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: Wednesday, September 9, 2026, Time: 9:30 a.m.
Michigan Bankers Association
507 S. Grand Ave, Lansing, MI 48933

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 (action item to approve agenda)
6. Consent agenda (action item)
    a. June 10, 2026 Meeting Minutes
7. Chair Report
    a. Welcome New Commissioners
    b. Committee Assignments
        i. New Commissioners
        ii. Nominating Committee
8. Executive Director Report
    a. Litigation update
    b. MIDC FY28 budget proposal (action item)
9. Commission Business
    a. Standing Committee Reports
        i. Executive Committee – Tracey Brame, Chair
        ii. Training and Evaluation – Tracey Brame, Chair

b. Ad hoc Committee Reports
   i. Rural Attorney Shortages – Gary Walker, Committee Chair
c. MIDC Standards Implementation
   i. FY25 Compliance Year End Reporting
      - Unexpended Balances Update
   ii. FY26 Compliance Planning
      - Overview of funding distributed to date
      - Unexpended Balance Projection
      - Non-compliance updates (new)
        - Alcona County
        - City of Eastpointe
        - Ontonagon County
      - Budget adjustments (information items)
      - Plan Change (information item)
        1. Eaton County

~break for lunch ~

   iii. FY27 Compliance Plans and Cost Analysis
      - Revised reporting requirements and support for local systems
      - Revisions to approved costs based on projected need (action items)
        - City of Grosse Pointe Park
        - City of Royal Oak
        - City of Warren
      - Resubmissions (action items)

Pursuant to M.C.L. 780.993(4):

Staff recommends *disapproval* of the compliance plan *and* cost analysis (no plan submitted):

1. City of Eastpointe

Staff recommends approval of the resubmitted plan *and* cost analysis (no substantive changes and no increased costs from MIDC approved version June 2026):

2. City of Birmingham
3. City of Farmington
4. City of Ferndale
5. City of Oak Park
6. City of St Clair Shores
7. Clinton Township
8. Lapeer County
9. Alcona County
10. Bay County
11. Clare County
12. Huron County
13. Iosco County
14. Isabella County
15. Mason County
16. Mecosta County
17. Montmorency County
18. Newaygo County
19. Ogemaw County
20. Osceola County
21. Oscoda County
22. Saginaw County
23. Sanilac County
24. Tuscola County
25. Chippewa County
26. Crawford County
27. Emmet County
28. Grand Traverse County
29. Houghton County
30. Kalkaska County
31. Leelanau County
32. Luce County

33. Mackinac County
34. Manistee County
35. Menominee County
36. Presque Isle County
37. Schoolcraft County
38. Wexford County
39. Clinton County
40. Genesee County
41. Gratiot County
42. Ingham County
43. Jackson County
44. Lenawee County
45. Livingston County
46. Monroe County
47. Washtenaw County
48. Canton Township
49. City of Dearborn
50. City of Dearborn Heights
51. City of Detroit
52. City of Grosse Pointe Farms
53. City of Grosse Pointe Woods
54. City of Hamtramck
55. City of Highland Park
56. City of Lincoln Park
57. City of Livonia
58. City of Romulus
59. City of Taylor
60. City of Wayne
61. City of Westland
62. City of Wyandotte
63. Grosse Ile Township (now City of Flat Rock)
64. Township of Redford
65. Wayne County
66. Allegan County
67. Barry County

68. Berrien County
69. Branch County
70. Calhoun County
71. City of Grand Rapids
72. Ionia County
73. Kalamazoo County
74. Kent County
75. Montcalm County
76. St. Joseph County
77. Van Buren County

Staff recommends approval of the resubmitted plan and cost analysis (reduced funding request and/or system change):

78. City of Southfield
79. Alger County
80. Eaton County

Staff recommends approval of the resubmitted plan and cost analysis (increased funding request based on projected need):

81. Hillsdale County
82. Gogebic County
83. Ontonagon County
84. Muskegon County

Staff recommends approval of the plan and *a portion of* the resubmitted cost analysis:

Based on projected funding needs:

85. City of Hazel Park
86. Macomb County
87. Oakland County

88. St. Clair County
89. Ottawa County
90. Marquette County

Based on inclusion of a cost allocation plan exceeding 10% of personnel and fringe benefits:

91. Shiawassee County
92. Lake County
93. Oceana County
94. Cheboygan County

10. Adjourn – next meeting December 2, 2026 beginning at 9:30 a.m.

Online Access: For members of the public who wish to join the meeting online, please email Jacqueline 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.

June 10, 2026
Time: 9:30 AM
Michigan Bankers Association
507 S. Grand Ave, Lansing, MI 48933

Commission Members Participating

The following members participated in person:
- Chair Tracey Brame
- Andrew DeLeeuw
- Judge James Fisher
- Christine Green
- John Hays
- Charissa Huang
- James Krizan
- Judge Paula Mathes
- Margaret McAvoy
- Coriann McMillen
- Alicia Moon (non-voting member)
- Jim Samuels
- Alan Vanderberg
- Rob VerHeulen
- Gary Walker

The following Commissioners were absent:
- Thomas Adams
- Michael Carter
- Loren Khogali
- Sofia Nelson

Chair Brame called the meeting to order at 9:33 am.

Public Comment
The following people provided public comment:
- Angela Cope
- Rachel Jackson
- Erin Freers-Cole
- Karen Moore
- Melanie Young
- Pete Menna
- Erin Van Campen
- Mike Naughton
- Amy Campenelli

Approval of Agenda
Judge Mathes moved that the agenda be approved as presented. Commissioner DeLeeuw seconded. The motion carried.

Consent Agenda
Commissioner Krizan moved that the consent agenda containing the February 12, 2026 meeting minutes be adopted. Commissioner Vanderberg seconded. The motion carried.

Chair Report
Chair Brame welcomed Commissioners Hays, Nelson, and Samuels who were recently appointed to replace Commissioners McMillin, Jones, and Simmington. Commissioners Nelson and Samuels were appointed to the Training and Evaluation Committee. Commissioner Hays was appointed to the Selection Standards Committee. Commissioner DeLeeuw was appointed chair of the Data Committee replacing Commissioner Buddin.

Executive Director Report
Ms. Staley introduced Sainath Iyer, Regional Manager for the Lapeer, Macomb, Oakland, and St. Clair region.

Ms. Staley gave an overview of the mediation process with Lake and Oceana Counties and results.

Commissioner VerHeulen moved to approve the FY26 compliance plan and a portion of the cost analysis submitted by Lake and Oceana Counties, consistent with the MIDC's previous action at the October 21, 2025 meeting, and MCL 780.993(4) and 780.995(2)(b). Chair Brame seconded. The motion carried.

Ms. Staley presented a policy regarding receipt of complaints and recommendations. Judge Fisher moved that the process for complaints and recommendations be approved. Commissioner Krizan seconded. The motion carried.

The Commission reviewed the draft FY27 grant contract. Commissioner Vanderberg moved that the draft contract be approved with two amendments. The first amendment adds a definition of equipment as valued over $5000. The second amendment modified second 2.8 Competitive Bidding on page 9 to read: "Grantee agrees that all procurement transactions involving the use of state funds shall be conducted in a manner that provides maximum open and free competition, consistent with the Grantee's purchasing policies. Sole source contracts should be negotiated to the extent that such negotiation is possible. Attorney contract for representation of indigent or partially indigent defendants, contracts for managed assigned counsel coordinators, all direct service providers who are members of the defense team, and those involved in research and data collection required by the MIDC Act, are exempt from a competitive bid process but must meet standard internal procurement policies, as applicable." Commissioner Green second. The motion carried.

