

HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE  
June 4, 2018  
Minutes

Members Present: Banas, Nolan, Koenig (arrived at 6:30 p.m.), Louney, Tennis, Sebolt, and Naeyaert

Members Absent: None.

Others Present: Michael Unsworth, Simar Pawar, Chad Stevens, Irene Armock-Schaaf, Abigail Tanner, Melissa Buzzard, Tim Morgan, Matt Bennett, Jared Cypher, Lindsey LaForte, and others.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Banas at 6:30 p.m. in Personnel Conference Room "D & E" of the Human Services Building, 5303 S. Cedar Street, Lansing, Michigan.

Approval of the May 14, 2018 Minutes

MOVED BY COMM. SEBOLT, SUPPORTED BY COMM. LOUNEY, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 14, 2018 HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Koenig

Additions to the Agenda

None.

Limited Public Comment

None.

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

2. Facilities – Resolution to Extend the Current Tri-County Office on Aging (TCOA) Lease Agreement
3. Health Department – Resolution to Enter Agreement with AGS Data, LLC
5. Community Agencies – Resolution Approving Criteria for Evaluating 2019 Applications for Community Agency Funding

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Koenig

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE ITEMS ON THE CONSENT AGENDA CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Koenig

Commissioner Koenig arrived at 6:30 p.m.

1. Parks Commission – Interviews

Abigail Tanner interviewed for a position on the Parks Commission.

Irene Armock-Scaaf interviewed for a position on the Parks Commission.

Michael Unsworth interviewed for a position on the Parks Commission.

Chad Stevens interviewed for a position on the Parks Commission.

Shimar Pawar interviewed for a position on the Parks Commission.

4. Parks Department – Resolution to Approve the Application Form, Scoring Criteria for the Trails and Parks Millage, and Declaring a Fourth Round of Applications for the Trails and Parks Millage (*Discussion/Possible Action*)

Chairperson Banas stated that there had been a recommendation from the Parks Department to alter the application process and streamline the scoring criteria based on comments they had received from the Board of Commissioners in the recent past.

Melissa Buzzard, Parks and Trails Millage Coordinator, stated that one of the changes to the application process was based on the Drain Commission's recommendations to unify design standards.

Chairperson Banas asked what the Drain Commission's suggested design standard said.

Ms. Buzzard stated that this would allow uniform design standards to be approved for use on the trail projects.

Chairperson Banas asked how these changes would help the selection of applicants for the Trails and Parks Millage funding.

Tim Morgan, Parks Department Director, stated that it would allow more flexibility.

Ms. Buzzard stated the second change was that small grants would be selected separately.

Chairperson Banas stated that this change was based on out-County concerns from residents and officials and would allow the process to be fairer.

Ms. Buzzard stated that there had been a restructuring of criteria, to include connectivity and if the project was a top-five ranked trail based on the Mannik and Smith report.

Chairperson Banas stated that the report was done based on input from the community.

Ms. Buzzard stated that the third criteria change looked at the match funding. She further stated that there was a change to the formula which provided for looking for closely at the match funding.

Discussion.

Chairperson Banas asked for an explanation of the match funding formula.

Matt Bennett, Parks Commission Chair, stated that based on comments from previous meetings they were attempting to find a way to make the match funding portion more equitable. He further explained that in order to figure this number out, they would look at the applicant's match funding percentage, divide it by 10, and use that number to factor with a multiplier of three in order to total the points.

Mr. Morgan stated that the beauty of the formula was that it gave equal weight for all match money. He further stated that the last round of funding was based on a range of match funding rather than a specific amount.

Mr. Bennett stated that this would push communities to really attempt to provide as much match money as they could.

Chairperson Banas stated that the application process would also prioritize the top-five ranked trails in the County.

Commissioner Koenig stated that the Parks Commission wanted the match money to be more heavily weighed and focused on that meaning dollars, not in-kind donations or labor.

Chairperson Banas stated that decision to recommend this criteria was unanimous from the Parks Commission.

Commissioner Tennis stated that he disagreed with both of the points Commissioner Koenig raised because he thought this would make it more difficult for some smaller communities to compete with larger communities. He further stated he had concerns about in-kind services, such as a contribution of land, not counting toward match money and he would not like to penalize in-kind contributions compared to match cash funding.

Commissioner Tennis stated that he was also unsure what criteria was to be used to compare the small scale projects against one another. He further stated that 29% of the millage funds came from communities that received less than 5% of the total millage amount, so there needed to be an equitable way of disturbing funds to these communities.

Commissioner Tennis stated that if the concern was to allow everyone to have access to funds, these changes did not go far enough to be equitable.

Chairperson Banas asked if it could be clarified how the small communities would be treated in this process.

Mr. Morgan stated that small communities would be considered separately if their project was under \$50,000, otherwise they would be considered with everyone. He further stated that Stockbridge went through the last round of projects as a large project, even though they were a small community, because of the size of their projects.

Mr. Morgan stated that communities had always been considered based on sizes, but had been listed all together rather than separated out in the chart at the end of the scoring. He further stated that by separating those out into two charts, it would allow the differences to be better understood.

