastern Daylight Time, and that said meeting was conducted and public notice of said meeting was given pursuant to and in full compliance with the Open Meeting Act, being Act 267, Public Acts of Michigan, 1976, and that the minutes of said meeting were kept and will be or have been made available as required by said Act.

I further certify that the following Commissioners were present at said meeting

_____ and

that the following Commissioners were absent

_____.

I further certify that Commissioner _____ moved adoption of said resolution and that Commissioner _____ supported said motion.

I further certify that the following Commissioners voted for adoption of said resolution:

_____, and that the following Commissioners voted against adoption of said resolution:

_____.

Mike Bryanton
County Clerk

EXHIBIT A
FORM OF
CONTINUING DISCLOSURE UNDERTAKING

This Continuing Disclosure Undertaking (the “Undertaking”) is executed and delivered by the County of Ingham, State of Michigan (the “County”), in connection with the issuance by the Briarwood Drain Drainage District of its \$_____ 2006 Drainage District Bonds (General Obligation Limited Tax) (the “Bonds”). The County covenants and agrees for the benefit of the Bondholders, as hereinafter defined, as follows:

(a) *Definitions.* The following terms used herein shall have the following meanings:

“Audited Financial Statements” means the annual audited financial statement pertaining to the County prepared by an individual or firm of independent certified public accountants as required by Act 2, Public Acts of Michigan, 1968, as amended, which presently requires preparation in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

“Bondholders” shall mean the registered owner of any Bond or any person (a) with the power, directly or indirectly, to vote or consent with respect to, or to dispose of ownership of, any Bond (including any person holding a Bond through a nominee, depository or other intermediary) or (b) treated as the owner of any Bond for federal income tax purposes.

“Disclosure Representative” means the Controller of the County or his or her designee, or such other officer, employee, or agent as the County shall designate from time to time in writing.

“Disclosure USA” means the internet-based electronic filing system at www.disclosureusa.org operated by the Municipal Advisory Council of Texas or successor.

“MSRB” means the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board.

“NRMSIR” means each nationally recognized municipal securities information repository as designated by the SEC in accordance with the Rule.

“Rule” means Rule 15c2-12 promulgated by the SEC pursuant to the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended.

“SEC” means the United States Securities and Exchange Commission.

“SID” means the state information depository for the State of Michigan as designated by the SEC in accordance with the Rule.

(b) *Continuing Disclosure.* The County hereby agrees, in accordance with the provisions of the Rule, to provide or cause to be provided to each NRMSIR and to the SID for the State of Michigan (“SID”), on or before the last day of the sixth month after the end of the fiscal year of the County, the following annual financial information and operating data, commencing with the fiscal year ending December 31, 2006:

(1) Updates of the numerical financial information and operating data (excluding any pictorial representation) included in the official statement relating to the Bonds (the “Official Statement”) appearing in the Tables or under the headings in the Official Statement as described below:

- a. County of Ingham General Financial Information - Property Valuations - Historical Valuation;
- b. County of Ingham General Financial Information - Major Taxpayers;
- c. County of Ingham General Financial Information - Tax Rates;
- d. County of Ingham General Financial Information - Tax Levies and Collections;
- e. County of Ingham General Financial Information - Debt Statement – Direct Debt;
- f. County of Ingham General Financial Information - Legal Debt Margin.

(2) Audited Financial Statements; provided, however, that if the Audited Financial Statements are not available by the last day of the sixth month after the end of the fiscal year, they shall be provided when available and unaudited financial statements in a format similar to the financial statements contained in the Official Statement will be filed by such date and the Audited Financial Statements will be filed as soon as available.

Such annual financial information and operating data described above are expected to be provided directly by the County in the following documents to be filed with each NRMSIR and the SID: the Audited Financial Statements; materials containing the updates described in (b) (1) above; and in subsequent official statements of the County filed with the MSRB.

If the fiscal year of the County is changed, the County shall send notices of such change to each NRMSIR or the MSRB, and to the SID, prior to the earlier of the ending date of the fiscal year prior to such change or the ending date of the fiscal year as changed.

(c) *Notice of Failure to Disclose.* The County agrees to provide or cause to be provided, in a timely manner, to (i) each NRMSIR or the MSRB and (ii) the SID, notice of a failure by the County to provide the annual financial information with respect to the County described in subsection (b) above on or prior to the dates set forth in subsection (b) above.

(d) *Occurrence of Events.* The County agrees to provide or cause to be provided in a timely manner to (i) each NRMSIR or the MSRB and (ii) the SID, if any, notice of the occurrence of any of the following events listed in (b)(5)(i)(C) of the Rule with respect to the Bonds, if applicable, if material:

- (1) principal and interest payment delinquencies;
- (2) non-payment related defaults;
- (3) unscheduled draws on debt service reserves reflecting financial difficulties;
- (4) unscheduled draws on credit enhancements reflecting financial difficulties;
- (5) substitution of credit or liquidity providers, or their failure to perform;
- (6) adverse tax opinions or events affecting the tax-exempt status of the security;
- (7) modifications to rights of security holders;
- (8) bond calls;
- (9) defeasances;
- (10) release, substitution, or sale of property securing repayment of the securities; and
- (11) rating changes.

(e) *Materiality Determined Under Federal Securities Laws.* The County agrees that its determination of whether any event listed in subsection (d) is material shall be made in accordance with federal securities laws.

(f) *Central Post Office Filing.* Any filing with each NRMSIR and the SID under sections (b), (c), (d) or (i) of this Undertaking may be made by transmitting such filing to Disclosure USA as provided at www.disclosureusa.org unless the SEC withdraws the interpretive advice contained in its letter to the Municipal Advisory Council of Texas dated September 7, 2004.

(g) *Termination of Reporting Obligation.* The obligation of the County to provide annual financial information and notices of material events, as set forth above, shall be terminated if and when the County no longer remains an "obligated person" with respect to the Bonds within the meaning of the Rule, including upon legal defeasance of all Bonds.

(h) *Benefit of Bondholders.* The County agrees that its undertaking pursuant to the Rule set forth in this Undertaking is intended to be for the benefit of the Bondholders and shall be enforceable by any Bondholder; provided that, the right to enforce the provisions of this Undertaking shall be limited to a right to obtain specific enforcement of the County's obligations hereunder and any failure by the County to comply with the provisions of this Undertaking shall not constitute a default or an event of default with respect to the Bonds.

(i) *Amendments to the Undertaking.* Amendments may be made in the specific types of information provided or the format of the presentation of such information to the extent deemed necessary or appropriate in the judgment of the County, provided that the County agrees that any such amendment will be adopted procedurally and substantively in a manner consistent with the Rule, including any interpretations thereof by the SEC, which, to the extent applicable, are incorporated herein by reference. Such interpretations currently include the requirements that (a) the amendment may only be made in connection with a change in circumstances that arises from a change in legal requirements, change in law, or change in the identity, nature, or status of the County or the type of activities conducted thereby, (b) the undertaking, as amended, would have complied with the requirements of the Rule at the time of the primary offering of the Bonds, after taking into account any amendments or interpretations of the Rule, as well as any change in circumstances, and (c) the amendment does not materially impair the interests of Bondholders, as determined by parties unaffiliated with the County (such as independent legal counsel), but such interpretations may be changed in the future. If the accounting principles to be followed by the County in the preparing of the Audited Financial Statements are modified, the annual financial information for the year in which the change is made shall present a comparison between the financial statements as prepared on the prior basis and the statements as prepared on the new basis, and otherwise shall comply with the requirements of the Rule, in order to provide information to investors to enable them to evaluate the ability of the County to meet its obligations. A notice of the change in accounting principles shall be sent (i) to each NRMSIR or the MSRB and (ii) the SID.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the County has caused this Undertaking to be executed by its authorized officer.

