



MICHIGAN INDIGENT DEFENSE COMMISSION

The Michigan Indigent Defense Commission ensures that quality public defense services are accessible to all eligible adults charged with a criminal offense in Michigan.

Date: Tuesday October 21, 2025, Time: 9:30 a.m.
Michigan Public Services Building
7109 W. Saginaw Hwy. Lansing, MI 48917

AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Roll call and opening remarks
3. Introduction of Commission members and guests
4. Public comment
5. Additions to agenda
6. Consent agenda (**action item**)
 - a. September 12, 2025 Meeting Minutes
7. Chair Report
8. Executive Director Report
9. Commission Business
 - a. Standing Committee Reports
 - i. Executive Committee
 - b. Ad Hoc Committee Report
 - i. Data Collection
 - c. Regional Update: South Central MI, *Nicole Walter, Regional Manager*

~ Break for Lunch ~

- d. MIDC Standards Implementation
 - i. FY26 Compliance Plans and Costs (action items)

Staff recommends approval of the resubmitted plans and costs:

1. Charter Township of Shelby
2. City of Sterling Heights
3. City of Detroit
4. City of Inkster
5. Ogemaw County
6. City of Oak Park
7. Lapeer County
8. Cass County
9. Kalamazoo County
10. St. Joseph County
11. Arenac County
12. Bay County
13. Huron County
14. Iosco County
15. Kalkaska County
16. Leelanau County
17. Marquette County
18. Wexford and Missaukee Counties
19. City of Highland Park
20. City of Dearborn
21. Ingham County
22. Isabella County
23. Calhoun County
24. Cheboygan County
25. Delta County
26. Alger County
27. Antrim County
28. Charlevoix County
29. Chippewa County
30. Crawford County

31. Dickinson County
32. Emmet County
33. Gogebic County
34. Houghton, Baraga and Keweenaw Counties
35. Luce County
36. Mackinac County
37. Menominee County
38. Ontonagon County
39. Otsego County
40. Presque Isle County
41. Alcona County
42. Alpena County
43. Montmorency County
44. Oscoda County
45. Roscommon County
46. Tuscola County
47. Jackson County
48. City of Garden City
49. City of Grosse Pointe Farms
50. City of Grosse Pointe Park
51. City of Hamtramck
52. City of Southgate
53. City of Eastpointe
54. City of Farmington
55. City of Hazel Park
56. City of Roseville
57. City of Royal Oak
58. City of Southfield
59. City of Warren
60. Clinton Township
61. Macomb County
62. Oakland County
63. Allegan County
64. Kent County
65. Montcalm County

66. Muskegon County

Staff recommends approval of the resubmitted plans and a portion of the resubmitted costs, pursuant to MCL 780.993(4):

67. City of Allen Park

68. Hillsdale County

69. Lenawee County

70. Wayne County

71. Mecosta County

72. Clare/Gladwin Counties

73. Lake County

74. Mason County

75. Newaygo County

76. Oceana County

77. Osceola County

78. Saginaw County

Staff recommends approval of revised costs to approved FY26 plans:

1. City of Taylor

10. Adjourn – next meeting December 16, 2025 beginning at 9:30 a.m.

Online Access: For members of the public who wish to join the meeting online, please email Jacklyn Downer at DownerJ1@michigan.gov or contact Jackie by phone at 517-582-1741 to request a Zoom link. This link will be provided in the morning before the meeting begins.

Michigan Indigent Defense Commission Meeting Minutes

The meeting was held in person at the Michigan Bankers Association building in Lansing, Michigan. Remote access via Zoom was available for Commissioners and, upon request, for members of the public. The MIDC website and meeting notice included information for members of the public on how to contact the MIDC to obtain the Zoom link for participation. Commissioners were able to participate remotely if they qualified for an exemption under the Open Meetings Act or if they requested an accommodation under the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 USC 12131 *et. seq.*, and Rehabilitation Act, MCL 395.81 *et. seq.*, pursuant to Attorney General Opinion No. 7318.

September 12, 2025

Time: 1:30 pm

Michigan Bankers Association
507 S. Grand Ave, Lansing, MI 48933

Commission Members Participating

The following members participated in person:

- Chair Tracey Brame
- Thomas Adams
- Kimberly Buddin
- Christine Green
- Charissa Huang
- David Jones
- Loren Khogali
- James Krizan
- Judge Paula Mathes
- Margaret McAvoy
- Tom McMillin
- Glenn Simmington
- Alan Vanderberg
- Rob VerHuelen

The following Commissioners were absent:

- Michael Carter
- Andrew DeLeeuw
- Judge James Fisher

The following members requested accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act to participate via Zoom:

- Gary Walker (Marquette City, Marquette County, Michigan)

Alicia Moon observed the meeting via Zoom but did not participate in the discussions or voting.

Chair Brame called the meeting to order at 1:35 pm.

Public Comment

The following people provided public comment:

- Robin Dillard Russaw
- Rachel McRipley
- Thomas Hausman
- Tom Tomko
- Pete Menna
- Dr. Karen Moore
- Toby Lake
- Chad Catalino

Approval of Agenda

Commissioner Adams moved that the agenda be adopted as presented. Commissioner Khogali seconded. The motion carried.

Consent Agenda

Judge Mathes moved that the consent agenda containing the minutes from the April meeting be adopted. Commissioner Krizan seconded. The motion carried.

Chair's Report

Chair Brame welcomed new commissioner Alan Vanderberg. She has assigned Commissioner Vanderberg to the Independence Committee and the Data Collection Committee.

Executive Director Report

Ms. Staley provided an overview of proposed amendments to the FY26 grant contract. Commissioner VerHuelen moved that the FY26 grant contract with amendments allowing reduced payments in the first, second, third and fourth quarters be approved. Commissioner McMillin seconded. The motion carried.

Executive Committee

Chair Brame updated Commissioners about the Executive Committee's meeting in preparation for the September Commission meeting.

Indirect Costs Ad Hoc Committee

Committee chair VerHuelen gave an update on the committee's August meeting. The committee's work will continue.

MIDC Standards Implementation – FY26 Compliance Plans and Costs

Staff recommends approval of the following compliance plans and cost analyses:

- City of Westland
- Barry County
- Canton Township
- City of Ferndale
- City of Grosse Pointe
- City of Lincoln Park
- City of Madison Heights
- City of Pontiac
- City of Romulus
- Genesee County
- Iron County
- Monroe County
- Van Buren County

Commissioner McMillin moved that the compliance plans and cost analyses for the systems listed above be approved. Commissioner Adams supported. The motion carried. Commissioner Krizan abstained from the discussion and vote with respect to the City of Ferndale. Commissioner Simmington abstained from the discussion and vote with respect to Genesee County.

Ms. McCowan provided an overview of the revised cost analyses for the City of Birmingham and Waterford Township. The revisions remove duplicative costs. Staff recommends approval. Commissioner McAvoy moved that the revised cost analyses for the City of Birmingham and Waterford Township be approved. Commissioner Krizan seconded. The motion carried.

Chair Brame adjourned the meeting at 3:45 pm.



MICHIGAN INDIGENT DEFENSE COMMISSION

October 15, 2025

To: MIDC Commissioners
From: Kristen Staley, Executive Director, MIDC

RE: FY25 Spending, FY26 Annual Budget Plan, and Proposed FY27 Budget Request

Over the past decade, our Commission has transformed the way Michigan supports and delivers indigent defense. We have set expected standards, sought and received support from state and local governments, and seen the changes take effect, improving all elements of our criminal legal system and ensuring due process is given to those facing prosecution. It truly is incredible.

But now, rather than focusing on building the new pathways of indigent defense, we are tasked with sustaining the work we've constructed. There are no more pending MIDC Standards to implement locally. Local budget predictability is increasing and "start-up" costs for new offices, departments, and other systemic changes are minimal.

The Fiscal Year 2026 State Budget, for the first time in the MIDC's existence, reduces support for our grants to local systems. This moment was most likely always coming, and perhaps this will make us more successful and efficient in the long-run. If a budget reduction was destined to occur, it is better to happen while we are focusing on sustainability rather than transition. Plus, it never hurts to reassess and prepare for the ups and downs of the state appropriation process.

This memo captures year-end spending of Fiscal Year 2025, depicts our expected Fiscal Year 2026 spending plan, and proposes a Fiscal Year 2027 budget request.

Key takeaways include:

- There is an expected lapse of FY25 grant appropriations totaling over \$78.7 million.
- Current work project funds are expected to lapse back into the General Fund.
- The FY26 budget provides a reduction of \$22.3 million in grant funding and increases operations by \$200,000 securing funding of a currently term-limited grant funded employee.
- The FY 27 proposal is to restore the \$22.3 million in grant funding, realigning state appropriations with local system needs.

FISCAL YEAR 2025 SPENDING

The MIDC has two line items in the state budget, MIDC Grants and MIDC Operations.

FY25 MIDC Grants

All approved grant funding was distributed to the local systems. In FY25, the MIDC approved \$295.2 million for the grants and the state budget appropriated \$258.3 million from the General Fund, a difference of about \$36.8 million.

The MIDC relies upon a combination of General Fund appropriations, local unexpended balances from prior grant years, attorney fees collected from indigent clients, and, if necessary, approved work project balances to pay for its approved grants.

Due to larger than expected local unexpended balances from 2024 grants, we lapsed about \$78.7 million from the available funds in FY25. Our available work project funds were not needed to support the FY25 grants.

Authorized Funds for FY25 MIDC State Grants	
FY25 GF Appropriation	\$ 258,345,300.00
FY24 Local Unexpended	\$ 115,471,055.82
Attorney Fees from partially indigent clients (est)	\$ 200,000.00
Total	\$ 374,016,355.82

Authorized for FY25 MIDC Grants	Approved FY25 Grants	Expected Lapse
\$ 374,016,355.82	\$ 295,282,167.22	\$ 78,734,188.60

FY25 MIDC Operations

The MIDC operates with a staff of 18 FTEs, supported by General Fund appropriations and a US Department of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency grant. The staff also manages a contracted program manager who operates our Trial Skills Simulation Project, funded by a US Byrne JAG federal grant.

Authorized Funds for FY25 MIDC Operations	
FY25 GF Appropriation	\$ 3,140,200.00
OJJDP Grant (FY25 allotment of 3 yr grant)	\$ 233,738.00
Byrne JAG Grant	\$ 225,000.00
Total	\$ 3,598,938.00

The majority of our expenses continue to be employee salaries and benefits, encompassing more than 90% of the budget. We experienced no staff turnover in FY25 and will lapse only about \$32,000 or 1% of our total General Fund appropriation.

The following page displays our FY25 operations spending of our General Fund appropriation through September 30, showing both condensed and detailed expenses. Year-end accounting has not quite closed and there may be some slight changes once all payments are processed.

Category	FY25 to date
Appropriation	\$3,140,200.00
Wages	\$1,943,595.51
Benefits	\$1,014,053.15
Materials/Equipment, Contracts, all other operations	\$115,965.91
Total	\$3,073,614.57

Expense	By Vendor
Travel & Employee Reimbursements	\$32,825.53
Training	\$2,503.62
includes:	
NAPD	\$450.00
Fit Leaders	\$2,053.62
Building Occupancy Charges (by quarter)	\$29,352.24
IT costs	\$27,946.52
vendors in this category include:	
Verizon	\$8,774.97
Zoom	\$900.76
DTMB IT Allocation	\$3,793.55
DTMB Voice/Data/Fees	\$1,550.74
OneSpan	\$97.50
Computers	\$12,750.00
Office materials	\$2,315.69
vendors in this category include:	
Staples/office supplies	\$926.88
Copier/Printer	\$1,062.40
DTMB Print Bill (mail and printing)	\$180.65
Cost Allocation (assessed quarterly)	\$1,783.76
Meeting Costs	\$7,146.33
vendors in this category include:	
Catering	\$1,933.92
Meeting Space Rental	\$1,080.00
Commissioner Travel Reimbursement	\$4,132.41
Contracts	\$12,092.22
Elefant	\$4,592.22
AG	\$7,500.00

Federal Grants

The MIDC is the recipient of two US Department of Justice grants, both for facilitating attorney skills training and assisting local systems meet requirements under Standard 1, Attorney Training, and Standard 7, Attorney Qualifications and Review.

- Byrne Justice Assistance Grant (JAG), *Making Standards Meaningful: Qualifying Attorneys Through a Unique Skills*, \$225,000 for 1 year, ending Sept. 30, 2025. The MIDC contracts with attorney Keeley Blanchard to administer this program.

We were again awarded Byrne JAG funding for FY26, our eighth year of operation. In anticipation of this award, we published a request for proposals (RFP) to solicit competitive bids for program management. After engaging in the RFP process with the LARA procurement team, Keeley Blanchard was again selected as our program manager.

- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) Enhancing Youth Defense grant, *Youth Defender Trial Simulation Program*, \$649,327 for three years, ending September 30, 2026. MIDC staff member Susan Prentice Sao is our program manager and her position was fully supported by grant funding in FY25. The grant also supports attorney trainer compensation and other training related expenses.

Work Project Funds

The MIDC has two work project funds that can be used “to work with systems to adjust their compliance plans as needed to support the implementation of compliance plans, help systems research and adopt best practices for the delivery of indigent defense services, and monitor compliance and comply with the MIDC Act’s requirements.” We rely upon these funds to support various items, including

- Reimbursing systems who overspent in a previous grant cycle
- Financial auditing of grant usage
- Unexpected defense costs, i.e. cold cases, juvenile life without parole resentencing hearings, etc.
- Specialized data projects to support statewide implementation of standards

These funds are created by unexpended appropriations of grant dollars from the previous grant year. Work projects must be approved by the State Budget Office and renewed by the legislature each year but can only be renewed for up to 4 years. To date, the MIDC maintains over \$50.4 million in work project funds:

- FY2022 work project with a balance of \$38,610,269 (expires Oct. 1, 2026)
- FY2023 work project with a balance of \$11,868,880 (expires Oct. 1, 2027)

In early FY26, the State Budget Office is expected to lapse our unused FY22 and FY23 balances back into the State General Fund and seek approval for reserving a portion of the lapsed FY25 appropriations for a new work project fund.

