COUNTY SERVICES COMMITTEE
March 5, 2019
Minutes

Members Present: Celentino, Grebner, Koenig (arrived at 6:10 p.m.) (departed at 7:30 p.m.) Maiville, Naeyaert, Sebolt and Stivers.

Members Absent: None.

Others Present: Commissioner Bryan Crenshaw, Clerk Barb Byrum, Treasurer Eric Schertzing, Russel Church, Becky Bennett, Tim Dolehanty, Sue Graham, Alan Fox, Bill Conklin, Rick Terrill, Ron Lester, Steve Walters, Charlaine Stevenson, Liz Noel, Michelle Wright, Tyler A Smith, and others.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Celentino at 6:00 p.m. in Personnel Conference Room “D & E” of the Human Services Building, 5303 S. Cedar Street, Lansing, Michigan.

Approval of the February 19, 2019 Meeting Minutes

MOVED BY COMM. GREBNER, SUPPORTED BY COMM. NAeyaERT, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 19, 2019 COUNTY SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.Absent: Commissioner Koenig.

Additions to the Agenda

Substitutes –

10. Controller’s Office
   b. Resolution Approving Transfer of Reimbursement Agreement from Ingham County Brownfield Redevelopment Authority to Meridian Township Brownfield Redevelopment Authority

10. Controller’s Office
   d. Resolution Adopting Ordinance Amending Ordinance Regulating Parking in County Parking Lots

Limited Public Comment

Barb Byrum, County Clerk, read a statement which is included in the minutes as Attachment A.

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

(1)
2. **Farmland and Open Preservation Board** – Resolution to Approve Proceeding to Close Permanent Conservation Easement Deeds

4. **Equalization Department**
   a. Resolution to Award a Contract for Monumentation and Remonumentation Project Representative
   c. Resolution to Award Contracts for Peer Review Group Members

5. **Public Defenders Office**
   a. Resolution Creating Positions for the Public Defenders Office
   b. Resolution to Authorize a Lease Agreement with 320 North Washington Partners and Ingham County

6. **Innovation and Technology Department**
   a. Resolution to Approve the Purchase of Wireless Access Points and Associated Licenses from Sentinel Technologies, Inc.

7. **Health Department** – Resolution to Amend Agreement with MDHHS for HIV Care Coordination

8. **Road Department** – Resolution to Approve the Special and Routine Permits for the Ingham County Road Department

9. **Human Resources Department** – Resolution to Approve a Collective Bargaining Agreement with the Capital City Labor Program, Inc. Supervisory Unit

10. **Controller’s Office**
    a. Resolution to Approve an Inter-Local Agreement Granting Limited Waiver of Exemption of Property Taxes from Capture by Meridian Charter Township Downtown Development Authority
    b. Resolution Approving Transfer of Reimbursement Agreement from Ingham County Brownfield Redevelopment Authority to Meridian Township Brownfield Redevelopment Authority

11. **Board of Commissioners Office**
    a. Resolution Declaring March 31, 2019 as “Cesar E. Chavez Day” in Ingham County
    b. Resolution Establishing a Roadways Subcommittee

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Koenig.

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

1. **Women’s Commission** – Interviews

(2)
Charlaine Stevenson interviewed for a position on the Women’s Commission.

MOVED BY COMM. GREBNER, SUPPORTED BY COMM. STIVERS, TO RECOMMEND THE APPOINTMENT OF CHARLAINE STEVENSON TO THE WOMEN’S COMMISSION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Koenig.

3. **Treasurer’s Office** – Resolution to Authorize a Reorganization within the Ingham County Treasurer’s Office

MOVED BY COMM. MAIVILLE, SUPPORTED BY COMM. NAEYAERT, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION.

Commissioner Grebner stated that if this resolution had been part of the regular budget, it would have consumed the entire discretionary budget of the Board of Commissioners. He further stated that there was no right way to organize the budget, but that this was a very substantial 26% or 30% increase in the base cost of running the Treasurer’s Office.