The Commission reviewed a request by staff to allow the MIDC's Deputy Director to prepare and submit an amicus brief in the case of *People v Pamela Jean Taylor*, MSC Case No. 168814. Commissioner Green moved that this request be approved. Commissioner Walker seconded. The motion carried.

Chair Brame briefly left the meeting and Vice Chair VerHeulen assumed the role of Chair in her absence.

Executive Committee

Vice Chair VerHeulen gave an overview of the Executive Committee's meeting.

Ms. McCowan reviewed the meeting of the Training and Evaluation and Indigence and Compensation Committees.

Commissioner Walker provided an update on the Ad hoc Committee on Rural Attorney Shortages.

MIDC Standards Implementation

FY26 Compliance Plan and Cost Analysis Changes

Ms. McCowan gave an overview of the recommendation to change Van Buren County's compliance plan. No additional funding is required for the request. Commissioner McAvoy moved that the compliance plan change for Van Buren County be approved. Commissioner Walker seconded. The motion carried.

Ms. McCowan gave an overview of the recommendation to change Wayne County's compliance plan. No additional funding is needed in FY26 to facilitate this change. Commissioner DeLeeuw moved that the recommendation be approved. Commissioner Green seconded. The motion carried.

Ms. McCowan gave an overview of the requests submitted by systems for reimbursement for overspending in FY25 or that have demonstrated projected additional funding needs in FY26. The following systems have requested modifications to their cost analyses:

	FY26 Approved Funding (total costs)	Additional Funding Requested	Revised FY26 total system costs
Antrim County	$529,331.08	$125,000.00	$654,331.08
City of Detroit	$7,634,539.32	$437,444.31	$8,071,983.63
City of Dearborn Heights	$379,285.29	$141,503.96	$520,789.25
City of Livonia	$761,683.43	$151,283.00	$912,966.43

City of Romulus	$238,901.43	$82,000.00	$320,901.43
City of Roseville	$1,277,041.52	$220,000.00	$1,497,041.52
City of St Clair Shores	$263,504.73	$157,894.00	$421,398.73
City of Shelby Township	$535,444.00	$200,000.00	$735,444.00
City of Sterling Heights	$848,791.32	$189,550.19	$1,038,341.51
City of Wyandotte	$355,056.60	$85,000.00	$440,056.60
Clare County	$1,202,323.95	$662,759.23	$1,865,083.18
Gratiot County	$1,283,571.23	$237,419.00	$1,520,990.23
Grosse Ile Township	$404,040.00	$55,000.00	$459,040.00
Iosco County	$677,143.62	$98,821.26	$775,964.88
Mason County	$1,045,472.94	$18,046.86	$1,063,519.80
Sanilac County	$643,196.86	$72,493.76	$715,690.62
Total		$2,934,215.57	

Judge Fisher moved that funding be increased in FY26 for the systems listed above.

Commissioner Brame resumed the role of Chair at 11:30 am. The Commission recessed for 30 minutes.

FY27 Compliance Plans and Cost Analyses

Ms. McCowan presented an overview of the FY27 compliance plan and cost analysis submitted by the City of Eastpointe. Staff recommends disapproval of the compliance plan and cost analysis. Commissioner VerHeulen moved that the staff recommendation be adopted. Commissioner Vanderberg seconded. The motion carried.

Lapeer, Macomb, Oakland, and St. Clair Counties

Ms. Wangler presented an overview of the compliance plan review process and of the plans submitted by this region.

Staff recommends the approval of the compliance plan and cost analysis for the following systems:

- Charter Township of Shelby
- Charter Township of Waterford
- City of Madison Heights
- City of Pontiac
- City of Roseville
- City of Royal Oak
- City of Sterling Heights
- City of Warren

Commissioner McAvoy moved that the compliance plans and cost analyses be approved for the systems listed above. Commissioner Walker seconded. The motion carried.

Staff recommends the approval of the compliance plan and a portion of the cost analysis be approved for the following systems:

- City of Birmingham
- City of Farmington
- City of Ferndale
- City of Hazel Park
- City of Oak Park
- City of Southfield
- City of St Clair Shores
- Clinton Township
- Lapeer County
- Macomb County
- Oakland County
- St. Clair County

Judge Mathes moved that the compliance plans and a portion of the cost analyses be approved for the systems listed above. Commissioner Hays seconded. The motion carried. Commissioner Krizan abstained from the vote.

Northern Michigan Region
Lauren Calef provided an overview of the plans submitted by systems within the region.

Staff recommends approval of the compliance plan and cost analysis be approved for the following systems:

- Antrim County
- Charlevoix County
- Iron County
- Otsego County

Commissioner Huang moved that the compliance plans and cost analyses for the systems listed above be approved. Commissioner VerHeulen seconded. The motion carried.

Staff recommends approval of the compliance plans and a portion of the cost analyses for the following systems:

- Alger County
- Cheboygan County
- Chippewa County
- Crawford County
- Emmet County
- Gogebic County

- Grand Traverse County
- Houghton County
- Kalkaska County
- Leelanau County
- Luce County
- Mackinac County
- Manistee County
- Marquette County
- Menominee County
- Ontonagon County
- Presque Isle County
- Schoolcraft County
- Wexford County

Judge Mathes moved that the compliance plans and a portion of the cost analyses be approved for the systems listed above. Commissioner DeLeeuw seconded. The motion carried.

Western Michigan
Joseph Kanan provided an overview of the systems within the region.

Staff recommends the approval of Cass County's compliance plan and cost analysis. Commissioner Vanderberg moved that the staff recommendation be adopted. Commissioner Krizan seconded. The motion carried.

Staff recommends that the compliance plans and a portion of the cost analyses submitted by the systems listed below be approved:

- Allegan County
- Barry County
- Berrien County
- Branch County
- Calhoun County
- City of Grand Rapids
- Ionia County
- Kalamazoo County
- Kent County
- Montcalm County
- Muskegon County
- Ottawa County
- St. Joseph County
- Van Buren County

Commissioner McAvoy moved that the compliance plans and a portion of the cost analyses submitted by the systems listed above be approved. Commissioner Hays seconded. The motion carried. Commissioner Vanderberg and Judge Mathes abstained from the vote.

South Central Michigan
Nicole Walter provided an overview of the compliance plans submitted by the systems within her region.

Staff recommends the approval of the compliance plans and approval of a portion of the cost analyses for the systems listed below:

- Clinton County
- Eaton County
- Genesee County
- Gratiot County
- Hillsdale County
- Ingham County
- Jackson County
- Lenawee County
- Livingston County
- Monroe County
- Shiawassee County
- Washtenaw County

Commissioner Vanderberg moved that the compliance plans and a portion of the cost analyses for the systems listed above be approved. Commissioner Huang seconded. The motion carried. Commissioner DeLeeuw abstained from the vote.

Wayne County
Jessica Paladino provided an overview of the compliance plans submitted by the systems within the region.

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

- City of Allen Park
- City of Garden City
- City of Grosse Pointe
- City of Grosse Pointe Park
- City of Harper Woods
- City of Inkster
- City of Southgate

Judge Mathes moved that the compliance plans and cost analyses submitted by the systems listed above be approved. Commissioner Krizan seconded. The motion carried.