COUNTY OF INGHAM
State of Michigan

By _____

Its Controller

Dated: _____, 2006

PULLED BY THE BOARD ON MAY 9, 2006

Introduced by the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE INGHAM COUNTY HOUSING COMMISSION TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH THE CITY OF EATON RAPIDS TO ACT AS A THIRD PARTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR A DOWNTOWN RENTAL REHABILITATION PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the City of Eaton Rapids has applied for Community Development Block Grant funding from the Michigan State Housing Development Authority; and

WHEREAS, the Michigan State Housing Development Authority has awarded the City of Eaton Rapids a grant for their downtown rental rehabilitation program; and

WHEREAS, the City of Eaton Rapids desires to contract with the Ingham County Housing Commission for administration of the project; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Housing Commission will receive an administrative fee of \$43,000 covering the costs of implementation of this program through 2007.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham Board of Commissioners authorizes the Ingham County Housing Commission to enter into a contract with the City of Eaton Rapids to act as the third party administrator of their downtown rental rehabilitation program.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Housing Commission is authorized to receive administrative fees in the amount of \$43,000 to cover the costs of program implementation from May 1, 2006 through December 31, 2007.

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

RESOLUTION STAFF REVIEW

DATE: May 10, 2006

Agenda Item Title: Resolution Authorizing Entering Into a Contract with AVI Systems for Upgrades and/or Purchases for Court Recording Equipment

Submitted by: Purchasing Department on behalf of 55th District Court, 30th Judicial Circuit Court, 30th Judicial Court – Family Division, and Probate Court

Committees: LE ____, JD __*, HS ____, CS __*, Finance __*

Summary of Proposed Action: This resolution will authorize the purchase of one unified audio/video digital system for all Ingham County Courts from AVI Systems along with top of the line annual preventative maintenance contracts.

Financial Implications: The total cost of \$49,900.00 are funds budgeted within the CIP budget. The preventative maintenance contracts will be paid from existing funds within the Courts' budgets. The Probate Court's upgrade for log notes, at a cost of \$175.00, will come from their existing budget.

Other Implications: This was not the lowest cost proposal, but the most responsive proposal as determined by the Evaluation Committee.

Staff Recommendation: JN X HH ____ TM ____ JC ____
This resolution should be approved.

**Ingham County Circuit Court
30th Judicial Circuit**

P.O. BOX 40771
313 W. KALAMAZOO STREET
LANSING, MI 48901-7971
TELEPHONE: (517) 483-6500
FAX: (517) 483-4591

WILLIAM E. COLLETTE
Chief Circuit Judge

DAVID L. EASTERDAY
Circuit Court Administrator



NERVY OLIVER
Deputy Court Administrator
Juvenile Division

DONALD L. REISIG
Deputy Court Administrator /
Friend of the Court

RHONDA K. SWAYZE
Deputy Court Administrator /
General Trial Division

May 3, 2006

Jane Valentine
Procurement Specialist
Purchasing Department
P.O. Box 519
Mason, MI 48854

Dear Ms. Valentine:

The Circuit Court – Juvenile Division supports the agreement to proceed with the AVI proposal.

Nery Oliver
Deputy Court Administrator

Ingham County Circuit Court

30th Judicial Circuit

P.O. BOX 40771
313 W. KALAMAZOO STREET
LANSING, MICHIGAN 48901-7971
TELEPHONE: (517) 483-6500
FAX: (517) 483-6501

WILLIAM E. COLLETTI
Chief Circuit Judge

DAVID L. EASTERDAY
Circuit Court Administrator



RHONDA K. SWAYZE
Deputy Court Administrator /
General Trial Division

DONALD L. REISKI
Deputy Court Administrator /
Family Division / Friend of the Court

MEMORANDUM

To: Janeil Valentine
From: David Easterday *DE*
Date: April 7, 2006
Re: Courtroom Recording Equipment

Judge Giddings would like to proceed with obtaining the FTR Video / Audio Courtroom recording equipment for his Courtroom. He and Susan Melton have reviewed both Audiovisual, Inc.'s proposal and Business Information Systems' proposal and agree that the FTR equipment is the preferred system.

If you need further information please let me know.

cc: Judge James R. Giddings
Susan Melton
Marilyn Reed

Rosemarie E. Aquilina
Chief Judge

Thomas P. Boyd
Judge

James B. Pahl
Magistrate

Anethia O. Brewer
Court Administrator

55th Judicial District Court of the State of Michigan

700 Buhl Avenue, Mason, Michigan 48854 – Phone 517.676.8400

April 21, 2006

To: Janeil Valentine, Purchasing

Fr: Anethia Brewer

Re: Digital Recording Equipment

I am writing to provide you with the decision District Court has made regarding digital recording. Both district court recorders agree with me that FTR Gold is the product district court would like to have. We are familiar with the product and are pleased with the references we've contacted to date. A big factor in the decision to choose FTR was the ease of operation. This plays a major role in this court because of the number of back-up recorders who do not use the system often. There are also two magistrates who will be trained to use the product.

The court was allocated \$20,000 to secure digital recording during 2006. This should be enough funds to secure three systems. We have also decided that we would like go with the extended service agreement (\$1000) because the court does not want to be responsible for the costs of servicing and/or replacing existing equipment that will be used along with the FTR product. We determined it is cheaper to have the extended warranty versus the cost of single a single visit to repair or replace any item. This would take a toll on the court's budget. The court is prepared to work with your office in determining the course of installation. Any assistance we can provide will be available.

Once again, thank you for your hard work and please contact me if additional information is needed to complete this process.

Cc: Rodney Taylor, MIS Director
Rosemarie Aquilina, Chief Judge

May 2, 2006

Janeil Valentine
Procurement Specialist
Purchasing Department
Ingham County
Hilliard Building
P.O. Box 319
Mason, MI 48854

Dear Ms. Valentine:

We are in agreement of awarding the Ingham County digital recording contract to AVI. It is our understanding that under this contract Judge Garcia's courtroom would receive a free upgrade of the FTR Gold product, an upgrade of court notes for \$175, and year-round Gold Service Plan maintenance for \$500 per year.