Chairperson Banas asked if the largest city in the County could also apply for a small grant.

Mr. Morgan stated that it would not be possible for larger communities to apply for smaller grants and be considered with the smaller communities.

Commissioner Tennis asked where the line would be drawn in order to adequately fund the 17 smaller communities in the County. He further stated that the smaller communities would be scored against each other and he would like to know how it would be decided which projects to fund.

Ms. Buzzard stated that it depended on the quality of the project.

Mr. Morgan stated that in every round of applications, there had been more projects than funding, so only quality projects were funded. He further stated that looking at multiple-year projects this past year helped to fund projects a bit more in the long term.

Mr. Morgan stated that this process had been tweaked and would continue to be in order to make it the most beneficial to the County.

Chairperson Banas stated that the review process had been very helpful and the small grant process had helped to make the process fairer.

Commissioner Koenig stated that the reason why in-kind donations were no longer being counted toward the match funding was because larger communities would benefit more since they had staff such as engineers and planners that were being utilized for a high dollar amount.

Commissioner Nolan stated that she wanted to know how many points were possible without the match figured in.

Mr. Bennett stated that it would be 30 points.

Commissioner Nolan stated that it may have been possible to get an additional 15 points for a project with 50% match money.

Mr. Morgan stated that the match money points awarded would about a third of the total points if the project reached an additional 15 points for match money as in Commissioner Nolan's example.

Mr. Bennett stated that the Parks Commission would not be able to put a poor quality project forward just because of the match money put forward.

Commissioner Naeyaert asked if a smaller community applied for a Michigan Department of Natural Resources (DNR) grant would that count toward the cash match.

Mr. Morgan stated that the DNR grants counted as a cash match.

Commissioner Naeyaert stated that at times those grants would not be awarded if the millage funding was not awarded.

Mr. Morgan stated that the Parks Commission would assume the DNR funding would be awarded, but if that did not happen, the community would have to come before the County again to ask for additional funding and at that time the project may not go forward.

Mr. Bennett stated that this conversation linked with what a Parks Commission candidate had said during their interview, about wanting to see the projects happening, but so many other parts needed to come together before the work could happen.

Commissioner Naeyaert stated that was the reason why she wanted to understand the whole process.

Discussion.

Mr. Morgan stated that it did take a bit of time to get moving on the millage funding for the first rounds because they needed to develop the task force, hire the consultant, the application round then happened, and then the work finally happened. He further stated that a lot of work would be completed this year, so the millage was becoming more visible.

**Chairperson Banas asked if the Board of Commissioners could be notified as millage projects were completed so that they may communicate that with constituents.**

Commissioner Sebolt stated that he was concerned that small projects in the larger communities would be overlooked. He further stated that there was a small project in his community where parks needed a small connector trail, but it was not a priority for the City and there was no incentive for it to become one.

Ms. Buzzard stated that they had funded a few smaller City of Lansing projects under \$15,000 in the last round of applications. She further stated that this was probably not a concern because small projects were already being funded in larger communities as long as the communities brought them forward.

Mr. Morgan stated that those smaller projects often came with large grant matches from DNR funding, so they were often easily approved. He further stated that this current process would not encourage communities to bring small projects but small projects were low-hanging fruit and if the communities brought them forward, they would likely be funded.

Commissioner Sebolt stated that those smaller City of Lansing projects during the last round of funding happened because they were specialized, water trail projects. He further stated that it seemed that the millage funding criteria had been designed to give more incentives for larger projects.

Mr. Morgan stated that communities should have a desire to bring those projects forward because they were projects that would be very appealing for approval.

Chairperson Banas stated that as a Commissioner sitting on the Park Commission, she would look forward to supporting a project such as the one Commissioner Sebolt was describing.

Mr. Bennett asked if the project involved the Lansing City Park.

Commissioner Sebolt stated that it included two parks, one of which was Lansing City Park.

Commissioner Tennis asked about the point scale because it appeared that there were 35 possible points. He further stated that even if a community could provide engineering, it would reduce the total cost of the project, so it did not make sense to not allow in-kind services.

Commissioner Tennis stated that he could understand that in-kind services would need to be looked at closely to make sure that were valued properly, such as engineering and the sale of land. He further stated that he would like to see that part of the policy change.

Commissioner Tennis stated that he would like to see the match with a multiplier of two rather than three, as it would bring more balance to this application process.

Commissioner Sebolt asked Commissioner Tennis if he would be comfortable with in-kind match be taken into account, with a smaller multiplier.

Commissioner Tennis stated that he thought in-kind services brought value and he was concerned that if given as smaller consideration than cash it would not be worthwhile.

Chairperson Banas stated that there needed to be some definition of what was allowable for in-kind services.

Commissioner Tennis stated that he would imagine it would be done on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Morgan stated that the Parks Department would like guidelines because it was difficult for staff to know what should be allowed and not allowed. He further stated that at times, the staff allowed certain values for in-kind services and then the Parks Commission disagreed, leaving the staff to look like the bad guy.