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

- Canton Township
- City of Dearborn
- City of Dearborn Heights
- City of Detroit
- City of Grosse Pointe Farms
- City of Grosse Pointe Woods
- City of Hamtramck
- City of Highland Park
- City of Lincoln Park
- City of Livonia
- City of Romulus
- City of Taylor
- City of Wayne
- City of Westland
- City of Wyandotte
- Grosse Ile Township
- Township of Redford
- Wayne County

Commissioner McAvoy moved that the compliance plans and a portion of the cost analyses for the systems listed above be approved. Commissioner Hays seconded. The motion carried.

Mid-Michigan
Matthew Lozen gave an overview of the compliance plans submitted by the systems within his region.

Staff recommends the approval of the compliance plan and cost analysis for the following systems:

- Alpena County
- Arenac County
- Midland County
- Roscommon County

Commissioner VerHeulen moved that the compliance plans and cost analyses for the systems listed above be approved. Commissioner Vanderberg seconded. The motion carried.

Staff recommends the approval of the compliance plan and a portion of the cost analysis for the following systems:

- Alcona County
- Bay County

- Clare County
- Huron County
- Iosco County
- Isabella County
- Lake County
- Mason County
- Mecosta County
- Montmorency County
- Newaygo County
- Oceana County
- Ogemaw County
- Osceola County
- Oscoda County
- Saginaw County
- Sanilac County
- Tuscola County

Judge Mathes moved that the compliance plan and a portion of the cost analysis be approved for the systems listed above. Commissioner Green seconded. The motion carried.

Chair Brame adjourned the meeting at 1:45 pm.

MICHIGAN INDIGENT DEFENSE COMMISSION

September 9, 2026

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

RE: FY26 Spending, FY27 Annual Budget Plan, and Proposed FY28 Budget Request

This memo captures year-to-date spending of Fiscal Year 2026, depicts our expected Fiscal Year 2027 spending plan, and proposes a Fiscal Year 2028 budget request.

Key takeaways include:

- There is an expected lapse of FY26 grant appropriations totaling over $81 million.
- The FY22 and FY23 work project funds were lapsed back into the General Fund and we are awaiting final approval from the legislature of a new $50 million work project that would be available through FY30.
- The FY27 budget reduces grant funding by 10% from the prior year to $211.8 million and operations are slightly increased to cover COLA expenses.
- The FY 28 proposal is to request 4 new FTEs for the MIDC operations and a 5% increase to grant funds due to requirements of Standard 8, a total of $222,389,895.

FISCAL YEAR 2026 SPENDING

The MIDC has two separate line items in the state budget, supported by General Fund dollars: Grants and Operations. This year, the Commission also relied upon federal grants and had access to work project funds to support its work.

1. FY26 MIDC Grants

All approved grant funding was distributed to the local systems. In FY26, the MIDC approved $254.7 million in grants to local systems and the state budget appropriated $236 million from the General Fund, a difference of about $18.7 million.

The MIDC relies upon a combination of General Fund appropriations, local unexpended balances from prior grant years, attorney fees collected from partially indigent clients, and, if necessary, approved work project balances to pay for its approved grants. Unexpended grant balance amounts are determined once all prior grant year reporting is submitted and approved by the MIDC Grants Director. This year, due to various delays in report submissions, FY25 reporting was finalized on September 1, 2026.

Due to large local unexpended balances from 2025 grants already distributed to local systems, we covered the difference of $18.7 million solely with unexpended grant dollars and did not rely on available work projects for this year. We expect to have $81 million in undistributed funds remaining with the MIDC. The FY27 budget included language allowing $50 million to be placed in a new work project that can be used for specific purposes. This is discussed in greater detail below.

Authorized Funds for FY26 MIDC State Grants	
FY26 GF Appropriation	$ 236,016,800.00
FY25 Local Unexpended (w/interest)	$ 111,642,078.80
Attorney Fees from partially indigent clients	$ 300,000.00
Total	$ 347,860,878.80

FY26 GF Appropriation	Actual FY26 GF Spend	Expected GF Remaining
$ 236,016,800.00	$ 154,457,243.45	$ 81,561,556.55

2. FY26 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 managed a contracted program manager who operated our Trial Skills Simulation Project, funded by a US Byrne JAG federal grant. This was the final year of the Byrne JAG funded project, which ended in July.

Authorized Funds for FY26 MIDC Operations		
FY26 GF Appropriation	$	3,378,800
OJJDP Grant (FY26 allotment of 3 yr grant)	$	370,862.00
Byrne JAG Grant	$	225,000.00
Total	$	3,974,662.00

The majority of our expenses continue to be employee salaries and benefits, encompassing more than 90% of the budget. We experienced some staff turnover in FY26, but little operation funding will lapse due to unanticipated DTMB/IT costs.

The following page displays our FY26 operations spending of our General Fund appropriation through July 31, the most recent accounting, showing both condensed and detailed expenses. There are still a few weeks left in FY26 and there may be some slight changes once all payments are processed.

10/1/2025-07/31/2026		
Wages		**$1,708,811.00**
Benefits	**$**	**811,448.00**
Materials (highlights below)	**$**	**275,082.02**
Total Expenditures through 7/31/2026	**$**	**2,795,341.02**
Travel & Reimbursements	**$**	**27,426.15**
Employee Travel/Reimbursements	$	24,919.97
Commissioner Travel Reimbursements	$	2,506.18
IT Costs	**$**	**114,588.57**
Verizon	$	6,111.61
Zoom	$	261.30
DTMB IT/Software Allocation	$	3,381.18
DTMB Telephones/Data/Fees	$	1,551.37
Computers/DTMB Encumbrance	$	101,978.11
Other software	$	1,305.00
Office Space and Materials	**$**	**23,656.33**
Rent	$	22,119.06
Office Supplies	$	86.24
Copier/Printer Lease	$	1,238.30
DTMB Mail and Printing	$	212.73
Contracts	**$**	**106,603.75**
Elefant	$	4,592.22
Mediation	$	4,511.53
Gault Center	$	40,000.00
Orion Solutions	$	50,000.00
Attorney General	$	7,500.00

3. **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 one year. The MIDC contracted with attorney Keeley Blanchard to administer this program for its eighth year and closed the program in July 2026. In FY27, the project will be administered and operated by CDAM.

- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) Enhancing Youth Defense grant, *Youth Defender Trial Simulation Program*, $649,327. The OJJDP recently approved a one-year grant extension, allowing the work to continue over four years, ending September 30, 2027. MIDC Training Director Susan Prentice Sao is our program manager and her position is partially funded by the grant. The grant also supports attorney trainer compensation and other training related expenses.

4. **Work Project Funds**

The MIDC had two work project funds intended to 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." These funds were created by unexpended appropriations of grant dollars from the previous grant year. We relied upon these funds to support reimbursing systems who overspent in a previous grant cycle, unexpected defense costs, i.e. cold cases, juvenile life without parole resentencing hearings, etc.

- FY2022 work project with a balance of $38,157,669 (expires Oct. 1, 2026)
- FY2023 work project with a balance of $11,868,880 (expires Oct. 1, 2027)

On August 4, 2026, the State Budget Director issued a directive to lapse the balance of the FY22 and FY23 work project funds back into the General Fund.

As part of the FY27 budget, a new work project of $50 million was created to be used for the following purposes:

> "(a) The purpose of the project is to support court-mandated resentencing of youthful defendants, planning or implementation costs related to the possible expansion of commission standards to include juvenile defendants, enhanced cost verification of local compliance plans, and grants to local indigent defense systems to support costs not covered by other funding.
> (b) The project will be accomplished by utilizing state employees or contracts with service providers, or both."