Sincerely,

George M. Strander
Court Administrator & Probate Register

Cc: Hon. Richard J. Garcia
Hon. R. George Economy
Patty Vance
Tracy Smith

Introduced by the Judiciary, County Services, and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ENTERING INTO A CONTRACT WITH AVI SYSTEMS FOR UPGRADES AND/OR PURCHASES FOR COURT RECORDING EQUIPMENT

WHEREAS, the Courts of Ingham County have demonstrated a need to either upgrade and/or purchase audio and/or video court recording equipment; and

WHEREAS, an Evaluation Committee was formed with representation from the 55th District Court, 30th Judicial Circuit Court, 30th Judicial Court – Juvenile Division, Probate Court, and the MIS and Purchasing Departments; and

WHEREAS, the Purchasing Department, with consultation and recommendation from the Evaluation Committee issued Request for Proposals for audio and video recording equipment; and

WHEREAS, upon review and consultation of the proposals received, the Evaluation Committee decided that it would be in the County's best interest to purchase one unified system for all courts from AVI Systems; and

WHEREAS, the 30th Judicial Circuit Court recommends purchasing a new audio and video system for Judge Giddings' Courtroom for \$23,404.00, with annual preventative maintenance costs of \$3,700.00; and

WHEREAS, the 30th Judicial Circuit Court Juvenile Division recommends purchasing a new audio system for its hearing rooms for \$6,624.00, with annual preventative maintenance costs of \$1,500.00; and

WHEREAS, the Probate Court recommends purchasing an audio system upgrade for log notes at a cost of \$175.00, and annual preventative maintenance costs of \$500.00; and

WHEREAS, the 55th District Court recommends purchasing three (3) audio systems for its two (2) courtrooms and one (1) hearing room for \$19,872.00, and annual preventative maintenance costs of \$3,000.00; and

WHEREAS, the 30th Judicial Circuit Court and the 55th District Court have funds approved in the Capital Improvement Plan for courtroom recording, and the Probate Court is in need of purchasing upgrades to its current system.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby authorizes entering into a contract with AVI Systems, 4575 44th Street, SE, Suite C, Grand Rapids, Michigan for the purchase of new systems at a cost of \$49,900.00, including an upgrade for log notes costs of \$175.00 and annual preventative maintenance costs of \$8,700.00.

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

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners directs the Controller's Office to make the necessary budget adjustments in the Ingham County Courts 2006 budget.

RESOLUTION STAFF REVIEW

DATE: April 13, 2006

Agenda Item Title: Resolution Approving the UAW-TOPS Collective Bargaining Agreement

Submitted by: Harold Hailey, Human Resources Director

Committees: LE ____, JD ____, HS ____, CS __*, Finance __*

Summary of Proposed Action: This resolution will authorize a contract with the UAW-TOPS Unit.

- 1) Contract duration 1/1/06 - 12/31/08.
- 2) Holidays
 - a) Employees scheduled to work holidays shall be compensated at the rate of one and one-half (1 ½) times in addition to receiving eight (8) hours of holiday pay.
 - b) Employee preference is to eliminate Columbus Day and add eight (8) bonus hours plus Christmas and New Years Eve.
- 3) Retirement - Union has the option of adding benefits at their cost, subject to a 10% limitation of total salary.
- 4) Wages - 2.5% effective 01/01/06, 2.5% effective 01/01/07, and 3% effective 01/01/08.
- 5) Eighteen (18) reclassifications – Total Cost \$45,523.
- 6) Grievance Procedure – If mutually agreed, proceed to State Mediation before County Services Committee.
- 7) Discipline – disciplinary actions more than two years old may be used in cases involving same type of infraction.
- 8) Union Business – Union may use the current 11 hours in contract per month to attend meetings or prepare for negotiations.
- 9) Union V-Cap added.
- 10) Funeral Leave – added step-sister, step-brother and grandchildren.
- 11) Employees have the option to add the MERS Health Care Savings Program at their cost.

Financial Implications: The costs are within the 2006 Budget.

Other Implications: None.

Staff Recommendation: JN ____, HH X, TM ____, JC ____

Staff recommends approval of this resolution.

Introduced by the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION APPROVING THE UAW-TOPS BARGAINING AGREEMENT

WHEREAS, an agreement has been reached between representatives of the UAW-TOPS Employees and the County on a collective bargaining agreement for January 1, 2006 through December 31, 2008; and

WHEREAS, the agreement has been ratified by the employees within the bargaining unit; and

WHEREAS, the provisions of the agreement have been approved by the County Services and Finance Committees, and are within the guidelines established by the Board of Commissioners.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby approves the contract with the UAW-TOPS Unit, and the Chairperson of the Board of Commissioners and the County Clerk are authorized to sign it on behalf of the County. Further no retro-pay shall be given until the contract is signed by both parties.

RESOLUTION STAFF REVIEW

DATE: May 8, 2006

Agenda Item Title: Resolution Approving a Collective Bargaining Agreement with the Ingham County Employees' Association for the Professional Employees

Submitted by: Harold Hailey, Human Resources Director

Committees: LE ____, JD ____, HS ____, CS __*, Finance __*

Summary of Proposed Action: This resolution will authorize a contract with Ingham County and the Ingham County Employees' Association for their Professional Employees.

- 1) Contract duration 1/1/06 - 12/31/08.
- 2) Holidays - Employee preference is to eliminate Columbus Day and add 8 vacation bonus hours plus Christmas and New Years Eve.
- 3) Wages - 2.5% effective 01/01/06, 2.5% effective 01/01/07, and 3% effective 01/01/08.
- 4) Eight (8) reclassifications – Total Cost \$56,089.
- 5) Longevity increased from \$18,000 to \$20,000 effective 01/01/06.
- 6) Retirement - Union has the option of adding benefits at their cost, subject to a 10% limitation of total salary.
- 7) Domestic Partner Benefits to extent permitted by law.
- 8) Family Illness – Employees may use accumulated sick time for approved leave under FMLA.
- 9) Funeral Leave – add step-sister, step-brother and grandchildren to Immediate Family Definition.

Financial Implications: The costs are within the 2006 Budget.

Other Implications: None.

Staff Recommendation: JN __ HH X TM __ JC __
Staff recommends approval of this resolution.

Introduced by the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION APPROVING A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT WITH THE INGHAM COUNTY EMPLOYEES' ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES

WHEREAS, an agreement has been reached between representatives of Ingham County and the Ingham County Employees' Association for their Professional Employees during the period of January 1, 2006 through December 31, 2008; and

WHEREAS, the agreement has been ratified by the employees within the bargaining unit; and

WHEREAS, the provisions of the agreement have been approved by the County Services and Finance Committees, and are within the guidelines established by the Board of Commissioners.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby approves the contract with Ingham County and the Ingham County Employees' Association for their Professional Employees.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Board of Commissioners and the County Clerk are authorized to sign the contract on behalf of the County. Further no retro-pay shall be given until the contract is signed by both parties.

RESOLUTION STAFF REVIEW

DATE: May 8, 2006

Agenda Item Title: Resolution Approving A Collective Bargaining Agreement with the Thirtieth Judicial Circuit Court and 55th Judicial District Court and Ingham County Employees' Association for the Professional Court Employees

Submitted by: Harold Hailey, Human Resources Director

Committees: LE ____, JD ____, HS ____, CS __*, Finance __*

Summary of Proposed Action: This resolution will authorize a contract with the Thirtieth Judicial Circuit and 55th Judicial District Courts, and Ingham County Employees' Association for the Professional Court Employees.

- 1) Contract duration 1/1/06 - 12/31/08.
- 2) Holidays - Employee preference is to eliminate Columbus Day, add Cesar Chavez Day plus Christmas and New Years Eve every year.
- 3) Retirement - Union has the option of adding benefits at their cost, subject to a 10% limitation of total salary.
- 4) Wages - 2.5% effective 01/01/06, 2.5% effective 01/01/07, and 3% effective 01/01/08.
- 5) Bumping, Recall – combine Seniority Groups A and B.
- 6) Domestic Partner Benefits to Extent Permitted by Law
- 7) Family Illness – Employees may use accumulated sick time for approved leave under FMLA.
- 8) Job Opening and Temporary Assignment – Career Ladder – Replace Parenting Time Advocate with Senior Case Examiner and Senior Enforcement Specialist.
- 9) Grievance Procedure – Replace Labor Relations Committee with Arbitration.
- 10) Longevity increased from \$18,000 to \$20,000 effective 01/01/06.
- 11) Funeral Leave – added step-sister, step-brother and grandchildren to Immediate Family Definition.

