



## **Criminal Justice Collaborative Council**

Friday, August 15, 2025

11 AM – 1:00 PM

Meeting in person and via Zoom

[Join by Zoom Webinar](#)

### **AUGUST MEETING AGENDA**

1. Call to Order
2. Attendance
3. Approval of the Agenda
4. Public Participation (up to 3 minutes per speaker)
5. Council Response to Public Participation
6. JIS Transition Impacts
  - a. Delphia Simpson, Public Defender
7. Mental Health and Public Safety Millage Ordinance Review
  - a. Commissioner Katie Scott
8. Community Corrections
  - a. All
9. Adjourn



## **Criminal Justice Collaborative Council**

Friday, June 13, 2025  
11 AM – 1:00 PM  
Meeting in person and via Zoom

[Join by Zoom Webinar](#)

### **JUNE MEETING AGENDA**

1. Call to Order
1. Attendance
  - a. Present: Carol Kuhnke (PROXY), Erane Washington, Victoria Burton-Harris (PROXY), Delphia Simpson, Renee Casey (PROXY), Andrew DeLeeuw (PROXY), Katie Scott, Trish Cortes, Derrick Jackson, Adam Grant, Larry Root, Karen Valvo, Annie Somerville, Anna Frushour
  - b. Absent: Pat Conlin, Eli Savit, Alyshia Dyer, Gregory Dill
  - c. Community members Present: 0
2. Approval of the Agenda
  - a. Moved by Larry Root
  - b. Seconded by Karen Valvo
3. Public Participation (up to 3 minutes per speaker)
  - a. None
4. Council Response to Public Participation
  - a. None
5. Community Corrections Plan
  - a. Sheriff & Courts
    - ☐ RC: 406 individuals with electronic monitoring. Down significantly from early March. We've seen that the courts are releasing people using SCRAM. GPS numbers continue to climb. This is a trend we've seen. We have an electronic management plan that has been sent out several times to judges/prosecutor for feedback. We have received some feedback. We are still collecting signatures as we continue to incorporate feedback. We tried to take the plan and make it around the process. It's in a pre-phase so we can only remove people we really need to. More discussion needs to be had about operationalizing low/high risk

labels. We need to make sure we're all on the same page and comfortable with the plan. We are still sending out a list monthly with who is on electronic monitoring. Trying to be proactive in monitoring how long individuals have been on the list. When we dip down to 390 to low 400s individuals we do see a dip in our revenue.

- KV: we have discussed in the different courts the plan. I want to have a person-by-person approach so that we are providing tailored support, so they get the support they need and reduce the recidivism.
- CK: seeing greater cases of monitoring or greater cases in removing monitoring – either way being more watchful of this has been very helpful. This is a limited resource and we want to reserve it for who really needs it. There is a lot of support for this in the circuit court.
- RC: our numbers and referrals have declined. However, our jail population has stayed high. Which is concerning.
- AF: we don't change the way we're doing referrals. If there's a need there's a need. We have a review process and we are hearing from community corrections to review on a case by case basis. As far as referrals that is different week to week so I can't really speak to any changes.
- KS: is this a natural trend happening here that is historical (based on time of year)? It might be helpful to understand.
- AF: there are a lot of moving pieces in this puzzle. We could look at trends but it may be hard to pin down given all these factors.
- KS: we could get really scientific with this data. I'm asking this questions because, as I said when we first convened, I want this to be a working group.
- EW: KV is correct. I do things differently. All the judges are reviewing the lists as they're coming out. And we're just being more cognizant of the numbers, when people are released. I'm not sure if this is a seasonal trend. We usually see an uptick in activity in spring. I think the numbers are down due to everyone just being more cognizant.
- AS: the ongoing budget challenges mentioned by RC – I'm interested in looking at the data in SoberLink. I'm uncomfortable with the fact we are paying for every individual's program costs, especially those not on their first offence. I was considering since our last meeting, what factors can we consider when we determine who must pay. We are the only county in the state who doesn't charge anyone.
- DS: we must calculate someone's eligibility for our services. Some standards play into that. We do determine eligibility, there are standards we could go from. I feel a bit uncomfortable sharing our clients' income information with corrections. Perhaps this committee could come up with some sort of sliding scale. I'd warn against sliding scales systems that force those to pay who cannot. We don't want to have a bigger impact than what we intend to have. There is a way to come up with a fair sliding scale system.
- AF: when folks come to the courts and ask for public defender, they get one. So everyone may not meet those standards just because they request a public defender.
- DS: we do all the eligibilities for anyone in the county requesting an attorney.
- AS: between now and our next meeting some of us could get together and dive deeper. Its unrealistic to keep going down this path. The money we're pouring into electronic monitoring could be used to fill gaps in our community.
- DJ: we could refer to criminal justice reform best practices, have someone come to this working group to help guide the work.

