

DRAFT – Agenda
Tuscola County Board of Commissioners
Committee of the Whole – Monday, August 10, 2015 – 7:30 A.M.
HH Purdy Building - 125 W. Lincoln, Caro, MI
Finance
Committee Leaders-Commissioners Kirkpatrick and Bierlein

Primary Finance

1. County Performance Dashboard Update for State Revenue Sharing Compliance (See A)
2. CPI and Impact on Property Tax Revenue (Walt Schlichting – Equalization Director)
3. 2015/2016 County Health Insurance Renewal (Dan Skiver - Brown and Brown) (See B)
4. Retirement Bonding Resolutions
5. MAC 7th District Meeting in Tuscola County
6. Potential IT Services for Sanilac County
7. Potential MSU-e Ballot Language (See C)
8. Financial Planning

On-Going Finance

1. Update Regarding Road Commission Tree Removal Grant
2. County Solid Waste Management Plan
3. Road Commission Legacy Cost
4. Tuscola County Broadband Certification
5. Tuscola County Community Foundation and Next Steps
6. Review of Bank Accounts without County Treasurer Signature
7. Budget Financial Meeting Schedule with Departments
8. MSU-e Ballot Language Development

Personnel

Committee Leader-Commissioner Trisch

Primary Personnel

1. Hiring for HDC Stop Grant Violence Against Women

On-Going Personnel

1. DOL Proposes Rule Changes to Exempt Employees
2. New Hire DC Plan Negotiations Update
3. Region VII AAA Advisory Council Vacancy

Building and Grounds

Committee Leader-Commissioner Allen

Primary Building and Grounds

1. Vanderbilt Park (See D)
2. DTE Looking for Sites for Solar Projects (See E)

On-Going Building and Grounds

Other Business as Necessary

1. Farm Bureau Invitation (See F)

Public Comment Period

2

TUSCOLA COUNTY DASHBOARD 2014

Measurement Factors	Prior Period	Current Period	Progress Positive	Progress Negative
Per Capita Personal Income (Source: Bureau of Labor Analysis)	\$30,923	\$31,410	↑	
County Gov. Debt Per Capita (Source: County Financial Reports)	\$427	\$386	↓	
County Assessed Value (Source: County Equalization)	\$1,922,519,067	\$2,191,425,889	↑	
Actual Debt as a Percent of Allowed Debt (Source: County Debt Schedules)	9.0%	7.9%	↓	
Property Foreclosures (Source: County Register of Deeds - 2009 to 2010)	179	116	↓	
County Bond Rating (Source: Standard and Poor's)	AA-	AA-	Stable	
Sheriff Arrests (Source: Sheriff Annual Report)	746	725	↓	
Jailed Offenders (Source: Sheriff Annual Report)	1,761	1,987		↑

TUSCOLA COUNTY DASHBOARD 2014

Measurement Factors	Prior Period	Current Period	Progress Positive	Progress Negative
Circuit Court New Case Filings (Source: State Court Administrators Office)	1,314	1,212		
District Court New Case Filings (Source: State Court Administrators Office)	7,783	7,111		
Probate Ct. New Case Filings (Source: State Court Administrators Office)	400	394		
Population Change Long-Term (Source: U.S. Census 2000 to 2014)	58,266	54,000		
Population Change Short-Term (Source: U.S. Census)	54,263	54,000		
Unemployment Rate (Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics)	10.5%	8.5%		
Number of Tuscola Residents Employed (Michigan Labor Market information)	22,655	23,442		
Public School Enrollment (Source: Michigan Department of Education)	9,140	8,833		

BCBS RENEWAL FOR 2015/2016 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Dan Skiver, Vice President
Brown & Brown of Central Michigan, Inc.
dba Public Employee Benefits Solutions

(866) 421-0478 www.bbcmich.com



BCBS RENEWAL SEPT. 2015



- Budget increase \$14,600 to \$15,500 for actives
 - 5.4% increase
 - Includes estimated \$33,000 in state and federal taxes – 1.8% of cost
 - Total estimated taxes \$41,000 (includes health dept. and retirees)
 - Enrollment County actives
 - 86% PPO 4
 - 6% PPO 3
 - 1% PP0 2
 - 7% PP0 1
- 

TUSCOLA COUNTY & HEALTH DEPT.