Financial Implications: The costs are within the 2006 Budget.

Other Implications: None.

Staff Recommendation: JN __ HH X TM __ JC __

Staff recommends the approval of this Resolution.

Introduced by the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION APPROVING A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT WITH THE THIRTIETH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT AND 55TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT AND INGHAM COUNTY EMPLOYEES' ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROFESSIONAL COURT EMPLOYEES

WHEREAS, an agreement has been reached between the Thirtieth Circuit Court and 55th District Court and the Ingham County Employees' Association for Professional Court Employees for a collective bargaining agreement during the period of January 1, 2006 through December 31, 2008; and

WHEREAS, the agreement has been ratified by the employees within the bargaining unit; and

WHEREAS, the agreement has been approved by both Chief Judges of the Thirtieth Circuit and 55th District Courts; and

WHEREAS, the provisions of the agreement have been approved by the County Services and Finance Committees, and are within the guidelines established by the Board of Commissioners.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby approves the contract with the Thirtieth Circuit Court and 55th District Court and Ingham County Employees' Association for the Professional Court Employees.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Board of Commissioners and the County Clerk are authorized to sign the contract on behalf of the County. Further no retro-pay shall be given until the contract is signed by both parties.

MEMORANDUM

TO: All Liaison Committees – Ingham County Board of Commissioners

FROM: County Services Committee

DATE: May 8, 2006

RE: Review of Process for Making Appointments to Boards, Committees, and Commissions

In response to concerns about the appointment of citizens to Ingham County advisory boards, committees, and commissions, and the process in which these appointments have been made, at its meeting of Tuesday April 4, the County Services Committee discussed strategies for implementing an improved process.

As a result, the County Services Committee requests that each liaison committee of the Ingham County Board of Commissioners review the manner in which citizen appointments are made to their various boards, committees and commissions. It is suggested that additional questions beyond those that are listed on the appointment application be asked, and that each committee attempt to tailor their questioning of each applicant in an appropriate manner that is specific to the individual board/committee/commission the applicant is interviewing for. For example, for the Friend of the Court Advisory Board, it may be reasonable to ask if the applicant has been previously involved with the Friend of the Court (not necessary for the custodial parent slot), and if so, were there ever any requirements related to child support payments or other issues that were not met?

APPOINTMENTS MADE BY THE COUNTY SERVICES COMMITTEE

Agriculture Preservation Board
Environmental Affairs Committee
Equal Opportunity Committee
Fair Board
Parks and Recreation Committee
Youth Commission

INTERVIEWED BY COUNTY SERVICES, BUT APPOINTED BY THE BOARD CHAIRPERSON

EDC Board of Directors
Historical Commission
Housing Commission
Road Commission

MEMORANDUM

TO: Finance and Liaison Committees

FROM: John Neilsen, Interim Controller

DATE: May 2, 2006

SUBJECT: 2007 Update of County Fees

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. This review has been completed and some adjustments are being presented to the Board of Commissioners for their consideration. This information is being presented at the current round of committee meetings as a discussion item. A resolution recommending any fee increases will be presented at the next round of meetings. A draft version for discussion is included in this packet.

Attached are spreadsheets detailing the recommended adjustments to fees to be effective January 1, 2007.

The first set of spreadsheets is an analysis of the 2007 update of county fees. The following information is included for each fee:

1. Location of Service.
2. Fee Description.
3. The 2006 cost as calculated in last year's fee update process.
4. The cost increase factor. This is based on the 3-year average increase for each department's adopted General Fund budget from 2003 to 2004, 2004 to 2005 and 2005 to 2006.
5. The 2007 cost, which is calculated by multiplying the 2006 cost by the cost increase factor.
6. 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, it is assumed that the fee as passed is charged at the appropriate cost with a target recovery of 100%.
7. The 2006 fees were passed by Resolution #05-145. In September 2005, the Equalization Department fees were amended by Resolution #05-241 and the Health Department fees were amended by Resolution #05-242. In December 2005, the Drain Commissioner's Residential Drain Crossing Permit and the 6-month and 9-month Soil Erosion Permits were established by Resolution #05-336. (Since passage of these resolutions, some fees have been amended or added, as noted on the spreadsheets.)
8. The 2007 calculated fee is based on the 2007 cost multiplied by the target percent.

9. Although many fees were proposed to remain unchanged in 2007, the initial proposed fees were determined by rounding down the calculated fee to the full dollar amount, and, in some of the larger fees, rounded to the lower \$5 or \$10 increment. In some cases, the cost multiplied by the target percent is much more than the current fee, so only an incremental increase is proposed, with the full cost times target percent planned to be reached after several years. Fees that are proposed to increase are presented in bold.
10. Units. This information is used to calculate revenue to be generated by the proposed fees. This information was initially provided in the Maximus study, and in some cases, has been updated by the departments. The departments have not been able to estimate the number of units for all of the individual fees and therefore the projected additional revenue is understated.
11. Department Recommendation. In most cases, the department agreed with the Initial Proposed Fees. In cases where there is disagreement, information such as a memo of explanation from the department has been included.
12. Controller Recommendation. In all cases, the Controller agreed with the department recommendations.
13. Additional revenue is projected from the Controller's Recommended increase in fees multiplied by the units.

The final spreadsheet presents a summary of fees proposed to be increased in 2007. They simply list the 2006 fee, the department recommendations, the Controller recommendation, and projected additional revenue, for each of the fees where an increase is proposed.

As shown in the attached correspondence, some of the departments disagreed with the initially proposed fees. The Controller took this feedback under consideration and made final recommendations based on the department input.

- (a) The District Court recommends not increasing these fees, rather they will pose a number of solutions/increases to assist with funding Sobriety Court and other services threatened by federal and state cuts. The proposed solutions will affect some of the services listed on the fee schedule and will alleviate problems without creating financial hardships, as well as, generate some additional revenue.
- (b) The Circuit Court, Family Division, and Friend of the Court agreed with all initial proposed fees except for the Friend of the Court Bench Warrant fee. The Bench Warrant fee went from \$45 to \$180 in five years. In addition, they are currently in discussion with the SCAO concerning the question of Program Income which would affect how much of the current \$180 the County is able to keep. For both of these reasons, they feel the fee should remain the same.
- (c) The Animal Control department agreed with all initial proposed fees except for the Kennel Inspections. The department has restructured the Kennel Inspection format to ensure the kennels licensed in Ingham County are providing adequate conditions as dictated by the State of Michigan. More staff time and paperwork is now dedicated to complete the inspections and observations and meticulous report writing is now required. The required resources have more than doubled as compared to a year ago.

- (d) The Drain Commission rates related to Commercial Soil Erosion will be sent under separate cover. The Drain Commissioner is in the process of implementing a more comprehensive program that will comply with new Federal Phase II guidelines and Part 91 as amended. Therefore, new fees will also be added.