Discussion.

Treasurer Eric Schertzing stated that the funding the Treasurer’s Office received from the County general fund was about $600,000.

Commissioner Koenig arrived at 6:10 p.m.

Commissioner Grebner stated that this was a big deal, and that simply consenting it would not be a good idea. He further stated that at the Veterans’ Memorial Courthouse there was often a sign in the Treasurer’s Office service window that stated that there was no one to staff the window, which indicated some level of under-staffing.

Commissioner Grebner stated that he did not have much of an opinion on this because he was close to the Treasurer and the Chief Deputy Treasurer. He further stated that he still wanted to bring up the fact that this was a big decision, and that if this were the Sheriff’s Office, it would be equivalent to adding 20 new positions or building a new jail.

Commissioner Naeyaert stated that it would cost the County a lot of money, but that it was a change that was needed in the Treasurer’s Office, and would effect a positive environment. She further stated that there was no reason why the Treasurer’s Office could not be successful with these additions, which were long overdue.

Commissioner Koenig stated that she did not know whether what was going on under the reorganization had been discussed.

Treasurer Schertzing stated that the complexity of the Treasurer’s Office’s work had grown tremendously in the years he had been in Office. He further stated that his Office had not had sufficient staff for many years, especially in the Lansing location.
Treasurer Schertzing stated that the Treasurer’s Office was funded from the County general fund and the Delinquent Tax Revolving Fund, and that the reorganization would expand the number of positions funded from the Delinquent Tax Revolving Fund. He further stated that there had been issues in 2017, which were ultimately his responsibility, but some of which might have been prevented if there had been adequate staffing. He further stated that the reorganization would allow the Treasurer’s Office to get to a much better place.

Treasurer Schertzing stated that recently, the Treasurer’s Office had collected approximately $10,000 by enforcing County dog licensing requirements. He further stated that processing dog licenses took time, and had fallen by the wayside.

Treasurer Schertzing stated that his Office at one time had a position which spent half of the time doing dog licensing. He further stated that the Treasurer’s Office had a lot of responsibilities that had grown in complexity due to changes in federal, state and local law and practices.

Treasurer Schertzing stated he had had staff screaming at him about needing staffing at various times in the past, and that Commissioner Grebner had once said that few problems were solved by spending less money. He further stated that he wanted to thank Alan Fox, Deputy Treasurer, for helping fit a reorganization process into day-to-day office operations.

Commissioner Grebner stated that the Committee should understand that the delinquent tax fund and the general fund were essentially fungible, in accordance with a complicated set of legal rules. He further stated that it seemed that short-staffing at the Treasurer’s Office had resulted in additional burdens on other County entities, which had to pick up where the Treasurer had left off.

Commissioner Grebner stated that providing staffing to the Treasurer’s Office should unburden several other County entities, including the Land Bank, Financial Services, and Animal Control.

Commissioner Sebolt stated that the reorganization appeared to have been thoroughly prepared, unlike some past reorganization proposals. He further stated that he would be interested in a report from the Treasurer on the successes of the Foreclosure Prevention Specialist, and that the increased revenue from keeping people in their homes and paying property taxes might mean the position paid for itself.

Treasurer Schertzing stated that much of the work his Office did was social services.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. **Equalization Department**
   b. Resolution to Award Contracts for Remonumentation Project Surveyors

MOVED BY COMM. MAIVILLE, SUPPORTED BY COMM. KOENIG, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION.
Commissioner Grebner stated that the new Equalization Director was not available to come to this meeting, and was not to blame for old problems. He further stated that the County had put interesting people in the Equalization Director position, some of whom had deliberately created a rigged process for hiring surveyors.

Commissioner Grebner stated that one director told bidders how much to bid, and how many hours to accept. He further stated that he had told that director that what he was doing was criminal, and he supposedly stopped.