PA 152 HARD CAP PROJECTION 9/1/15-8/31/16



CONTRACT	CENSUS	Division 0005 (PPO 4) (Med & Rx)	ANNUAL COST	CAP AMOUNT
SINGLE	18	\$425.77	\$5,109.24	\$5,992.30
2-PERSON	35	\$1,021.85	\$12,262.20	\$12,531.75
FAMILY	98	\$1,277.30	\$15,327.60	\$16,342.66
TOTALS	151	\$168,604	\$2,023,248	\$2,148,053

Projected Hard Cap **(\$2,148,053)**

Projected Employer Cost **\$2,023,248**

State and Federal Taxes **\$38,801**

Over/(Under) Hard Cap **(\$86,004)**



- BCBS RENEWAL SEPT. 2015**
- 
- BCBS administrative fee increasing by 5.5%
 - Recommended stop loss level is \$15,000 - 0% increase
 - Recommending adding Rx coverage to stop loss
 - Specialty medications are the fastest growing costs to a health plan
 - 6/14-5/15 County paid for 135 scripts that cost over \$500 per month
 - Average of \$1834 or total of \$247,600
- 

BCBS RENEWAL SEPT. 2015



- Additional stop loss premium of \$162,000 annually
- If coverage was added in plan year ending 8/31/14, County would have received additional \$169,000 in stop loss reimbursements
- The stop loss credits will pay for the additional premium
- Allows county to buy more protection at same cost
- Questions?

THANK YOU!



mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org

From: mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org
Sent: Thursday, August 06, 2015 2:58 PM
To: Joseph Bixler
Cc: ctrisch@tuscolacounty.org; 'Bardwell Thom'; 'Bierlein Matthew'; 'Kirkpatrick Craig'; 'Roger Allen'
Subject: FW: MSU-e potential ballot language

Joe

Please review the draft potential ballot language below and feel free to forward it any other parties that you want to review it. Let me know if you are satisfied and if you believe the commissioners should move ahead and approved this language. The county attorney has approved the language with his comments below.

Thank you.

Mike

From: Clayton J. Johnson [mailto:CLAJOH@BraunKendrick.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 06, 2015 11:33 AM
To: 'mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org' <mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org>
Subject: RE: MSU-e potential ballot language

Dear Mike:

You asked below whether the proposed ballot language regarding the MSU extension ballot language is consistent with that which in my opinion is necessary to allow funds from the general fund to be used in 2016 for MSU Extension and repaid from millage funds in later years. The reason for this is so that the expenses which will ultimately be paid from millage funds are incurred in a year covered by the levy of the millage.

I have reviewed the language below and I do find it appropriate in the above respect. The language also meets the applicable requirements under MCL 211.24f. I also note that MCL 285.51 specifically authorizes a county to raise funds by taxation for agricultural extension purposes.

Please feel free to let me know if you would like any further information or analysis at all on this.

Very best regards,

Clay



BRAUN KENDRICK
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

CLAYTON J. JOHNSON
Attorney
Tel: 989.399.0606
Fax: 989.799.4666
Email: clajoh@braunkendrick.com

EMAIL CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information contained in this message may be subject to the attorney-client privilege, constitute attorney work product, or be strictly confidential, and is intended only for the use of the addressee listed above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

From: mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org [<mailto:mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org>]
Sent: Thursday, July 30, 2015 1:15 PM
To: Clayton J. Johnson
Cc: Bierlein Matthew; Kirkpatrick Craig; Joseph Bixler
Subject: MSU-e potential ballot language

Clayton

The current draft of the MSU-e ballot language reads as follows:

**Tuscola County
Michigan State University Extension
Millage Proposal**

For the purpose of sustaining 4-H youth development, agriculture and agribusiness, health and nutrition and other community education programs through Michigan State University Extension services within Tuscola County, shall the County increase the limitation in the total amount of ad valorem taxes which may be imposed for all purposes upon real and personal property in the County, as provided in the Michigan Constitution of 1963, as amended, which would result in a new levy of 0.1 mills (\$0.10 per \$1,000) of taxable valuation, for a period of six (6) years, in the years 2016 to 2021, both inclusive? This levy is estimated to raise \$173,094 in the first year.