- (e) Many of the Health Department fees have been determined using Board authorized methodology per Resolution #05-166 and are no longer necessary to establish per the fee schedule. The INS Vaccination Verification Form I-693 and the Immigration Physical Exam fees were set per Resolution #05-242.

If all fee increases were enacted as recommended by the Controller's Office, it is projected that an additional \$163,016 would be generated in 2007. The current total revenue generated by the listed fees is approximately \$3.38 million, so the fee adjustments would increase the base by about 5.0%.

Please contact me if you have any questions regarding this information.

JLN/tm/lrs

2007 Drain Commissioner Fee Recommendation

Preliminary Commercial Site Plan Review – \$590.00

Preliminary Plat Review – \$590.00

Plat and Commercial Drainage Review

- First Acre – \$590.00
- Additional acre – \$70.00
- After 2nd Drainage Review for continued errors by applicant, there will be a \$200.00 Re-submission Administrative fee, plus all associated costs.

Plat Drain Administration Fee – \$1800.00

Drain Crossing Permits (Commercial) – \$430.00

Drain Crossing Permit (Residential) – \$115.00

Tap-in Permit – Residential – \$90.00

Tap-in Permit – Commercial – \$350.00

Soil Erosion Permit – Commercial – See note *

Soil Erosion Permit – Residential

- 12 month - \$230.00
- 9 month - \$200.00
- 6 month - \$170.00
- Renewal – ½ of original fee

Commercial Minor Disturbance Soil Erosion Permit - \$260.00

- Renewal – ½ of original fee

Residential Minor Disturbance Soil Erosion Permit - \$40.00

Violation and Cease & Desist Order - ~~\$300.00~~ 260.00 per Sheldyn Lewis

Title Search – Drain Assessments - \$4.00

* Fees related to Commercial Soil Erosion will be sent under separate cover. The Drain Commissioner is in the process of implementing a more comprehensive program that will comply with new Federal Phase II guidelines and Part 91 as amended.

SUMMARY OF FEES WHERE CHANGES ARE RECOMMENDED

County Services Committee

Location of Service	Fee Description	2006 Fee	Department Recommend.	Controller Recommend.	Additional Revenue
Drain Comm.	Preliminary Comm. Site Plan Review	\$570.00	590.00	590.00	\$2,800
Drain Comm.	Preliminary Plat Review	\$570.00	590.00	590.00	\$160
Drain Comm.	Plat and Commercial Drainage Review				
Drain Comm.	First acre	\$570.00	590.00	590.00	\$2,800
Drain Comm.	Additional acre	\$60.00	70.00	70.00	\$400
Drain Comm.	Re-submission Admin fee		200.00	200.00	\$2,800
Drain Comm.	Plat Drain Administration Fee	\$1,725.00	1,800.00	1,800.00	\$2,625
Drain Comm.	Drain Crossing Permits, Review (Commercial)	\$410.00	430.00	430.00	\$800
Drain Comm.	Drain Crossing Permit- (Residential)	\$110.00	115.00	115.00	\$0
Drain Comm.	Tap in Permit - Residential	\$85.00	90.00	90.00	\$650
Drain Comm.	Tap-in Permit - Commercial	\$325.00	350.00	350.00	\$625
Drain Comm.	Soil Erosion Permit-Residential-12 mo.	\$220.00	230.00	230.00	\$15,000
Drain Comm.	9 month duration	\$195.00	200.00	200.00	\$0
Drain Comm.	6 month duration	\$160.00	170.00	170.00	\$0
Drain Comm.	Commercial Minor Disturbance Soil Erosion - Permit/Review/Inspection	\$250.00	260.00	260.00	\$460
Drain Comm.	Violation and Cease&Desist Order	\$250.00	260.00	260.00	\$0

Judiciary Committee

Location of Service	Fee Description	2006 Fee	Department Recommend.	Controller Recommend.	Additional Revenue
All Courts	Work Release *	20.00	\$23.00	\$23.00	\$15,750
Circuit Court	Felony Case Costs	525.00	550.00	550.00	\$17,100
Circuit Court	Show Cause - Probation	65.00	70.00	70.00	\$1,885
Family Division	Delinquency Costs	130.00	140.00	140.00	\$17,250
Family Division	Traffic	60.00	65.00	65.00	\$8,875

Law Enforcement Committee

Location of Service	Fee Description	2006 Fee	Department Recommend.	Controller Recommend.	Additional Revenue
Animal Control	Enforcement/Dog License Fees:				
	Delinquent	24.00/40.00	25.00/42.00	25.00/42.00	\$3,366
	Unaltered	20.00	21.00	21.00	\$5,610
Animal Control	Boarding Fee per day	5.00	10.00	10.00	\$18,333
Animal Control	Adoption Fee- Puppies(age-four months or less)	90.00	95.00	95.00	\$935
Animal Control	Animal Redemption: - 1st offense	25.00	26.00	26.00	\$682
	2nd offense	30.00	31.00	31.00	\$177
	3rd offense	60.00	63.00	63.00	\$80
	after 3rd offense	120.00	125.00	125.00	\$0
Animal Control	Ten Dog Kennel Inspection Fee	42.00	70.00	70.00	\$280
Animal Control	Over Ten Dog Kennel Inspection Fee	48.00	90.00	90.00	\$210
Pros Atty	Diversion-Svc Fee-Misdemeanor Offender	375.00	380.00	380.00	\$0
Pros Atty	Diversion-Svc Fee-Felony Offender	675.00	680.00	680.00	\$0
Pros Atty	Costs-eligible convictions - Guilty Plea	70.00	75.00	75.00	\$4,940
Pros Atty	Costs for eligible convictions - Trial	110.00	115.00	115.00	55
Jail	Day Rate	30.00	35.00	35.00	3000