FISCAL YEAR 2027 BUDGET SPENDING PLAN

On July 21, 2026, Governor Whitmer signed her eighth and final budget for FY27. The FY27budget reduces the MIDC grants by 10% from the previous year, or $24.6 million, maintains the current number of FTEs, and includes a small economic increase in the operations line.

The state appropriated $3.4 million for MIDC operations and $211.8 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 indirect costs for FY27, the following components will be included in our budget.

FY27 MIDC Operations - $3,424,100

The FY27 operations budget increased by $45,300 to cover general economic increases. No other operational changes were included.

- *Employee Wages and Benefits*: This is the most significant portion of MIDC's operations budget. The FY27 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 FY27 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, $29,492.08 annually. We may see a slight increase once LARA finalizes indirect cost calculations.

- *Contracted Services:* As of now, the FY27 budget anticipates continued contracting with three vendors to supplement operational needs:

    - Elefant, 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 FY27. To continue to support this transition we will need to continue to contract with Elefant.

    - Orion Solutions Group, LLC – up to $353,890, annual contract. The Orion team assists staff with financial auditing and review of grant expenditures. The auditing work has traditionally been funded by work project funds; however, due to a reinterpretation of allowable work project usage halfway through 2026, their work was pared down. In FY27, the Orion work is expected to resume with auditing and assisting the grants team. Work project funding will cover the cost of this contract.

- HTC Global Services, Inc. – $106,800, contract expires Sept. 30, 2030. HTC maintains and supports our grants management system, EGrAMS. We share the cost of the HTC contract with other departments including LARA.

FY27 MIDC Grants – $211,799,900

The total cost for every indigent defense system to comply with the MIDC Standards is a combination of a required local share and a state share provided in the form of an annual grant. The state share is funded by the FY27 budget with General Fund dollars. Per the MIDC Act, grant dollars are advanced to the local systems, rather than reimbursed, and all unexpended grant dollars are kept and accounted for locally to offset the following year's grant amount. The approved FY27 Grant Agreement requires quarterly disbursement of grant dollars; however, to reduce the chance of overpayment, disbursement is contingent on receipt and approval of required quarterly grant reporting.

The annual state appropriation for FY27 is 10% less than the previous year, a reduction of $24,216,900. As of the June 2026 MIDC meeting, the Commission has approved about $246.4 million, a difference of about $34.6 million from the state appropriation.

FY27 GF Appropriation	Approved FY27 Grants (est.)	Diff of FY27 Approp v. Approval (est.)
$ 211,799,900.00	$ 246,457,410.39	$ 34,657,510.39

To compensate for this difference, a combination of General Fund appropriations, unexpended prior year grant funds, and work project funds are available, as planned, and should be sufficient to cover anticipated FY27 grant needs.

Authorized Funds for FY27 MIDC State Grants	
FY27 GF Appropriation	$ 211,799,900.00
FY26 Local Unexpended (est.)	$ 20,000,000.00
FY27 Work Project Fund	$ 50,000,000.00
Attorney Fees from partially indigent clients	$ 300,000.00
Total	$ 282,099,900.00

FISCAL YEAR 2028 BUDGET REQUEST (Action Needed)

1. **MIDC Grants Request** – *Additional $10,589,995, or 5% increase over FY27 appropriation, totaling $222,389,895.*

While all local implementation needs for FY27 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, eventually restricting overpayment and reducing the amounts of local unexpended dollars.

This increase would ensure that systems are able to include a cost-of-living adjustment as required in Standard 8 – Attorney Compensation and provide for overall statewide inflationary increases indigent defense services. The request factors in the potential unknowns of future administration priorities as well as the likelihood of remaining unexpended balances offsetting future grants.

2. **MIDC Operations Request** – *Increase of $821,560.96 for 4 new FTEs.*

With the passage of SB 81 the MIDC faces an increase of responsibilities to develop, implement, and enforce youth defense standards. Amending the MIDC Act to include youth defense services is a monumental change for the Commission and a huge victory for Michigan's justice-impacted children. If we are to be successful in meeting these responsibilities, the MIDC staff level must increase.

The amendments to the MIDC Act will take effect on October 1, 2027, the first day of FY28. New anticipated tasks include: the creation of new youth defense standards; increased technical assistance for new stakeholders in the youth defense systems; additional research and assessment of the State's youth defense systems; and development and administration of new programmatic and financial compliance protocols.

These additional tasks cannot be absorbed by the current MIDC staff structure. To meet these new requirements, the FY28 request is for four new FTEs: two Departmental Analysts and two Indigent Defense Coordinators 13-15 (Regional Managers) who specialize in youth defense. The request includes associated IT, supplies, and other FTE related costs as well as funding for increased travel.

Fortunately, we are not starting this work from scratch and have many lessons learned from our years of development, implementation, and enforcement of criminal defense standards. However, it will still take time to make these necessary changes and our duties will likely increase as years go on.

To: Michigan Indigent Defense Commission

From: Marla R. McCowan
Deputy Director

Re: Compliance Planning and Costs:
FY25 and FY26 status updates; FY27 re-submissions

Date: September 4, 2026

I. Funding Awards by Fiscal Year

	MIDC Funding	Local Share	Total Costs Approved	Total Funding Used
FY 2019	$86,990,991.42	$37,694,585.10[1]	$124,685,576.52	$79,264,606.41[2]
FY 2020	$119,175,098.56	$38,523,883.90	$157,698,982.46	$100,465,529.28[3]
FY 2021	$129,089,696.93	$38,523,865.93	$167,613,562.86	$124,154,258.01
FY 2022	$138,348,406.27	$38,146,920.09	$176,495,326.36	$145,262,514.40
FY 2023	$173,928,393.06	$38,825,422.67	$212,753,815.73	$172,389,946.28
FY 2024	$281,237,724.24	$38,825,422.67	$320,063,146.91	$209,980,777.32
FY 2025	$295,282,167.22	$38,825,422.67	$334,107,589.89	$249,511,882.98
FY 2026[4]	$254,796,001.50	$38,712,338.93	$293,508,340.43	ongoing
FY 2027[5]	$246,457,410.39	$38,433,214.89	$284,890,625.28	Contracts pending

Funding for each system, each fiscal year, is posted on the MIDC's website at https://michiganidc.gov/grants/.

[1] The annual inflationary increase described in M.C.L. §780.983(i) is calculated from the FY2019 local share.
[2] No contract was executed with the City of Detroit, funds were not disbursed.
[3] The City of Detroit did not expend their full local share.
[4] Revised June 10, 2026 to add $2,934,215.57 across 16 funding units.
[5] As of June 10, 2026 reflecting approved plans and portions of approved costs. Does not include City of Eastpointe (disapproved June 10, 2026).

II. FY25 Compliance Plans and Costs

A. Final Reporting

The fourth quarter of reporting from systems for FY25 (covering July 1, 2025 through September 30, 2025) was due by October 31, 2025. 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 M.C.L. §780.993(15)[6]

Multiple resources are available on the grants page of the Commission's website including 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* is posted to our Grants webpage and serves as a resource as well.

All reporting was finalized as of September 1, 2026.

[6] 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, M.C.L. §780.993(15).

III. FY26 Compliance Planning

A. Status Overview and Funding Distribution

As of the MIDC's October 21, 2025 meeting, all 120 compliance plans and cost analyses were approved, and communication regarding that status was sent through our grant management system.

Beginning in FY26, payments were reduced by the amount of unexpended funds from the prior fiscal year's grant balance (plus interest) across all payments scheduled.