You mentioned the importance of including 2016 in your opinion concerning repaying a loan from the general fund that would be used in 2016 to sustain MSU programs in 2016. My understanding is that the ballot language applies to the year the tax is levied. In other words, funds would be levied in 2016 and collected in 2017.....levied in 2021 and collected in 2022.....

Your statement in your opinion regarding the loan stated in part: "In doing so, it will be important that the years covered by the millage include 2016 ", as well as that the purposes set forth within the ballot language include the expenditures to be reimbursed to the general fund.

Mike

Michael R. Hoagland
Tuscola County Controller/Administrator
989-672-3700
mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org

VISIT US ON LINE FOR COUNTY SERVICES @ www.tuscolacounty.org

mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org

From: mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org
Sent: Friday, August 07, 2015 7:56 AM
To: ctrisch@tuscolacounty.org; 'Bardwell Thom'; 'Bierlein Matthew'; 'Kirkpatrick Craig'; 'Roger Allen'
Subject: FW: Vanderbilt County Park

Commissioners

Corporate council has provided potential methods of discontinuing involvement with Vanderbilt in his email below. A decision is needed by the board to determine if county is going to discontinue involvement at this time.

If the decision is to discontinue involvement then the attorney and myself can pursue alternatives listed below. If the decision is to continue involvement then the attorney can assist and develop an ordinance. Also, the parks and recreation commission needs direction as to whether to pursue a Natural Resource Trust Fund Grant or not.

Mike

From: Clayton J. Johnson [mailto:CLAJOH@BraunKendrick.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 06, 2015 5:46 PM
To: 'mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org' <mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org>
Subject: RE: Vanderbilt County Park

Mike,

Within your message below, you have requested our advice on the most straightforward procedure to be followed in the event that it is determined that the County will discontinue operating Vanderbilt County Park. There are a few options in this regard, which I will briefly describe below:

1. Convey the property to another entity, such as Wisner Township or the State of Michigan to be operated by the recipient entity as a public park. This could be accomplished by a deed from the County, subject to the rights reserved by the Vanderbilt family within the 1938 document. The language of the 1938 document does contemplate that the County may assign the property. The transfer would therefore be of full legal effect and the operation of the park would then be the responsibility of the recipient entity.
2. Seek out the heirs of Mr. and Mrs. Vanderbilt in order to convey the property back to the family, extinguishing the County's further obligation with regard to the property. We would be happy to assist in this process if it is desired. Whether this is a particularly complicated process will depend in large part upon (a) the number of living direct descendants of Mr. and Mrs. Vanderbilt, (b) whether a probate estate was ever administered for Mr. and Mrs. Vanderbilt and any deceased children, and (c) whether the living descendants are cooperative.
3. Close the park, taking appropriate measures to prevent access to the property by the public. In the event that the heirs of the Vanderbilts were to come forward to assert the reversion of the property under the 1938 document, the property could then be transferred to them. This option is not the preferable route due to the potential of a lawsuit in the event of an injury by a trespasser. While governmental entities are normally entitled to immunity from tort claims relating to the exercise of a governmental function, the expense and distraction of litigation would certainly be

preferable to avoid, and there is a possibility that a plaintiff may assert that the County was not engaged in a governmental function in this regard.

If it were instead determined that the County will continue operating the park, but would take steps to enforce a fee structure for admission to the park, the proper way to do so would indeed be through the passage of an ordinance setting the amount of the fees, imposing penalties for violation of the ordinance as a civil infraction with a fine imposed, and authorizing the enforcement of the ordinance by all law enforcement officers within the County.

Please feel free to let me know if you would like any assistance or any additional information regarding these issues.

Very best regards,

Clay



CLAYTON J. JOHNSON
Attorney
Tel: 989.399.0606
Fax: 989.799.4666
Email: clajoh@braunkendrick.com

EMAIL CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information contained in this message may be subject to the attorney-client privilege, constitute attorney work product, or be strictly confidential, and is intended only for the use of the addressee listed above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

From: mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org [<mailto:mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org>]
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2015 9:54 AM
To: Clayton J. Johnson
Cc: Mike Miller (Mike Miller); ctrisch@tuscolacounty.org; 'Bardwell Thom'; 'Bierlein Matthew'; 'Kirkpatrick Craig'; 'Roger Allen'
Subject: Vanderbilt County Park

Clayton

The Board of Commissioners and myself have been heavily engaged in multi-year financial planning. The need to reduce costs and/or increase revenue over the next several years has been determined. One method of reducing cost centers on elimination of services that are not mandated by law. One of these services is Vanderbilt County Park. This is the only park operated by the county. The dilemma of the board is whether to discontinue the park or work to achieve park-financial self-sufficiency (general fund appropriations are no longer provided). The Board is still discussing which approach will be implemented. The debate to keep or eliminate involvement with the park has been discussed by county commissioners for the 30 years I have been the Controller/Administrator for this county.