Commissioner Grebner stated that under the resolution, there were six firms, each of which wanted the exact same amount of money and hours. He further stated that instead of doing this in a way that was efficient for the County, the County had allocated a bit of the money granted to it for the purpose of remonumentation to each of several firms.

Commissioner Grebner stated that it must be extremely inefficient to contract with multiple firms over just $12,400 apiece. He further stated that he had tried to convince the Equalization Department for years to simply put all the money in one contract with one party, or at least try to get the best deal for the County.

Commissioner Grebner stated that the County ought to be trying to get the most out of the money, and should not tolerate the rigged process. He further stated that he had fought with this for years, and had proposed methods of proceeding in the past.

Commissioner Grebner stated that he wanted to table this resolution until somebody came back with bids that did not match across six firms. He further stated that somebody would come up with a proper process.

Commissioner Naeyaert stated that she agreed with Commissioner Grebner, and that the funds were grants given to the surveyors.

Commissioner Grebner stated that the money was received as a grant, but that the contracts were with individuals.

Commissioner Sebolt asked whether there was a timeframe on spending the money and doing the remonumentation.

Mr. Dolehantry stated that the grant expired at the end of the calendar year.

Commissioner Sebolt stated that the Committee could delay things a couple months, but not much longer.

Ron Lester, County Representative for Remonumentation, stated that he had been in his position since 1992, and the contracts had been mandated to be awarded using quality-based selection. He further stated that the County had had to come up with its own plan, which had been accepted by the Board of Commissioners at the time.

(5)
Mr. Lester stated that the key thing was that all the choices in hiring the surveyors were done by quality-based selection, and that there were six contractors in the County who were qualified.

Mr. Lester stated that he had worked in the County as a surveyor since 1971, and that the original survey was in 1835, and no program to maintain or replace the section corners was begun until 1993. He further stated that at one time, county surveyors were appointed in each county, but most ceased to exist because they cost money, and because a private individual could petition the Surveyor for a survey, which would be billed to the County, gradually losing favor with the public.

Mr. Lester stated that the Ingham County Surveyor had been abolished 45 years ago, and that there had been no maintenance or attention to the section corners. He further stated that in 1989 to 1990, this was becoming a big problem across the state, because high-dollar properties were being sold without a good way to determine how big the properties were, or where the boundaries were.

Mr. Lester stated that remonumentation at that time had been funded by deed recordation fees. He further stated that 40% of those fees went to the County that recorded the deed, with the rest being distributed by a formula to ensure that small counties got some funds.

Chairperson Celentino asked why each bid was exactly $12,400.

Mr. Lester stated that every year, he recommended to the grant administrator who to hire to do the work under the quality-based selection process, and that the grant varied every year. He further stated that these firms were the best in the area, because they were more efficient and faster than larger companies.

Mr. Lester stated that the head surveyors of these companies worked in the field themselves, which eliminates unnecessary hours. He further stated that the rate was the same for all of them, which he had set.

Mr. Lester stated that he put out an RFP, and used the lowest hourly rate from that for the standard pay rate.

Commissioner Koenig stated that the County had been doing this since 1990, and asked why the County was doing this every year.

Mr. Lester stated that there were approximately 3,000 section corners in the County.

Commissioner Koenig asked if the contractors were rotating through them all and redoing them over time.

Mr. Lester stated that since 1993, they had been working to get through them all, but that 279 corners were remaining. He further stated that crews could complete 70 to 75 corners per year or so, and had completed 2,355 of them since 1993.
Commissioner Koenig asked what the hourly pay rate for the contractors was.

Mr. Lester stated that it started at $100 per hour for one professional surveyor, with two-man crew time at $120 to $130 per hour.

Commissioner Naeyaert asked why, if the firms were hired on a quality basis, one firm would not be equipped to do everything needed. She further stated that it would have been helpful to see what each firm was doing under the resolution.

Mr. Lester stated that each firm brought a lot of expertise and knowledge to the table, but that they had a lot of turnover. He further stated that new surveyors were not familiar with the history of the County, which was important to the job because it appeared some of the original surveyors had made fraudulent surveys, among other things.