Human Services Committee

Location of Service	Fee Description	2006 Fee	Department Recommend.	Controller Recommend.	Additional Revenue
Comm. Health	INS Vaccination Verif Form I-693	25.00	26.00	26.00	\$300
Comm. Health	MSS Tran. Bus/Van	21.97 (max)	22.56 (max)	22.56 (max)	\$30
Comm. Health	MSS - Trans Taxi	22.08 (max)	22.68 (max)	22.68 (max)	\$30
Comm. Health	ISS Trans. Bus/Van	21.97 (max)	22.56 (max)	22.56 (max)	\$30
Comm. Health	ISS - Trans Taxi	22.08 (max)	22.68 (max)	22.68 (max)	\$30
Comm. Health	Compreh Envir Investigation	205.00	212.00	212.00	\$77
Comm. Health	Assessment of Home	85.00	90.00	90.00	\$25
	Immigration Physical Exams	137.00	140.00	140.00	\$30
Med Examiner	Cremation Permits	15.00	17.00	17.00	\$0
Med Examiner	Autopsy Report Copies (family)	10.00	11.00	11.00	\$140
Med Examiner	Autopsy Report Copies (others)	25.00	28.00	28.00	\$168
Env. Health	Fixed Food Svc Estab-Nonprofit	150.00	175.00	175.00	\$1,075
	Fixed Food Svc Estab - Profit:				
Env. Health	Initial License incl. 2 hours Plan Rev	966.00	992.00	992.00	\$12,485
Env. Health	Initial Restricted License	480.00	493.00	493.00	\$1,338
Env. Health	Initial License (Mobile)	340.00	349.00	349.00	\$617
Env. Health	Multiple facility renewal license	150.00	154.00	154.00	\$137
Env. Health	Renewal License:				
Env. Health	At least \$750,000	800.00	821.00	821.00	\$3,602
Env. Health	At least \$500,000,less than \$750,000	655.00	672.00	672.00	\$625
Env. Health	At least \$250,000,less than \$500,000	505.00	518.00	518.00	\$319
Env. Health	Less than \$250,000	360.00	369.00	369.00	\$110
Env. Health	Seasonal Renewal License, FSE:				
Env. Health	Seasonal Gross sales exc. \$750,000	480.00	496.00	496.00	\$470
Env. Health	SeasnI at least \$500,000,less \$750,000	393.00	403.00	403.00	\$74
Env. Health	SeasnI at least \$250,000,less \$500,000	303.00	311.00	311.00	\$39
Env. Health	Seasonal less than \$250,000	216.00	221.00	221.00	\$12
Env. Health	Non-profit	75.00	77.00	77.00	\$10
Env. Health	Change of Ownership of FSE	286.00	293.00	293.00	\$0
Env. Health	Fixed FSE - Initial License, Nonprofit	200.00	205.00	205.00	\$25
Env. Health	Initl Lic Fee Exmpt(plan revw only) Govt	166.00	170.00	170.00	\$0
Env. Health	FSE-Schools/Indigent-late renewal - additional	100.00	102.00	102.00	\$56
Env. Health	Public Pool Inspection	166.00	170.00	170.00	\$712
Env. Health	Each add'l pool at same location	83.00	85.00	85.00	\$0
Env. Health	Pool Reinspection (after violation)	83.00	85.00	85.00	\$0
Env. Health	Child&Adult Care Fac Ins-Full	162.00	166.00	166.00	\$0
Env. Health	Child&Adult Care Fac Ins.-W&S	102.00	104.00	104.00	\$0
Env. Health	Child & Adult Care Plan Review	300.00	308.00	308.00	\$0
Env. Health	Initial STFU license Incl. Plan Review	260.00	267.00	267.00	\$329
Env. Health	STFU Renewal	94.00	96.00	96.00	\$0
Env. Health	Tattooing Business License	332.00	341.00	341.00	\$108
Env. Health	Tattooing Lic-late renewal-additional	100.00	102.00	102.00	\$0
Env. Health	Temp FSE - Non-Profit	80.00	82.00	82.00	\$124
Env. Health	Temp Nonprf FSE-Ops Beg Bef Licg (double)	160.00	164.00	164.00	\$0
Env. Health	Temp FSE- Preparation Type	166.00	172.00	172.00	\$0
Env. Health	Temp FSE-Ops Began Before Licg (double)	332.00	344.00	344.00	\$0
Env. Health	Temp FSE-each add'l lic.after 2 at 1 loc	54.00	55.00	55.00	\$0

Human Services Committee (Cont'd)

Location of Service	Fee Description	2006 Fee	Department Recommend.	Controller Recommend.	Additional Revenue
Env. Health	Vending: 1-3 Licensable Mach. in Same Loc.	60.00	62.00	62.00	\$82
Env. Health	Vending: 4-6 Licensable Mach. in Same Loc.	80.00	82.00	82.00	\$0
Env. Health	Vending: 7-10 Licensable Mach. in Same Loc.	105.00	108.00	108.00	\$120
Env. Health	Vending: Larger Location (First 10 machines)	105.00	108.00	108.00	\$0
Env. Health	<i>Sewage Only (new)</i>	425.00	436.00	436.00	\$2,750
Env. Health	<i>Well Only (new)</i>	425.00	436.00	436.00	\$3,300
Env. Health	Vacant Land Evaluation	405.00	420.00	420.00	\$2,175
Env. Health	On-Site Sewage syst Plan Revw	405.00	416.00	416.00	\$2,640
Env. Health	Repair - Well	150.00	154.00	154.00	\$0
Env. Health	Altern On-site Sewage Syst Plan Revw	310.00	319.00	319.00	\$900
Env. Health	Hourly Rate Over Standard Service	83.00	85.00	85.00	\$0
Env. Health	Subdivision Evaluation of Preliminary Plat	166.00	170.00	170.00	\$0
Env. Health	Bathing Area Operational Permit	166.00	170.00	170.00	\$0
Env. Health	Reinstmt of bathing area permit	83.00	85.00	85.00	\$0
Env. Health	Sanitary Surv for Prop. Bathg Beach	332.00	341.00	341.00	\$0
Env. Health	<i>Loan Evaluation-Residential Premises</i>	225.00	231.00	231.00	\$0
Env. Health	<i>Munic Requ Eval. of Well/Septic</i>	83.00	85.00	85.00	\$0
Env. Health	Reinstatemt of Susp FSE	424.00	435.00	435.00	\$0
Env. Health	Surcharge-Fail submit plans/chg own	424.00	435.00	435.00	\$0
Env. Health	Surcharge-Fail of applic - vending	140.00	143.00	143.00	\$0
Env. Health	Critical Follow-up Inspection fee	101.00	103.00	103.00	\$0
OYC	Consultation Request (per hr.)	50.00	51.00	51.00	\$0
OYC	Agency Training Request- Base, 1.5 hr.	150.00	155.00	155.00	\$0
OYC	Agency Training Request- Base, 2.5 hr.	250.00	257.00	257.00	\$0
OYC	Agency Train. Request- Base, 1.5 hr, each add.	10.00	11.00	11.00	\$0
OYC	Agency Train. Request- Base, 2.5 hr, each add.	15.00	16.00	16.00	\$0
OYC	OYC-Advertised Train.- 1.5 hr./per person (min. 15 attending)	15.00	21.00	21.00	\$0
OYC	OYC-Advertised Train.- 2.5 hr./per person (min. 15 attending)	15.00	26.00	26.00	\$0
OYC	OYC-Advertised Train.- 5.0 hrs./per person (min. 15 attending)	15.00	52.00	52.00	\$0
Vet. Affairs	County User Fee	15.89	16.04	16.04	\$275