The attached 1938 agreement between the County and Vanderbilt Family states that the county is permitted to use the premises only for a public park and upon failure of the county to use it as a park the property shall revert back to the grantors, their heirs and assigns. If the Board decides to discontinue involvement with this park what is the simplest legal procedure to accomplish this objective. Of course this procedure needs to assure any county liability and responsibility is eliminated. Keep in mind in the past Vanderbilt Family heirs have not been found.

Please answer the above question first. Then, depending on further Board discussion and decisions your assistance may be requested to develop an ordinance or another approach to enforce fees that are changed in the winter when the park is used for access to Saginaw Bay for fishing and other activities. The County Prosecutor started ordinance research for this purpose but with his work load has asked for help to complete this task. If this approach is decided, you will want to have discussion with the Prosecutor and Sheriff.

Your assistance is appreciated.

Mike

Michael R. Hoagland
Tuscola County Controller/Administrator
989-672-3700
mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org

VISIT US ON LINE FOR COUNTY SERVICES @ www.tuscolacounty.org

mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org

From: mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org
Sent: Tuesday, August 04, 2015 1:04 PM
To: Steve Erickson
Cc: ctrisch@tuscolacounty.org; 'Bardwell Thom'; 'Bierlein Matthew'; 'Kirkpatrick Craig'; 'Roger Allen'
Subject: FW: PV solar RFP for DTE
Attachments: Atlas Energy Group Tri-Fol II.pdf

Steve.....DTE looking for sites to build solar projects.....will you contact this person about potential in Tuscola County.....Mike

From: cdjohnson@amexum-united.com [mailto:cdjohnson@amexum-united.com]
Sent: Monday, August 03, 2015 6:46 PM
To: mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org
Subject: PV solar RFP for DTE

Good Day Mr. Hoagland

Atlas Energy is looking for properties to build solar on for a DTE RFP due back on the 19th of Aug. We are looking for 50 to 100 acre sites to build the new solar fields on in multiple counties and have been contacting farms, municipalities and airports that may be willing to lease property for this purpose. The term of the lease will be 20-25 years with equipment removed after lease is up or DTE may decide to purchase to property in some cases. We would prefer that sites are 1 mile or less from a DTE substation site. We are willing to pay \$500 dollars per lease acre plus any legal cost required if we can come to arrangement. Our brochure is attached for your use and my card is also attached.

Thank You in advance

C.Johnson
<http://atlaspower.us/>





1023 E Caro Rd / Caro MI 48723
Ph: 989-673-4157 / Fax: 989-672-0391

August 3, 2015

Dear Tuscola County Commissioners,

The Board of Directors of the Tuscola County Farm Bureau cordially invites you to attend the 2015 Tuscola County Annual Meeting on Thursday, August 20, 2015 at the MSU Saginaw Valley Research and Extension Center, located at 3775 S. Reese Rd, in Frankenmuth.

We will begin the evening with registration and "Taste of Tuscola" at 5:00 p.m., Dinner at 6:30 p.m. The business meeting will follow dinner this will include Policy Development, Election of Directors, and the award recognition.

The "Taste of Tuscola" event will have vendors & growers from Tuscola County. You will have the opportunity to see and sample what's produced right here in Tuscola County.

We ask that you call the Tuscola County Farm Bureau office at 989-673-4157 or email dfoley@ctyfb.com with your reservation by Friday, August 14, 2015.

This year we are collecting your home grown garden produce and/or non-perishable items in exchange for your ticket cost. (Cash is also welcome). All collections will be donated locally within Tuscola County. (Please do not bring any out-dated items)

We look forward to seeing you at our County Annual Meeting.

Sincerely,

Nathan Rupprecht

Nathan Rupprecht, President