FISCAL YEAR 2026 BUDGET SPENDING PLAN

On October 7, 2025, Governor Whitmer signed the FY26 budget, signaling the end of the state appropriations process for this year. The FY26 budget reduces the MIDC grants by \$22.3 million and adds \$200,000 to the MIDC operations. This is the first time the MIDC grants appropriations have been reduced.

The state appropriated \$3,140,200 for MIDC operations and \$236,018,800 for MIDC grants covering all MIDC Standards.

The MIDC staff works with the LARA financial team closely to plan and monitor our budget. While LARA has not quite finalized its projections related to in-direct costs for FY26, the following components will be included in our upcoming budget.

FY26 MIDC Operations - \$3,140,200

The FY26 operations budget increased by \$200,000 to support staff and operations currently funded by term-limited OJJDP grant. No other major operational changes were provided.

- *Employee Wages and Benefits*: This is the most significant portion of MIDC's operations budget. The FY25 budget allocates 21 FTEs for the MIDC; however, the budget only assumes full-year funding of 18 FTEs. State employees are expected to receive a COLA 3% increase in salary in FY26 and several MIDC staff members are eligible to receive automatic step increases pursuant to the Michigan Civil Service Commission's schedule.
- *Travel and Other Reimbursement (employee and commissioner)*: Travel costs include regional and senior staff traveling statewide for meetings with local funding units, court watching, or attending or conducting in-person trainings or public defense related events. Commissioners are also compensated for their travel to our in-person MIDC meetings.
- *Lease*: State of Michigan's Ottawa Building, \$29,352 annually. We may see a slight increase once LARA finalizes in-direct cost calculations.
- *Contracted Services*: As of now, the FY26 budget anticipates continued contracting with three vendors to supplement operational needs:
 - Elephant, LLC – \$120/hr for annual web server hosting, website developer and annual site maintenance as needed. DTMB has slowly been transitioning our website

maintenance over from an independent host to the State of Michigan server; however, this is not yet complete and will continue into FY26. To continue to support this transition we will need to continue to contract with Elefant.

- Orion Solutions Group, LLC – \$535,500, contract expires Sept. 30, 2026. The Orion team assists staff with financial auditing and review of grant expenditures. The auditing contract work is supported by work project funds, as it directly relates to local system grant compliance. In FY26, Orion is expected to assist with audits of 24 systems.
- HTC Global Services, Inc. – \$89,400, contract expires Sept. 30, 2030. HTC maintains and supports our grants management system, EGrAMS. The State of Michigan recently completed an RFP process and HTC was again selected as the vendor to provide this system for several departments, with a new contract starting in FY26. We share the cost of the HTC contract with other departments including LARA. There is a slight increase in the contracted amount of \$17,400 and it is part of a proposed FY27 request.

FY26 MIDC Grants – \$236,016,800

The FY25 budget allocation for MIDC grants supports the state portion of annual compliance grants to local systems for implementing minimum MIDC standards.

As anticipated, the annual state appropriation for FY26 is less than the estimated Commission approved grant totals. To compensate for this difference, a combination of General Fund appropriations and unexpended grant funds maintained by the local systems should be more than enough cover the expected MIDC approved FY26 grant total. Systems have until October 31, 2025 to report their year-end expenses; however, staff estimates there will be over \$90 million in local unexpended grant funds from FY25.

FISCAL YEAR 2027 BUDGET REQUEST (Action Needed)

FY27 MIDC Grants Request – Additional \$22,300,000, returning to the FY25 appropriated amount of \$258.2 million.

While all local implementation needs for FY26 should be covered with the state appropriation and unexpended local grant dollars, this is not sustainable in the long-term. There are no more pending MIDC Standards to implement and the needs of the local systems are significantly more predictable. The Commission has also amended its grant contract, preventing overpayment and reducing the amounts of local unexpended dollars.

Our advancement grant model has limitations and there is no way to perfectly predict future indigent defense needs. There will always be unexpected case expenses, staff or contractor turnover, or changes to local system models. But it is very unlikely to see the high level of unexpended local grant dollars going forward and we should close the gap between necessary local grant funding and state appropriations as much as possible.

Additionally, grant costs will likely always see gradual annual increases due to requirements of attorney pay. MIDC Standard 8 requires attorney pay rates to be “adjusted annually for cost of living increases consistent with economic adjustments made to State of Michigan employees’ salaries.” The estimated COLA adjustments from the Office of the State Budget for FY27 are 3% for State of Michigan employees.

MIDC Operations Request – Increase of \$17,400 for HTC contract (EGrAMS).

A new 5-year contract with HTC was signed, beginning October 1, 2025. Several departments will share in the costs, the MIDC’s share is anticipated to be \$89,400/year or \$447,000 for the five-year term of the agreement. The amount appropriated on the technology line for the prior EGrAMS contract was \$72,000. The difference between the FY25 amount appropriated and the new FY26 contract is \$17,400 annually for the next 5 years.

To: Michigan Indigent Defense Commission

From: Marla R. McCowan
Deputy Director/Director of Training

Re: Compliance Planning and Costs:
FY24 and FY25 status updates; FY26 Resubmitted
Compliance Plans

Date: October 14, 2025

I. Funding Awards by Fiscal Year

	MIDC Funding	Local Share	Total System Costs
FY 2019	\$86,722,179.85	\$37,963,396.67 ¹	\$124,685,576.52
FY 2020	\$117,424,880.47	\$38,523,883.90	\$157,698,982.46
FY 2021	\$129,127,391.54	\$38,486,171.32	\$167,613,562.86
FY 2022	\$138,348,406.27	\$38,146,920.09	\$176,495,326.36
FY 2023	\$173,928,393.06	\$38,825,422.67	\$212,753,815.73
FY 2024	\$281,237,724.24	\$38,825,422.67	\$320,063,146.91
FY 2025 ²	\$295,282,167.22	\$38,825,422.67	\$334,107,589.89

The MIDC annually collects information about the balance of funds distributed to systems in a form completed by the local funding units due no later than October 31. See the MIDC Act, MCL 780.993(15).

¹ The annual inflationary increase described in MCL 780.983(i) is calculated from the FY2019 local share.

² The list of funding approved annually for each funding unit is on the MIDC's website, updated through April 2025.

II. FY24 Compliance Plans and Costs

A. Final Reporting

The fourth quarter of reporting from systems for FY24 (covering July 1, 2024 through September 30, 2024) was due by October 31, 2024. Funding units were required to enter the following reporting in EGrAMS:

- Attorney List
- Financial Status Report
- Quarterly Program Report
- Unexpended balance of Funds, pursuant to MCL 780.993(15)

MIDC staff published a document on the [grants page of the Commission's website](#) identifying changes to reporting for FY24, along with updated compliance reporting instructions, and a [recorded webinar](#) covering submission of reports through our EGrAMS. Sample invoicing for attorneys is available, along with a document relating to entering codes to capture various data points. The MIDC's Grant Manual was updated in February and posted to our Grants webpage as well.

As of this writing, all reporting has been submitted.

B. Notice of Noncompliance Issued

Pursuant to the [Compliance Resolution Process approved by the MIDC in June of 2021](#), the following systems received notices of noncompliance with the MIDC's Standards or grant contract terms:

1. Houghton County

Failure to submit reports, issued 5-7-25 (reporting submitted 10-7-25).

2. Wayne County

On November 7, 2024, notice advising that the Compliance Resolution Process was being initiated was sent to the funding unit via U.S. Mail and electronic mail for the following reasons:

1. Failure to provide confidential meeting space for in-custody defendants to meet with assigned counsel as required by MIDC Standard 2 - initial interviews.

Regional Manager Jessica Paladino completed a site evaluation on October 13, 2025 and her notes are in the [shared drive](#).

III. FY25 Compliance Planning

A. Overview of status and funding distributed to date

As of the MIDC's October 15, 2024 meeting, all 120 compliance plans and cost analyses were approved, and communication regarding that status was sent through our grant management system. The MIDC has distributed contracts to all funding units and as of this writing all 120 have been fully executed by the local system, the MIDC, and LARA. Funding has been distributed pursuant to the contract terms, requiring:

Initial Advance of 25% of total grant – Within 15 days of receipt of executed agreement

25% disbursement – January 15, 2025

25% disbursement – April 15, 2025

25% disbursement – July 15, 2025 (upcoming final payment)

The current fiscal year's grant funds advanced are reduced by the amount of unexpended funds from the prior fiscal year's grant by reducing the 2nd and 3rd disbursement equally.

The schedule of disbursement of funds is contingent upon receipt of quarterly reporting. As of this writing, the only system that has not received payments according to the schedule (above) is Houghton County, with the process for payment initiated October 13, 2025.

B. Budget Adjustments

The Grants Director processed and approved the following [budget adjustment requests](#) (line item transfer requests) pursuant to the process set forth in the MIDC's Grant Manual at p. 43 (February 2025):

- Alger County
- Barry County
- Barry County
- Charter Township of Waterford
- Cheboygan County
- Chippewa County
- Genesee County
- Gogebic County
- Huron County
- Ingham County
- Kalkaska County
- Muskegon County
- Muskegon County
- Van Buren County
- Wayne County
- Wexford County

C. Reporting Due

The MIDC Staff hosted live webinars on December 11 and December 13 covering a variety of topics related to grant management in this new fiscal year. The slides from the webinar were subsequently emailed to all defender leaders and posted to the MIDC’s website. Daily zoom-based “office hours” were offered by MIDC staff daily the week of January 27, ahead of the first quarterly reporting due date. The first quarter of reporting from systems for FY25 (covering October 1, 2024 through December 31, 2024) was due by January 31, 2025 and the second quarter of reporting (covering January 1, 2025 through March 31, 2025) was due by April 30, 2025. The third quarter of reporting (covering April 1, 2025 through June 30, 2025) was due July 31, 2025. Funding units were required to enter the following reporting in EGrAMS:

- Attorney List
- Financial Status Report
- Quarterly Program Report

Most funding units have submitted their reporting timely and those reports are currently being reviewed by MIDC staff if not already approved. As of this writing, the following reporting remains unsubmitted and pending with the funding unit:

	Report	Due thru	Status
Chippewa County	QPR	6/30/2025	Pending
Eaton County	FSR	6/30/2025	Pending

D. Notice of Noncompliance Issued

The following systems received a notice of noncompliance for failing to submit timely reporting. Reports have since been submitted and continue to be resolved by staff and the local system:

Notice issued 5/7/25:

- Wayne County

Notice issued 7/8/25:

- Cheboygan County
- Delta County
- Houghton County
- Presque Isle County

IV. FY26 Compliance Planning

All funding units were required to submit a plan for compliance with all approved MIDC Standards pursuant MCL §780.993, which provides:

(3) No later than 180 days after a standard is approved by the department, each indigent criminal defense system shall submit a plan to the MIDC for the provision of indigent criminal defense services in a manner as determined by the MIDC and shall submit an annual plan for the following state fiscal year on or before October 1 of each year. A plan submitted under this subsection must specifically address how the minimum standards established by the MIDC under this act will be met and must include a cost analysis for meeting those minimum standards. The standards to be addressed in the annual plan are those approved not less than 180 days before the annual plan submission date. The cost analysis must include a statement of the funds in excess of the local share, if any, necessary to allow its system to comply with the MIDC's minimum standards.

(4) The MIDC shall approve or disapprove all or any portion of a plan or cost analysis, or both a plan and cost analysis, submitted under subsection (3), and shall do so within 90 calendar days of the submission of the plan and cost analysis. If the MIDC disapproves any part of the plan, the cost analysis, or both the plan and the cost analysis, the indigent criminal defense system shall consult with the MIDC and, for any disapproved portion, submit a new plan, a new cost analysis, or both within 60 calendar days of the mailing date of the official notification of the MIDC's disapproval. If after 3 submissions a compromise is not reached, the dispute must be resolved as provided in section 15. All approved provisions of an indigent criminal defense system's plan and cost analysis must not be delayed by any disapproved portion and must proceed as provided in this act. The MIDC shall not approve a cost analysis or portion of a cost analysis unless it is reasonably and directly related to an indigent defense function.

Funding units are using the MIDC's Grant Management System (EGrAMS) to submit compliance plans. A detailed, self-guided tutorial was prepared for funding units and [linked on our website](#) along with resources and materials for planning.

A. Status

As of the September 12, 2025 Commission meeting, 42 systems have their plans and costs approved for FY2026. The approved funding to date appears at the end of this memo.

B. Resubmissions

Resubmissions pursuant to MCL 780.993(4) were due no later than Friday August 29, 2025 by 11:59 p.m. All resubmissions were timely received.