2007 County Fees Analysis
County Services Committee

FEE PROPOSED TO INCREASE ARE IN BOLD

Location of Service	Fee Description	2006 Cost	2007 Cost Increase Factor	2007 Cost	Target Percent	2006 Fee	2007 Calc. Fee	2007 Initial Prop. Fee	Units	Department Recommend.	Controller Recomm.	Additional Revenue
Clerk	Certified Copy - 1st Copy (1)	\$14.76	4.08%	\$15.36	100.0%	\$15.00	\$15.36	\$15.00	10,500	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$0
Clerk	Certified Copy - Add'l Copies (1)	\$7.77	4.08%	\$8.09	100.0%	\$8.00	\$8.09	\$8.00	24,500	8.00	8.00	\$0
Drain Comm.	Preliminary Comm. Site Plan Review	\$1,099.22	5.03%	\$1,154.56	75.0%	\$570.00	\$865.92	\$590.00	140	590.00	590.00	\$2,800
Drain Comm.	Preliminary Plat Review	\$1,412.33	5.03%	\$1,483.43	75.0%	\$570.00	\$1,112.57	\$590.00	8	590.00	590.00	\$160
Drain Comm.	Plat and Commercial Drainage Review	\$686.93 Avg	5.03%	\$1,686.93			1,686.93					\$0
	First acre	incl. above	5.03%	incl. above	100.0%	\$570.00	incl. above	\$590.00	140	590.00	590.00	\$2,800
	Additional acre	incl. above	5.03%	incl. above	100.0%	\$60.00	incl. above	\$70.00	40	70.00	70.00	\$400
	Re-submission Admin fee			\$0.00		\$0.00			14	200.00	200.00	\$2,800
Drain Comm.	Plat Drain Administration Fee	\$5,923.93	5.03%	\$6,222.17	75.0%	\$1,725.00	\$4,666.63	\$1,800.00	35	1,800.00	1,800.00	\$2,625
Drain Comm.	Drain Crossing Permits, Review (Commercial)	\$417.31	5.03%	\$438.32	100.0%	\$410.00	\$438.32	\$430.00	40	430.00	430.00	\$800
Drain Comm.	Drain Crossing Permit - (Residential) (3), (5)	\$110.00	5.03%	\$115.54	100.0%	\$110.00	\$115.54	\$115.00	0	115.00	115.00	\$0
Drain Comm.	Tap in Permit - Residential	\$117.42	5.03%	\$123.33	75.0%	\$85.00	\$92.50	\$90.00	130	90.00	90.00	\$650
Drain Comm.	Tap-in Permit - Commercial	\$458.36	5.03%	\$481.44	75.0%	\$325.00	\$361.08	\$350.00	25	350.00	350.00	\$625
Drain Comm.	Soil Erosion Permit - Commercial (4)								184	*	*	\$0
	First acre (4)	\$627.21	5.03%	\$658.79	100.0%	\$570.00	\$658.79	\$590.00	0	*	*	\$0
	Additional acre (4)	\$43.90	5.03%	\$46.12	100.0%	\$60.00	\$46.12	\$70.00	0	*	*	\$0
	Renewal (4)					1/2 of orig fee		1/2 of orig fee	0	*	*	\$0
Drain Comm.	Soil Erosion Permit-Residential-12 mo.	\$220.00	5.03%	\$231.08	100.0%	\$220.00	\$231.08	\$230.00	1,500	230.00	230.00	\$15,000
Drain Comm.	9 month duration (3)	\$282.65	5.03%	\$296.88	75.0%	\$195.00	\$222.66	\$200.00	0	200.00	200.00	\$0
Drain Comm.	6 month duration (3)	\$229.17	5.03%	\$240.71	75.0%	\$160.00	\$180.53	\$170.00	0	170.00	170.00	\$0
Drain Comm.	Renewal					\$125.00		1/2 of orig fee		1/2 of orig fee	1/2 of orig fee	\$0
Drain Comm.	Commercial Minor Disturbance Soil Erosion - Permit/Review/Inspection (2)	\$333.33	5.03%	\$350.12	75.0%	\$250.00	\$262.59	\$260.00	46	260.00	260.00	\$460
Drain Comm.	Renewal		5.03%			\$125.00		1/2 of orig fee		1/2 of orig fee	1/2 of orig fee	\$0
Drain Comm.	Residential Minor Disturbance Soil Erosion Permit/Review/Inspection	\$53.47	5.03%	\$56.17	75.0%	\$40.00	\$42.12	\$40.00	170	40.00	40.00	\$0
Drain Comm.	Violation and Cease&Desist Order (5)	\$250.00	5.03%	\$262.59	100.0%	\$250.00	\$262.59	\$250.00	0	260.00	260.00	\$0
Drain Comm.	Title Search - Drain Assessments	\$4.54	5.03%	\$4.77	100.0%	\$4.00	\$4.77	\$4.00	4,000	4.00	4.00	\$0
Equalization	Pre-2005 Paper Maps/Aerial photos (blueprints)	\$10.11	0.23%	\$10.13	100.0%	\$10.00	\$10.13	\$10.00	3,000	10.00	10.00	\$0
Equalization	Digitally Produced Paper Maps- Parcel Layer											
Equalization	8.5" x 11" (6)	\$5.00	0.23%	\$5.01	100.0%	\$5.00	\$5.01	\$5.00		5.00	5.00	\$0
Equalization	11" x 17" (6)	\$10.00	0.23%	\$10.02	100.0%	\$10.00	\$10.02	\$10.00		10.00	10.00	\$0
Equalization	17" x 22" (6)	\$15.00	0.23%	\$15.03	100.0%	\$15.00	\$15.03	\$15.00		15.00	15.00	\$0
Equalization	22" x 34" (6)	\$20.00	0.23%	\$20.05	100.0%	\$20.00	\$20.05	\$20.00		20.00	20.00	\$0
Equalization	28" x 40" (6)	\$25.00	0.23%	\$25.06	100.0%	\$25.00	\$25.06	\$25.00		25.00	25.00	\$0
Equalization	34" x 44" (6)	\$30.00	0.23%	\$30.07	100.0%	\$30.00	\$30.07	\$30.00		30.00	30.00	\$0

2007 County Fees Analysis
County Services Committee

FEEES PROPOSED TO INCREASE ARE IN BOLD

Location of Service	Fee Description	2006 Cost	2007 Cost Increase Factor	2007 Cost	Target Percent	2006 Fee	2007 Calc. Fee	2007 Initial Prop. Fee	Units	Department Recommendation	Controller Recomm.	Additional Revenue
Equalization	Digitally Produced Paper Maps - Parcel layer w/2005 Digital Photo Layer											
Equalization	8.5" x 11" (6)	\$10.00	0.23%	\$10.02	100.0%	\$10.00	\$10.02	\$10.00		10.00	10.00	\$0
Equalization	11" x 17" (6)	\$20.00	0.23%	\$20.05	100.0%	\$20.00	\$20.05	\$20.00		20.00	20.00	\$0
Equalization	17" x 22" (6)	\$30.00	0.23%	\$30.07	100.0%	\$30.00	\$30.07	\$30.00		30.00	30.00	\$0
Equalization	22" x 34" (6)	\$40.00	0.23%	\$40.09	100.0%	\$40.00	\$40.09	\$40.00		40.00	40.00	\$0
Equalization	28" x 40" (6)	\$50.00	0.23%	\$50.12	100.0%	\$50.00	\$50.12	\$50.00		50.00	50.00	\$0
Equalization	34" x 44" (6)	\$60.00	0.23%	\$60.14	100.0%	\$60.00	\$60.14	\$60.00		60.00	60.00	\$0
Plat Board	Plat Administration Fee	\$100.09	0.58%	\$100.67	100.0%	\$100.00	\$100.67	\$100.00	10	100.00	100.00	\$0
Treasurer	NSF Checks	\$27.28	4.96%	\$28.63	100.0%	\$25.00	\$28.63	\$25.00	20	25.00	25.00	\$0
TOTALS												\$29,120

(1) Per MCL 333.2891, local clerks cannot charge more than the State fees of \$26 for the first copy and \$12 for the second.

(2) The Drain Commission has determined that the actual cost is much higher than the Maximus, since this not only includes 1-2 hours for review and issuance, but also 3-4 hours for inspection over the six-month permit period, similar to the staff time for a residential soil erosion permit. Therefore, it should have the same fee.

(3) These 2006 Fees were omitted in Resolution 05-145 and were set later by Resolution 05-336 on December 13, 2005.

