



AGENDA
Committee on Ways and Means
Wednesday, September 7, 2016 @ 8:15 a.m.
10th Floor Conference Room, City Hall

Councilmember Judi Brown Clarke, Chair
Councilmember Carol Wood, Vice Chair
Councilmember Tina Houghton, Member

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Roll Call**
- 3. Minutes**
 - August 3, 2016
 - August 17, 2016
 - August 29, 2016
- 4. Public Comment on Agenda Items**
- 5. Discussion/Action:**
 - A.) RESOLUTION – Approval of the Office of Community Corrections Funding Application
 - B.) Update on Tie-Bar Memo
- 6. Place on File**
- 7. Other**
- 8. Adjourn**



DRAFT



MINUTES

**Committee on Ways and Means
Wednesday, August 3, 2016 @ 8:15 a.m.
10th Floor Conference Room, City Hall**

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 8:15 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Councilmember Judi Brown Clarke, Chair
Councilmember Carol Wood, Vice Chair
Councilmember Tina Houghton, Member

OTHERS PRESENT

Sherrie Boak, Council Staff
Jim DeLine, Interim City Council Internal Auditor
Jim Smiertka, City Attorney - arrived at 8:17 a.m.
Angie Bennett, Finance Director
Lori Welch, City of Lansing Operations & Maintenance
Kathy Miles
Tonia Olson, Granger
Kevin McKinney, Granger
Breina Push, Granger
John Lancour, Friedland
Victor Rose, City of Lansing Operations and Maintenance
Lynne Meade, UAW IBT 243
Phil Mikus, Granger

MINUTES

MOTION BY COUNCIL MEMBER WOOD TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM JUNE 1, 2016 AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED 3-0.

MOTION BY COUNCIL MEMBER WOOD TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM JUNE 1, 2016 AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED 3-0.

MOTION BY COUNCIL MEMBER WOOD TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM JULY 20, 2016 AMENDED TO REFLECT THE COMMENT BY MR. SMIERTKA THAT HE WOULD MEET WITH MS. MEADE AND MS. ESTEE. MOTION CARRIED 3-0.

DRAFT

Public Comment on Agenda Items

Was discussed during each agenda item.

Discussion/Action:

Authorization of Participation in the Capital Area Recycling Initiative

Ms. Welch referenced the information she provided via email to the Committee based on the last meeting. This included the feasibility study that was requested in a power point presentation. They hope to continue to work together to accomplish their goals.

Council Member Brown Clarke asked who was represented during the discussions. Ms. Welch stated that the process of the report had one component reaching out to 5-6 of the private sectors. This part did not involve the steering committee.

Ms. Olson acknowledges they did participate in the discussions, but it only involved a consultant representing the principal. There was a dialogue and discussion, and Granger shared where they thought the study missed the mark, and they also inquired to participate. They would want to be in the mix, if this area recycling was chosen and the only choice. Ms. Olson lastly clarified that Granger does not believe the volume is sufficient enough for this proposal they Granger continues to be interested in working towards a collaborative outcome. Ms. Olson handed out a draft resolution recently used by Delta Township as an appropriate resolution.

Council Member Wood referenced the 2008 and 2015 studies, which showed a projection. She then asked Ms. Welch where the City sits now in 2016 in relationship to the projections. Ms. Welch answered they had not officially evaluated the data and released a statement. With single stream, which was the bigger one, in 2010 they went to single stream and increased recycling, and then later with the changes in carts that also increased. Council Member Wood again asked for the breakdown on the projection comparison, and also tonnage for 2009-2015. Ms. Welch agreed to provide that in a yearly breakdown, which is what they currently track.

Council Member Brown Clarke stated that it appeared they were looking at creating a regional facility but the City already has existing resources. Therefore what is showing them that the current resources cannot meet the needs, and in our current situation do we have the resources to meet. Ms. Welch acknowledges she did not have a simple answer, because currently every community is doing their own collecting, shipping, etc. They believe they can do better by pooling the resources. They believe it was proven by working with East Lansing. This proposal will be market driven. Ms. Welch added that they haven't found they don't have the local resources. Mr. Rose added to the discussion that currently the City uses a transfer and haul system, shipping to Ann Arbor. The City has a trucking issue they don't want and a facility on site they don't want. Regional collaboration is important to the City and they have begun to partner with a private entity to participate in a pilot program who will be tipping on floor. They hope if they see an increase in tonnage, they might convince Granger and Friedland that there could be a joint tipping floor.