Commissioner Grebner stated that Mr. Lester’s contract had already been approved, and that this resolution was about whether the Committee approved of the distribution of the grant money in equal proportion to six firms. He further stated that, if nothing else, tabling the resolution would get people to come in and talk about it.

MOVED BY COMM. GREBNER, SUPPORTED BY COMM. KOENIG, TO TABLE THE RESOLUTION.

THE MOTION TO TABLE THE RESOLUTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. Innovation and Technology Department
   b. Resolution to Authorize Planned Annual Continuing Education Program from MUNIS

MOVED BY COMM. GREBNER, SUPPORTED BY COMM. KOENIG, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION.

Commissioner Naeyaert stated that the County should not approve a continuing education program until a review of the Munis system implementation had been done.

Tim Dolehanty, Controller, stated that this resolution was like the driver’s education course, while the Resolution to Authorize an Independent Review of MUNIS Software and County Processes was the mechanics of the “car.” He further stated that Munis had been upgraded in March of 2018, and that this package would provide for a certain number of hours of direct instruction from Munis, along with a few registrations to the Munis conference.

Mr. Dolehanty stated that it would be a good idea to approve this resolution regardless of whether or not the Resolution to Authorize an Independent Review of MUNIS Software and County Processes was approved.

Steve Walters, IT Department Senior Network Administrator, stated that he had to use Munis as a supervisor, and that there had been no training in how to use it. He further stated that he picked up his knowledge of the software by talking to others about it.
Mr. Walters stated that he used Munis infrequently, and it was hard to get information about how to use it. He further stated that everyone who had been working for the County when Munis was implemented had left, including Jill Rhode, Former Financial Services Director, who he had relied on as a resource for information about Munis.

Commissioner Naeyaert stated that if County departments wanted to get the best usage out of the investments, a representative from the Innovation and Technology Department (IT) should be present at meetings between department heads regarding Munis.

Mr. Dolehanty stated that the IT Director had been present at those meetings.

Commissioner Naeyaert asked whether someone who had trouble with Munis should call IT for help.

Mr. Walters stated that IT maintained the back end and the servers, and were not trained on Munis. He further stated that anyone experiencing issues with Munis should call support for whatever specific issue they were having.

Commissioner Maiville asked how much the County paid for Munis every year.

Mr. Dolehanty stated that the County paid $177,926 each year.

Commissioner Maiville asked why Munis could not tell the County that they were not fully using the program. He further asked why, if Plante Moran had already done some auditing, they did not have recommendations on how to get more out of the program.

Mr. Dolehanty stated that the recommendations in the Resolution to Authorize an Independent Review of MUNIS Software and County Processes would go to the way data was organized in the server. He further stated that the current resolution would get training to the employees in basic functions like printing W2s and budget projections, or estimating reorganization costs.

Commissioner Sebolt stated that he was now more confused. He further asked whether the current resolution provided for training for IT.

Mr. Dolehanty stated the resolution would provide training for employees across the County.

Commissioner Sebolt asked whether, if Plante Moran came through and recommended using certain functions not covered by Munis’s training sessions, the County would need to arrange for additional training.

Mr. Dolehanty stated that if both resolutions were approved, the Controller would make the resolutions work together, and would not let the County get ahead of itself.

Commissioner Sebolt asked why Munis could not do the training itself.
Mr. Dolehanty stated that the Munis helpline was not responsive, and that technicians were booked three months in advance. He further stated that the Resolution to Authorize an Independent Review of MUNIS Software and County Processes would help get through that maze to get customer service.

Mr. Dolehanty stated that the current resolution had already been budgeted for.

Commissioner Sebolt asked why the County should pay Munis anything more if it was not getting the customer service it needed.

Mr. Dolehanty stated that the County had already expended $2 million to implement and use Munis.

Commissioner Sebolt asked whether the County should look at the contract and have the County Attorney write a letter demanding better service. He further stated that if he had a customer relationship with somebody who was not providing what was promised, the last thing he would do is give them more money.