C. Recommendations (action items)

Staff recommends approval of plans and costs as resubmitted:

Increased costs from prior year:

Reimbursement required for overspending, pursuant to MCL 780.993(16):

1. [Charter Township of Shelby](#)
 FY 24 approved funding utilized: 69%
 FY 25 approved funding: \$384,012.50
Spending through Q3: 69%
 FY 26 requested funding: \$535,444.00

The Macomb County Chief Public Defender serves as the MAC and oversees a roster of attorneys. The Macomb Compliance Attorney will utilize a new case management system to monitor and audit caseloads on a monthly basis. Attorneys who wish to become a roster attorney will have their qualifications reviewed as part of the approval process. The Compliance Attorney will assist with attorney reviews as required by Standard 7/Qualification and Review. Reviews will consist of court observation, individual attorney meetings, and reviewing files. Attorney reviews will occur once every three years, at minimum. Increase to contracts for attorneys due to a major change in the court's system comprised of one assigned judge and how the court schedules cases. The system change also reflects hourly rate increases and appeals (+\$278,147.50) which should be evaluated in light of projected needs and Q3 spending; increase to experts and investigators (+\$8,400.00) reflects increased demand and hourly rate increase for investigators, increase in supplies and services to cover costs of per page increase for transcripts (+\$2,220.00); interpreters status quo. RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Contracts for attorneys has increased (+\$110,307.50) due to implementation of individualized

representation on 4/1/2025. System is seeking \$30,000 in reimbursement for overspending on direct services in FY25.

2. [City of Sterling Heights](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 61%

FY 25 approved funding: \$602,875.00

Spending through Q3: 92%

FY 26 requested funding: \$848,791.32

Contract MAC oversees a roster of attorneys; system will continue to collaborate with the Macomb County Office of the Public Defender system and use the services of the Macomb Compliance Attorney on a monthly basis. System participates in monthly LMOS Pilot Project by submitting attorney caseload data to assist with regional collaboration on caseload tracking. Compliance Attorney will conduct formal attorney reviews every three years, but reviews may occur more often as needed. Contracts for attorneys increased (+\$51,250.00) and experts/investigators increased (+\$2,500.00) based on projected needs. RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. System increased assigned counsel/contracts for attorneys (+\$157,620.00) due to significantly increased hours based on an uptick in prosecutor-requested adjournments tied to case resolution needs. System also slightly increased experts/investigators (+\$302.50). System has overspent by \$120,801.13 but was overpaid pursuant to the FY25 contract terms by \$32,827.31. As such, staff revised the reimbursement for overspending request to \$87,937.82.

3. [City of Detroit](#)
 - FY 24 approved funding utilized: 119%
 - FY 25 approved funding: \$6,116,046.59
 - Spending through Q3: 71%*
 - FY 26 requested funding: \$7,634,539.32

Employee co-MACs oversee a roster of attorneys providing services in an extremely busy district court. Manual system for tracking caseloads will be replaced with ZLS case management software in FY26. Qualification to be added to the roster includes a mentorship program; attorneys will be reviewed on an annual basis. The plan for reviews includes a checklist covering court observations, client feedback, and compliance with the MIDC's standards. Increase to personnel/fringes for COLA and a second administrative assistant (+\$170,127.27); increase to contracts for attorneys for rate increase and increase in hours (+\$1,238,515) based on projected needs; increase to experts/investigators (+\$145,000) which should be evaluated in light of spending; other contracts (+\$40,200) for case management system; overall supplies/services decreased but there is a need for reimbursement for overspending to be addressed after quarterly spending is evaluated.

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending, and for FY26 now matches projected needs particularly in light of appointments to previously-unfilled judicial vacancies. System is seeking \$450,000 in reimbursement for overspending on direct services in FY25.

4. [City of Inkster](#)
 FY 24 approved funding utilized: 117%
 FY 25 approved funding: \$153,640.00
Spending through Q3: 84%
 FY 26 requested funding: \$200,240.00

Many Wayne County Third Class District Courts are part of a Regionalized Managed Assigned Counsel System (RMACO) based in the City of Dearborn which oversees compliance related to the MIDC's standards.

Third class district court participates in RMACO. Increase to contracts for attorneys due to an increase in the hourly rate and hours (+\$31,600); last year the system was reimbursed for overspending on direct services; the amount included for that request has been reduced(-\$5,062.98).

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending including reimbursement from FY24 and projected overspend for FY25. System is projecting \$25,000 in overspending on direct services, which has been evaluated in light of the FY25 overpayment amount of \$11,045.85.

Special Assignment Team rehoused in funding unit:

5. [Ogemaw County](#)
 FY 24 approved funding utilized: 50%
 FY 25 approved funding: \$791,003.00
Spending through Q3: 40%
 FY 26 requested funding: \$941,315.00

Contractor MAC oversees a roster of attorneys and also serves as the administrator in Roscommon County. Process for monitoring outside

caseloads, assessing qualifications of attorneys, and documenting review of counsel is required. Indigency screening standard has inconsistent answers for appointments and oversight.

RESUBMISSION: System revised Standard 6/Workloads to include a process for monitoring caseload information from other funding units, which involves attorney self-report and verification by the MAC. Standard 7/Qualification and Review was also revised to include a process for assessing attorney qualifications by utilizing an attorney questionnaire. Additionally, there is a plan for annual written performance reviews with each attorney that will be stored in the attorney's digital file at the MAC office. The system revised its answers to the indigency screening questions to provide more clarity regarding who is conducting the screening and what that process will entail. Significant decrease to attorney fees (-\$158,230); MAC (-\$27,530) and MAC Assistant decreased (-\$5,028.00); minor decreases to training/travel (-\$135); decreased Experts (-\$17,000); deleted case management system (-\$10,000); decrease for transcripts (-\$1,000); added Special Assignment Team (+\$369,235) to support resolution of attorney shortages statewide.

Increases due to caseloads/projected needs:

6. [City of Oak Park](#)
 - FY 24 approved funding utilized: 77%
 - FY 25 approved funding: \$643,625.00
 - Spending through Q3: 78%*
 - FY 26 requested funding: \$710,000

Fulltime MAC and one part-time contract co-MAC oversee a roster of attorneys. MACs created Excel database to enter the number of assigned misdemeanor cases for each MIDC roster attorney. Oak Park partnered with the Oakland County IDSO system to transition attorney caseload monitoring to the IDSO Standard 6/Workloads and Standard

7/Qualification and Review Compliance Attorney. MACs participate in LMOS monthly caseload pilot project to coordinate with other regional MACs to obtain caseload information from other systems. Request for additional (potentially duplicative) funding for caseload data collection requires clarification.

RESUBMISSION: Data collection costs removed; increased contracts for attorneys (+\$68,500) from prior year based on projected caseload needs. Minor adjustments elsewhere in cost analysis.

7. [Lapeer County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 74%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,173,295.00

Spending through Q3: 75%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,240,580.00

Contractor MAC oversees a roster of attorneys. Assignment data collected on 365-day rolling basis, i.e. case (or docket hours) "falls off" of an attorney's caseload on the 366th day after the appointment is made. Database gives warnings as attorneys approach caseload maximum; system can generate report at any time to determine current caseload percentages; information about assignments in other jurisdictions is collected and participates in LMOS pilot project. MAC annually reviews qualifications and performance of all roster attorneys and includes a self-assessment and input from system stakeholders. The increase to contracts for attorneys is (+\$66,520.00) based on projected needs; increase for experts/investigators for high profile murder case (+\$54,500).

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. The revised increase to contracts for attorneys (+\$26,740) matches projected needs.

8. [Cass County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 77%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,011,632.05

Spending through Q3: 70%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,105,958.11

Small MAC system with eight total attorneys accepting assignments. MAC will monitor caseloads with spreadsheet and communication with other counties assigning rosters cases. MAC will communicate with attorney when close to cap and stop assigning new cases at cap. MAC observes attorneys regularly and updates qualifications. Increase to contracts for attorneys (+\$97,640) due to projected caseload needs; minor adjustments elsewhere in cost analysis.

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Revised request for contracts/attorneys (+\$103,344) matches projected caseload needs; system reduced expert/investigator spending (-\$17,902) other contracts (-\$3,216) and supplies (-\$2,160) based on historic use. Increase in training due to roster addition (+\$3,915).

9. [Kalamazoo County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 93%

FY 25 approved funding: \$10,090,262.32

Spending through Q3: 93%

FY 26 requested funding: \$11,435,666.67

Large non-profit defender office model with a conflict MAC. Clarification is required as to MAC role in assignments and tracking requests for experts/investigators. Significant increase in staff requested (+15 FTEs) that is not supported by caseload projections at this time. Increase in ancillary spending requires supporting documentation.

RESUBMISSION: Standard 2/Initial Interview was updated to include process for MAC role in conflict assignments. System revised answers to Standard 3/Experts and Investigators to reflect new process of invoices being submitted directly to the County and not the vendor for payment. Process for tracking requests has been identified. Standard 7/Qualification and Review was revised to clarify that the Evaluation/Review Specialist is an experienced attorney. Vendor cost analysis was revised to seek three additional attorneys and three support positions, which is consistent with caseload needs. Contracts for attorneys (which includes the vendor office, problem solving courts, and MAC administration) increased (+\$1,587,763); reduction in expert/investigators (-\$282,000) based on historic spending.

10. [St. Joseph County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 90%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,103,983.67

Spending through Q3: 77%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,214,804.97

Part-time employee MAC oversees a small roster of attorneys. Additional information is needed to analyze attorney payments for “duty weeks” and supporting documentation is required for confidential space modification.

RESUBMISSION: Additional information was provided to describe attorney assignments and payment for “duty weeks” to ensure compliance with Standard 8/Attorney Compensation. Request for space modification was removed. Increase to contracts/attorneys (+\$99,418) is consistent with caseload needs. Minor/neutral adjustments elsewhere in cost analysis.

11. [Arenac County](#)
 - FY 24 approved funding utilized: 79%
 - FY 25 approved funding: \$567,013.79
 - Spending through Q3: 78%*
 - FY 26 requested funding: \$709,262.50

Part-time contractor MAC oversees a roster of attorneys. The process to gather information about an attorney's caseload or assignments from other funding units is incomplete; additional information about review of counsel is required.

RESUBMISSION: Roster managed by part-time MAC. System revised Standard 6/Workloads to include description of the process for how caseload information from other funding units will be gathered. Plan for attorney review for compliance with Standard 7/Qualification and Review now includes collecting information from attorneys on questionnaires. Also includes annual performance review meetings with each attorney. Increases to personnel (+\$504.50), contract attorneys (+\$21,191.04), MAC administration (+\$700), experts/investigators (+\$65,000), mileage for client visits (+\$10,439.40) and training (+\$32.22), travel time for visits (+\$44,272.80), and office equipment (+1,108.85). Decrease to transcripts (-\$1,000). The system has a murder case that is scheduled for trial in December of 2025, as well as a new Criminal Sexual Conduct 1 case. The murder case has two attorneys. Both cases require expert and investigative services necessitating additional funding this year.

12. [Bay County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 87%

FY 25 approved funding: \$2,431,107.73

Spending through Q3: 70%

FY 26 requested funding: \$2,683,777.33

County has two public defender offices and a conflict MAC administrator overseeing a roster accepting conflict cases and contracting for arraignments in district and circuit court. Financial reporting errors recently discovered required a hold for further evaluation after corrections.

RESUBMISSION: Reporting issues were resolved and system made several adjustments to the plan upon resubmission, as follows:

Standard 3/Experts and Investigators was updated to include the method of tracking expert and investigator requests; Standard 4/Counsel at First Appearance compensation section was updated to include how overflow attorneys and PD office attorneys are compensated at first appearance and all other critical stages; Standard 6/Workloads now describes what action will be taken when caseload cap is reached; costs for data collection have been added to the miscellaneous section of the plan. Increases for personnel for COLA/steps (+\$87,085.73); increase in contracts for attorneys (+\$114,080.20); increase for case management system (+\$19,360) and increase in legal research software (+\$9,607.92); increases to travel/training (\$6,958.75); increase to transcripts (+\$9,000); computer replacement (+\$2,215); increase in indirect costs (+8,707); decrease in legal books (-\$2,008) and malpractice insurance (-\$2,337).

13. [Huron County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 102%

FY 25 approved funding: \$935,576.00

Spending through Q3: 61%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,024,861.00

MAC contractor overseeing roster of attorneys. Significant additional detail is required to analyze caseload, qualification, and review standards.

RESUBMISSION: System now has a plan to monitor caseloads that involves the MAC monitoring and tracking monthly by way of spreadsheets. System added a plan to track caseloads for attorneys who practice in other systems, and there is a plan in place to suspended assignments if cap is reached. MAC determines attorney qualifications upon application to the roster and meets annually to evaluate attorneys. Increase to Assigned Counsel (+\$95,975) and MACA (+\$4,550); decrease in experts/investigators (-\$2,650), training/travel (-\$8,390) and supplies/services (-\$200).

14. [Iosco County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 101%

FY 25 approved funding: \$646,195.92

Spending through Q3: 72%

FY 26 requested funding: \$677,143.62

Contractor MAC oversees roster of attorneys. Assignments are tracked using Clio spreadsheet and reviewed regularly (at least quarterly). If an attorney exceeds, assignments will be paused until caseload drops. MAC will consult with surrounding systems regularly to monitor attorneys in multiple systems. New attorneys will be evaluated consistent with MIDC Standards and a decision as to qualifications can be appealed to neighboring MAC. Lead Attorney meets with Roster attorneys once a year to evaluate and discuss any issues with representation. Increase to attorney contracts (+\$21,697.74); increase in expected

expert/investigator rates and hours (+\$18,375); minor increase to training/travel. System is projecting overspending in FY2025 which will be evaluated after additional reporting is submitted.

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Increase to Assigned Counsel (+\$20,977) matches projected needs; increase to MAC (+\$720); increase in expert/investigator rates and hours (+\$18,375); decrease to training/travel and humanitarian support (-\$8,625).