- AD: a couple resources: MIDC standards has been vetted and is public. SCAO is also working on another framework they'll likely publish in the fall.
- VBH: question for corrections – is there a way to collect income information when they come to get fitted for the monitoring device so that isn't coming from defense counsel? So, we can have an early determination
- RC: it's a possibility. We'd have to iron out the details of - if we'd need verification, that would put more work on corrections. If there are some verifications needed then that could delay release in some cases (individuals that require the device to be released from incarceration). So I'm not sure if during the fitting would be the best time. The court may have information on income when they're first brought in.
- KV: we do not. We don't receive that information until conviction. There is a kiosk in the district court that could be used instead of a SoberLink. Now the SoberLink is convenient.
- DJ: does it have to be in downtown AA?
- KV: there used to be another kiosk at the sheriff's office but it wasn't used much. Any facility can request the device
- KS: maybe it's the association with the court/sheriff's office.
- AG: Asking questions about income early doesn't mean they can't participate. We could come at this in lots of different ways. One concern I have is people who do side jobs or nontraditional jobs may not report their income accurately. So we'll need to be very intentional in capturing this.
- VBH: it sounds like corrections may have the capacity. It would depend on how it's done. I'll speak for me personally, but Eli would likely agree: if a person is doing gig work to make ends meet, those are not the people we would be going after for using a SoberLink device. But we could pull documentation (W2) to ascertain need. Perhaps we can ask for documentation on income.
- AS: the more I think about this the more I want to be able to explain this. When we're paying for everyone, that isn't equity. I want to be equitable across corrections. I want more information on the data. What determines if a person is put on SoberLink. I don't to exacerbate a bad financial situation for an individual who made a mistake. I especially want to be aware of how we're managing those with repeat offenses.
- AF: back to the kiosk. I represent a very rural district that would really struggle without the SoberLink. It would be great to have more kiosks across the county, but I don't know how cost effective that is.
- KS: is SoberLink just for those with DUIs?
- CK: SoberLink isn't just for individuals with driving offenses. It's for any alcohol related offense (a common one is DV).
- KS: I see the sides of this discussion. We don't want to be paying for individuals who have ample income.
- CK: we see very few uber rich people coming through the program. We have to look at how we are viewing our criminal justice system. If we go too far down a punitive model, we lose the general community benefit given by SoberLink (it's beneficial to community members if someone is able to be rehabilitated while contributing to society).
- RC: with punitive models being less effective, it will be a process moving towards a restorative system. It will take creativity to operationalize equity. And we'll need to also have a plan for individuals who refuse to pay who we determine are able to