Mr. Morgan stated that for land they had been looking at the Federal Yellow Book appraisals, but for other work, such as engineering, it was more difficult to account for the actual cost.

Commissioner Tennis stated that if the engineering was done by the community, then the community should be credited with what the cost-savings was of not hiring that portion out.

Mr. Morgan stated that it was a dilemma for staff because they were unsure what the value would be for something like that and it would be impossible to take bids for a project that would never be hired out to get an average cost. He further stated that it would be helpful to have clear guidelines for considering in-kind service values.

Mr. Morgan stated that communities might start reducing the amount of cash match if they saw other communities being allowed to inflate their monetary match with huge in-kind service values.

Discussion.

Chairperson Banas stated that this discussion would need to continue at the next Committee meeting because there was not a motion to adopt this resolution.

Commissioner Koenig stated that the Parks Commission had been in discussions about the value of in-kind services and sometimes communities would argue that they needed more than another community for the same job because it was based on the salary paid by each community. She further stated that those discussions had been uncomfortable and complicated.

MOVED BY COMM. LOUNEY, SUPPORTED BY COMM. NOLAN, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION.

Commissioner Louney stated that the Parks Commission members and Parks Department staff had worked for a long time on these issues and it was time to move forward. He further stated his experience with the grant process had been that criteria like this was often changing and moving forward.

MOVED BY COMM. TENNIS, SUPPORTED BY COMM. SEBOLT, TO AMEND THE INGHAM COUNTY TRAILS AND PARKS PROGRAM SCORING CRITERIA AS FOLLOWS:

- 3. How the project provides for other available funders and partners.**

**Has Potential Available Funds:** Projects that have the potential to be funded through state or federal grants, donations, partner contributions, or other funding sources will receive a higher priority than projects without other identified funding opportunities. ~~Only monetary contributions will be considered.~~ To determine whether a project has leveraged potential available funds, a project should address the following matching % to receive points, *match = what total percent of the project all matching dollars account for.* The number of points a project will receive is determined by dividing the percent match by 10 then multiplying that number by three. (ex. 63% match will receive 18.9 points)

Commissioner Nolan stated that she supported the staff and their work. She further stated that there were also Parks Commission members that had worked very hard, volunteering many hours, on this grant process.

Commissioner Nolan stated that she would not support this amendment.

Commissioner Koenig stated that she would vote against the amendment because this needed to be moved forward and Commissioner Tennis' concerns could be reviewed later. She further stated that if in-kind services were to be included in the criteria, Commissioner Tennis should work on that and then bring it forward to the Committee.

Commissioner Koenig stated that she had already spent 10 or more hours on this process and it was time to move on.

Commissioner Tennis stated that he would have worked the next couple weeks on a formula and brought it to the next Committee meeting; however, he did not have time since the resolution was moving toward being adopted now. He further stated that perhaps he could have something ready before it moved through Finance Committee on Wednesday.

Commissioner Naeyaert stated that this had been worked on for a long time and she supported what the staff recommended.

Commissioner Banas stated that she would not support the amendment.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT FAILED.

**Yeas:** Tennis and Sebolt **Nays:** Banas, Nolan, Koenig, Louney, and Naeyaert

MOVED BY COMM. TENNIS, SUPPORTED BY COMM. SEBOLT, TO AMEND THE INGHAM COUNTY TRAILS AND PARKS PROGRAM SCORING CRITERIA AS FOLLOWS:

3. **How the project provides for other available funders and partners.**

**Has Potential Available Funds:** Projects that have the potential to be funded through state or federal grants, donations, partner contributions, or other funding sources will receive a higher priority than projects without other identified funding opportunities.



Only monetary contributions will be considered. To determine whether a project has leveraged potential available funds, a project should address the following matching % to receive points, *match = what total percent of the project all matching dollars account for*. The number of points a project will receive is determined by dividing the percent match by 10 then multiplying that number by ~~two~~ **three**. (ex. 63% match will receive **12.6** ~~18.9~~ points)

Commissioner Nolan stated that she really liked the formula and the weight given to the multiplier. She further stated that with all of her hours on the Park Commission it had been her dream to double their money, or even bring in another 1/3 with match money, and this would move toward making that a reality.

Commissioner Koenig stated that she would vote against the amendment and that she recommend Commissioner Tennis serve on the Park Commission next January after Chairperson Banas' absence left a vacancy

Commissioner Tennis stated that there was an impression that he had been ignoring the Parks Commission and staff's hard work, but he was simply voting his conscience and trying to do what was best for the County.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT FAILED.

**Yeas:** Tennis and Sebolt **Nays:** Banas, Nolan, Koenig, Louney, and Naeyaert

Commissioner Sebolt stated that he would support this resolution although he agreed with Commissioner Tennis that it needed further amending. He further stated that he would move this resolution forward because many resolutions were altered in the Finance Committee and he expected this to be also.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION CARRIED.

**Yeas:** Banas, Nolan, Koenig, Louney, Sebolt and Naeyaert **Nays:** Tennis

Announcements

None.

Public Comment

None.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:54 p.m.



\_\_\_\_\_  
**BARB BYRUM, CLERK OF THE BOARD**