15. [Kalkaska County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 55%

FY 25 approved funding: \$604,738.22

Spending through Q3: 88%

FY 26 requested funding: \$799,758.89

Contractor MAC overseeing a roster of attorneys tracks assignments and will use CMS; if an attorney reaches their cap the assignments will be given to alternate counsel. Attorneys will self-report cases from other systems quarterly and MAC will verify with surrounding MACs. All current attorneys are qualified to accept life-eligible offenses; new attorneys would be assessed by MAC using guidance and requirements from MIDC and qualification appeals will be heard by a neighboring MAC. Attorneys are reviewed in person annually at the end of each fiscal year by the MAC. Increase to contracts for attorneys (+\$315,150) requires evaluation of additional spending.

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Revised request for contracts/attorneys (+\$197,850) is consistent with increased felony caseload; upcoming murder trial requires conflict counsel and administrative oversight.

16. [Leelanau County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 91%

FY 25 approved funding: \$369,376.60

Spending through Q3: 76%

FY 26 requested funding: \$421,123.76

Contracted MAC office overseeing a roster of attorneys, regionalized with Grand Traverse and Antrim Counties; caseloads are monitored through CLIO case management system; attorneys will be notified when they are getting close to the caseload cap, and again when they reach the cap; when an attorney's cap is reached, they will not be assigned new cases. Reviews are conducted annually by MAC to determine qualification level and provide feedback. Reviews include meeting with attorney, feedback from court personnel, court observation, and review of attorney invoices. Increase in contracts for attorneys (+\$54,970) through tailoring of hours based on FY25 reporting and current spending.

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Revised request for contracts for attorneys (+52,470) is consistent with projected needs. Minor adjustments elsewhere in cost analysis.

17. [Marquette County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 63%

FY 25 approved funding: \$2,880,689.27

Spending through Q3: 47%

FY 26 requested funding: \$3,240,863.62

County-based public defender office with a roster of attorneys for conflicts and overflow. Conflict MAC administrator responsibilities must be detailed in the plan and specifically in relation to process for compliance with the standards.

RESUBMISSION: System added Conflict MAC to plan and added provided sufficient detail as to how that role will be utilized to achieve

compliance in relation to all applicable standards. Added Senior Public Defender Position and litigation assistant, and rate increases for staff (+\$349,320); contracts including new leased space (+\$25,450); and supplies and services including cost allocation (+\$234,258); reduction in contracts for attorneys (-\$231,785); training/travel (-\$11,508.25) and experts/investigators (-\$1,975).

18. [Wexford and Missaukee Counties](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 82%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,977,431.35

Spending through Q3: 59%

FY 26 requested funding: \$2,248,517.03

County-based regional public defender office with a MAC/conflict administrator overseeing a roster of attorneys. The process for determining attorney qualifications is not addressed in the compliance plan.

RESUBMISSION: System will monitor caseloads daily and any attorney approaching their caseload cap is notified in writing and via email. Attorneys self-report cases in other jurisdictions. Once cap is reached, attorney will refrain from taking new cases until below the cap. All contract attorneys are required to submit verifiable documentation to the Conflict Administrator demonstrating compliance with the requirements outlined in Standard 7/Qualification and Review. As part of a new process implemented in March 2025, the Conflict Administrator is responsible for assigning, reviewing, and monitoring contract attorney qualifications and caseloads, with updates reported quarterly to the Chief Public Defender. Staff attorneys follow the same qualification and caseload standards; however, their assignments, reviews, and weekly monitoring are conducted directly by the Chief Public Defender. New attorneys are reviewed at 3, 6, and 12 months; all attorneys are reviewed annually. Evaluations conducted by PD and Conflict MAC and incorporate stakeholder feedback. Overall increase from FY25 includes salary rate increases and an additional social

worker to manage high caseload volume (\$312,533), additional intern, new case management system for PD office and roster attorneys, and IT support. Reductions to contracts for attorneys (-\$86,170) and experts/investigators (\$-33,800) based on projections.

19. [City of Highland Park](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 90%

FY 25 approved funding: \$115,189.61

Spending through Q3: 48%

FY 26 requested funding: \$123,254.93

Third class district court participates in RMACO. Increase to personnel/COLA (+\$1,400.50), increase to contracts for attorneys (+\$18,234.82) due to an increase in the hourly rate and docket hours. RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Revised request for contracts for attorneys (+\$6,664) matches projected needs.

Increases due to COLA and/or neutral spending:

20. [City of Dearborn](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 92%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,663,406.66

Spending through Q3: 57%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,713,003.60

Third class district court where RMACO is based with personnel for administration and a roster of contracted attorneys providing services. MAC will oversee compliance with MIDC standards for 19 district and municipal courts in Wayne County. The MAC uses a case management system to track assignments and audits caseloads monthly, and will also gather information from attorneys about outside assignments. The MAC

determines qualification levels of roster attorneys and will review attorneys annually with a process that includes court watching and feedback from system stakeholders. Increase to personnel/fringes for COLA (+\$50,145); increase to contracts for attorneys for increased rate and hours for docket coverage (+\$58,910); increase to experts/investigators (+\$44,841) for projected needs; increase to contracts/other (+\$14,650) for the office lease; increase to training/travel (+\$16,912) for personnel and roster; and increase to supplies/services (+\$28,660) for office needs.

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Revisions to experts/investigators (-\$20,159) training/travel (+\$8,762) and supplies/services (-\$58,681) match projected needs and historic spending.

21. [Ingham County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 96%

FY 25 approved funding: \$11,625,284.60

Spending through Q3: 54%

FY 26 requested funding: \$11,834,302.88

County-based public defender office with a roster for conflict/overflow cases. System plan contemplates adding a MAC to oversee the roster. The PD Office will monitor caseloads via MIDC tracker (rolling year) spreadsheet; when implemented, the MAC will monitor roster caseloads. System will participate in the South-Central Caseload Tracking Pilot Program. Attorneys will be suspended from assignments if cap is reached. The PD Chief determines qualifications and reviews PD attorneys annually; when implemented, the MAC will determine qualifications and review roster attorneys. Increasing personnel for COLA & re-classify one position (+\$206,034). Reduce contracts for attorneys based on projected needs & add MAC (-\$327,758). Decrease experts/investigators for Poole cases and minor increase for investigator rates (-\$236,850); increase to other/contracts for new building lease (+\$68,111); decrease to supplies and services related to

completion of office move (-\$111,108 - new furniture); other adjustments to equipment, training/travel and supplies/services based on staffing needs and anticipated use.

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Increases to: personnel/fringes from completed union negotiations (+\$916,792.6) and supplies/services (+\$9,202.43) to add building security/alarm to new office. Decreases to: contracts for attorneys (-\$277,859.42); experts and investigators (-\$25,000); supplies/services furniture (-\$6,355.68); contracts/other (-\$12,040); travel/training (-\$31,884); all consistent with actual spending and projected needs.

22. [Isabella County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 88%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,942,924.58

Spending through Q3: 65%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,952,934.94

Public defender office (county employees) with a managed assigned counsel administrator overseeing roster of attorneys. Request for two new full time corrections officers requires supporting documentation and further analysis.

RESUBMISSION: Increase includes salary and fringe benefits (+\$165,424.36), and MACA (+\$1,200); decrease in assigned counsel (-\$129,050.30), and experts/investigators (-\$7,500); Minor decreases elsewhere in the cost analysis. System revised request for corrections staff, seeking a part time officer to facilitate compliance with the MIDC standards at the new jail. Documentation supporting requested time is included in the compliance plan.

23. [Calhoun County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 89%

FY 25 approved funding: \$7,974,499.70

Spending through Q3: 59%

FY 26 requested funding: \$8,465,130.84

Large county public defender office with 38 system attorneys. Current submission includes request for 18 FTE PD attorney positions, 17 FTE non-attorney positions, and 6 PT non-attorney positions; anticipates a shift reducing 4 FTE PD positions from prior FY 25 request and significantly increases budget for contracts for attorneys. Funding unit has requested an opportunity to revise the FY26 compliance plan.

RESUBMISSION: On resubmission, salary adjustments to personnel/fringes and a restructured position for an attorney career specialist to serve as an internal trainer and recruiter while carrying a partial caseload (+\$210,230); increases to contracts for attorneys (+\$221,414) based on projected caseload needs; increase to training/travel (\$70,895) and added indirect costs (\$492,978); reduced experts/investigators (-\$272,500) based on usage.

24. [Cheboygan County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 62%

FY 25 approved funding: \$937,536.52

Spending through Q3: 63%

FY 26 requested funding: \$976,917.56

County-based MAC overseeing a roster of attorneys. Reporting must be submitted to properly assess plan and costs.

RESUBMISSION: System submitted Q3 reporting which allowed staff to further evaluate needs. System is relying heavily on Special Assignment Team support due to lack of qualified attorneys in the area, resulting in a slight increase in costs. Adjustments to salary/fringes (+\$22,362); training and travel (+\$234,388); supplies (\$3,984); and

Westlaw (+\$176); decrease to contracts for attorneys (-\$37,892); and experts/investigators (-\$2,875).

25. [Delta County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 96%

FY 25 approved funding: \$888,926.70

Spending through Q3: 56%

FY 26 requested funding: \$890,727.11

Contractor-based MAC overseeing a roster of attorneys. Information supplied for Standard 5/ Independence from the Judiciary is not compliant as it involves the court and/or non-attorney reviews.

RESUBMISSION: The plan for Standard 5/Independence from the Judiciary was revised and now requires the selection and assignment of attorneys and review and approval of attorney invoices to be handled by the Lead Attorney. The Courts have no involvement in these processes. Adjustments in the cost analysis for contracts for attorneys (+\$56,900); training/travel (\$28,279); and experts/investigators (-\$25,000) along with minor changes elsewhere reflect essentially neutral spending.

Decreased costs from prior year (organized by region):

Northern MI Region:

26. Alger County

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 87%

FY 25 approved funding: \$599,233.50

Spending through Q3: 57%

FY 26 requested funding: \$598,317.57

County based public defender office; clarification is required for MAC position, methods of payment, and caseload tracking for roster attorneys.

RESUBMISSION: Resubmission includes conflict MAC in both the plan and cost analysis. Attorney Compensation was revised to include a description for on-call rates for roster attorneys who fill in for arraignment duty when the PD Chief is not available. Standard 6/Workloads was updated to include the method used for tracking attorney caseloads, which is a spreadsheet. Decrease to contracts for attorneys (-\$31,746); decrease to experts/investigators (-\$12,500); decrease to contracts-other for social worker (-\$3,475); increase to salaries/fringes (+\$8,371) and training/travel (+\$26,879) to include hourly compensation and mileage for case-related travel.

27. Antrim County

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 73%

FY 25 approved funding: \$610,194.60

Spending through Q3: 62%

FY 26 requested funding: \$529,331.08

Contracted MAC office overseeing a roster of attorneys, regionalized with Grand Traverse and Leelanau Counties; caseloads are monitored through CLIO case management system; attorneys will be notified when

they are getting close to the caseload cap, and again when they reach the cap; when an attorney's cap is reached, they will not be assigned new cases. Reviews are conducted annually by MAC to determine qualification level and provide feedback. Reviews include meeting with attorney, feedback from court personnel, court observation, and review of attorney invoices. Decrease in contracts for attorneys (-\$83,147) through tailoring of hours based on FY24 and FY25 reporting; addition of \$1,500 for regional MIDC conference.

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Revised request reduced contracts for attorneys (-\$76,147); reduced expert and investigator request to reflect actual usage (-\$4,000); reduced mileage for case-related travel (-\$1,890) and made minor adjustments elsewhere in the cost analysis.

28. [Charlevoix County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 60%

FY 25 approved funding: \$905,424.95

Spending through Q3: 66%

FY 26 requested funding: \$861,519.27

Employee-based MAC system overseeing roster of attorneys. MAC tracks cases on a spreadsheet and is considering case management in FY26, attorneys are notified via email if they reach their cap and attorneys report assignments in other funding units monthly. Clarification is required as to training plan for attorneys with less than two years of experience; incomplete information was submitted for Standard 7/Qualification and Review.

RESUBMISSION: System expanded response to Standard 1/Training to provide detail to plan for attorneys with less than two years of criminal defense experience. Delivery model and plan for Standards 6 and 7/Workloads and Qualification and Review: MAC tracks cases weekly and monthly. Attorneys report assignments from other funding units monthly. Attorney notified by MAC via email if they reach their cap and

assignments stopped. MAC determines qualification level. Qualifications updated yearly during annual review when proof of attendance at CLEs is submitted. Review was expanded to create a more detailed plan for performance reviews that will include a self-rating piece and also the MAC's expectations for the following year. Any third party complaints about attorney performance will be reduced to writing and discussed with the attorney. A plan of action will be implemented when necessary. Decreased contracts for attorneys (-\$75,300) based on use and projected needs; decreased training/travel (-\$1,391) based on anticipated usage. Minor adjustments elsewhere in the cost analysis.

29. [Chippewa County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 69%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,225,290.11

Spending through Q3: 41%

FY 26 requested funding: \$962,538.61

County-based public defender office with a contractor MAC for conflict cases. Clarification is required about initial interviews and confidential meeting spaces, payment rates for contractors, and how challenges are resolved under Standard 5/Independence from the Judiciary.

RESUBMISSION: Additional information was provided related to Standard 2/Initial Interviews and a new Zoom meeting room was added to the jail. Attorney hourly rates meet minimums under Standard 8/Attorney Compensation. System refined the appeal process under Standard 5/Independence from the Judiciary to include the Conflict MAC in effort to avoid conflict in the appeal process. Increase to personnel and fringes (+147,531) for rate increases and new hire; decrease to contracts for attorneys (-\$340,400), experts/investigators (-\$63,000), and supplies/services (-\$41,597.72) to reflect projected usage; increase in training/travel (+\$29,923) to accommodate case-related travel at the hourly rate plus mileage.