- VBH: it's a balance of pursuing dollars but also not sinking more dollars into the pursuit. We can explore what other counties have done
- DJ: there have been great changes in our system based on our values. But many things have been discussed but not brought to the BOC. I'd like to add to future conversations about bringing a presentation to the board
- KS: I appreciate the acknowledgement of the budgetary concerns. What is the cost benefit ratio? Do we make money doing this work? It's also philosophical in the idea of do we want to spend our time as a county exploring this.
- DJ: looking at 2022 SCRAM data – let's compare those numbers to now
- RC: GPS numbers are going down
- DJ: what components other than timing do we need to consider?
- RC: We need to identify a tipping point. We aren't seeing declines so we'd like to bring the information back to the judges. So it would be a list of individuals ranked from high to low risk and ask the judges to consider the ranking when sentencing.
- RC: this is not an algorithm situation.
- Population management plan:
  1. VBH: Eli has reviewed it and talked with the sheriff. The public defender has reached out to us with a list of people to have stipulated releases for. I'd like to continue this collaboration.
  2. DS: how the information is getting to us is very time intensive to receive and go through. I'd like to sit down with community corrections to simplify that. If the judges are removing people, my only request is that that list come to us.
  3. RC: if the emergency electronic management plan is approved then that will be the vehicle for those lists. Right now, it's just individual removal orders.
  4. KS: with this population management plan would it be a good for this group to review the plan and workshop it. I think it will help with everyone's understanding since all the stakeholders are at this table
  5. VBH: my concern is that we may have privacy concerns
  6. KS: not talking about individual cases – the plan being developed for population management. Can we bring the plan to this room so all the voices are involved in creating it who will have to engage with it once it's launched.
  7. VBH: I misunderstood but agree with that
  8. AF: we will have a district court meeting and the judges will have input
  9. RC: my concern isn't including this group, but the more people you add to a meeting the more agenda items. I'm worried this will delay the process and it will have to go back to the judges who aren't here. So I think the smaller work group is the way to go
  10. KS: but would we be able to bring a draft here and discuss it/provide feedback?
  11. RC: yes
  12. KS: great, lets do that next meeting
- b. Roundtable Discussion: Role of the carceral system in community corrections
  - KS: not only what is the role but what is the perception. There are only two counties that house community corrections in the sheriff's office

- RC: one thing to keep in mind in MI is that community corrections is unique to the county it serves. So we are who are we in WC because we have leveraged what we needed to be that way.
- KV: we have a lot of special/treatment courts in our county. We are providing support for individuals on probation. We are so grateful for community corrections being a facilitator of that support. We could never operationalize that in the courts without that facilitation. I don't get the impression from defendants that there is a negative association or reluctance to go to community corrections.
- DS: I agree and disagree. WC is unique in how we view the services we provide to those involved in the justice system. There are individuals who think community corrections is part of law enforcement. It would be a tad disingenuous to say individuals don't have that association with community corrections. I'm not sure if there's a way to alter that perception.
- VBH: if there are some folks who feel community corrections is a part of the carceral system does that mean they view it was something problematic. Some people view community corrections as an extension of the carceral system. There are certainly buckets of folks who feel differently. And even within those buckets there is variation. Some folks who feel that the association impacts their perception, others don't.
- CK: the circuit court barely uses community corrections as carceral. It's a pre-trial resource as needed. Folks have told me that they do see it as part of that system though. However, I have heard much more negative things about the probation office than community corrections.
- AG: I agree with CK. We talk about separating support from supervision, but separation isn't always good. Interconnection can provide accountability. We don't want to be in silos, WC is getting better about that. But old habits die hard. And when community corrections was born it was punitive. So some of those roots may remain and I'm not sure how to address that. But I really do think having it in a location you cannot remove the association.
- KS: say more about other forms of accountability
- AG: its not just systems for accountability. Its about the interconnectedness of the system, knowing if you slack off, you'll get told on adds some accountability. But it's a balance of supervising/supporting in a way that each individual part becomes the same system. There is a place for punitive, it's necessary for some people, but it can't be a one size fits all
- KS: I'm thinking about how we get people to ask for what they need and how the trauma associated with a place doesn't just go away. I don't want to perpetuate that trauma. So how do we strike that balance, find that sweet spot. We need to motivate individuals to be accountable but not out of fear.
- DJ: I see this system as a continuum. And not everything works for everyone. When I think of community corrections, and the physical space it occupies, people definitely look at me like I'm about the arrest them when I'm there. But that serves a purpose. We need to think of all the rungs on our ladder in all the services we have at our disposable. What rungs are we not actively using. We're doing great things in our county and sometimes I think that blinds us to what is going on in other communities. I'd like to explore some of those ideas
- VBH: while I do want to get to a place that we're not governing from fear, I do want to be aware of those individuals who get on the right path because of a consequence they were afraid of. The choice to be on the right path is so hard

for individuals who have substances issues, they need the full village including the corrections. It will need to be a nuanced approach

