

Health and Public Safety Committee

Christian Marcus

Karen Bargy, Chair

Bob Wilson

Minutes - February 23, 2015

Members present: Karen Bargy, Christian Marcus, Bob Wilson
Members absent: None
Others present: Pete Garwood, Janet Koch, Bill Hefferan

1. The meeting was called to order at 9:04 a.m. by Chair Karen Bargy.

2. Public Comment

None.

3. Probate Court

Bill Hefferan, Probate Court Administrator, had included legislative analyses from the House Fiscal Agency in the agenda packets regarding House Bills 4949 through 4956, which had to do with adding 17-year olds to the family court. Currently, 17-year olds are charged in either District or Circuit Court depending on the criminal offense. Mr. Hefferan estimated a cost increase of \$10,000 to \$20,000. He said most offenses committed by 17-year olds are misdemeanors.

Mr. Hefferan said if the bills were passed there would likely be an 18 month implementation phase. He added that Michigan is one of 9 states that charge 17-year olds as adults. Mr. Hefferan provided a copy of a Michigan Probate Judges Association statement regarding the bills (**attached pgs. 5-7**).

Final Fiscal Year 2015 Child Care Fund Costs and Collections

Included in the agenda packets were financial statements for the fiscal year 2015 that listed monthly collection totals and the monthly net County costs for the Child Care Fund. Mr. Hefferan noted the concerns in counties throughout the State about the delayed completion of a State of Michigan audit.

Agreement for Services/Independent Contractor

Mr. Hefferan asked that the Committee consider the agreement at their next meeting. He and Pete Garwood, County Administrator, were still discussing some details. Insurance liability was one of the discussion points.

4. Antrim County Transportation (ACT) Update

Financial Reports

Al Meacham, ACT Director, had provided the following documents for the agenda packets: Revenue Schedule 2016, 2016 Expense Schedule, and Miscellaneous Revenue Fiscal Year 2016. Ms. Bargy noted the annuity, hospitalization, worker's compensation and telephone expenses. Mr. Garwood and Mr. Meacham said the worker's compensation refund will be distributed across all departments.

5. Airport Update

Financial Reports

John Strehl, Airport Manager, had provided the Airport's financial reports in the agenda packets. Mr. Strehl said a posting to expenditure line item 864 – "Vehicle Maintenance" should have been posted to "Equipment Maintenance" and will be corrected.

Mr. Strehl expected that he'd be able to present the engineering design contract at the May committee meeting. He added that NationAir Aviation Insurance had been sold to Arthur J. Gallagher & Co., but didn't anticipate the insurance rates to change significantly. It was understood by the Committee and staff that if the current insurance company is selected, and there are no "substantive" changes in the insurance policy, the continuance binder can be initiated by the Airport Manager and the County Administrator. If this is not the case, Mr. Strehl will bring insurance quotes to the upcoming Finance Committee meeting.

6. Sheriff Department Update

Sheriff Bean said he had not heard back from Leads Online regarding changes to the proposed contract. He said the contract amount of \$1,758.00 was a new expense and would be an annual cost. Ms. Bary asked about potential savings due to contracting with Leads Online and any potential liability issues. Sheriff Bean said the service is being used at other counties; the information can be shared. He added that Leads Online information could be verified through LEIN, the Law Enforcement Information Network that is under control of the State of Michigan. Sheriff Bean said access to the LEIN information is restricted.

911 Connect

Sergeant Mike Gank, 911 Dispatch Sergeant, told the Committee that he had preliminary numbers for the cost of a NextGen911 system, but should have solid numbers at the next Committee meeting. Working with the multi-county collaboration group, which is called 911 Connect, could save the County (initially) approximately \$30,000 due to not having to purchase an additional piece of equipment. That equipment and future equipment would be purchased by at least 2 counties in the region and used and cost shared by all counties in the collaboration group. Having the equipment in at least 2 counties provides redundancy without every county having to purchase the exact same piece of equipment.

NextGen911 is an IP (Internet Protocol) emergency call handling equipment and services system. It would allow dispatchers to receive photos, videos, and text messages in addition to the phone calls they already receive.

911 Connect is working to complete an ESInet system (Emergency Services IP network) that will provide redundancy to all the counties in the group. A NextGen911 system would work across the ESInet system. The ESInet is a data network with multiple nodes.

Sergeant Gank said Peninsula Fiber Network (PFN), the company working 911 Connect, has received funding from the State of Michigan to move forward with the next phase of the project. He and the Committee discussed the various 911 funds. Sergeant Gank said the original intent of the 911 millage was to finance NextGen911, a new Orchard Hill tower, and Mobile Data Terminals. Sergeant Gank said 17 years are left on the narrow band.

Ms. Bary asked Sergeant Gank to map out the current projects and to track the existing money with the projects. She asked for an explanation of the 911 system with an description of the acronyms involved.

Public Information Officer (PIO)

Ms. Bary's opinion was the PIO should be part of the Sheriff's Office. Sheriff Bean said in an emergency situation law enforcement officers are so engaged with the emergency that they would not be able to take the necessary time to write press releases. Ms. Bary asked if someone from the Prosecuting Attorney's Office would be suited to the PIO position. The Associate Planner, Janet Koch, was also discussed as a possible PIO. Ms. Koch was agreeable to accepting the responsibilities. Mr. Garwood was asked to contact Jim Rossiter, Prosecuting Attorney, about the position.

7. Weapons in County Building

At the previous Committee meeting, County Clerk Sheryl Guy, had asked weapons to be banned from the County Building as the Clerk's Office was used for official court business. Mr. Garwood said it was the opinion of the County's civil counsel that firearms cannot be banned from the County Building, but could be banned from inside the Clerk's Office. Sergeant Todd Rawling offered suggestions for increasing security; Mr. Garwood said he would bring those suggestions to the next department head meeting.