30. [Crawford County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 74%

FY 25 approved funding: \$600,712.79

Spending through Q3: 58%

FY 26 requested funding: \$504,442.27

Contractor MAC overseeing a roster of attorneys. Additional information is required to assess caseload monitoring, how attorneys are selected for the roster, and how reviews are documented.

RESUBMISSION: System included information about how caseloads will be monitored and how often they will be reviewed: appointments are tracked using a spreadsheet, spreadsheet tracks cases by month and are reviewed quarterly; attorneys report caseloads from other funding units through a required quarterly interview with MAC. The MAC sends an email to the attorneys when they reach the cap; if cap is reached, assignments are stopped until below the cap. Administrator determines qualification level through interviews; reviews are conducted annually by administrative attorneys with input from stakeholders including clients, prosecutors, and judges and stored electronically. Reduction in costs for contracts for attorneys (-\$88,237), case management software (-\$2,780); training/travel (-\$6,763).

31. [Dickinson County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 71%

FY 25 approved funding: \$560,375.87

Spending through Q3: 71%

FY 26 requested funding: \$553,187.20

Contractor MAC tracks cases assigned through excel spreadsheets. If attorney meets cap they are notified in writing and not assigned cases until they are under the cap. Attorneys self-report monthly case numbers from other funding units. MAC tracks qualification level via excel spreadsheet and evaluates each attorneys' qualifications based on

attorney self-report of criminal defense experience, jury trials, and training. MAC notifies attorney of qualification level. Any attorney appeal is sent to Iron Defense. MAC privately meets with each attorney annually for review and assessment of any concerns. Decrease contracts for attorneys (-\$43,133.47); increase to expert and investigators (+\$7,000) for increased investigator hourly rates and increased usage; increase to training and travel (+\$14,880) for case related travel.

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. System is utilizing Special Assignment Team for over 40 cases that had to be reassigned after losing two felony attorneys. System is down to one attorney accepting felony cases and two accepting misdemeanors. System is competing with multiple surrounding systems that are also experiencing attorney shortages and will likely be relying on Special Assignment Team coverage to ensure Standard 6/Workload compliance, which will be an increased cost through FY26. Hours reported on Attorney List have increased consistently in FY25 over FY24. Additionally, system added Standard 4/Counsel at First Appearance on-call and case-related travel as new expenses in FY26. These expenses are crucial in maintaining some amount of competitiveness with surrounding counties who are also down attorneys and are using the limited number of criminal defense attorneys in the UP willing to accept indigent cases. Revised cost analysis adjusted contracts for attorneys to reflect system needs (-\$15,933), maintained expert/investigator funding from prior year, and increased training/travel (+\$9,204).

32. [Emmet County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 50%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,067,722.62

Spending through Q3: 44%

FY 26 requested funding: \$636,950.20

Contractor MAC overseeing a consortium of attorneys paid hourly. Attorney administrator tracks caseloads using caseload tracking

spreadsheet, CLIO, and reports provided by the court to ensure there is a balance in appointments for the consortium attorneys. When an attorney reaches half of their cap, they meet with the MAC to discuss a plan for the remainder of the year. Once cap is met the attorney is not assigned new cases until they are below the cap. Attorneys self-report outside appointments. MAC assesses qualification level, reviews will be conducted annually using self-assessment, stakeholder feedback, and meeting with attorney to determine qualification level. Decrease in contracts for attorneys (-\$394,905.22); addition of \$3,440 for case related travel time and mileage.

RESUBMISSION: Funding unit made additional reduction to contracts for attorneys (-\$36,961) based on projected needs and factoring in FY25 overpayment pursuant to contract terms; reduction to experts/investigators (-\$4,000) based on historical spending; reduced training/travel based on number of attorneys who actually seek reimbursement from the system for CLE expenses (-\$2,288).

33. [Gogebic County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 50%

FY 25 approved funding: \$578,413.98

Spending through Q3: 51%

FY 26 requested funding: \$486,336.36

Contractor MAC oversees roster in this and Ontonagon County. MAC Administrator tracks assignments to ensure attorneys do not exceed caseload caps; communicates with attorneys when reaching cap and coordinates with neighboring counties about caseloads. Attorneys self-report years of practice, jury trials, criminal defense experience, and training to MAC administrator. Stakeholder committee determines qualification level based on information reported by attorneys and review of counsel conducted by MAC; appeal process in place. MAC will conduct annual reviews of attorneys. MAC will observe them in court,

meet with attorney, interview stakeholders. Committee of stakeholders will participate in process. Surveys of stakeholders or clients will be discussed by the committee. Decrease in contracts for attorneys (-\$18,050) through tailoring of hours based on FY24 reporting; addition of Standard 4/Counsel at First Appearance on-call (\$33,800) for five days per week at \$130; addition of \$26,880 for case related travel time and mileage.

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Revision reflects reduction to contracts for attorneys (-\$72,080) based on projected spending; removed contract social worker position (-\$41,600); increased travel/training for case-related travel (+\$22,287); reduced experts and investigators (-\$7,500).

34. [Houghton, Baraga, and Keweenaw Counties](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 81%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,245,514.92

Spending through Q3: 61%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,157,852.70

Vendor-based public defender office with a MAC overseeing a roster handling conflicts/overflow. Reporting must be submitted to properly assess plan and costs.

RESUBMISSION: System submitted all required reporting which allowed MIDC staff to complete a thorough review of system needs. Standard 1/Training was revised to include an increase in CLE hours for new attorneys. System further refined its process for requesting expert and investigative assistance. Standard 5/Independence from the Judiciary was revised to be more inclusive of the conflict MAC in decision making processes and to address selection of attorneys. Standard 6/Caseloads was expanded to include a process for verifying caseloads from other funding units and to correct the timeframe for compliance (rolling year, not fiscal year). Decrease to contracts for

attorneys (-\$109,806); increase to overall expert and investigators budget (+\$10,000); Increase to travel/training (+\$12,141).

35. [Luce County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 84%

FY 25 approved funding: \$382,161.00

Spending through Q3: 48%

FY 26 requested funding: \$330,795.50

Contractor MAC oversees roster and also serves as the MAC in Mackinac County. MAC tracks cases assigned within Luce and Mackinac County using ZLS. Roster attorneys accepting cases in other jurisdictions self-report case assignments quarterly, and these are verified by administrators in adjoining jurisdictions. If an attorney reaches the caseload cap they are notified and not assigned cases until they are under the cap. MAC will conduct yearly review of all attorneys using a scoring/review sheet. MAC reviewed by an adjoining MAC yearly. Increase in contracts for attorneys for increased rates and addition of mental health court and appeals representation (+\$13,248); Increase in training/travel for addition of travel time - client visits (+\$13,309.50); overall increase from FY25 of \$26,001.50.

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Revised submission reflects revision to contracts for attorneys (-\$50,852) and experts/investigators (-\$15,000) to match projected spending. Increase to training/travel due to addition of travel time, client visits and case-related mileage (+\$20,042).

36. [Mackinac County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 90%

FY 25 approved funding: \$519,911.00

Spending through Q3: 57%

FY 26 requested funding: \$492,251.00

Contractor MAC oversees roster and also serves as the MAC in Luce County. MAC tracks caseloads using case management software, roster attorneys required to self-report caseloads quarterly; attorneys who exceed caseload limit in any rolling year are notified and no longer assigned until the defect is cured. Caseload disputes can be appealed to a MAC or PD in a different county. Yearly reviews are conducted by the Grant Administrator (attorney) focusing on attorney performance, qualifications, client relationships, communications, organization, advocacy, professionalism, interaction with the criminal justice system and compliance with MIDC standards when assessing qualification level. Annual reviews include feedback from stakeholders, attorney observation, and meeting with the attorney. Increase in contracts for attorneys for increased rates and addition of mental health court and appeals representation (+\$15,578); Increase in training/travel for addition of travel time – client visits (+\$19,968).

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Revised submission reflects revision to contracts for attorneys (-\$40,822) and experts/investigators (-\$13,000) to match projected spending. Increase to training/travel due to addition of travel time-client visits and case-related mileage (+\$19,968).

37. [Menominee County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 60%

FY 25 approved funding: \$741,995.22

Spending through Q3: 42%

FY 26 requested funding: \$466,624.68

Contractor-based MAC overseeing a roster of attorneys. Process for monitoring caseloads is incomplete and plan for reviewing counsel is noncompliant with the MIDC standard. Clarification as to attorney payment methods is required.

RESUBMISSION: System revised Standard 6/Caseloads to include a thorough process for monitoring caseloads, notifying attorneys when they have reached the cap, and gathering information about attorney caseloads from other funding units. The Standard 7/Qualification and Review process was rewritten to remove non-attorneys from the review process. Reviews will be conducted by the Lead Attorney. An explanation was provided as to attorney compensation that is not hourly. Decrease in contracts for attorneys (-\$311,420) due to reducing number of attorneys on contract from 6 to 4, which reflects the number of attorneys working for the system, and making additional reductions across the category; decrease in experts and investigators to set system at original tier (+\$250); increase in training/travel to add hourly reimbursement for case related travel (+\$40,510.02).

38. [Ontonagon County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 53%

FY 25 approved funding: \$209,937.73

Spending through Q3: 44%

FY 26 requested funding: \$153,554.53

Contractor MAC oversees roster in this and Gogebic County. MAC Administrator tracks assignments to ensure attorneys do not exceed caseload caps; communicates with attorneys when reaching cap and coordinates with neighboring counties about caseloads. Attorneys self-

report years of practice, jury trials, criminal defense experience, and training to MAC admin. MAC committee determines qualification level based on information reported by attorneys and review of counsel conducted by MAC; appeal process in place. MAC receives experience levels from roster attorneys and determines qualification in accordance with Standard 7/Qualification and Review. Attorney appeals are heard by stakeholders committee. Judges on committee may participate but not vote. MAC reviews attorneys annually by meeting with stakeholders and sitting in on cases. Decrease in contracts for attorneys (-\$22,450) through tailoring of hours based on FY24 reporting; addition of CAFA on-call (\$33,800) for five days per week at \$130; addition of \$26,880 for case-related travel time and mileage.

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Revision reflects changes to contracts/attorneys (-\$64,255) experts/investigators (-\$6,500) and case related travel (+\$17,292).

39. [Otsego County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 79%

FY 25 approved funding: \$994,234.07

Spending through Q3: 45%

FY 26 requested funding: \$645,455.98

Contractor MAC oversees roster of attorneys; office maintains spreadsheet to track caseloads which is updated quarterly; attorneys are notified in writing if cap is met, attorneys self-report cases in other systems quarterly. Qualification is determined by contracted defense attorney based on resume submitted by attorney; appeals resolved by attorney administrator. Attorney administrator will review attorneys at least once every three years. Attorneys with less than five years of experience evaluated once per year. Decrease in contracts for attorneys (-\$212,137.50) through tailoring of hours based on FY24 reporting;

Addition of case management software (+\$8,640); Addition of \$9,920 for case related travel time.

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Revision reflects reduction to contracts for attorneys (-\$355,882) based on further tailoring of hours.

40. [Presque Isle County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 42%

FY 25 approved funding: \$259,051.88

Spending through Q3: 66%

FY 26 requested funding: \$242,122.36

Contractor MAC overseeing a roster of attorneys. Reporting must be submitted to properly assess plan and costs.

RESUBMISSION: System submitted Q3 reporting which allowed staff to further evaluate needs. Standard 6/Caseload objectives updated to reflect cases are tracked quarterly by MAC using a spreadsheet. Attorneys practicing in other systems required to report caseloads quarterly by email. MAC verifies with other systems to verify reported caseloads. Standard 7/Qualification and Review plan updated to include qualification level updated during annual review or at the request of an attorney. Attorney reviews include in person observations, relevant experience from the last year, and any concerns. MAC maintains records of qualification level and annual reviews. Minor increases to contracts/attorneys (+\$5,200) and decrease in experts/investigators (-\$6,000), training and travel (-\$9,715), and supplies/services (-\$6,700).

*Mid-Michigan Region:***41. Alcona County**

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 67%

FY 25 approved funding: \$299,642.74

Spending through Q3: 48%

FY 26 requested funding: \$252,658.62

MAC contractor oversees a roster of contract attorneys; updates required to reflect implementation of caseload, qualification, and review standards to assess requests for next year.

RESUBMISSION: Updates to Standard 6/Caseloads were made to provide sufficient detail about how caseloads will be monitored and tracked. The MAC Manager will monitor caseloads on a spreadsheet throughout the year. If an attorney reaches the cap, they will be notified by email and will no longer receive appointments until the issue is resolved. The MAC Manager will require information from each contract attorney on their other contact/roster work in other systems. The MAC Manager will verify this with other systems as required/appropriate. Standard 7/Qualification and Review includes a process for assessing and documenting attorney qualifications. The MAC Manager will review attorney performance in conjunction with other professionals in the system and surrounding systems as well if appropriate. This will include judges, probation officers, court staff and other senior private attorneys as appropriate. The system will develop a screening process for use as necessary. The MAC Manager will be rated in the same fashion except he will not be personally involved in that evaluation. Attorney review process includes individual performance reviews as well as attorney self- review. Increase to MAC administration (+\$2,280), data collection (+\$96), and transcripts (+\$750); decreases to contract attorneys (-\$41,810) experts/investigators (-\$5,000), Zoom subscription (-\$300), office equipment (-\$1,000) and mileage (-\$2,000.12).

42. [Alpena County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 80%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,156,945.92

Spending through Q3: 65%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,140,764.05

Vendor-based public defender office works regionally to also cover Montmorency and Oscoda Counties. Process for monitoring caseloads of roster attorneys is insufficient to ensure compliance; additional information about review of counsel is required.