- KS: what if there is a layered way to layer in community corrections. So perhaps a starting point outside of community corrections' main location.
- AG: before this I worked as a peer recovery support in the courts. Framing is key. Many people come into these courts kicking and screaming but it's their best option. Then they see it as only something they need to get through. So how it's framed is essential to getting individuals to have self-discipline. We need to find ways to inspire and incentivize engaging with these other programs and developing self-discipline. I mean people can be suspicious of me because I'm publicly working with the sheriff/Derrick and I have to frame it correctly
- VBH: consequences not as punitive but as a vehicle to having self-discipline. I'd like to look more into a layered approach. Maybe we can get volunteers or set aside funding to support folks outside of community corrections. That might be an expansion the special court
- DS: services are so intense for individuals. The number of people involved in specialty court is large. I like the idea of layer onto this model to service a broader community.
- Trish: from a CMH perspective, how many people do we put on an AOT and how many do we have to utilize the courts to follow their treatment plan. The last thing we want to do is take someone's civil liberties away but we need to care for people. Conversations about physical places is important and community corrections is probably in the worst location if we're trying to get away from stigma.
- KS: I remember the first time I pulled into the LRC, that feeling of danger. Kind of like when you see a police officer and slowdown even if you aren't speeding. That feeling is real for individuals whether it's fair or not
- KV: a new program statewide for judges to be paired with a psychiatrist in underway. As the program gets up and running I'll bring updates to this group.
- RC: community corrects in WC are really two programs in one
  1. Pretrial services: this is public safety option to not keep someone incarcerated. It's been clear that this program isn't intended to be that spark for change in individuals. In this program we do try and connect individuals with resources, but we don't force them to do it because they are innocent.
  2. Community treatment: how most use our program. We have CBT, substance treatment, anger management – programs to instill change and promote positive pathways for folks to move forward.
- RC (con't): so it's hard to have these discussions because the topics apply differently to these two very different arms.
- KS: that is helpful because we have been talking about this like it's a monolith and it's not
- DJ: when you look at other counties, they're doing very different things. Some programs are focused more on pretrial and others on community treatment.
- RC: originally in the early 90s community corrections was either in county courts or administration. All of the funds come from MDOJ and they want those funds to service the population. When community corrections was moved to the circuit courts there were not pretrial services. When I joined in 2005 we would go into the jail to find candidates for pretrial services and would then go advocate for them to the judges. The national institute of corrections was

brought in to help with the population of jail, part of that was developing a formal pretrial services program. It started by collecting very basic background information and giving that to judges. As it grew judges required defendants to engage in pretrial services. Until 2010 community corrections was under the trial court. Community corrections was cut from trial court as a budgetary measure. So the sheriff was approached to pick up community corrections. From there we have rapidly built up community services. Now what we do is 75% pretrial program. As a system we have chosen to create pretrial services within community corrections. That is likely why some of community treatment programs in community corrections, we have a more robust system of support.

- ☐ KS: Where are pretrial services housed in counties without community collections?
- ☐ RC: some don't have it
- ☐ KS: then how are decisions made by judges
- ☐ KV: the police report and the person in front of them
- ☐ AG: want to give context to some of what RC said. I am a product of that old system. Perception impacts reality. The pretrial experience impacts the attitude if someone is convicted and goes into community treatment. The system has generations of trauma. So telling people to trust us while we're housed under the same system is a heavy lift.
- ☐ RC: there are a lot of counties that don't have pretrial services. Rural, low resource, and low need counties typically don't have them. But know from a state and national level that there is a very strong push for pretrial services. It's supported as a best practice for reducing incarceration rates. It keeps the public safe but also provides support for individuals using the services. I think we will be seeing more and more pretrial services.
- ☐ VBH: how did we get here versus a conversation about effectiveness of programs. We need to be upfront about all of us being a part of the carceral systems with a nasty history. Once we agree there how can we use this context in concert with what is effective. Let's think about what our realistic options are why we are talking about what we're talking about. I would hope we are looking at effectiveness and how we're measuring that effectiveness.
- ☐ KS: I think effectiveness is key. And considering the first part of what you said, a big part of the carceral system is rooted in racism and can we dismantle that in our system here.
- ☐ VBH: it's a complex conversation with a lot of moving parts
- ☐ DS: I want us to be creative about how we add onto the existing structure. We can look at the things being done in San Francisco. As we've said how do we layer onto what we're already doing. We shouldn't limit ourselves because we have an existing structure
- ☐ VBH: San Francisco pulls from the state and county budget
- ☐ KS: it's much more centralized
- ☐ RC: it's coming back to budget again. That's why community corrections came to CJCC. We need to have a budget put together for the BOC for the next fiscal year. We can't lose sight of the budget issue, community corrections are hugely underfunded especially given how the county has chosen to utilize it. We've outgrown our space. We're going to be in deficit at the end of this year.
- ☐ KS: the budget is coming from millage funds and allocations from the BOC. It's my understanding that the sheriff's office itself isn't providing funds outside of the public safety millage of the funds