Council Member Brown Clarke agreed with regional collaboration however, the resolution proposed is progressive to where the City currently is. Mr. Rose saw the value of the resolution, however with so many government agencies involved they need to start on the process.

Council Member Wood voiced a concern on the recent information of a pilot program with a private entity. Mr. Rose clarified that they are dumping the load, the City takes care of it and bills the private entity. This is nothing to do with staffing or equipment.

DRAFT

Council Member Wood referenced the “Options for Recycling” graph in the 2008 powerpoint, and asked for follow up information, and any projections on what was collected when it got to single stream. This research should also reflect revenue projections.

Council Member Brown Clarke asked Ms. Olson and Mr. Lancour, in comparing the two resolutions, what language is problematic in the original resolution if they are looking at collaboration, and private partnerships.

Mr. Lancour pointed out that the resolution has list of commodities, and that list is a big part of what Friedland already does, it also says they are working towards and ordinance to have haulers use the regional. His belief is that this will force people to go to the facility. The determination is flow control, and that is why their consultant tonnage count is off. Friedland is already providing the service to the community. Lastly he wanted it noted that in 2009 Friedland did bid on the transfer haul.

Ms. Olson acknowledge her support of the revised resolution she submitted today, and did recognize Ms. Welch for listening, however it still says that the concept is to work towards a facility. A facility infrastructure already exists, so this would be a replacement. It says “collaborating”, but that means “contracting”, which is a flag to the private sector. The revised resolution, was an initiative by Delta Township and revolves around activity to increase volumes so services already provided are uses. Right now the resolution does not tip to support the ventures.

Council Member Brown Clarke asked for an updated list of what municipalities had definitely confirmed to the Resolution. Ms. Welch admitted that the resolution can be customized for each community so not all have agreed to the original resolution. Delta Township has adopted the revised resolution that was handed out. It is possible that the revised resolution will get more collaboration, but both have mutual support of her resolution. The purpose of the resolution is to show everyone is working together.

Council Member Wood encouraged a resolution that has buy in from the private sector and public sector, then use that one resolution.

Ms. Olson pointed out that other communities have opted to not use the original resolution, those being Clinton County and Delhi.

Council Member Houghton asked Ms. Welch what her resolution addresses that the Delta Township did not. Mr. Rose answered stating it theirs focuses on increasing volume, the City works towards a facility being created. Ms. Olson confirmed the Delta version struck out the idea of pushing towards a facility, and maintaining that would increase the volume to drive a facility with normal market conditions, instead of forced market control. From the private sector, the information exists, there is no need for the group to push the facility because the private has sector already made the investment and needs to fill the need.

Ms. Miles recalled the last meeting where it appeared that multi-family residences were not in place for recycling. Ms. Welch stated that most are best serviced through commercial usage with larger dumpsters. They are exploring on a case by case basis.

Council Member Houghton asked if the steering committee can continue without the resolution, and Ms. Welch did state they could.

DRAFT

Council Member Brown Clarke asked Ms. Welch to take the new resolution back to the steering committee, then Council will discuss again at Ways and Means on September 7th.

Council Member Wood added that her concern is that there are multi resolutions out there with different concepts, and therefore the steering needs to settle on one resolution.

Vacancy Report

Council Member Brown Clarke recapped a meeting she held with HR Director Ms. Mary Riley on August 2, 2016. This discussion involved the restructuring of the vacancy report. The process will begin with Finance as it has done in the past, then forwarded to Ms. Black in HR. The HR department will do their regular process but also create the column that was introduced in 2015 that would address the status of the vacant positions. Council President Brown Clarke acknowledged the report is not amended to burden the two departments, so the Council staff will assist with financial research. Items that have been added to the spreadsheet include the status column, if the position is offset by a contract worker, if it is offset by a retiree. The earlier request on if the work had been distributed to others via overtime was eliminated because Council Member Brown Clarke acknowledged that after talking to Ms. Riley that would be hard to determine. The column that would reflect how long a position was vacant could be difficult, therefore the Committee is looking for an annual reporting as a baseline. Therefore Ms. Black would look back 6 months, and then annually to see if each vacant position was vacant at those two baselines. Ms. Black confirmed that she can look back 6 months and make note for each positions if it was or was not vacant at that time. Council Member Brown Clarke clarified that the audience for the generation of the report is the Council, so they need these changes to help them better understand the vacancies and positions. Ms. Bennett added that the administration also uses it as a budget monitoring tool.