8. North County Community Mental Health (CMH) Services & Jail Diversion Agreement

Sergeant Rawling and Sheriff Bean expressed their concerns with the current level of assistance from CMH. Mr. Wilson said CMH was accountable and responsible for the mental health of Jail inmates; Sheriff Bean said CMH had received budget cuts at the State level. He added that he would like to explore contracting with another source for mental health services at the Jail. He said the County was at a disadvantage because there is no hospital in Antrim County.

Mr. Marcus made a motion to recommend the Board of Commissioners authorize the Board Chairman to execute an agreement between North County Community Mental Health, Antrim County Sheriff, Antrim County Prosecuting Attorney, 86th District Court, 13th Circuit Court and the Antrim County Board of Commissioners for purposes of Mental Health Services and Jail Diversion. The motion had no support.

The Committee, Sheriff Bean, Sergeant Rawling and Mr. Garwood spoke with Ms. Alexis Kaczynski, CMH Director, by speaker phone regarding the concerns of the Sheriff's Office. Sergeant Rawling said he would like to see language in the agreement regarding a response plan for suicide evaluations. He added that he'd like a maximum of a 12-hour response time for suicide evaluations and a re-evaluation with 24 hours of the initial evaluation. Sergeant Rawling also said he would like a defined plan of treatment and would like to have the CMH time spent in the Jail itself defined. The liaison program, not currently in effect, was also discussed. Ms. Kaczynski said she would respond to Mr. Garwood by the end of the week. Depending on the timing of Ms. Kaczynski's response, Mr. Garwood will send the agreement to the Administration Committee, the Finance Committee, or directly to the Board of Commissioners.

Sheriff Office Watercraft

In response to a question from Mr. Wilson, Sheriff Bean said the boats are in good condition.

9. Various Matters

The Committee moved the date of the next meeting to Tuesday, March 22.

Department of Health & Human Services Lease

Mr. Garwood said the lease application had been delivered to Lansing. Ms. Bary asked that Mr. Garwood contact Mr. Wilson with any updates about the lease in time for the next Meadow Brook Board meeting.

February 18, 2016 Power Outage

The 1905 Courthouse had a small amount of flooding on the lower District Court level of the Courthouse after the power outage late on Thursday, February 18. Mr. Garwood had contacted an emergency cleaning service; they had disinfected the carpet in the affected areas and would be finishing the cleaning soon. The cost of the cleanup will be submitted for possible insurance reimbursement.

COA Financial Reports

Judy Parliament, COA Director, had included the reports in the agenda packets. The Committee and Mr. Garwood discussed the worker's compensation line item.

10. Public Comment

None.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

MICHIGAN PROBATE JUDGES ASSOCIATION

**STATEMENT FOR THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
RE: HB 4947-HB 4966
ON BEHALF OF THE MICHIGAN PROBATE JUDGES ASSOCIATION
December 1, 2015**

This statement is being submitted on behalf of the Michigan Probate Judges Association (MPJA), regarding HBs 4947-4966, which seek to reduce the number of youth in Michigan prisons by, among other things, raising the jurisdictional age of juveniles from 17 to 18 years old. MPJA thanks Representative Santana and his staff for their efforts to solicit feedback on these proposals as they were being drafted.

Philosophically, MPJA agrees that raising the jurisdictional age of youth makes sense for several reasons. However, it is not persuaded that the change will make much difference in the number of youth serving time in prison or jail. The Michigan Department of Corrections released information for 2013, which indicated that of the 663 17-year olds under its jurisdiction, 14 were in prison (2%) and 33 (4%) were serving jail time. These youth are, likely, the most serious offenders and would probably be serving these same sentences regardless of the jurisdiction age since they could be waived or designated into the adult system. .

Although this package has merit, from a practical perspective, there are several barriers to accomplishing this change. The most pressing problem would be a significant increase in Child Care Fund expenditures. Raising the age of jurisdiction to 18 will force counties to spend

millions of additional dollars. Failure to include the additional necessary monies could bankrupt the counties and financially strain the State. Taking care of the funding issue is a must before this package can responsibly advance.

This package contains language which sets forth certain factors for the court to consider when sentencing youth who have been waived or designated into the adult system. It is important that any changes to this language do not constrain a court's discretion as to the weight each factor can be given. There are other related statutes and court rules, not covered by this package, that define "juvenile" by age. For example, MCL764.1f authorizes a prosecutor to directly charge a juvenile as an adult under certain circumstances. The statute identifies a juvenile as a youth 14 years or older but less than 17 years old. Statutes, such as this, would have to be amended to reflect changes made by these bills.

Another consequence of the changes would be the elimination of the Holmes Youthful Trainee Act and 7411 options for 17 year olds. Unfortunately, these diversion alternatives are not available to any juveniles. MPJA would support the eligibility of these programs for all juveniles; however, that proposal is not before the Committee today. Additionally, for youth that require out-of-home placement, courts would have fewer in-state options because many of Michigan's detention centers and residential facilities do not accept 17 year olds. This limitation could result in expenses for counties to build new facilities, or it could force courts to send youth out-of-state.

Finally, there are some programming challenges. The goal of the juvenile system is to rehabilitate the offenders. Currently, courts can maintain jurisdiction over juveniles only until they reach 19 years old. By raising the jurisdictional age, situations will occur where courts will have very little time to work with the youth who come into the juvenile system at 17, and resources may be disproportionately allocated to these older offenders. The programming challenges are not insurmountable; however, most courts agree that some transitional period may be appropriate to adapt programming approaches.

As always, MPJA appreciates the opportunity to weigh in on issues impacting the responsibilities of its members and looks forward to working with the Committee on these proposals in the weeks ahead.