To date, $154,457,243.45 has been distributed to all systems eligible for payment in FY2026. Quarterly reporting continues to be analyzed. The final reporting is due October 31, 2026.

B. Notice of Noncompliance Issued (across fiscal years)

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:

- Alcona County - continued failure to submit time tracking by case type as supporting documentation for quarterly attorney lists, as required by Standard 8 and the Grant Manual issued August 14, 2026.
- City of Eastpointe – failure to submit FY26 Q3 FSR issued September 2, 2026.

C. Noncompliance resolved

- Ontonagon County - failure to submit the FY25 Unexpended Balance Report, resolved August 10, 2026.

- City of Eastpointe – failure to submit FY26 Q1 and Q2 FSRs, resolved August 28, 2026.
- City of Inkster – failure to submit the FY25 Unexpended Balance Report, resolved September 3, 2026.

D. 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. 42-43 (February 2026):

- Bay County
- Charlevoix County
- Charter Township of Waterford
- Cheboygan County
- City of Roseville
- City of Southgate
- Clinton Township
- Dickinson County
- Eaton County
- Emmet County
- Gogebic County
- Ingham County
- Jackson County
- Kalamazoo County
- Kalkaska County
- Kent County
- Macomb County
- Marquette County
- Monroe County
- Muskegon County
- Ogemaw County
- Ontonagon County

- Osceola County
- Otsego County
- Ottawa County
- Van Buren County
- Wexford County

The following requests for budget adjustments were denied:

- Clare County – requesting an increase to corrections staff, denied at this time for insufficient detail related to MIDC standards.

E. FY26 Plan Change (information item)

1. Eaton County

Eaton County requested a budget adjustment to establish a contract-based Executive Leadership Team, in lieu of in-house Public Defender leadership. The ELT will be accountable to the County and will be responsible for oversight and administration of the PD Office. The ELT will consist of three attorneys who will provide executive leadership, operational oversight, attorney supervision, and are responsible for ensuring MIDC compliance and quarterly reporting. The Public Defender Office will continue to have a fully operational office with full-time salaried attorneys, support staff, and investigators, as contained in the FY26 budget and compliance plan. Should the County choose to hire a Chief/Deputy Public Defender or other supervisory personnel in the future, the ELT would be phased out over a 90-day period, to ensure an orderly transition to their new leadership model. The ELT's contracted services are estimated for 30 hours/week at $160/hour.

Changes are reflected in Eaton County's FY27 resubmission.

III. FY27 Compliance Planning (action items)

A. Overview

All funding units are annually required to submit a plan for compliance with all approved MIDC Standards pursuant M.C.L. §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 used the MIDC's Grant Management System (EGrAMS) to submit compliance plans. Multiple live webinars were offered in March 2026 and a detailed, self-guided tutorial was prepared for funding units and distributed via listserv along with resources and materials for planning.

All initial plans were received no later than the due date of March 27, 2026 by 11:59 p.m. At the MIDC's June 10, 2026 meeting, the Commission fully approved 24 plans, and approved the plans and *a portion of the cost analyses* for 93 systems. The City of Eastpointe's plan and cost analysis was fully disapproved.

The systems that had funding disapproved, or only a portion of the funding approved, received official mailings regarding the MIDC's action via U.S. Mail on July 1, 2026. The mailing explained that the Commission will be prepared to issue a contract at the beginning of the fiscal year reflecting the approved plan and costs consistent with the Commission's action at their June 10, 2026 meeting.

Because some portions of the cost analysis were disapproved, funding units were entitled to resubmit those disapproved costs within 60 days from the mailing pursuant to M.C.L. §780.993(4). The deadline for the resubmission was Monday August 31, 2026 by 11:59 p.m. All funding units have a designated point of contact and all were advised that they could make edits or simply accept the award from the Commission, but were still required to resubmit the plan and cost analysis through our grant management system by that deadline.

Three funding units with fully approved plans and costs have been identified by MIDC Staff as requiring more funding than initially awarded, but did not have the statutory opportunity to resubmit through EGrAMS.

Staff recommendations are as follows.

B. Revisions[7]

Staff recommends revisions to the approved cost analysis:

1. City of Grosse Pointe Park
   FY 26 approved funding: $22,783.67
   Spending through Q3: 99.88%
   FY 27 approved funding: $23,484.71
   FY27 recommended funding: $31,084.71

City of Grosse Pointe Park		Attorney Workloads (Last 4 Quarters) = 0.1 Std6 "FTE"				
		Docket Hours	Misd	LS Felonies	HS Felonies	Life Offenses
Delivery System	# Attorneys	222	0	0	0	0
MAC	0 PD / 4 Roster	Hourly Rates for Contract Attorneys in FY27				
		$134	$134	-	-	-

Wayne County municipality that is part of Regional Managed Assigned Counsel Office based in Dearborn. Revised recommended funding matches projected overspend in FY26 and FY 27 needs.

2. City of Royal Oak
   FY 26 approved funding: $931,976.00
   Spending through Q3: 94.25%
   FY 27 approved funding: $902,280.00
   FY27 recommended funding: $1,214,631.00

City of Royal Oak		Attorney Workloads (Last 4 Quarters) = 4.2 Std6 "FTE"				
		Docket Hours	Misd	LS Felonies	HS Felonies	Life Offenses
Delivery System	# Attorneys	3611	1235	0	0	0
MAC	0 PD / 45 Roster	Hourly Rates for Contract Attorneys in FY27				
^Measurement change		$132	$132	-	-	-

Third class district court in Oakland County requires additional funding for projected overspend in FY26 as well as projected need in FY27 (actual spending in FY25 was $978,409.27).

[7] The links in this section are to the original compliance plans submitted in March 2026.

3. Cities of Warren and Centerline
FY 26 approved funding: $1,270,982.47
Spending through Q3: 96.04%
FY 27 approved funding: $1,333,499.77
FY27 recommended funding: $1,993,499.77

City of Warren		Attorney Workloads (Last 4 Quarters) = 10.1 Std6 "FTE"				
		Docket Hours	Misd	LS Felonies	HS Felonies	Life Offenses
Delivery System	# Attorneys	3033	3990	0	0	0
MAC	0 PD / 59 Roster	Hourly Rates for Contract Attorneys in FY27				
		$135	$135	-	-	-

Third class district court in Macomb County requires additional funding for projected overspend in FY26 as well as projected need in FY27 (actual spending in FY25 was $1,590,667.63).

C. Resubmissions

Staff recommends disapproval of the compliance plan and cost analysis:

1. City of Eastpointe
FY 26 approved funding: $816,971.00
Spending through Q2: 50%
Spending through Q3: *unknown*

Consistent with the MIDC's prior action for non-submissions, it is staff's recommendation to treat the failure to resubmit as a "disapproval" of the plan and cost analysis for purposes of opening the final submission opportunity within 60 calendar days of the mailing date of the official notification of the MIDC's disapproval, pursuant to M.C.L. 780.993(4).