Council Member Brown Clarke instructed Mr. DeLine to update the Internal Auditor job scope to include this new task.

Lastly, Council Member Brown Clarke noted the new report will have a key to define the labels HR uses for status.

Ms. Black confirmed she had a conversation with Ms. Riley after the August 2, 2016 meeting and that the discussion in this meeting was the same information she shared.

Ms. Meade informed the Committee that she, as Union representative, gets a report from HR with all temporary contracted listed. Ms. Meade noted that the reports are never complete, and she is required to always ask further questions and more requests to obtain the information she asked for. This includes the need to have the contract, amendments to contracts, and information on if the temporary contracts receive benefits, overtimes, etc. Ms. Black acknowledged the information in the past given to Ms. Meade was insufficient, and that request has now been turned over to her, and therefore she solely will be responsible for providing everything.

Discussion - Lansing Housing Commission Financial Statements **Discussion - Lansing Housing Commission Recovery Agreement with** **HUD and the City of Lansing**

Council Member Brown Clarke informed all present that Council staff sent a letter to Ms. Baines Lake inviting her again to a Committee meeting. There was no response, and so she asked Council staff to invite her again and include Mr. Baltimore with the LHC Board also. Ms. Baines

DRAFT

Lake attendance is requested to discuss the financials and recovery plan before her retirement from the LHC at the end of 2016.

Council Member Wood informed the Committee that she had sent information to Mr. Smiertka that addressed the section of the ordinance that speaks to all contracts, and other than purchasing and contracts with tenants, all are supposed to be approved by Council. Currently there is no contract in the Clerk's office for Ms. Baines Lake, and no proofs of insurance for the LHC as required. Mr. Smiertka acknowledged the information sent to him by Council Member Wood, and admitted he is still researching the statute that pre-empts the ordinance, and that has also been amended. There is currently no language in the ordinance that states the organizations have to physically attend Committee meetings. Mr. Smiertka will continue to research, and Council Member Brown Clarke stated the item will appear on the agenda in September when a determination has been made by Law.

Threshold on Council Approval on Separation Agreements (J. Abood)

Mr. Smiertka informed the Committee that in terms of employment contracts that are currently being signed, they are following the recent Charter provision. To address other issues, they could consider amending the executive plan and attach it to the contract. The amendment states that provision of 4 month's severance is not in effect.

Mr. Smiertka addressed the question on Ms. McIntyre, stating that the calculations on Ms. McIntyre payment included issues of benefits. The benefit amount was right, the hours weren't reflected right. Ms. Bennett added to the discussion that the dollar amount in the contract was correct, but it only gave a vacation balance, not sick leave or personal time, that was also part of the calculation. Mr. Smiertka assured them again that it had to do with transmission of the calculation. The determination was \$49,565 the excess of that was structurally authorized for payment because there were claims, whether under the City Attorney McIntyre or the Mayor. Council Member Wood asked if that was because of the communications of a potential law suit, and Mr. Smiertka confirmed there was nothing in writing found, just claims of employment related and those could take various natures. The \$78,000+ was for the release of the claim.

Mr. Smiertka moved onto the options Council has to address similar situations in the future. One option he proposed was to address it in the upcoming annual contracts, adding in that any separation or severance benefits not otherwise covered must be ratified by the Mayor and City Council. A second option would be to put language in the executive plan with fringe benefit summaries. This can be put in the executive management rules for the end of year approval by City Council. A third option would be for Council to consider a Charter amendment and lastly Council can consider a resolution which would not be as effective. Mr. Smiertka did assure Council that what occurred is not unusual; a severance and release agreement.

Council Member Houghton asked if other municipalities have the similar options or a common practice. Also what the benefit would be to put the language in or not put it in for safe guards. Mr. Smiertka stated it is always seen in the employment relationship, what Council wants is a safe guard to review but then it becomes difficult to negotiate. Mr. Smiertka admitted he has seen these practices in private and public practice. Council Member Houghton then asked who has the authority in the other municipalities he has researched. Mr. Smiertka admitted it depends, in Grand Rapids it is the City Commission, but they do not have a Mayor. Some corporations it is the personnel manager.

DRAFT

Council Member Brown Clarke asked if there was a way to impose a threshold, so anything below that threshold would not go through Council, but anything over would. This would allow anything below management to have discretion. Mr. Smiertka was asked for a best practice recommendation. Mr. Smiertka confirmed it is standard if you are talking severance vs. settle. If it is a layoff, the company policy would be they get severance pay per the time worked. If the employee had issues they negotiate. Mr. Smiertka basically stated there is no standard. For a public body he stated they adopt language. The Charter says litigation is settled with Council approval, so he agreed to continue to research. Currently with the provision of 4 months, there is no flexibility. Council could see issues of termination of department heads, but that would be in closed sessions.