RESUBMISSION: The Chief Defender monitors attorney caseloads via the case management system. The MAC manager tracks the number of cases assigned to conflict/overflow attorneys. Those attorneys will be asked to periodically report their total caseloads including retained cases and cases from other counties. The MAC Manager will track the number of cases assigned to private attorneys on a spreadsheet, and those attorneys will report their total caseload numbers to the MAC Manager approximately every six months and at any time the attorney believes they may be approaching the caseload cap. If an attorney does reach their caseload cap, no further cases will be assigned until the attorney can demonstrate that they are within the caseload limits. Conflict/overflow attorneys will inform the MAC Manager of any other systems where they accept assignments. The MAC Manager will communicate with the administrators of those other systems to obtain caseload information on a regular basis. In the PD office, the Chief Defender will notify attorneys when they reach the cap, and will pause new assignments until such time as the attorney's caseload falls within the acceptable limit. The Chief Defender or MAC Manager will conduct an initial interview with all attorneys accepting assignments, and may follow up by speaking to the judges, prosecutors, and other attorneys. The attorney will be informed of their qualification level and will be asked to report back with updates if they try cases or otherwise gain relevant experience so that the Chief Defender or MAC Manager can monitor their progress toward the next qualification level. The MAC

Manager and Chief Defender will each be available to review the other's decision if an attorney disputes the qualification level assigned. Reviews of all attorneys are completed annually; new hires are reviewed at the six month period. The rating system, participants, and process are thoroughly detailed in compliance plan. Decrease to PD office (-\$25,583.87) with COLA increases but combined some positions to keep overall costs down; increase to contract attorneys (+\$43,840) to help cover rural shortages and comply with Standard 8/Attorney Compensation increases; increase to MAC administration (+\$2,280); eliminated emergency Rural Shortage Coverage in experts/investigators (-\$37,200), increase in data collection (+\$672), decrease in training mileage (-\$130) and meals (-\$600), and rural shortage mileage (-\$2,500); increase to transcripts (+\$3,000).

43. [Montmorency County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 81%

FY 25 approved funding: \$462,608.92

Spending through Q3: 66%

FY 26 requested funding: \$424,469.22

See Alpena, above.

RESUBMISSION: Decrease in regional office expenses (-\$38,656.95), Increase in experts/investigators (+\$5,000), training/travel (-\$878.75) and supply/services (-\$200). Small increases in MAC (+\$2,280) and contracts for attorneys (+\$4,220) and data collection (+\$96).

44. [Oscoda County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 97%

FY 25 approved funding: \$549,071.15

Spending through Q3: 61%

FY 26 requested funding: \$536,786.29

See Alpena, above.

RESUBMISSION: Decrease in regional office expenses (-\$11,442.39); Small increases in MAC Conflict Defense (+\$5,330) and data collection (\$96); decrease in experts/investigators (-\$2,500), travel/training (-\$1,168.47) and transcripts (-\$2,600).

45. [Roscommon County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 66%

FY 25 approved funding: \$803,777.00

Spending through Q3: 70%

FY 26 requested funding: \$775,905.00

Contractor MAC oversees a roster of attorneys and also serves as the administrator in Ogemaw County. Process for monitoring outside caseloads, assessing qualifications of attorneys, and documenting review of counsel is required. Indigency screening standard has inconsistent answers for appointments and oversight.

RESUBMISSION: System includes a process for monitoring caseload information from other funding units, which involves attorney self-report and verification by the MAC. Standard 7/Qualification and Review was also revised to include a process for assessing attorney qualifications by utilizing an attorney questionnaire, and it also includes a plan for annual written performance reviews with each attorney that will be stored in the attorney's digital file at the MAC office. Additionally, the system revised its answers to the Indigency Screening questions to provide more clarity regarding as to the court conducting the screening and subsequent assignment by the appointing authority. Decreases to contracts for attorneys (-\$14,470), MAC admin (-\$18,780) experts/investigators (-\$20,100) and admin assistant (-\$1,560); added travel time to visit clients housed in neighboring county jail (+\$45,750); decreased training costs (-\$2,707) and interpreters (-\$5,000).

46. [Tuscola County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 92%

FY 25 approved funding: \$2,406,226.80

Spending through Q3: 52%

FY 26 requested funding: \$2,129,768.24

Full-time employee MAC with staff attorney to cover CAFA and small docket while overseeing a roster of contract attorneys. Clarification is needed as to process for roster requesting and using investigator services and how challenges are resolved under the independence from the judiciary standard.

RESUBMISSION: Revised cost analysis includes an administrative assistant that they would like to promote to Office Manager. System revised the compliance plan to provide clarification as to process for roster attorneys to request and use investigator services. The system also revised Standard 5/Independence from the Judiciary to provide a meaningful appeal process when there are disputes. Revised plan includes current staff increases (+\$40,571.24); a decrease in contract attorney fees with office taking on larger share of the docket (-\$309,102.40); reduction to lease (-\$1,500); decrease in training/travel (-\$9,227.40); increase for transcripts (+\$2,800), eliminated separate line item for internet and phones (-\$3,000).

South Central Region:

47. Jackson County

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 82%

FY 25 approved funding: \$4,998,037.12

Spending through Q3: 63%

FY 26 requested funding: \$4,917,602.97

County-based public defender office with a roster for conflict/overflow cases. System plan contemplates adding a MAC to oversee the roster. A Compliance Analyst will monitor PD caseloads and system will participate in the South-Central Caseload Tracking Pilot Program; MAC will track and monitor roster caseloads. Assignments will be suspended if caps are reached. Chief PD determines qualifications and annually reviews PD's; MAC will determine qualifications and annually review roster attorneys. Increases in staffing in PD office to add 3 PD's & 1 Admin Asst for data collection/legal support *and* increase contracts for attorneys is not consistent with caseload projections at this time.

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Revisions to: personnel/fringes after reevaluating staffing needs and adjusting salaries (including 4 unfilled PD positions) and removing request for 3 new PD's (+\$90,615); decreased contracts for attorneys (-\$110,207); and experts and investigators for resolved Poole/Parks cases (-\$155,000); increased contracts/other (+\$7,267); travel/training (+\$17,504) and supplies/services (+\$69,026); all consistent with FY24-FY25 Q1-Q3 actual spending and projected needs.

Wayne County Region:

48. [City of Garden City](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 80%

FY 25 approved funding: \$156,871.85

Spending through Q3: 70%

FY 26 requested funding: \$142,377.36

Third class district court participates in RMACO. Increase to personnel/COLA (+\$3,209.58), overall increase to contracts for attorneys (+\$1,790.00) due to an increase in the hourly rate but a decrease in docket hours.

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Revised request for contracts for attorneys (-\$17,240) is consistent with projected needs.

49. [City of Grosse Pointe Farms](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 63%

FY 25 approved funding: \$88,440.03

Spending through Q3: 53%

FY 26 requested funding: \$66,560.00

Third class district court participates in RMACO. Increase to rates for contracts for attorneys but overall reduction in hours based on projections (-\$27,342.37).

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Revised request for contracts for attorneys (-\$21,880) is consistent with projected needs.

50. [City of Grosse Pointe Park](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 49%

FY 25 approved funding: \$31,122.00

Spending through Q3: 52%

FY 26 requested funding: \$22,783.67

Third class district court participates in RMACO. Increase to rates for contracts for attorneys but overall reduction in hours based on projections (-\$5039.97).

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Revised request for contracts for attorneys (-\$8,338) is consistent with projected needs.

51. [City of Hamtramck](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 99%

FY 25 approved funding: \$157,531.50

Spending through Q3: 41%

FY 26 requested funding: \$100,100.00

Third class district court participates in RMACO. Increase to rates for contracts for attorneys (+\$5,004) but no change in hours.

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Revised request for contracts for attorneys (-\$57,431) is consistent with projected needs.

52. [City of Southgate](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 76%

FY 25 approved funding: \$200,340.00

Spending through Q3: 54%

FY 26 requested funding: \$150,020.00

Third class district court participates in RMACO. Increase to rates for contracts for attorneys but overall reduction in hours based on projections (-\$17,040).

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Revised request for contracts for attorneys (-\$50,320) is consistent with projected needs.

Lapeer, Macomb, Oakland, St. Clair Region:

53. [City of Eastpointe](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 37%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,908,056.25

Spending through Q3: 35%

FY 26 requested funding: \$816,971.00

Contract MAC who oversees a roster of attorneys. The MAC tracks caseloads and is able to share caseload information with other systems in the region. Eastpointe collaborates with the Macomb system, its new compliance attorney, and other MACs in the region to eventually utilize case management software to support Standard 6/Workloads compliance. The MAC will conduct a review of each roster attorney once every three years. The review will include, but will not be limited to, one-on-one interviews, court observation and review of any feedback from stakeholders about attorney performance. Significant reductions to contracts for attorneys (-\$908,555.25) should be evaluated against Q3 spending.

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Upon resubmission, system revised contracts for attorneys (-\$1,071,185), experts/investigators (-\$14,150) and supplies/services (-\$5,750) to match projected needs.

54. [City of Farmington](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 71%

FY 25 approved funding: \$787,500.00

Spending through Q3: 68%

FY 26 requested funding: \$705,000.00

Contractor co-MACs oversee roster of attorneys. This system now screens for indigency as the appointing authority and implemented an appeal process for any denials. The system also opted in to the Oakland County Indigent Defense Services Office (IDSO) to further monitor compliance with Standard 6/Workloads and Standard 7/Qualification and Review via the County's Compliance Attorney, on a regional basis to ensure attorneys stay below the cap. MACs created an Excel database to track caseloads. MACs also rely on the MIDCs LMOS Pilot Program to enter and track monthly caseload statistics across the region. Request for additional (potentially duplicative) funding for caseload data collection requires clarification.

RESUBMISSION: System deleted redundant data collection costs (-\$19,968), reduced contracts for attorneys (-\$77,500) and experts/investigators (-\$5,000), based on current and historical spending.

55. [City of Hazel Park](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 66%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,119,666.69

Spending through Q3: 51%

FY 26 requested funding: \$785,942.83

Contractor MAC participates in LMOS pilot project, a collaborative, regionally-based project where systems submit attorney caseloads. Hazel Park has also partnered with Oakland County Indigent Defense Services Office (IDSO) to further monitor compliance with Standard 6/Workloads and Standard 7/Qualification and Review via the County's Compliance Attorney, on a regional basis to ensure attorneys stay below the cap. The MAC also monitors attorney caseloads and confirms that attorneys on the roster are qualified to take assignments under Standard 7. New Oakland County Indigent Defense Services Office (IDSO) Compliance Attorney reviews and observes MIDC attorneys every three years. Compliance Attorney sends reports to MAC and all concerns are followed up by the MAC. Slight increase to personnel per local contract (+\$8,401.20) and supplies/services (+\$38,585.00) due to system budgeting for booths to accommodate the need for more confidential meeting space; decrease to contracts for attorneys reflect budget reduction (-\$161,815.00).

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Upon resubmission, system revised contracts for attorneys (-\$335,599), experts/investigators (-\$5,200) and supplies/services (+\$450) to match projected needs.

56. [City of Roseville](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 54%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,642,355.02

Spending through Q3: 56%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,277,041.52

Contractor MAC overseeing a roster of attorneys. Roseville opted into a regional plan for compliance with Standard 6/Workloads and Standard 7/Qualification and Review, by way of collaborating with a Compliance Attorney under the Macomb County plan. The new Compliance Attorney will gather, track, process and report caseload data. Increase to personnel per local contract (+\$30,428.65); decrease to contracts for attorneys despite increased hourly rates (-\$73,055.00).

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. System adjusted for a 3.25% wage increase for its administrative assistant and put in additional units for its IDC runner positions (+\$16,550) who provide backup coverage for the IDC administrative assistant while absent. Reduced contracts for attorneys (-\$340,761), experts/investigators (-\$5,000) and supplies/services (-\$1,590) based on historical spending across categories.

57. [City of Royal Oak](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 76%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,224,425.00

Spending through Q3: 67%

FY 26 requested funding: \$931,976.00

Contract MAC oversees a roster of attorneys and works in conjunction with a funding unit employee (MIDC Project Manager) who assists with Standard 6/Workloads and Standard 7/Qualification and Review. They will be implementing case management software which will allow reports with criteria to track assignments, caseloads, and hours more

accurately and efficiently. Software criteria will be set to flag warnings for roster attorneys approaching Standard 6 maximums. As a precaution, monthly reports will be monitored by the Project Director and information relayed to the MAC. If a roster attorney reaches the 70% range, new assignments will be paused and the roster attorney informed of the pause by the MAC. The project director will monitor these attorneys weekly and inform the MAC when they can begin receiving new assignments immediately. Royal Oak has entered into a 5-year Interlocal Agreement with Oakland County to have its Indigent Defense Services Office provide qualification monitoring and review for attorneys working in both the Oakland County and Royal Oak indigent programs via the newly hired Compliance Attorney. Decrease to contracts for attorneys (-\$148,416.00).

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Upon resubmission system revised contracts for attorneys (-\$265,024), case management system (-\$20,800) and supplies/services (-\$1,625) to match projected needs.

58. [City of Southfield](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 51%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,230,865.00

Spending through Q3: 46%

FY 26 requested funding: \$755,759.00

Contract MAC who oversees a roster of attorneys. Southfield partnered with the Oakland County system to utilize the Compliance Attorney to implement and monitor compliance with Standard 6/Workloads and Standard 7/Qualification and Review. Hourly rates must be increased to meet Standard 8/Attorney Compensation. The process to gather information about an attorney's caseload or assignments from other funding units is incomplete.