Mr. Dolehanty stated that the $177,000 was for the license to use Munis software, and for technical support, but did not provide a way to train employees.

Commissioner Naeyaert asked how long the County had been using Munis.

Mr. Dolehanty stated that the County had been using Munis since 2004.

Commissioner Naeyaert stated that the County had been paying $178,000 per year in addition to its $2 million investment, and could not print W2s.

Mr. Walters stated that the issue with printing W2s was due to a change in directors, with no training for the successor.

Commissioner Naeyaert stated that she did not understand why the County was receiving no help from Munis after making such a significant investment in its software.

Commissioner Grebner stated that the Committee should understand that Munis was an application, and that IT was not to blame. He further stated that Munis was like a large building the County owned, and that if it stopped using Munis now, it would take at least three years to get something else, bring it up, train people, and switch over to it.

Commissioner Grebner stated that the County needed to act as if Munis was the immediate future, because it was a huge investment. He further stated that he had been around when software systems were switched, and that it was anything but trivial.

Commissioner Stivers stated that the County was not getting its money's worth out of Munis, and that she invited Clerk Byrum to speak further about her concerns.
Clerk Byrum stated that it was her impression that the lack of full utilization of Munis was not IT’s fault, but the choice of Jill Rhode, Former Financial Services Director, not to change the process she was used to. She further stated that the County had had the capability to use electronic timecards for years, and that she personally supported IT having continuing education on Munis.

Clerk Byrum stated that IT was severely understaffed, and that Munis had not been utilized properly because the former Financial Services director did not accept it, not because of any lack of interest or enthusiasm on the part of IT or the Clerk’s Office. She further stated that all departments and County-wide elected officials used Munis to pay bills, among other functions.

Clerk Byrum stated that for every bill or invoice, she checked for accuracy, Clerk staff entered data from the paper bill into the computer, the paper bill or invoice was signed, arranged according to the preferences of the former Financial Services Director, and walked over to Financial Services, who it seemed pressed one button to pay the bill. She further stated that Clerk’s Office staff was doing much of Financial Services’s and Munis’s job.

Clerk Byrum stated that she frequently got callbacks from Munis on her direct line that were meant for other Offices, so she knew that Munis was in fact returning calls. She further stated that she had been generally satisfied with the performance of Munis and Eagle Recorder, another program from Tyler Technologies.

Clerk Byrum stated that she had emailed the County contract with Tyler Technologies to Commissioners who had requested it. She further stated that the problems with Munis were the fault of leadership at the County who had not held departments accountable for forward-thinking.

Mr. Walters stated that one of his first projects when he started at the County was converting from the old software to Munis, and that the two pieces of software had different methods of organizing data. He further stated that Tyler Technologies forced Munis to match the old system rather than updating the old data.

Mr. Walters stated that various features of Munis were not used simply because people had not used them in the past. He further stated that County supervisors had molded Munis to match legacy systems in many ways, and that seeing where the County was not using Munis the way it was meant to be used would be a good start.

Mr. Walters stated that the training called for in this resolution was for County staff generally, but not IT employees.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
10. **Controller's Office**
   c. **Resolution to Authorize an Independent Review of MUNIS Software and County Processes**

MOVED BY COMM. GREBNER, SUPPORTED BY COMM. NAEYAERT, TO APROVE THE RESOLUTION.

Commissioner Naeyaert stated that there was language in the resolution that prompted her to wonder why the County would be paying Plante Moran to conduct an independent review of Munis. She further asked whether this was something that the Controller or somebody in that Office should be doing, instead of hiring Plante Moran.

Mr. Dolechanty stated that he had had meetings with a group of six directors to discuss that. He further stated that they had concluded that the Munis system had been built in the image of the old system, leading to inefficiencies.

Mr. Dolechanty stated that there were many directors present, who had stated that Munis did not work well enough, with budget projections taking hours, for example. He further stated that he was proposing using Plante Moran because they knew the County, and how County employees used the system.