Council Member Wood spoke on her frustration in what had occurred with Ms. McIntyre departure, and the lack of information that was provided to Council, or incorrect information.

The discussion continued on appropriate language, claims that would run through Council, considering adopting a resolution for any insured or uninsured claim made by a department head shall not be settled without City Council approval, or something similar. Council Member Brown Clarke asked for something in place to address future claims and make sure they comport to certain rules and procedures so Council can address with the constituents.

Council Member Wood gave an example of a Council resolution on appointments adopted, not vetoed, then later the Mayor state he would not follow what it stated. The question to Mr. Smiertka was how was that legal. Mr. Smiertka stated if the resolution referenced the Charter, the Charters says no litigation settlement without Council. What would happen in that scenario, the Mayor would say Council was prohibiting his executive power. In the terms of the Charter where Council approves litigation he could not guarantee what happened wouldn't happen again. If Council does a Charter amendment it will take care of the concerns and issues, and there will be no wiggle room.

Ms. Miles spoke in opposition to the information that was provided to Council and asked the Committee to find out if a contract for Ms. McIntyre was ever found. Mr. Smiertka stated the original was found, but no signed amendments were found. The employee remained in office under employment of the Mayor, and there is no requirement in the Charter.

Council Member Houghton asked Mr. Smiertka if it needs to be a blanket for all department heads or just the City Attorney office since there is a unique working responsibility with Council. Mr. Smiertka stated they could start out addressing Councils authority to settle and then reference the City Attorney position as unique and therefore no claims will settle without Council. Committee asked for two documents to review, one for just the departments and one for the City Attorney.

Process to Securing an External Investigator (Council Member Wood)

Request by Council Member Wood to remove the item from the Committee agenda. Council Member Brown acknowledged that the Committee is aware they will not get the votes from Council they will need to complete this process and hiring.

Ms. Miles asked why, and Council Member Brown Clarke reiterated that it was not fund driven, but they knew they would not get the votes of Council to pursue. It does not mean there aren't other steps, just not this step.

Ms. Miles offered financial assistance, and asked for a roll call vote on this item at Council.

DRAFT

ADJOURN

Adjourn at 9:54 a.m.

Submitted by,

Sherrie Boak, Recording Secretary Lansing City Council

Approved by the Committee on_____

DRAFT



MINUTES

**Committee on Ways and Means
Wednesday, August 17, 2016 @ 8:15 a.m.
10th Floor Conference Room, City Hall**

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 8:15 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Councilmember Judi Brown Clarke, Chair
Councilmember Carol Wood, Vice Chair
Councilmember Tina Houghton, Member- arrived at 8:19 a.m.

OTHERS PRESENT

Sherrie Boak, Council Staff
Jim DeLine, Interim City Council Internal Auditor
Jim Smiertka, City Attorney
Denise Estee
Bill Barkyoumb
Teresa Faussetto
Lynne Meade

MINUTES

Action moved to the next meeting.

Public Comment on Agenda Items

Public comment will be taken during the agenda items.

Discussion/Action:

Resolution – First Amendment of the Defined Contribution Plan

Mr. Barkyoumb clarified the need for the amendment. Currently the plan states that the investment management collects, when technically the City collects and remits to the management plan as directed by the participants. This amendment is to correct the defect.

Council Member Wood asked for clarification from Law, since she is member of the defined contribution group that collects benefits if she could make the motion and vote, and Mr. Smiertka state any trustee can make a motion.

MOTION BY COUNCIL MEMBER WOOD TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION ON THE FIRST AMENDMENT OF THE DEFINED CONTRIBUTION PLAN. MOTION CARRIED 3-0.

DRAFT

Update on Tie-Bar Memo Status

Mr. Smiertka confirmed he had met with Ms. Estee and Ms. Meade on August 16th where they went over the details and the history of the issues. The step is to meet with the Administration with the plans to report back to the Committee at the next meeting.

Council Member Wood reminded the group that they also need to make sure if there were changes needed or refunds, that process needs to be determined also. Mr. Smiertka noted he would meet with Finance to see the economic ramifications.