For the balance of the submissions, all compliance plans are recommended for approval. Every plan includes:

- Standard 1 – annual training for attorneys relevant to the practice of criminal defense, and skills training for new attorneys;
- Standard 2 – descriptions of meeting spaces for attorneys to meet confidentially with their clients in the jails and courthouses, and a process to verify that counsel has met with their clients within three business days of assignment;
- Standard 3 – a process to request expert or investigative resources that is independent from the court system;
- Standard 4 - counsel's presence at arraignment and all critical stages of the proceedings;
- Standard 5 – an assignment, payment, and review process for counsel that operates independently from the judiciary;
- Standard 6 – manageable caseloads[8] and a process to alert attorneys when limits are approaching;
- Standard 7 – assessment of an attorneys qualifications that match the complexity of the cases they are assigned, and review of attorney performance at regular intervals;
- Standard 8 – appropriate compensation for attorneys including minimum hourly rates[9] for contracted time, along with payment schedules that allow for assessment of compliance;
- A plan to screen adults charged with criminal offenses for eligibility to have counsel appointed and/or access resources for experts and investigative assistance;
- A clear description for attorneys to resolve disputes regarding billing, access to resources, and assignment and qualification levels, with review partners listed and a timeframe for resolution.

[8] Most of the funding units are actively participating in the MIDC's pilot project to monitor attorney caseload assignments.
[9] Minimum hourly rates for attorneys approved by the MIDC:

	Misdemeanors	Felonies	Life Offenses
FY 2027 (eff 10-1-26)	$131.68	$144.85	$157.98

Staff recommends approval of the resubmitted plan and cost analysis (no substantive changes and no increased costs from MIDC approved version June 2026):

The following funding units accepted the MIDC's award as reflected in the action items on June 10, 2026. Some adjustments between cost categories were made on resubmission for allowable expenses, identified by track changes in the linked plans. Staff will continue to monitor spending and local system needs throughout the upcoming fiscal year.

For additional information about these systems, the MIDC's June meeting materials included regional highlights and caseload details for all delivery models across Michigan.

	FY26 Total System Costs (Revised June 2026)	FY26 Q3 Spending	FY27 APPROVED Costs (June 10, 2026)
LOMSC Region			
2. City of Birmingham	$542,872.91	72%	$515,729.26
3. City of Farmington	$705,000.00	70%	$669,750.00
4. City of Ferndale	$520,960.65	74%	$494,912.62
5. City of Oak Park	$710,000.00	57%	$579,816.00
6. City of St Clair Shores	$421,398.73	80%	$470,830.59
7. Clinton Township	$645,220.00	68%	$645,220.00
8. Lapeer County	$1,240,580.00	82%	$1,383,193.25
Mid MI Region	FY26 Total System Costs (Revised June 2026)	FY26 Q3 Spending	FY27 APPROVED Costs (June 10, 2026)
9. Alcona County	$252,658.62	48%	$214,759.83
10. Bay County	$2,683,777.33	75%	$2,817,966.20

11. Clare and Gladwin Counties	$1,865,083.18	68%	$1,609,351.41
12. Huron County	$1,024,861.00	67%	$973,617.95
13. Iosco County	$775,964.88	71%	$703,519.42
14. Isabella County	$1,952,934.94	64%	$1,855,288.19
15. Mason County	$1,063,519.80	71%	$1,125,839.26
16. Mecosta County	$756,657.05	57%	$782,561.00
17. Montmorency County	$424,469.22	59%	$403,245.79
18. Newaygo County	$1,050,834.60	72%	$1,050,834.60
19. Ogemaw County	$941,315.00	61%	$839,607.00
20. Osceola County	$432,360.05	76%	$432,360.05
21. Oscoda County	$536,786.29	69%	$509,946.98
22. Saginaw County	$7,540,585.34	66%	$7,540,585.34
23. Sanilac County	$715,690.62	49%	$794,201.58
24. Tuscola County	$2,129,768.24	57%	$1,916,791.42
Northern MI Region	FY26 Total System Costs (Revised June 2026)	FY26 Q3 Spending	FY27 APPROVED Costs (June 10, 2026)
25. Chippewa County	$962,538.61	57%	$818,157.82
26. Crawford County	$504,442.27	72%	$504,442.27
27. Emmet County	$636,950.20	72%	$636,950.20
28. Grand Traverse County	$2,654,340.00	75%	$2,654,340.00
29. Houghton, Baraga and Keweenaw Counties	$1,157,852.70	60%	$1,217,536.28
30. Kalkaska County	$799,758.89	59%	$754,386.52
31. Leelanau County	$421,123.76	48%	$379,011.38
32. Luce County	$330,795.50	Not submitted	$330,795.50
33. Mackinac County	$492,251.00	Not submitted	$492,251.00

34. Manistee County	$1,345,985.52	Not submitted	$1,278,686.24
35. Menominee County	$466,624.68	69%	$443,293.45
36. Presque Isle County	$242,122.36	57%	$230,016.24
37. Schoolcraft County	$230,659.00	49%	$230,659.00
38. Wexford and Missaukee Counties	$2,248,517.03	71%	$2,023,665.33
S. Central Region	FY26 Total System Costs (Revised June 2026)	FY26 Q3 Spending	FY27 APPROVED Costs (June 10, 2026)
39. Clinton County	$2,018,518.95	76%	$2,313,995.49
40. Genesee County	$10,795,968.27	64%	$10,256,169.86
41. Gratiot County	$1,520,990.23	54%	$1,322,806.84
42. Ingham County	$11,834,302.88	61%	$11,242,587.74
43. Jackson County	$4,917,602.97	77%	$5,137,602.97
44. Lenawee County	$2,547,847.13	66%	$2,547,847.13
45. Livingston County	$3,336,010.62	65%	$3,169,210.09
46. Monroe County	$2,863,547.67	60%	$2,577,192.90
47. Washtenaw County	$14,451,034.92	Not submitted	$13,005,931.43
Wayne Region	FY26 Total System Costs (Revised June 2026)	FY26 Q3 Spending	FY27 APPROVED Costs (June 10, 2026)
48. Canton Township	$386,020.96	76%	$423,939.06
49. City of Dearborn	$1,713,003.60	59%	$1,755,127.28
50. City of Dearborn Heights	$520,789.25	62%	$468,977.01
51. City of Detroit	$8,071,983.63	65%	$7,184,539.32

52. City of Grosse Pointe Farms	$66,560.00	50%	$68,608.00
53. City of Grosse Pointe Woods	$65,803.00	53%	$59,222.70
54. City of Hamtramck	$100,100.00	59%	$86,025.00
55. City of Highland Park	$123,254.93	54%	$114,378.71
56. City of Lincoln Park	$346,644.50	68%	$326,438.74
57. City of Livonia	$912,966.43	76%	$776,020.68
58. City of Romulus	$320,901.43	76%	$348,903.20
59. City of Taylor	$577,563.37	71%	$542,616.63
60. City of Wayne	$223,497.18	67%	$212,599.88
61. City of Westland	$690,295.00	54%	$661,138.00
62. City of Wyandotte	$440,056.60	71%	$440,056.60
63. Grosse Ile/Flat Rock	$459,040.00	65%	$459,040.00
64. Township of Redford	$597,860.00	60%	$561,091.00
65. Wayne County	$34,525,428.17	70%	$32,799,156.76
W. Mich Region	FY26 Total System Costs (Revised June 2026)	FY26 Q3 Spending	FY27 APPROVED Costs (June 10, 2026)
66. Allegan County	$4,139,222.68	67%	$3,932,261.45
67. Barry County	$1,356,911.28	74%	$1,492,602.41
68. Berrien County	$6,018,895.86	70%	$6,218,895.86
69. Branch County	$1,801,615.91	60%	$1,711,535.11
70. Calhoun County	$8,465,130.84	67%	$8,465,130.84
71. City of Grand Rapids	$5,170,455.25	70%	$4,934,561.85
72. Ionia County	$1,097,031.57	57%	$1,063,329.10
73. Kalamazoo County	$11,435,666.67	78%	$14,866,366.67
74. Kent County	$17,623,715.02	71%	$16,742,529.27