Mr. Dolechanty stated that the Plante Moran technicians knew Munis, and had the right knowledge to help make things work better. He further stated that the group of six directors dealt with finances as their main responsibility, and that they felt there must be a better way.

Commissioner Naeyaert stated that it sounded as if Mr. Dolechanty wanted the group of six directors to tell Plante Moran that so they could tell Munis.

Mr. Dolechanty stated that Plante Moran would do an independent review. He further stated that Munis did not help very much, whereas Plante Moran would help the County use the system in the most efficient way.

Mr. Dolechanty stated that the Road Department, for example, needed to have its data precisely entered, and that a former electronic timecard system would not allow them to enter their timecards in a way that aligned with their specific accounting practices regarding grant monies. He further stated that Plante Moran would be able to tell staff what they need to know.

Commissioner Maiville stated that he felt similarly to Commissioner Naeyaert. He further stated that if Munis was providing services for so many other government entities, one would think the timecard-grant issue would be easily fixed without needing a strange workaround. He further stated he did not understand why Munis could not fix the issue, and that it did not make sense to spend more money to have Plante Moran come in and fix it while Munis appeared to be fleecing the County.
Commissioner Stivers asked whether the County had approached Munis for a high-level talk about the whole County's systems, rather than just specific issues. She further asked whether County personnel were being trained to use the whole system.

Mr. Dolehanty stated that the training provided under the Resolution to Authorize Planned Annual Continuing Education Program from MUNIS would cover how to do things the right way.

Commissioner Stivers asked why the County needed to bring in Plante Moran, in that case.

Mr. Dolehanty stated that Plante Moran was needed because the system the County had built was not the way Munis was meant to work.

Commissioner Sebolt stated that he felt the Committee was talking in circles. He further stated that, if the County was going to have Munis come in, it should have Munis fix all of the issues instead of paying Plante Moran and then bring in Munis anyway. He further stated that he felt Plante Moran would likely simply say to use Munis the way it was meant to be used, and that the County would pay $60,000 to two companies just to tell County leadership what it already knew.

Alan Fox, Chief Deputy Treasurer, stated that it was a mistake to think of Munis as a piece of software with one problem that could be fixed. He further stated that fixing Munis was like the old tale about the blind men and the elephant, in that each department saw a different problem, and proposed a different solution.

Mr. Fox stated that the Budget Office took two hours to print a report, Human Resources had to constantly reenter data, and other departments and offices experienced other problems. He further stated that some of these problems were a result of the program having been structured strangely in 2004, and some were the result of people deciding to do things the way they wanted instead of the way the program was built to function.

Mr. Fox stated that there was a clear need to look at Munis systematically and determine what solutions fit what issues, and that Munis was a very complex program, even compared to other computer systems. He further stated that County administration was also very complex, with different needs in different offices, and that until there was a systematic way of going through things office by office, there would not be a solution.

Mr. Fox stated that he did not know whether this was the right way to do that, but that the County did need a systematic look at Munis, Eagle Recorder, BS&A, and Courtview. He further stated that a lot of reentry of data by hand was being done in all departments, and that the County needed someone from outside of Tyler Technologies to look at all of this.

Commissioner Koenig stated that Munis was a customizable system that got built up over time, like a city, and that the County needed a consultant to determine what to take out. She further stated that Munis always just wanted to sell the County more products, and that the Community Mental Health Authority had experienced Munis issues in the past.
Commissioner Koenig stated that the County was not the only entity having trouble with Munis, and that she agreed with Mr. Fox that the system needed to be looked over. She further stated that there would be no simple fix for it, that these were very complex systems, and that she wanted to hear from IT.

Mr. Walters stated that the current version of Munis was Version 15, and that the County was still using Version 11.3. He further stated that the County had done upgrades based on the lowest version that Munis still supported at all.

Commissioner Koenig asked why the County did not upgrade to Version 15.