Ms. Estee acknowledged the meeting with Mr. Smiertka and provided him with additional information that she did not have at her meeting with him on August 16th. This was a list of names from February 2004 – May, 2014 where she believed was a 10 year period where the City has not given the retirees the correct plan or charged correctly. The document reflected group 580 retirees that were impacted. Ms. Estee believed the list contained up to 90 names. Mr. Smiertka accepted the documents. Ms. Meade also acknowledged Mr. Smiertka participation in a meeting.

Council Member Wood informed Mr. Smiertka of another issue where contracts are being ratified, however they are not modifying the ordinances based on those contracts, some going back 3-4 years. She is recommending to Council that they no longer approve a contract until it is writing. Mr. Smiertka asked for clarification on the concern if it was there are no contracts or not converted into ordinance. Council Member Wood informed Mr. Smiertka that currently all Council sees is a document with bullet points on it, must return the document, and they never see them converted into the contract. Mr. Smiertka made it known he was not aware of this process, and acknowledged there are two issues; there needs to be a signed contract, and two the collective bargaining agreement appears to supersede the ordinance, those should be converted into ordinance.

Ms. Meade noted that if both sides agree to changes, they should be in the contract, in writing and signed off by both sides. Council Member Brown Clarke added that those signed documents should also be made available on line to all members anytime they need to see their contracts. Ms. Meade did clarify that the process now is there are no longer bullet point documents, but the proposals have the exact language for contract so nothing is vague.

Council Member Brown Clarke clarified that the next meeting is not in two weeks, but September 7th, at which point this item will appear on the agenda again.

Ms. Estee informed the group that from February, 2007 to January, 2011 there was a contract but not signed, and so the question is, was that legally binding. Mr. Smiertka noted that it would depend on the facts, and once they start acting on it, it becomes valid. Ms. Estee added there was a contract 2007 to January, 2012 that has nothing in written material either.

Council Member Brown Clarke asked that at the table there should not be people who are not part of the decision, and that the proposals should be approved by Law before presented to Council so that after Council approves they are not informed that Law did not sign off on it. Ms. Estee asked that HR be responsible for the record keeping, and Mr. Smiertka stated that can also be added in the ordinance.

Ms. Estee asked that it be noted that on April 20, 2016 she sent a letter to Ms. Riley, HR Director, and has no response, and also has emailed her with no response. There was also a FOIA request sent to Mr. Dotson, with the original dates of April 22, 2016 and April 28th, 2016.

DRAFT

These were resent July 25, 2016, but no response yet other than acknowledgement of receiving her email. Mr. Smiertka confirmed that the log is now on the Attorney web page, and the topic of unanswered FOIA's or denied without approval from Council President are topics on his staff meeting agenda for Monday, August 22, 2016.

Vacancy Report

No one from Human Resources or Finance were present, so Council Member Brown Clarke recapped the details from her meeting with Mary Riley, HR Director on August 2nd and what was discussed at the August 3, 2016 Committee meeting with Ms. Black from HR. The hopes for the Committee are that something will be presented at the Committee meeting on September 7, 2016. Ms. Meade asked that a column be added to the sheet to reflect the positions that are being filled on an "Interim" basis by current employees. Council Member Wood suggested that when the Committee looks at the Budget Priorities they add in a section that addressed that positions be filled in a timely manner.

Threshold on Council Approval on Separation Agreements

Mr. Smiertka presented two draft resolutions that spoke to the City Council participation in decisions regarding claims the City Attorney may have against the City and any At-Will employees have against the City. The recent provision in the Charter, Chapter 4; 6-401 has been into the last 3 employment contracts. The ordinance on classification for the executive management plan has the Mayor proposing additions or modifications to the fringe benefits with the rules having to be ratified by Council. It was acknowledged that Law is being told the fringe benefit will be before Council at the end of year will have that new Charter portion addressed. Council has ability to approve litigation, but there is nothing in the Charter on Council approve of claims, unless Council wants to include that provision to include claims. Mr. Smiertka offered that one way to handle that would be when the fringe benefit package comes up to Council they add a provision that any separation agreement cannot be added until approves by the Mayor and ratified by Council. Council Member Wood reminded Mr. Smiertka that in the past Council was told they can make suggestions, but the Mayor does not have to accept those. Mr. Smiertka confirmed that statement citing Ordinance 286.05 that states *The Mayor shall establish the compensation for employees covered by the executive management plan, formally known as the executive pay plan, or mayoral staff. (2) The Mayor shall establish all fringe benefits for said employees in an executive management fringe benefits plan...* Mr. Smiertka acknowledged that it appears the issue is what is covered over and above the 120 days they are granted. One suggestion he made was to put it in the annual fringe benefit plan that Council sees every year. Another way suggested was to make a charter amendment. Lastly, he suggested they could adopt a resolution, which were the documents he distributed earlier.