75. Montcalm County	$1,425,982.59	57%	$1,425,982.59
76. St. Joseph County	$1,214,804.97	67%	$1,214,804.97
77. Van Buren County	$3,143,162.99	63%	$2,986,004.84
	FY26	Average spending through Q3	FY27
Totals	$208,747,447.29	62%	$204,239,346.95

Staff recommends approval of the resubmitted plan and cost analysis (reduced funding request and/or system change):

78. City of Southfield
FY 26 approved funding: $755,759.00
Spending through Q3: 83%
FY 27 approved funding: $850,000.00
FY27 revised requested funding: $829,408.00

City of Southfield		Attorney Workloads (Last 4 Quarters) = 2.5 Std6 "FTE"				
		Docket Hours	Misd	LS Felonies	HS Felonies	Life Offenses
Delivery System	# Attorneys	1230	705	0	0	0
MAC	0 PD / 42 Roster	Hourly Rates for Contract Attorneys in FY27				
		$132	$132	-	-	-

Based on projected spending trends, staff originally recommended a 20% increase (not +80% requested) from the FY26 line item for contracts for attorneys for the system's FY27 cost analysis. The funding request was reduced on resubmission due to a reduction of administration hours in the local contracting process.

79. Alger County
FY 26 approved funding: $598,317.57
Spending through Q2: 28%
Spending through Q3: unknown
FY 27 approved funding: $508,569.93
FY27 revised requested funding: $407,184.94

Alger County		Attorney Workloads (Last 4 Quarters) = 0.5 Std6 "FTE"				
		Docket Hours	Misd	LS Felonies	HS Felonies	Life Offenses
Delivery System	# Attorneys	257	47	12	11	11
PD	1 PD / 8 Roster	Hourly Rates for Contract Attorneys in FY27				
*Estimated		Case Rate	$132	$145	$158	$158

In the original submission, staff recommended a 15% reduction from the FY26 approved total for the system's FY27 cost analysis based on projected spending. On resubmission, the funding unit is moving from a county-based public defender office to a contracted managed assigned counsel system.

80. Eaton County
FY 26 approved funding: $2,962,116.81
Spending through Q3: 70%
FY 27 approved/requested funding: $2,962,116.81

Eaton County		Attorney Workloads (Last 4 Quarters) = 5.6 Std6 "FTE"				
		Docket Hours	Misd	LS Felonies	HS Felonies	Life Offenses
Delivery System	# Attorneys	912	1060	272	104	5
PD	9 PD / 11 Roster	Hourly Rates for Contract Attorneys in FY27				
*Estimated		$135	$135	$150	$150	$165

In the original submission, staff recommended maintaining the FY26 funding level in FY27, in light of significant recent leadership change and office reorganization. The resubmission reflects the shift to a contracted Executive Leadership Team.

Staff recommends approval of the resubmitted plan and cost analysis (increased funding request based on projected need):

81. Hillsdale County
FY 26 approved funding: $627,635.08
Spending through Q3: 86%
FY 27 approved funding: $758,397.52
FY27 revised requested funding: $900,247.52

Hillsdale County		Attorney Workloads (Last 4 Quarters) = 2.6 Std6 "FTE"				
		Docket Hours	Misd	LS Felonies	HS Felonies	Life Offenses
Delivery System	# Attorneys	347	199	160	95	22
MAC	0 PD / 6 Roster	Hourly Rates for Contract Attorneys in FY27				
		$135	$135	$155	$155	$200

In the initial submission, staff recommended limiting the FY27 requested line item for funding contracts for attorneys to $600,000, and reducing the request for expert funding by $60,000 based on projected needs; the balance of the FY27 requested funding is recommended for approval. Upon review of updated quarterly spending, increased funding is now warranted based on projected spending needs.

82. Gogebic County
FY 26 approved funding: $486,336.36
Spending through Q3: 82%
FY 27 approved funding: $519,043.36
FY27 revised requested funding: $548,536.36

Gogebic County		Attorney Workloads (Last 4 Quarters) = 1.1 Std6 "FTE"				
		Docket Hours	Misd	LS Felonies	HS Felonies	Life Offenses
Delivery System	# Attorneys	144	123	59	48	4
MAC	0 PD / 8 Roster	Hourly Rates for Contract Attorneys in FY27				
		$135	$135	$150	$150	$160

In the initial submission, based on projected spending trends, staff recommended a 10% increase from the FY26 line item for contracts for attorneys for the system's FY27 cost analysis. Upon review of updated quarterly spending, increased funding is now warranted based on projected spending needs.

83. Ontonagon County
FY 26 approved funding: $153,554.53
Spending through Q3: 96%
FY 27 approved funding: $166,181.43
FY27 revised requested funding: $214,928.93

Ontonagon County		Attorney Workloads (Last 4 Quarters) = 0.3 Std6 "FTE"				
		Docket Hours	Misd	LS Felonies	HS Felonies	Life Offenses
Delivery System	# Attorneys	95	34	6	19	0
MAC	0 PD / 2 Roster	Hourly Rates for Contract Attorneys in FY27				
		$135	$135	$150	$150	$160

In the initial submission, based on projected spending trends, staff recommended a 10% increase from the FY26 line item for contracts for attorneys for the system's FY27 cost analysis. Upon review of updated quarterly spending, increased funding is now warranted based on projected spending needs.

84. Muskegon County
FY 26 approved funding: $8,209,846.47
Spending through Q3: 65%
FY 27 approve funding: $7,799,354.15
FY27 revised requested funding: $7,929,185.15

Muskegon County		Attorney Workloads (Last 4 Quarters) = 22 Std6 "FTE"				
		Docket Hours	**Misd**	**LS Felonies**	**HS Felonies**	**Life Offenses**
Delivery System	**# Attorneys**	4444	3871	1042	327	281
PD	24 PD / 14 Roster	Hourly Rates for Contract Attorneys in FY27				
		$135	$135	$160	$160	$160

In the initial submission, staff recommended a 5% reduction from the FY26 approved total for FY27. Resubmission reflects general acceptance of the award with the addition of in-state leadership training (+$2,400) and a public defender fellowship position (+$127,431).

Staff recommends approval of the plan and a portion of the resubmitted cost analysis:

Based on projected funding needs:

85. City of Hazel Park
FY 26 approved funding: $785,942.83
Spending through Q3: 70%
FY 27 approved funding: $746,645.69
FY27 revised requested funding: $774,231.52

City of Hazel Park		Attorney Workloads (Last 4 Quarters) = 2.2 Std6 "FTE"				
		Docket Hours	Misd	LS Felonies	HS Felonies	Life Offenses
Delivery System	**# Attorneys**	2953	299	0	0	0
MAC	0 PD / 31 Roster	Hourly Rates for Contract Attorneys in FY27				
^Measurement change		$132	$132	-	-	-

In the initial submission, staff recommended a 5% reduction from the FY26 approved total for the system's FY27 cost analysis.

Upon review of the resubmission and updated quarterly reporting, staff recommends maintaining the original FY27 award.

86. Macomb County
FY 26 approved funding: $13,974,219.77
Spending through Q3: 75%
FY 27 approved funding: $14,672,930.76
FY27 revised requested funding: $15,208,765.76

Macomb County		Attorney Workloads (Last 4 Quarters) = 46.5 Std6 "FTE"				
		Docket Hours	Misd	LS Felonies	HS Felonies	Life Offenses
Delivery System	**# Attorneys**	2594	1188	4652	1250	212
PD-Hybrid	18 PD / 148 Roster	Hourly Rates for Contract Attorneys in FY27				
		$135/150	$135	$150	$160	$160/215

In the initial submission, staff recommended a +5% increase (not +13% requested) to the FY26 total system costs for the system's FY27 cost analysis; staff further recommended moving the “cost allocation plan” line item to the indirect costs category to capture usage in quarterly reporting for the actual expenditures on personnel and fringe benefits during the fiscal year.