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Upon resubmission system revised

contracts for attorneys (-\$462,816), experts/investigators (-\$21,200) and training/travel (-\$3,750) to match projected needs.

59. [City of Warren](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 32%

FY 25 approved funding: \$2,159,618.97

Spending through Q3: 53%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,270,982.47

Contractor MAC utilizes a spreadsheet to track attorney caseloads. Attorneys will be notified when approaching their caseload cap. The MAC office will collaborate with other MACs in the Macomb region to track case assignments from other jurisdictions. Attorneys who wish to join the roster undergo an assessment by the MAC to determine eligibility based on qualification level. Currently, the MAC engages in court watching each quarter to review counsel. System opted in to the Macomb regional plan for compliance with Standard 6/Workloads and Standard 7/Qualification and Review. No increase to personnel or supplies/services; significant decrease to contracts for attorneys includes hourly rate increase; increase to MAC hours (-\$842,221.84). RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Upon resubmission system revised contracts for attorneys (-\$887,076) and supplies/services (-\$2,310) to match projected needs.

60. [Clinton Township](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 56%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,069,931.25

Spending through Q3: 54%

FY 26 requested funding: \$645,220.00

Contractor MAC overseeing a roster of attorneys will total cases and maintain on a spreadsheet; MAC also working on joining with the

Macomb PD office's efforts to monitor cases countywide. MAC responsible for monitoring and auditing caseload calculations. Macomb County PD compliance attorney will oversee the process to gather information about an attorney's caseload or assignments from other funding units. Once caseload cap reached, no further cases will be assigned for the year. Additional detail is required to evaluate plan for qualification and review of counsel.

RESUBMISSION: System clarified that qualifications are maintained through CLE compliance with the local bar association. System only requires misdemeanor qualification. MACC will be conducting interviews with roster attorneys once every three years and coordinating with the Macomb PD office on review. MAC will notify attorneys of their qualification level via email. MAC responsible for reviewing counsel every four years with assistance from the Macomb County Public Defender compliance counsel. Revised cost analysis for contracts for attorneys (-\$401,686), experts/investigators (-\$16,400), case management system (-\$6,250) and supplies (-\$375).

61. [Macomb County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 41%

FY 25 approved funding: \$16,710,883.38

Spending through Q3: 55%

FY 26 requested funding: \$13,974,219.77

County-based public defender office accepting 20-25% of assignments with the Chief Public Defender overseeing a roster of attorneys accepting the remaining cases. To monitor compliance with Standard 6/Workloads and Standard 7/Qualification and Review, Macomb will acquire new software and hire a Compliance Attorney. The Compliance Attorney will compile, report, monitor and audit caseloads both in the Macomb funding unit and in other Macomb County funding units. Attorneys who apply to become a roster attorney in Macomb will have their qualifications reviewed for the different levels of cases. The

Compliance Attorney will develop and employ a system of review for both roster attorneys and public defender employee attorneys. Attorney reviews will be conducted once every three years at minimum. Increase to personnel/fringes and staffing at PD office (+\$457,239.25); decrease to contracts for attorneys due to increased reliance on PD office and budget reduction (-\$2,522,467.38); decrease to experts and investigators based on actual use (-\$199,000.00); decrease to contracts other to reflect costs associated with case management software (-\$156,970.16); adjustments/ slight increases to all other categories.

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Significant reductions were made, largely to contracts/attorneys (-\$2,736,663.61 overall reduction) based on projected needs for FY26 from actual FY25 spending through Q4.

62. [Oakland County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 62%

FY 25 approved funding: \$22,360,689.74

Spending through Q3: 55%

FY 26 requested funding: \$19,805,047.28

County-based public defender office accepting approximately 20% of cases; county-based MAC office overseeing roster of attorneys accepting 80% of cases. The IDSO office expanded, boosting the overall number of roster attorneys from 193 to 204. The total number of IDSO staff attorneys also increased by five (+5) new staff attorney positions, which include the addition of two Senior Public Defenders (+2) one to supervise felonies, the other to supervise misdemeanors; plus three (+3) assistant public defenders and two law clerk interns. Oakland has a Compliance Attorney (employee) who is responsible for managing the compliance with Standard 6/Workloads and Standard 7/Qualification and Review. The system is also communicating with the third-class district courts in Oakland County and has entered into inter-local agreements to have the Compliance Attorney manage those systems'

compliance with these standards. The Compliance Attorney uses a combination of the internal appointment database as well as spreadsheet templates provided by the MIDC to track compliance. As a result of the first Lapeer Macomb Oakland, St. Clair County (LMOS) Regional Conference held on January 16, 2025, Oakland County also participates in the regional LMOS Pilot Project to track caseloads and compliance on a monthly basis. Attorneys self-report caseloads for work in other systems and Compliance Attorney will confirm with MACs in the Oakland region. New attorneys wishing to join the roster will complete an application that is utilized as a screening tool for attorney qualifications. Oakland County will implement a new 5-step review process to review 1/3 of attorneys on list with a built-in appeal process to handle disputes. Current attorneys are also surveyed as to their qualifications. Attorneys will be evaluated by the Compliance Attorney through in-court monitoring, attorney consultation, and surveys to stakeholders. IDSO Chief ultimately determines attorney qualifications. Increase to personnel due to PD office growth/COLA (+\$1,098,722.89); overall decrease to contractual attorneys due to PD office growth (-\$634,000); increase to experts & investigators (+\$112,000) based on projected needs. Adjustments in other cost categories consistent with staffing and projected spending.

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Significant reductions were made to contracts/attorneys (-\$3,957,828) based on projected needs for FY26 from actual FY25 spending through Q4. On resubmission, Oakland County will partner with the Special Assignment Team and faculty from the Social Work and Law Schools at Wayne State University to examine the experiences of stakeholders, asking critical questions about how the SAT impacts individual clients, defense attorneys, and court culture more broadly (+\$20,000) consistent with the MIDC's statutory requirement to identify and encourage best practices for delivering the effective assistance of counsel to indigent defendants charged with crimes (MCL 780.985).

Western Michigan Region:

63. Allegan County

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 80% (regional w/Van Buren)

FY 25 approved funding: \$4,532,342.07

Spending through Q3: 52%

FY 26 requested funding: \$4,139,222.68

County-based public defender office previously regionalized with Van Buren County. Mid-sized office with 12 attorneys and 11 non-attorney staff, including request for new holistic defense Tech assistant. Also includes large roster due to limited life-offense qualified in-house staff. System has worked with MIDC to personalize a caseload spreadsheet to monitor caseload limitations; roster is required to self-report non-MIDC caseloads. Chief PD selects all attorneys working in the system using interviews, court watching, reference checks, academic qualifications, and county employment protocols. Formal attorney reviews will occur will annually. Increase to personnel/fringes (+\$454,043) due largely to county-wide wage increases and PD specific increase to create parity with prosecutor's office. Significant decreases to contracts for attorneys (-\$245,246) and experts/investigators (-\$122,574) based on projected needs; minor increases elsewhere in travel/training and supplies.

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. System made some significant reductions to contracts for attorneys and calculated impact of a move away from roster reliance to in-house representation on all misdemeanor cases (-\$261,382.00). Other large reduction comes from the removal of 2 FT PDs based on historical inability to fill positions and systems restructuring of assignment methods. (-\$208,258.51). The proposed cost analysis creates a new position, Holistic Defense Technical Assistant Coordinator, which is intended to provide services and support to holistic defense PD offices statewide.

64. [Kent County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 45%

FY 25 approved funding: \$26,022,957.23

Spending through Q3: 36%

FY 26 requested funding: \$17,623,715.02

Large county PD department with large roster and high volume, 93 total attorneys in system (43 total in-house attorneys and 30 non-attorney staff). This fiscal year has seen a significant transition from a vendor-based provider to a county department. There is an overall budget decrease as system continues transition including some one-time costs for equipment and space modification. Additional reporting will be helpful to review overall request in next fiscal year.

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Significant reductions were made (-\$8,399,242.21) based on projected needs for FY26 from actual FY25 spending.

65. [Montcalm County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 81%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,593,680.58

Spending through Q3: 45%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,425,982.59

Small MAC with 13 roster attorneys taking cases. The MAC assigns and monitors all cases regularly, notifies an attorney if approaching case cap. Attorneys self-report outside assignments. MAC regularly reviews attorneys through courtroom observations and tracking of years/trial experience. MAC will formally review all attorneys at least annually. Neighboring Ionia County serves as an appeal partner. Increase to contracts for attorneys (+\$24,000) for projected needs; minor adjustments elsewhere in the cost analysis.

RESUBMISSION: Recommendation to fully approve initial submission was held to evaluate FY25 spending. Overall reductions (-\$167,697.99) based on projected needs for FY26 from actual FY25 spending.

66. [Muskegon County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 64%

FY 25 approved funding: \$8,631,598.81

Spending through Q3: 49%

FY 26 requested funding: \$8,209,846.47

Medium-size county PD office with external MAC for conflict cases with 28 FTE employee attorneys with 4 PT positions for law school interns and 10 PT legal undergrad interns. Many attorneys in the system have less than two years of criminal defense experience in Michigan. System is requesting significant overall budget increase largely from personnel and fringes (+1,499,708.54) which includes requests for 10 new positions (3 attorney, 5 non-attorney, and 2 PT non-attorney); increase to contracts for attorneys (+\$82,935.20). Overall increase must be evaluated in light of additional reporting and analysis of caseloads.

RESUBMISSION: Overall reductions (-\$421,752.34) based on projected needs for FY26 from actual FY25 spending. Costs in every category were evaluated and reduced based on projected needs. FY25 spending in personnel and fringes initially appeared low, but this is due to several positions not being filled at the start of the fiscal year. As documented in the cost analysis, the positions have been gradually filled. Reductions were made to contracts for attorney category to reflect reduced reliance on the roster.

Staff recommends approval of the resubmitted compliance plan and a portion of the cost analysis, pursuant to MCL 780.993(4):

67. [City of Allen Park](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 79%

FY 25 approved funding: \$265,477.45

Spending through Q3: 54%

FY 26 requested funding: \$213,507.56

FY26 RECOMMENDED funding: \$201,127.81

Third class district court participates in RMACO. Increase to COLA for personnel (+\$792.30), increase to rates for contracts for attorneys but overall reduction in hours based on projections (-\$21,840).

RESUBMISSION: After reviewing projected needs, system reduced the hours for contracts for attorneys by 467.863 hours from the prior year's award. MIDC Staff recommends eliminating the corrections staff spending (-\$12,379.75) as it is historically underused; funding unit did not respond to requests for time tracking support for this position.

68. [Hillsdale County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 47%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,031,564.53

Spending through Q3: 44%

FY 26 requested funding: \$672,635.08

FY26 RECOMMENDED funding: \$627,635.08

Contractor MAC accepts cases and oversees a roster of private attorneys. MAC will monitor caseloads and will participate in the South-Central Caseload Tracking Pilot Program. Attorneys will be suspended from assignments if cap is reached. The MAC determines attorney qualifications upon application to the roster and will provide annual written evaluations to attorneys. Decrease to contracts for attorneys (-\$291,620) based on use and projected needs; decrease to experts and investigators (-\$25,000) based on use. Adding case-related

travel costs to travel & training (+\$1800). Minor adjustments elsewhere in costs.

RESUBMISSION: Decrease \$54,028 from initial submission. Decreases to: travel/training for trial college for rate consistency (-\$250); contracts/other to recalculate MAC support hours (-\$1408); experts and investigators (-\$7,500) and contracts for attorneys (-\$44,870) based on historical use and FY25 Q1-Q3 spending/attorney hourly tracking. Overall system decrease \$358,929.45 from FY25. System was overpaid in FY25 pursuant to the contract terms by \$135,988.43. Staff recommends further reducing contracts/attorneys by an additional \$45,000 to match projected needs and spending.

69. [Lenawee County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 68%

FY 25 approved funding: \$2,773,097.86

Spending through Q3: 57%

FY 26 requested funding: \$2,587,847.13

FY26 RECOMMENDED funding: \$2,547,847.13

County-based public defender office with a MAC for conflicts and overflow assignments. System will use MIDC caseload tracker spreadsheet to track caseloads and MAC will track roster cases; PD will monitor monthly; will suspend assignments if cap is met and MAC will do the same with contract counsel. System will participate in the South-Central Caseload Tracking Pilot Program. Reviews of counsel are done annually. Personnel increase for COLA only (+\$17,842). Decrease to contracts for attorneys (-\$37,373) based on historical use; decreases to experts/investigators based on use and removal of juvenile life case (-\$65,000); minor adjustments to other categories.

RESUBMISSION: Funding unit reduced contracts/attorneys by \$96,000, however, staff recommends reducing by an additional \$40,000 based on projected spending across all categories.

70. [Wayne County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 52%

FY 25 approved funding: \$54,848,724.22

Spending through Q3: 33%

FY 26 requested funding: \$35,715,397.89

FY26 RECOMMENDED funding: \$34,525,428.17

County-based Managed Assigned Counsel Office overseeing a roster of attorneys taking 65% of cases; vendor-based office takes 35% of cases; FY26 plan proposes increasing the defender office capacity and decreasing reliance on the roster to 50% each. Plan requires clarification on all standards as to vendor office compliance with all MIDC Standards; confidential meeting space descriptions should be updated to match recent space modifications; Standard 4/Counsel at First Appearance must be addressed as to the felony/state docket assignment process in every district court; an appeal process related to selection and payment issues must be established; a timeframe for attorney payments must be included in the compliance plan.