Council Member Houghton asked for clarity on the word "participation" in the resolutions. Mr. Smiertka stated it can be changed to "engaged".

The Committee discussed the funding used for claims or judgements, and payments for litigation. Mr. DeLine outlined the finance process of using the funds at a yearend disbursement to the departments. Council Member Houghton asked for clarification from Finance on the funding and practice in Finance.

MOTION BY COUNCIL MEMBER WOOD TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION FOR DECISIONS ON AT-WILL EMPLOYEE CLAIMS. MOTION CARRIED 3-0.

DRAFT

MOTION BY COUNCIL MEMBER WOOD TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION FOR DECISIONS ON CITY ATTORNEY CLAIMS. MOTION CARRIED 3-0.
Resolution will appear before Council on August 29, 2016.

ADJOURN

Adjourn at 9:30 a.m.

Submitted by,

Sherrie Boak, Recording Secretary Lansing City Council

Approved by the Committee on _____

DRAFT



MINUTES

**Committee on Ways and Means
Monday, August 29, 2016 @ 5:15 p.m.
10th Floor Conference Room, City Hall**

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 5:17 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Councilmember Judi Brown Clarke, Chair
Councilmember Carol Wood, Vice Chair
Councilmember Tina Houghton, Member-excused

OTHERS PRESENT

Sherrie Boak, Council Staff
Jim DeLine, Interim City Council Internal Auditor
Andy Kilpatrick, City Public Service Department
No Law

Minutes

The action on the minutes was moved to the next regularly scheduled meeting.

Public Comment on Agenda Items

No Public Comment

Discussion/Action:

RESOLUTION – Maguire Park Parking Lot Expansion TAP Grant Support

Mr. Kilpatrick presented to the Committee that the request was for an alternative grant for Maguire Park thru the MDOT process for a parking lot expansion to the existing lot with one more row of asphalt and stripping. Mr. Kilpatrick admitted there are future projects but not in this grant. Council Member Wood if the parking lot is part of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, and therefore this grant will now free up funds in master plan for other projects. Mr. Kilpatrick admitted he could not speak to the Parks Master Plan but that would be a question for the Parks Department, however he confirmed it was in their 5 year plan. The City match will for this project will come from the parks millage now, but they plan to apply for a County Parks and Trail millage to put towards it. The parks mileage will only be affected by the match, because they only had funds for the match not the whole project.

Mr. DeLine asked about the costs for the tree removal. Mr. Kilpatrick confirmed it was quoted at \$24,000 trimming and removal. Since it is a parking lot construction, they have to complete

DRAFT

remove the root system on all the trees. The project for removal has been offered to the City Forestry Department, but they have not replied yet. If the City services are used they cannot use the grant, because this process is included as part of the grant. Council Member Wood asked if the funds that would be saved by using the City Forestry could be used for the match amount, and Mr. Kilpatrick noted it could be a consideration as an in-kind match. Lastly Mr. Kilpatrick informed the Committee that they have already obtained their MDEQ permit, and they have to take care of the trees between October and March, to work with the bat migration.

MOTION BY COUNCIL MEMBER WOOD TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION FOR THE MAQUIRE PARK PARKING LOT EXPANSION TAP GRAND SUPPORT. MOTION CARRIED 2-0.

Mr. Kilpatrick asked the Committee if there was a preference on which grants they would see, and the Committee asked to see all grants not just the one that had a City match.

ADJOURN

Adjourn at 5:32 p.m.