- c. RC: MI house bill may pass that will require judges to assign a GPS tether in cases of domestic violence at arraignment OR give oral reason why they are not a danger
  - d. AH: next meeting at LRC 7/25 11am-1pm
- 6. Adjourn

DRAFT

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING AN AMENDED COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH AND  
PUBLIC SAFETY PRESERVATION MILLAGE EXPENDITURE POLICY ORDINANCE

WASHTENAW COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

June 5, 2024

WHEREAS, pursuant to the authority granted to Washtenaw County by MCLA 46.11(j), the Board of Commissioners seeks to update the Community Mental Health and Public Safety Preservation Millage Expenditure Policy Ordinance to provide a framework for the expenditure of funds; and

WHEREAS, the Headlee Amendment to the Michigan Constitution and Proposition A have artificially reduced the amount of property taxes which all Michigan local governmental entities, including Washtenaw County, receive to pay for their various programs; and

WHEREAS, two critical areas in Washtenaw County which have been especially affected by this lack of funding are public safety which is overseen by the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Office ("WCSO") and mental health services which is overseen by the County's Community Mental Health Department and Board; and

WHEREAS, as costs increase to provide services in these two critical areas, the County is faced with either directing more of its general fund to these areas which reduces the funding for other critical County programs for County citizens or, in the public safety area, charging more to those jurisdictions which contract for police services throughout the County; and

WHEREAS, these two major areas often overlap as is the case in the County jail where a number of inmates are also being treated for mental health disorders; and

WHEREAS, treating inmates in the County jail, while important, is a reactive and expensive way to address these individuals' mental health needs; and

WHEREAS, additional funding would permit the WCSO and Community Mental Health to address these issues proactively which would ultimately prove to be much more cost effective; and

WHEREAS, the proposed amendment to the Community Mental Health and Public Safety Preservation Millage Expenditure Policy Ordinance would create a Public Safety Millage Advisory Committee; and

WHEREAS, the proposed amendment to the Community Mental Health and Public Safety Preservation Millage Expenditure Policy Ordinance would direct funds from the Public Safety portion of the Millage to Mental and Behavioral Health Services, Rapid Rehousing and Permanent Supportive Housing, and Community Violence Interruption; and

WHEREAS, this item has been reviewed by Corporation Counsel, the County Administrator, and the Board of Commissioners.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Washtenaw County Board of Commissioners hereby adopts the amended Community Mental Health and Public Safety Preservation Millage Expenditure Policy Ordinance as attached hereto and made a part hereof.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the attached ordinance take effect on January 1, 2025.

| COMMISSIONER | Y | N | A | COMMISSIONER | Y | N | A | COMMISSIONER | Y | N | A |
|--------------|---|---|---|--------------|---|---|---|--------------|---|---|---|
| Beeman       | X |   |   | Maciejewski  | X |   |   | Somerville   | X |   |   |
| Hodge        | X |   |   | Rabhi        | X |   |   |              |   |   |   |
| LaBarre      | X |   |   | Sanders      |   | X |   |              |   |   |   |
| Lyte         |   | X |   | Scott        | X |   |   |              |   |   |   |

CLERK/REGISTER'S CERTIFICATE - CERTIFIED COPY

ROLL CALL VOTE:

7 2 0

STATE OF MICHIGAN )

I, Lawrence Kestenbaum, Clerk/Register of said County of Washtenaw and Clerk of Circuit Court for said County, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate copy of a resolution adopted by the Washtenaw County Board of Commissioners at a session held at the County Administration Building in the City of Ann Arbor, Michigan, on June 5<sup>th</sup>, 2024, as it appears of record in my office. In Testimony Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said Court at Ann Arbor, this 6<sup>th</sup> day of June 2024.