(4) Fees related to Commercial Soil Erosion will be sent under separate cover. The Drain Commissioner is in the process of implementing a more comprehensive program that will comply with new Federal Phase II guidelines and Part 91 as amended.

DRAFT

Introduced by the Finance Committee of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION UPDATING VARIOUS FEES FOR COUNTY SERVICES

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners set various fees for county services in Resolution #02-155 based on information and recommendations of the *Maximus Cost of Services Analysis* completed in 2002; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners also established the percent of the cost of providing the services which should be covered by such fees, referred to in this process as a “target percent”; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners has directed the Controller’s Office to establish a process for the annual review of these fees and target percents; and

WHEREAS, this process begins with the calculation of a cost increase factor, which is equal to the previous three year average increase in General Fund adopted budget for the appropriate departments; and

WHEREAS, this cost increase factor is applied to the previous year’s calculated cost and multiplied by the target percent and in most cases rounded to the lower full dollar amount in order to arrive at a preliminary recommended fee for the upcoming year; and

WHEREAS, in cases where the calculated cost multiplied by target percent is much higher than the current fee, the fee will be recommended to increase gradually each year until the full cost multiplied by target percent is reached, in order to avoid any drastic increases in fees; and

WHEREAS, in cases where the calculated cost multiplied by target percent is lower than the current fee, no fee increase will be recommended for that year; and

WHEREAS, after initial recommendations are made by the Controller, these recommendations are distributed to the affected offices and departments, in order to receive their input; and

WHEREAS, after reviewing the input from the affected offices and departments, the Controller makes final recommendations to the Board of Commissioners; and

WHEREAS, the Controller’s Office has finished its annual review of these fees and recommended increases where appropriate based on increased costs of providing services supported by these fees and the percent of the cost of providing the services which should be covered by such fees as established by the Board of Commissioners; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners has reviewed the Controller’s recommendations including the target percentages, along with recommendations of the various county offices, departments, and staff.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Commissioners authorizes or encourages the following fee increases in Attachments A and B at the rates established effective January 1, 2007.

Groups/Organizations Using County Office Space

Department\Agency	Location	Relationship	Lease
Tri-County Office on Aging	HSB	Community Agency	They pay a % of operating & debt amounts.
Ingham Counseling Center/Community Mental Health	HSB	Community Agency	They pay a % of operating & debt amounts.
Dept. of Human Services	HSB	Community Agency	They pay a % of operating & debt amounts.
Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program	HSB	Community Agency	MSU Funding - No lease
MSU Extension	Hilliard	Community Agency	MSU Funding - No lease
Capital Area Community Services	Annex Building	Community Agency	\$3.65 Sq. Foot
Community Mental Health/House of Commons	Old Library	Community Agency	\$1 per year
Washtenaw Co.	Jail	Inmate Space	\$35 a bed
Court Appointed Special Advocate/CASA	GPB	Circuit Court	\$1 per year
PPO Office/EVE	GPB	Circuit Court	No cost - provides county services by contract
Adult Probation/Michigan Department of Corrections	GPB	Circuit Court	No cost - provided by state statute
Access to Justice	GPB	Community Agency	No cost
Bar Association	GPB	Community Agency	No cost
DART / Domestic Abuse	GPB	Community Agency	No cost
Housing Commission	Hilliard	Quasi County Agency	No cost

SUPERVISOR
Rick Galardi

CLERK
Diane K. Mosier

TREASURER
Phyllis Daggy



1401 W. Herbison Road, DeWitt, MI 48820-7900

Agenda Item 8 TRUSTEES
Jeff Baumann
Max Calder
Stephen C. Musselman
David Seeger

MANAGER
Matthew J. Kulhanek

May 2, 2006

Robert A. Owen, Jr.
Planning and Zoning Administrator
City of East Lansing Department of Planning and Community Development
410 Abbott Road
East Lansing, MI 48823

Re: Proposed Comprehensive Plan

Dear Mr. Owen:

At the May 1, 2006 regular meeting, the DeWitt Charter Township Planning Commission reviewed the proposed East Lansing Comprehensive Plan, *Big Picture – Comprehensive Plan for our Future*. This review was conducted pursuant to your recent notification under the requirements of the Municipal Planning Act, PA 285 of 1931, as amended. At the meeting, the Planning Commission asked that I forward the following comments to the East Lansing Planning Commission:

1. Objective 6-5 and Action 6-5.1 indicate that it is the goal of the City of East Lansing to expand its boundaries north to I-69 and west to US-127 in DeWitt Township. The objective and action are not consistent with the recently adopted DeWitt Charter Township Comprehensive Development Plan, particularly the General Vision stated in Chapter 3 of the Plan, and the goal and policies for Regional Cooperation and Coordination listed on page 4-23 of the Plan.

The Planning Commission would recommend that the references to the expansion of boundaries in the East Lansing Plan be deleted. The Commission would also recommend that language be added to indicate the City's willingness to work with its neighbors for the coordinated development of those areas beyond its present boundaries and to engage in planning consistent with its neighbors' plans. The Commission feels that planning for the big picture should involve communities working together to make their individual plans compatible.

2. The Proposed Land Use Districts are not defined in the proposed plan. In particular, the Mixed Development District and the Bath Village Planning Area District are proposed along and near the Chandler Road corridor. Without some definition as to the uses that might be allowed in these districts, it is difficult to comment as to whether the districts are consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Development Plan for this Township.

Main Office: 517.668.0270
Treasurer: 517.668.1411
Fax: 517.668.0277

Assessing: 517.669.6494
Building: 517.668.0278
Planning: 517.669.6576
Fax: 517.669.6496

Police: 517.669.6578
Fax: 517.669.6583
Fire: 517.669.0071
Fax: 517.669.6752

Community Center
Phone: 517.482.5117
Fax: 517.482.1293

The Commission understands that the City intends to develop a single Master Plan for the Bath Village Planning Area and looks forward to the opportunity to review that plan and provide its comments at the appropriate time.

3. The Proposed Land Use Map indicates that future land uses for areas outside of the City are shown for context and generally reflect the current master plans for the adjacent communities. The Planning Commission would note that some of the designations for properties within DeWitt Township are not consistent with our recently adopted Future Land Use Map. For example, the properties in DeWitt Township that are shown in the Mixed Development District should be shown in the General Retail/Service District. The properties north of State Road that are shown in various retail and residential districts are currently shown in the Agricultural designation on the Township's Future Land Use Map.

A copy of this Township's Comprehensive Development Plan and Future Land Use Map was provided to the City Planning Commission following adoption of the Plan. Additional copies can be obtained by contacting the Planning Department or from the Township's website, www.dewitttownship.org.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Act, a copy of this correspondence is being forwarded to the Clinton County Planning Commission and the Ingham County Board of Commissioners.

On behalf of the Planning Commission, I wish to express our thanks for the opportunity to review and comment. Should you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact me at 669-6576.

Sincerely,



Jeffrey M. Gray, AICP
Planning Director

cc: DeWitt Township Board of Trustees
DeWitt Township Planning Commission
Clinton County Planning Commission, 100 E. State Street, Suite 1300, St. Johns, MI 48879
Ingham County Board of Commissioners, Ingham County Courthouse, P.O. Box 319, Mason, MI 48854
Samir Singh, Mayor, City of East Lansing
Roberta McElmurry, Chair, East Lansing Planning Commission