Submitted by,

Sherrie Boak, Recording Secretary Lansing City Council

Approved by the Committee on _____



INGHAM COUNTY/CITY OF LANSING COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS ADVISORY BOARD

MARY E. SABAJ
CCAB Manager

JAMES WEBSTER
CCAB Staff Consultant

HON. CLINTON CANADY
30th Judicial Circuit
Criminal Division
CHAIRPERSON

MAJOR SAM DAVIS
Ingham Co. Sheriff's Office
VICE CHAIRPERSON

CAROL KOENIG
FINANCIAL OFFICER
Ingham County
Board of Commissioners

LISA MCCORMICK
SECRETARY
Ingham Co. Prosecutor's Office

HON. JANELLE A. LAWLESS
30th Judicial Court
Family Division

HON. FRANK DELUCA
54-A District Court

PATRICIA SPITZLEY
Lansing City Council

VACANT
Adult Probation Supervisor

MICK S. GREWAL
Criminal Defense Attorney

LT. TRACI RUIZ
Lansing Police Department

VACANT
Business Community

TIM BARRON
Communications
Media

MONICA JAHNER
Community Alternative Program

VACANT
Workforce Development

August 9, 2016


Chris Swope
City Clerk
9th Floor
124 W. Michigan Ave.
Lansing, MI 48933

Dear Mr. Swope,

On behalf of the Ingham County/City of Lansing Community Corrections Advisory Board (CCAB), I respectfully request that the Lansing City Council consider and approve the 2016-2017 State of Michigan - Office of Community Corrections Funding Application. This application provides State funding for administration, community treatment and services programming and community residential facility treatment services for the local offender population.

The Application was approved by the Ingham County Board of Commissioners on June 28, 2016. I have included a copy of Resolution #16-314 for your reference.

Thank you.



Mary Sabaj, J.D.
CCAB Manager

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

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SUBMISSION OF A GRANT APPLICATION AND ENTERING INTO A CONTRACT WITH THE MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS FOR INGHAM COUNTY/CITY OF LANSING COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS AND ENTERING INTO PROGRAM SUBCONTRACTS FOR FY 2016-2017

RESOLUTION # 16 – 314

WHEREAS, the State Community Corrections Advisory Board, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners, and the City of Lansing approved the original Ingham County/City of Lansing Community Corrections Comprehensive Plan in 1991; and

WHEREAS, the State Community Corrections Advisory Board approved the Funding Application and Plan for FY 2016-2017; and

WHEREAS, the FY 2016-2017 Application provides for the continuation of the following CCAB Plans and Services programming: Relapse Prevention and Recovery (\$47,200) to be provided by C-E-I CMH; Gatekeeper services (\$4,069) to be provided by the CCAB Staff Consultant; MRT Cognitive Change Groups (\$26,082) to be provided by Wellness, Inc.; Day Reporting services (\$48,328) to be provided by Northwest Initiative – ARRO; and, Sentinel, Inc. Electronic Monitoring Services for Pretrial defendants (\$10,134) for a subcontract program total of \$135,813; and

WHEREAS, the FY 2016-2017 Application also provides funding for a special part-time Pretrial Services Investigator (\$25,683) to enhance the community supervision capacity of 30th Circuit Court Pretrial Services and for CCAB Administration in the amount of \$50,422 for a Plans and Services total of \$211,918 for the time period of October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017; and

WHEREAS, the FY 2016-2017 grant award provides Ingham County with the use of a projected 30 residential beds with M.D.O.C. contracting directly with residential providers rather than with local jurisdictions for a projected value of \$531,075 and another 1.23 beds per day funded with Drunk Driver Jail Reduction – Community Treatment Program (DDJR-CTP) grant funds in the amount of \$21,169; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the FY 2016-2017 Application, residential services will be provided by Community Programs, Inc., Pine Rest Christian Mental Health Services, Kalamazoo Probation Enhancement Program, Inc. and CEI-CMH House of Commons; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the FY 2016-2017 grant award, the County may enter into subcontracts for the purpose of implementing Plans and Services programs and services identified in the Community Corrections Plan and Application; and

WHEREAS, the Subcontractors for Plans and Services programming are willing and able to provide the services that the County requires.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes entering into an Agreement with the Michigan Department of Corrections for Ingham County/City of Lansing Community Corrections FY 2015-2016 in the amount of \$211,918 in CCAB Plans and Services and Administration funds, \$21,169 in Drunk Driving Jail Reduction and Community Treatment Program funds for a total of \$233,087 and for the use of an estimated 30 residential beds per day for a value amounting to \$531,075 for the time period of October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes entering into subcontracts for CCAB Plans and Services programming from October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017 with Wellness, Inc. for the actual cost of MRT Cognitive Change groups not to exceed \$26,082; with CEI Community Mental Health for the actual cost of Relapse Prevention and Recovery services not to exceed \$47,200; with Northwest Initiative - ARRO for the actual cost of Day Reporting services not to exceed \$48,328; and with Sentinel, Inc. for the actual cost of electronic monitoring services for Pretrial defendants not to exceed \$10,134.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the continued funding of a special part-time (19 hours per week) Pretrial Services Investigator position at the ICEA PRO06 salary grade not to exceed \$25,683.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that entering into the subcontracts and maintaining the Pretrial Services Investigator position are contingent upon entering into the Agreement with the State.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the subcontracts and Pretrial Services Investigator position are contingent throughout the subcontract period on the availability of grant funds from the State of Michigan for these purposes.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board Chairperson is authorized to sign any necessary contracts\subcontracts consistent with this resolution subject to approval as to form by the County Attorney.