COUNTY OF WASHTENAW<sup>SS</sup>.

LAWRENCE KESTENBAUM, Clerk/Register

BY: \_\_\_\_\_

Deputy Clerk

Res. No. 24-121



**Title:** Community Mental Health and Public Safety Preservation Millage Expenditure Policy Ordinance

**Date of Adoption:** June 5, 2024

**Table of Contents:**

Preamble

Title

Body

Section 1: Declaration of Purpose

Section 2: Authorization

Section 3: Community Mental Health Services

Section 4: Community Mental Health Advisory Committee

Section 5: Public Safety

Section 6: Public Safety Millage Advisory Committee

Section 7: Duration

**PREAMBLE:** Whereas it is necessary to provide information regarding the procedures and standards for the expenditure of funds provided by Washtenaw County's Community Mental Health and Public Safety Preservation Millage enable through passage of Washtenaw County Resolution 24-121;

**Title:** AN ORDINANCE providing procedures and standards for Washtenaw County's expenditure of its Community Mental Health and Public Safety Preservation Millage funds, THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF WASHTENAW COUNTY ORDAINS:

**SECTION 1: Declaration of Purpose**

The Washtenaw County Board of Commissioners seeks to fully address the challenges of a lack of necessary resources affecting mental health services which is provided by the County's Community Mental Health Department and Board; and public safety which is provided by the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Office (WCSO).

**SECTION 2: Authorization**

Pursuant to the authority granted to Washtenaw County by MCLA 46.11(j), the Board of Commissioners seeks to enact this ordinance to govern the expenditure of funds provided by Washtenaw County's Community Mental Health and Public Safety Preservation Millage enable through passage of Washtenaw County Resolution 24-121, on June 5, 2024.

### SECTION 3: Community Mental Health Services

In exercising its authority to provide for the mental health needs of Washtenaw County residents, the Board of Commissioners and the CMH Board intends for the revenue raised by this millage to be used in a manner affecting four broad areas of mental health services and supplements to auxiliary services within other Washtenaw County Offices and Departments:

Crisis- Funding will be used to address mental health and substance abuse crises which include immediate crisis assessment, referral, treatment and diversion from jail or emergency departments. Additionally, funds will be used for supportive services post crisis engagement, including supportive housing services.

Stabilization- Funding will be used to provide mental health treatment services to adults and children with the severe mental illness and developmental disabilities who do not currently qualify for services due to insurance status or unaffordable deductibles and to those individuals for whom traditional outpatient treatment is not adequate.

Prevention- Funding will be used to support mental health awareness, prevention, and early intervention programming for use in working with community partners such as schools, law enforcement and other first responders, and health care providers.

Jail Services- Jail service expansion will include mental health and substance abuse assessment and treatment inclusive of counseling and psychiatric services and prisoner re-entry with a focus on case management.

### SECTION 4: Community Mental Health Advisory Committee

1. The County Board shall create and appoint, with recommendation of the Washtenaw County Community Mental Health Board a body under this Ordinance to be named the Community Mental Health Advisory Committee ("CMHAC"). CMHAC shall function as an advisory body to assist both the Board of Commissioners and the CMH Board on a yearly basis with the identification of the needs of community mental health service recipients, the evaluation of services provided for such need, related to millage funds, and promotion of collaborative and complementary practices among stakeholders and the community at large. The CMHAC will be responsible for

identifying and recommending entities or individuals which have an expertise and capacity to perform these functions under contract with CMH. The CMHAC may additionally serve directly as the advisory body to the CMH Board for the purposes of federal and state requirements allowing the County to be designated as a Certified Community Behavioral Health Clinic (CCBHC) and receive related funding.

In addition, CMHAC shall develop an annual Strategic County Mental Health Plan (hereafter the "Strategic Plan"), to respond to changing needs and conditions in the County; this Strategic Plan shall specify the Committee's advised expenditure of the portion of the millage funds that will flow to the Community Mental Health department. The Strategic Plan shall be based on 1) the Board of Commissioners' intended use of the portion of millage funds allocated to mental health needs as specified in the Community Mental Health and Public Safety Preservation Millage (Resolution 24-121); 2) the uses as identified in Section 3 of this Ordinance; 3) the CMHAC's evaluation of County mental health needs and evolving needs; and 4) input from the public and stakeholders.