Mr. Walters stated that ultimately that was because Jill Rhode, Former Financial Services Director, had not wanted to upgrade, and that Financial Services had been in charge of what happened with Munis since Day 1. He further stated that IT did not decide these things, and that the departments did.

Chairperson Celentino left at 7:17 p.m.

Commissioner Naeyaert stated that IT could advise departments, but that if the department did not want to comply, IT could not do much in response.

Mr. Walters stated that at a certain point, IT would refuse to let devices running old, non-secure software onto the County network.

Chairperson Celentino returned at 7:19 p.m.

Commissioner Naeyaert stated that Plante Moran’s letter to the Controller laid out 7 objectives, 5 of which she could answer right now based on the discussion. She further asked why the County was letting the Finance Director make decisions for the entire County.

Commissioner Naeyaert asked why the County was not listening to what Mr. Walters was recommending, and why the County needed Plante Moran when it knew what some of the answers were now. She further stated that it was unacceptable to pay for a support contract from Munis and not get support.

Mr. Dolehanthy stated that the support contract only covered enough support to keep the system running.

Mr. Walters stated that IT could only get support from Munis by having a department call the problem in.

Clerk Byrum stated that IT had come a long way in six years, and that many County Offices and Departments contracted with an IT vendor without involving the IT Department in the discussion. She further stated that she did not know if IT was involved in discussions with Munis in 2004.
Clerk Byrum stated that Munis called her back when she had issues or ideas, and that one would think that Munis would want customers to use their products well in order to maintain a good reputation. She further stated that she preferred the “silos” within the Munis system because they protected vital records from threats like viruses originating from malicious email messages opened by employees of other departments.

Commissioner Naeyaert stated that it seemed that Plante Moran was suggesting they do something that was not their job, and that this was a communication issue. She further stated that County administration should know what was happening in their departments.

Commissioner Naeyaert stated that everyone who utilized the system knew what the problems were, and it might be better to have those people tell Munis what the problems were directly. She further stated she would not support the resolution.

Chairperson Celentino asked what the alternative was if the resolution did not pass.

Mr. Dolehanty stated that the alternative would be “status quo.”

Chairperson Celentino asked whether Mr. Dolehanty would reconvene the group of six directors he had been speaking with.

Mr. Dolehanty stated that they had been very good to work with, and that they would all work with the system as best they could.

Commissioner Grebner stated that it appeared that confusion had arisen. He further stated that Munis had been customized to meet the needs of the County 15 years earlier, and that Plante Moran could bring and outside perspective to figure out what parts to eliminate or remake completely. He further stated that a big-picture view on how to reconfigure Munis was needed, and that millions of dollars had already been invested in Munis.

Commissioner Grebner stated that hundreds of employees depended on Munis for their work, and that its functions were not easily replaced. He further stated that the standard by which software was judged was that developers should try first and foremost to avoid disasters.

Commissioner Grebner stated that Lansing Community College’s (LCC) enrollment system had crashed and cost them $25 million in the recent past, and that the State had had some serious issues. He further stated that the County has never had an issue like that.

Commissioner Grebner stated that it seemed the resolution would “put duct tape” on the problem, and that he would be willing to throw a little money to fix the problem, in order to protect the huge investment the County had made in Munis. He further stated that if hundreds of employees used Munis, that was millions of dollars of training and software invested.

Commissioner Grebner stated that there were so many dysfunctions now because the software was very old, and that the plumbing underneath all of the upgrades and improvements still dated
back to 2004. He further stated that leaving Munis entirely and switching to something new would be a tremendous project.

Commissioner Sebolt stated that he was very frustrated, and that for the Controller to state that the alternative to adopting the resolution was “status quo” was unacceptable. He further stated that that should never be the answer to the question.

Commissioner Sebolt stated that he was not disagreeing that the County did not need to spend more money to make the system work, and that the Committee already knew the system needed to be upgraded. He further asked why the County did not just pay Munis up front to fix things.