LAW & COURTS: Yeas: Crenshaw, Celentino, Anthony, Banas, Maiville

Nays: None **Absent:** Tsernoglou, Schafer **Approved 6/16/2016**

FINANCE: Yeas: Bahar-Cook, Tennis, McGrain, Crenshaw, Schafer

Nays: None **Absent:** Anthony, Case Naeyaert **Approved 6/22/2016**

BY THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS & MEANS
RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LANSING

WHEREAS, the State Community Corrections Advisory Board, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners, and the City of Lansing approved the original Ingham County/City of Lansing Community Corrections Comprehensive Plan in 1991; and

WHEREAS, The State Community Corrections Advisory Board approved the Funding Application and Plan for FY 2016-2017; and

WHEREAS, the FY2016-2017 Application provides for the continuation of the following CCAB Plans and Services programming: Relapse Prevention and Recovery (\$47,200) to be provided by C-E-I CMH; Gatekeeper services (\$4,069) to be provided by the CCAB Staff Consultant; MRT Cognitive Change Groups (\$26,082) to be provided by Wellness, Inc.; Day Reporting services (\$48,328) to be provided by Northwest Initiative ARRO; and, Sentinel, Inc. Electronic Monitoring Services for Pretrial defendants (\$10,134) for a subcontract program total of \$135,813; and

WHEREAS, the FY 2016-2017 Application also provides funding for a special part-time Pretrial Services Investigator (\$25,683) to enhance the community supervision capacity of 30th Circuit Court Pretrial Services and for CCAB Administration in the amount of \$50,422 for a Plans and Services total of \$211,918 for the time period of October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017; and

WHEREAS, the FY 2016-2017 grant award provides Ingham County with the use of a projected 30 residential beds with M.D.O.C. contracting directly with residential providers rather than with local jurisdictions for a projected value of \$531,075 and another 1.23 beds per day funded with Drunk Driver Jail Reduction – Community Treatment Program (DDJR-CTP) grant funds in the amount of \$21,169; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the FY 2016-2017 Application, residential services will be provided by Community Programs, Inc., Pine Rest Christian Mental Health Services, Kalamazoo Probation Enhancement Program, Inc., and CEI-CMH House of Commons; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the FY2016-2017 grant award, the County may enter into subcontracts for the purpose of implementing Plans and Service programs and services identified in the Community Corrections Plan and Application; and

WHEREAS, the Subcontractors for Plans and Services programming are willing and able to provide the services that the County requires.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes entering into an Agreement with the Michigan Department of Corrections for Ingham County/City of Lansing Community Corrections FY 2016-2017 in the amount of \$211,918 in CCAB Plans and Services and Administration funds, \$21,169 in Drunk

Driving Jail Reduction and Community Treatment Program funds for a total of \$233,087 and for the use of an estimated 30 residential beds per day for a value amounting to \$531,075 for the time period of October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes entering into subcontracts for CCAB Plans and Services programming from October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017 with Wellness, Inx. for the actual cost of MRT Cognitive Change groups not to exceed \$26,082; with CEI Community Mental Health for the actual cost of Relapse Prevention and Recovery services not to exceed \$47,200; with Northwest Initiative AARO for the actual cost of Day Reporting services not to exceed \$48,328; and with Sentinel, Inc. for the actual cost of electronic monitoring services for Pretrial defendants not to exceed \$10,134.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the continued funding of a special part-time (19 hours per week) Pretrial Services Investigator position at the ICEA PRO06 salary grade not to exceed \$25,683.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that entering into the subcontracts and maintaining the Pretrial Services Investigator position are contingent upon entering into the Agreement with the State.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the subcontracts and Pretrial Services Investigator position are contingent throughout the subcontract period on the availability of grant funds from the State of Michigan for these purposes.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board Chairperson is authorized to sign any necessary contracts/subcontracts consistent with this resolution subject to approval as to form by the County Attorney.

AGENDA ITEM

INFORMATION
NOT AVAILABLE
AT THE TIME
PACKET WAS
DISTRIBUTED