The CMHAC's Strategic Plan shall also establish benchmarks by which the effective use of millage funds allocated to address mental health needs are measured. The Strategic Plan shall be presented on an annual basis to the CMH Board for its recommendations and approval, and upon approval, to the Board of Commissioners as a highly detailed line-item component of the annual CMH budget (operating on the State's fiscal calendar) for final approval.

Annual assessments and evaluations of the use of the millage monies allocated to CMH, based on the benchmarks established by the Strategic Plan and approved by the BOC, shall be presented by CMH staff to CMHAC, the CMH Board, and the Board of Commissioners.

2. CMHAC members must be County residents or representatives of entities, businesses or organizations within the County. At least one member shall be appointed who has demonstrable level of expertise in each of the following areas of expertise and/or representation: (a) primary consumer; (b) secondary consumer; (c) health system representative; (d) CMH unionized workforce representative; (e) Washtenaw County Court or Justice System representative; (f) CMH Director or their designee; (g) safety net primary care representative; (h) housing/homeless services representative; (i) education system representative; (j) member at large. In addition, the County Board may appoint ex-officio members.

CMHAC members shall serve two-year terms, except that the initial terms of six of the members shall be for a three-year period. The County Board may reappoint members to successive terms. The County Board shall have the

discretion to remove CMHAC members for good cause– provided under the Rules of the County Board.

4. CMHAC members shall not be compensated for their services but shall be reimbursed for attending meetings and for mileage as provided under the Rules of the County Board.
5. The County Board may terminate CMHAC upon approval of 2/3 of the County Board elected and serving.
6. Individual CMHAC members shall disclose any potential financial conflict of interest and abstain from any discussion or voting on the matter in which he/she has a conflict.

#### SECTION 5: Public Safety

The WCSO is comprised of over 350 staff supported by reserves and volunteers spread throughout five (5) divisions. Serving a population in excess of 350,000 residents spread across 25 local units of government, the WCSO focuses on co-creating community wellness and safety through quality public safety and social justice services for all of Washtenaw County.

The support received through the millage enables the WCSO to transcend the role of a traditional police agency. By utilizing millage funds, the WCSO can provide individuals with the necessary assistance to prevent their involvement in the judicial system, ultimately reducing the strain on our courts and jails. To accomplish this upstream impact, 50% of annual millage funding will be used in a proactive manner to provide services to help individuals with needs related to:

1. Mental and Behavioral Health Services (10% minimum)

Funds will be used to provide clinical therapy, case management, and other supportive services for mental health and behavioral health needs through Community Mental Health and external community providers. The intent of these funds is to provide access to trauma-based care for deputies and individuals inside jail, re-entry support for individuals leaving jail, harm reduction services through external partners, and to continue in partnerships with existing WCCMH Programs, and to continue existing programs within the Sheriff's Office. All external programs must be allocated through an RFP process to be reviewed by

the Public Safety Millage Advisory Committee and approved by the Board of Commissioners.

## 2. Rapid Rehousing and Permanent Supportive Housing (10% minimum)

Funds will be used to provide access to housing through a Request For Proposal (RFP) process by seeking proposals from organizations that provide re-entry housing for individuals exiting the Washtenaw County jail, or individuals in danger of great bodily harm due to community violence or domestic violence situations. The RFP should focus on harm reduction of ongoing interaction with law enforcement and provide housing opportunities for the homeless population to reduce interaction with law enforcement. The RFP process will be reviewed by the Public Safety Millage Advisory Committee and approved by the Board of Commissioners.

## 3. Community Violence Interruption (10% minimum)

Funds will be used to continue and/or expand existing internal programs and to increase new external programs to reduce community violence. All external programs must be allocated through an RFP process to be reviewed by the Public Safety Millage Advisory Committee and approved by the Board of Commissioners.

The millage allocation will further bolster the WCSO's ongoing initiatives aimed at delivering county-wide law enforcement services, including diverting individuals from the criminal justice system and promoting overall community well-being.