Commissioner Koenig left at 7:30 p.m.

Commissioner Sebolt stated that he was aware that money would need to be spent to fix this issue, but it seemed that there was no need to bring in Plante Moran as a middleman between the County and Munis.

Commissioner Maiville agreed that “status quo” was not an acceptable answer. He further stated that he did not understand why the County could not just bring in Munis to fix their own system.

Mr. Dolechanty stated that when he said “status quo,” he did not mean that the County would do nothing, but that while pursuing Munis, the County would have to do it the way they had been doing it. He further stated that if the resolution was voted down, the County would try to figure something else out.

Commissioner Maiville asked why the County could not implement electronic timecards on its own.

Mr. Dolechanty stated that he did not know, and had never used the Munis software for that.

Commissioner Grebner stated that the County was setting too high a standard, and that the real way to solve the problem was a terribly painful process of switching to an entirely new software system. He further stated that avoiding disaster was the first priority, and throwing money could do that.

Commissioner Maiville stated that the County should fix what it had, and that he was not sure it needed Plante Moran to come in in order to do that. He further stated that it seemed the County could fix things on its own with Munis’s help.

MOVED BY COMM. GREBNER, SUPPORTED BY COMM. SEBOLT, TO TABLE THE RESOLUTION.

THE MOTION TO TABLE THE RESOLUTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Absent: Commissioner Koenig.
Chairperson Celentino stated that it was the consensus of the Committee that staff should discuss other options and return to a future meeting of the Committee with a wide-ranging consensus recommendation.

Clerk Byrum stated that she was not an IT professional, but that she would suggest doing all upgrades for Munis as a first step. She further stated that the committee of six directors with whom Mr. Dolchany had been meeting should consider whether it was acceptable for one department head to control whether or not IT would be allowed to upgrade Munis.

Commissioner Stivers stated that Clerk Byrum or someone from her office should be a member of that committee.

10. Controller’s Office
   d. Resolution Adopting Ordinance Amending Ordinance Regulating Parking in County Parking Lots

MOVED BY COMM. SEBOLT, SUPPORTED BY COMM. MAIVILLE, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Koenig.

Announcements
None.

Public Comment
None.

Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 7:36 p.m.

[Signature]
BARB BYRUM, CLERK OF THE BOARD
Thank you for the opportunity to speak during Public Comment as I would like to flag Agenda item 10c for your review. I am not here to argue whether we, Ingham County, utilize Munis to its fullest capabilities as I know the answer is no. For example, I have been asking to utilize electronic time cards for over six years. I have it on very good authority that through the Munis upgrades, it has been possible to do this for years.

It is important to note the Munis is owned by Tyler Technologies, which also owns Eagle Recorder, the document management system that my Office utilizes. I have found Tyler to be very accommodating and accessible. One would think that Munis would want their customers, Ingham County, to utilize every component of their product.

It seems like we should have conversations amongst ourselves, department-heads and county-wides, before we contract with a third party. Why is the Controller bringing this resolution to contract with Plante Moran for $37,000? Has Munis been contacted, and have questions been posed regarding what modules Ingham County is not using that other counties utilize? Does Plante Moran have more knowledge about the Munis System than Munis? Is it cheaper to contract with Plante Moran to do this proposed independent review than it is with Munis? Does Munis even do such a review?

It is important to note that this resolution has not been discussed with County-wides, but in the proposal Plante Moran has indicated that they plan to do onsite interviews (up to 4 days with 2 consultants) with key County stakeholders, which include each County-wide, along with department heads. This feels like the Space Utilization Study, the Hay Study (which was about county compensation) and the Strategic Plan all over again. These initiatives cost the County $400,000. And this amount does not include the 100s of staff hours from each and every Office and department in the County. From those initiatives, I did not see the County move forward, and therefore, I am suspicious of this initiative as well.

I feel that there is not enough attention paid to the details and I worry that this resolution is just throwing more money at a problem before even looking within for, at a minimum, some solutions.