RESUBMISSION: All standards were revised in relation to vendor office compliance with all MIDC standards. Standard 2/Initial Interview as it relates to confidential meeting spaces has been updated to accurately reflect recent space modifications. Standard 4/Counsel at First Appearance was expanded to describe the process for felony/state case assignments in the district courts, including the addition of “mini rosters” at several district courts within the county, with the goal of improving the efficiency and timeliness of assignments. Standard 5/Independence from the Judiciary was revised to incorporate an additional step to the appeals process that goes beyond the Indigent Defense Services Department (IDSD). The attorney compensation section of the plan indicates that the approval process for invoice review can take between 30 and 45 days. The system anticipates full integration with Odyssey and JIS will occur in the last quarter of FY25, which may reduce the review time, thus reducing the time attorneys must wait to receive payment.

Upon resubmission of the costs, there were reductions to several categories in the IDSD and the Neighborhood Defender Services cost analysis (-\$19,133,326.33) from the FY25 spend plan. However, upon close review of the county-based portion of the program costs, staff recommends removing the IT positions from personnel/fringes and redundant indirect costs as they are not employees of the IDSD (-\$1,121,770.44) and *adding* a line to supplies and services for IT support to facilitate project needs (+\$500,000); further reductions to investigator spending (-\$566,000) would more accurately reflect projected needs, and the funding unit has agreed to reduce participation in the government finance training from four staff members to two (-\$2,200). Staff recommends that the ongoing IT “development” move to “maintenance” after this fiscal year.

- [Communication regarding recommendation](#) (included at Wayne County’s request)
- [Complete communication log maintained by MIDC staff](#)
- [MIDC staff calculation sheet](#) (includes overpayment detail and FY26 projections)

71. [Mecosta County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 59%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,381,789.76

Spending through Q3: 48%

FY 26 requested funding: \$769,243.05

FY26 RECOMMENDED funding: \$756,657.05

RESUBMISSION: Regional contractor MAC overseeing rosters of attorneys covering 8 counties (See Clare and Gladwin, below).

Reductions were made to contracts for attorney fees (-\$326,246.21) based on projected needs; increase in MAC admin (+\$4,830); deleted case management system (-\$7,460); decreased training/travel (-\$7,098) added line for emergency coverage (+\$20,000); decreased experts/investigators (-\$4,000); eliminated Special Assignments Team and administration fee (-\$312,658.50); supplies decreased (-\$500). Staff recommends deleting cost allocation as the system does not have any employees to support (-\$12,586).

72. [Clare and Gladwin Counties](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 79%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,200,000.01

Spending through Q3: 52%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,222,878.95

FY26 RECOMMENDED funding: \$1,202,323.95

Contractor MAC oversees a roster of attorneys and monitors compliance for Clare, Gladwin, Lake, Mason, Mecosta, Newaygo, Oceana, and Osceola Counties. The compliance plan addressing Standard 5/Independence from the Judiciary and other standards must establish a review/dispute resolution process outside of MIDC Staff; caseload cap communication to the roster and the process for qualification of counsel requires more detail.

RESUBMISSION: Clare and Gladwin have a single contract for the 2 systems, which is administered by Clare County. Updates to the Standard 5/Independence from the Judiciary were made to more thoroughly describe how attorneys are selected to provide indigent defense in the system, and also to identify an appeal partner. Added language to Standard 6/Workloads to describe what action will be taken when caseload cap is reached and how attorneys will be notified, and expounded on the process for identifying counsel's qualifications under Standard 7/Qualification and Review. The system also identified an appeal partner under this standard.

Decrease for personnel/fringes (-\$59,117.83); used previous four quarters spending to project increase to contract attorney fees plus estimated need for conflict coverage(+\$112,064.77) and yearly increase to MAC (+\$6,900); decrease to experts/investigators (-\$12,000) deleted case management system (-\$14,920); added travel expenses for special assignment attorneys (+\$16,320); other decreases to training/travel (-\$11,835). Plan was held in part based on projected spending but now is consistent with expected needs. The funding unit includes cost allocation for part time corrections staff (\$7,800 in salary and fringes for Clare County, and \$20,555 in indirect costs) and a full time corrections staff member (\$36,004.65 in salary and fringes in Gladwin County, and \$4,380 in indirect costs). Staff recommends limiting indirect costs to 10% of ancillary spending (-\$20,555).

73. [Lake County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 43%

FY 25 approved funding: \$577,886.00

Spending through Q3: 53%

FY 26 requested funding: \$467,830.23

FY26 RECOMMENDED funding: \$445,967.98

See Clare and Gladwin, above.

RESUBMISSION: Decrease in personnel (-\$6,281.21) in contracts/attorneys (-\$117,954.31), in experts/investigators (-\$7,500); increase in administration (+\$2,879.50); deleted case management system (-\$6068); increased training/travel for emergency coverage partly offset by other decreases (+\$6,740); decreases to transcripts and general supplies (-\$3,106). System has one part-time clerk/court staff for data and reporting and Standard 4/Counsel at First Appearance compliance (120 hrs./year) \$5,775.95 in salaries/fringes and is requesting \$22,439.25 in cost allocation. Staff recommends limiting indirect costs to 10% of ancillary spending (-\$21,862.25).

74. [Mason County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 74%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,091,301.21

Spending through Q3: 67%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,095,919.94

FY26 RECOMMENDED funding: \$1,045,472.94

See Clare and Gladwin, above.

RESUBMISSION: Minor increases to contracts for attorney fees (+\$809.10); personnel (+\$439.20); MAC admin (+\$3,450); deleted case management system (-\$8,156); decreased experts/investigators (-\$33,750) decreased training/travel offset by new lines totaling \$20,000 for emergency coverage (this resulted in an overall increase to training and travel of \$1,336.52); decreased general supplies (-\$500) and

transcripts (-\$8,501.09), eliminated interpreters (-\$1,000). System has one part-time administrative assistant (244 hrs./year) \$9,208.56 in salaries/fringes and is requesting \$51,367 in cost allocation. Staff recommends limiting indirect costs to 10% of ancillary spending (-\$50,447).

75. [Newaygo County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 79%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,341,720.70

Spending through Q3: 51%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,054,117.60

FY26 RECOMMENDED funding: \$1,050,834.60

See Clare and Gladwin, above.

RESUBMISSION: Reduced contracts for attorneys (-\$232,220); increased MAC admin (+\$4,575); decreased ancillary staff (-\$18,493.32); deleted case management system (-\$8,156); decreased experts/investigators (-\$40,000); added travel for emergency coverage to training/travel (+\$20,000) but budgeted for fewer attorneys based on historical use (-\$7,300); reduced general supplies (-\$749.78), transcripts (-\$6,443) and interpreters (-\$250). System has one full-time corrections staff (\$71,880.60) and is seeking \$10,471.00 in cost allocation. Staff recommends limiting indirect costs to 10% of ancillary spending (-\$3,283).

76. [Oceana County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 87%

FY 25 approved funding: \$853,168.31

Spending through Q3: 64%

FY 26 requested funding: \$802,225.70

FY26 RECOMMENDED funding: \$780,160.70

See Clare and Gladwin, above.

RESUBMISSION: Reduced contracts for attorneys (-\$51,235.06); increased MAC admin (+\$4,350); deleted case management system (-\$7,808); added travel for emergency coverage (+\$20,000), other decreases to training/travel (-\$7,196.20); supplies and interpreters reduced (-\$1,003.35). The system has one full-time and one part-time corrections staff (\$99,287.76 total in fringes and benefits) and is seeking \$31,993.00 in cost allocation. Staff recommends limiting indirect costs to 10% of ancillary spending (-\$22,065).

77. [Osceola County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 35%

FY 25 approved funding: \$700,000.00

Spending through Q3: 31%

FY 26 requested funding: \$439,695.11

FY26 RECOMMENDED funding: \$432,360.05

See Clare and Gladwin, above.

RESUBMISSION: Decrease in personnel based on historical usage (-\$17,070.40); reduced contracts for attorneys (-\$166,231.55); deleted 2nd chair eight-county program (-\$80,000); increased MAC admin (+\$3,450); deleted case management system (-\$7,808); reduced investigators (-\$5,000); decreased training expenses (-\$10,005), added travel for emergency coverage (+\$20,000); reduced supplies (-\$900) and reduced transcripts (-\$1,766). The system has a part-time

corrections staff (250 hrs./yr) and a part-time clerk (80 hrs./yr) for reporting (\$17,591.05 in salary and fringes) and is seeking \$9,094.06 in cost allocation. Staff recommends limiting indirect costs to 10% of ancillary spending (-\$7,335.06).

78. [Saginaw County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 78%

FY 25 approved funding: \$9,072,635.86

Spending through Q3: 50%

FY 26 requested funding: \$7,684,092.85

FY26 RECOMMENDED funding: \$7,540,585.34

Vendor-model public defender office and contract MAC overseeing a roster of attorneys sharing the caseload. Additional information is required for Standard 4/Counsel at First Appearance in prison cases; clarification needed as to caseload tracking process.

RESUBMISSION: System updated Standard 4/Counsel at First Appearance to describe the process for how counsel is provided to people charged with a crime while incarcerated in prison. The system also revised Standard 6/Workloads to include additional details about how caseloads will be tracked and monitored. Both the PD Office and the MAC Office will use the MIDC caseload tracker to comply with this standard. Increases to county personnel (+\$11,441.04), administration (+\$5,720) and vendor/nonprofit (+\$85,766.62). Decrease to contract attorney fees (-\$1,594,600), eliminated request for specialized case management system (-\$41,580); minor increase to training/travel (+\$57.82), added cost allocation (+\$149,267.51) for corrections personnel totaling \$57,606.64. Staff recommends limiting indirect costs to 10% of ancillary spending (-\$143,507.51).

FY26 Approvals through September 12, 2025:

Funding Unit	MIDC Funding	Local Share	Total System Costs	
Charter Township of Waterford	\$232,549.42	\$31,962.81	\$264,512.23	revised 9-12-25
City of Birmingham	\$525,323.96	\$17,548.95	\$542,872.91	revised 9-12-25
City of St Clair Shores	\$256,390.64	\$7,114.09	\$263,504.73	
St. Clair County	\$3,531,808.99	\$753,842.65	\$4,285,651.64	
Midland County	\$538,856.95	\$260,868.89	\$799,725.84	
Sanilac County	\$577,191.61	\$66,005.25	\$643,196.86	
Grand Traverse County	\$2,496,613.34	\$157,726.66	\$2,654,340.00	
Manistee County	\$1,061,449.75	\$284,535.77	\$1,345,985.52	
Schoolcraft County	\$194,167.14	\$36,491.86	\$230,659.00	
Clinton County	\$1,869,954.16	\$148,564.79	\$2,018,518.95	
Eaton County	\$2,514,609.78	\$447,507.03	\$2,962,116.81	
Gratiot County	\$1,199,762.22	\$83,809.01	\$1,283,571.23	
Livingston County	\$2,394,571.02	\$941,439.60	\$3,336,010.62	
Shiawassee County	\$1,507,398.26	\$106,600.55	\$1,613,998.81	
Washtenaw County	\$11,789,637.95	\$2,661,396.97	\$14,451,034.92	
City of Dearborn Heights	\$369,405.90	\$9,879.39	\$379,285.29	
City of Grosse Pointe Woods	\$62,636.76	\$3,166.24	\$65,803.00	
City of Harper Woods	\$381,914.42	\$12,722.74	\$394,637.16	
City of Livonia	\$744,006.85	\$17,676.58	\$761,683.43	
City of Taylor	\$455,875.84	\$40,567.53	\$496,443.37	
City of Wayne	\$199,906.58	\$23,590.60	\$223,497.18	
City of Wyandotte	\$353,587.11	\$1,469.49	\$355,056.60	
Grosse Ile Township	\$326,907.50	\$77,132.50	\$404,040.00	
Township of Redford	\$544,985.36	\$52,874.64	\$597,860.00	
Berrien County	\$5,440,985.43	\$577,910.43	\$6,018,895.86	
Branch County	\$1,646,151.73	\$155,464.18	\$1,801,615.91	
City of Grand Rapids	\$4,992,463.83	\$177,991.42	\$5,170,455.25	
Ionia County	\$872,525.61	\$224,505.96	\$1,097,031.57	
Ottawa County	\$6,444,298.75	\$948,010.35	\$7,392,309.10	
Approved June 24, 2025	\$53,525,936.86	\$8,328,376.93	\$61,854,313.79	

Barry County	\$1,124,477.22	\$232,434.06	\$1,356,911.28	
Canton Township	\$354,726.67	\$31,294.29	\$386,020.96	
City of Ferndale	\$505,577.22	\$15,383.43	\$520,960.65	
City of Grosse Pointe	\$9,763.43	\$3,248.40	\$13,011.83	
City of Madison Heights	\$525,699.59	\$1,790.08	\$527,489.67	
City of Lincoln Park	\$335,856.04	\$10,788.46	\$346,644.50	
City of Pontiac	\$668,316.13	\$18,111.15	\$686,427.28	
City of Romulus	\$183,315.05	\$55,586.38	\$238,901.43	
City of Westland	\$627,029.75	\$63,265.25	\$690,295.00	
Genesee County	\$9,453,835.37	\$1,342,132.90	\$10,795,968.27	
Iron County	\$562,599.60	\$73,428.78	\$636,028.38	
Monroe County	\$2,646,494.30	\$217,053.37	\$2,863,547.67	
Van Buren County	\$2,834,965.42	\$308,197.57	\$3,143,162.99	
Approved September 12, 2025	\$19,832,655.79	\$2,372,714.12	\$22,205,369.91	
Overall totals	\$73,358,592.65	\$10,701,091.05	\$84,059,683.70	