The WCSO will continue to collaborate closely with their partners in mental health and substance use disorder treatment to:

1. Prevent criminal justice engagement by serving people in the community;
2. Help incarcerated individuals prepare for success once they leave the jail through education, re-entry, and employment transition;
3. Improve the County's public safety infrastructure; and
4. Provide emergency services to local municipalities.

The millage funds shall not be used for the purchase or maintenance of firearms or other weapons of any kind, including chemical weapons used for crowd dispersal.

## SECTION 6: Public Safety Millage Advisory Committee

In recognition of the mandated authority granted to sheriffs in Article VII, Section 4 of the Michigan Constitution, and in recognition of the fiduciary duty of the Board of Commissioners, as well as the shared accountability of both the Board and the Sheriff as duly elected officials, and in alignment with the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Office commitment to collaboration on issues of community wellness and safety, the Public Safety Millage Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) shall be created by the Board of Commissioners. The Advisory Committee will be a 16-member body and under this Ordinance three (3) of the seats will be occupied by members of the Board of Commissioners.

1. The Board of Commissioners shall establish an Advisory Committee to allow for enhanced communication and coordination concerning the designated utilization of millage funds entrusted to the Sheriff by the voters of Washtenaw County.
2. The Advisory Committee members shall be recommended by the Chair of the Board and approved by the Board of Commissioners, including future vacancies.
3. In acknowledgment of the distinctive role of an elected officer overseeing voter-approved funding for the operation of a mandated county office, the Advisory Committee is established to serve as an advisory body to the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Office and the Board of Commissioners. The committee will provide guidance on the utilization of millage funds within the broader annual and multi-year budgets of the Sheriff's Office, fostering an additional pathway for community engagement regarding the allocation of these funds. This advisory function is designed to ensure shared compliance with the voter-approved ballot language, this Ordinance, and the overarching budgetary authority entrusted to the Board of Commissioners.
3. The Advisory Committee will provide a structured framework which aims to enhance and complement the community engagement processes used within the Sheriff's Office that currently guide millage priorities. This more formalized structure will also provide an additional avenue for stakeholders and the broader community to engage in the co-creation of community wellness and safety.
4. Annually, the Advisory Committee shall develop and propose a millage investment plan to the Sheriff. The Sheriff will take this plan under advisement

and include it as part of the annual millage investment plan to be submitted as a line-item budget to the Board of Commissioners for consideration and adoption as a component of the Board's annual budget process. The Board of Commissioners oversees the budget process and has final authority over how millage dollars are utilized, consistent with ballot language and this Ordinance.

5. The Advisory Committee shall not infringe on the fiduciary and policy roles and responsibilities of the Board of Commissioners nor the authority of the Sheriff to develop policy and oversee the operations of the WCSO.
6. Members of the Advisory Committee must reside in the County or represent entities, businesses, or organizations within the County. It is crucial to ensure diverse representation by including individuals with lived experience who have been impacted by the criminal legal system. Additionally, the Committee should have members with expertise in each of the specified areas.
  - a. Up to three members with lived experience with the criminal justice, carceral, and violence/trauma systems:
  - b. Western Washtenaw local contracting unit of government representative;
  - c. Eastern Washtenaw local contracting unit of government representative;
  - d. Primary user of permanent supportive housing representative;
  - e. An individual with lived experience of a Substance Use Disorder representative;
  - f. Community Violence prevention peer or specialist;
  - g. Washtenaw County Court System representative;
  - h. Washtenaw CMH System representative;
  - i. Washtenaw County Public Health representative;
  - j. Harm Reduction specialist or advocate;
  - k. Sheriff, as an ex-officio member
  - l. In addition, the Board may appoint three members of its body as ex-officio members
8. Advisory Committee members shall serve two-year terms, except that the initial terms of six of the members shall be for a three-year period. The County Board may reappoint members to successive terms. The County Board shall have the discretion to remove PSMAC members for good cause.

9. Advisory Committee members shall be reimbursed for attending meetings and for mileage as provided under the Rules and Regulations of the Board of Commissioners.
10. Advisory Committee members shall disclose any potential conflict of interest and abstain from any discussion or voting on the matter in which they have a conflict.

#### SECTION 7: Duration

This Ordinance will sunset once the millage is no longer being collected.