Upon review of the resubmission and updated quarterly reporting, staff recommends maintaining the original FY27 award.

87. Oakland County
FY 26 approved funding: $19,805,047.28
Spending through Q3: 68%
FY 27 approved funding: $17,824,542.55
FY27 revised requested funding: $19,513,618.53

Oakland County		Attorney Workloads (Last 4 Quarters) = 46 Std6 "FTE"				
		Docket Hours	Misd	LS Felonies	HS Felonies	Life Offenses
Delivery System	# Attorneys	20308	778	3859	663	156
PD-Hybrid	13 PD / 194 Roster	Hourly Rates for Contract Attorneys in FY27				
		$135	$135	$150	$160	$160/215

In the initial submission, staff recommended a 10% reduction from the FY26 approved total for the system’s FY27 cost analysis, factoring that the funding unit earned $377,722.38 in interest on indigent defense funds deposited in their account in FY2025. Staff further recommended moving the “cost allocation plan” line item to the indirect costs category to capture usage in quarterly reporting for the actual expenditures on personnel and fringe benefits during the fiscal year; line item request for voucher system support should be deleted as duplicative of indirect costs.

Upon review of the resubmission and updated quarterly reporting, staff recommends maintaining the original FY27 award.

88. St. Clair County
FY 26 approved funding: $4,285,651.64
Spending through Q3: 64%
FY 27 approved funding: $4,194,345.19
FY27 revised requested funding: $4,448,777.02

St. Clair County		Attorney Workloads (Last 4 Quarters) = 11.7 Std6 "FTE"				
		Docket Hours	Misd	LS Felonies	HS Felonies	Life Offenses
Delivery System	# Attorneys	2186	1601	464	333	219
PD	16 PD / 12 Roster	Hourly Rates for Contract Attorneys in FY27				
		$132	$132	$145	$145	$158

In staff's initial analysis of the plan and costs, it was believed that funding should be relatively neutral for this system from FY26 to FY27; line item for experts for youth resentencing should be deleted, along with line item for "wellbeing" training. Staff further recommended moving the "cost allocation plan" line item to the indirect costs category to capture usage in quarterly reporting for the actual expenditures on personnel and fringe benefits during the fiscal year.

Upon review of the resubmission and updated quarterly reporting, staff recommends maintaining the original FY27 award.

89. Ottawa County
FY 26 approved funding: $7,392,309.10
Spending through Q3: 55%
FY 27 approved funding: $5,913,847.28
FY27 revised requested funding: $6,879,300.02

Ottawa County		Attorney Workloads (Last 4 Quarters) = 12.9 Std6 "FTE"				
		Docket Hours	Misd	LS Felonies	HS Felonies	Life Offenses
Delivery System	# Attorneys	3170	2246	525	261	117
PD	18 PD / 16 Roster	Hourly Rates for Contract Attorneys in FY27				
		$145	$145	$160	$160	$175

In the initial submission, staff recommended a 20% reduction from the FY26 approved total for FY27. Staff further recommended moving the "cost allocation plan" line item to the indirect costs category to capture usage in quarterly reporting for the actual expenditures on personnel and fringe benefits during the fiscal year; line item request for the rent, insurances, and county phones should be deleted as duplicative of indirect costs; staff further recommends deleting funding for the aggregate wage impact of the salary study under review locally.

Upon review of the resubmission and updated quarterly reporting, staff recommends maintaining the original FY27 award.

Communication from Ottawa County with their resubmission.

90. Marquette County
FY 26 approved funding: $3,240,863.62
Spending through Q3: 60%
FY 27 approved funding: $2,916,777.26
FY27 revised requested funding: $2,935,728.86

Marquette County		Attorney Workloads (Last 4 Quarters) = 5.3 Std6 "FTE"				
		Docket Hours	**Misd**	**LS Felonies**	**HS Felonies**	**Life Offenses**
Delivery System	**# Attorneys**	437	680	208	327	11
PD	7 PD / 15 Roster	Hourly Rates for Contract Attorneys in FY27				
		$145	$135	$145	$145	$160

In the initial submission, staff recommended a 10% reduction from the FY26 approved total for the system's FY27 cost analysis. Staff further recommended moving the "cost allocation plan" line item to the indirect costs category to capture usage in quarterly reporting for the actual expenditures on personnel and fringe benefits during the fiscal year; line items for duplicative website development, generic recruitment, wellness, and office décor should be deleted from training and supplies categories.

Upon review of the resubmission and updated quarterly reporting, staff recommends maintaining the original FY27 award.

Based on inclusion of a cost allocation plan exceeding 54± of personnel and fringe benefits:

91. Shiawassee County
FY 26 approved funding: $1,613,998.81
Spending through Q3: 50%
FY 27 approved funding: $1,291,199.05
FY27 revised requested funding: $1,436,480.09

Shiawassee County		Attorney Workloads (Last 4 Quarters) = 4.7 Std6 "FTE"				
		Docket Hours	**Misd**	**LS Felonies**	**HS Felonies**	**Life Offenses**
Delivery System	**# Attorneys**	198	843	267	96	4
PD	4 PD / 5 Roster	Hourly Rates for Contract Attorneys in FY27				
		$145	$145	$165	$165	$165/200

In the initial request, based on projected spending, staff recommended a 20% reduction from the FY26 approved total for FY27; staff further recommended moving the “cost allocation plan” line item to the indirect costs category to capture usage in quarterly reporting for the actual expenditures on personnel and fringe benefits during the fiscal year.

Staff recommends maintaining the original award. The cost allocation plan should be deleted from resubmission, a separate line for indirect costs using the 10% personnel and fringes line is included and should remain. Additional funding for fringe benefits is not warranted based on projected spending and can be facilitated through a line item transfer as necessary.

92. Lake County
FY 26 approved funding: $445,967.98
Spending through Q3: 83%
FY 27 approved funding: $463,129.42
FY27 revised requested funding: $483,433.82

Lake County		Attorney Workloads (Last 4 Quarters) = 1.3 Std6 "FTE"				
		Docket Hours	Misd	LS Felonies	HS Felonies	Life Offenses
Delivery System	# Attorneys	189	204	76	16	27
MAC	0 PD / 6 Roster	Hourly Rates for Contract Attorneys in FY27				
		$135	$135	$150	$150	$165

Part of 8-County regional MAC system. Staff initially recommended deleting the "cost allocation" request (funding already included as indirect costs in compliance plan) and approving the balance of the FY27 request.

Staff recommends maintaining the original award. The cost allocation plan should be deleted from resubmission, a separate line for indirect costs using the 10% personnel and fringes line is included and should remain. Additional hours for clerk is not warranted based on submission at this time.

93. Oceana County
FY 26 approved funding: $780,160.70
Spending through Q3: 69%
FY 27 approved funding: $741,152.67
FY27 revised requested funding: $774,824.67

Oceana County		Attorney Workloads (Last 4 Quarters) = 2.8 Std6 "FTE"				
		Docket Hours	Misd	LS Felonies	HS Felonies	Life Offenses
Delivery System	# Attorneys	389	591	171	45	3
MAC	0 PD / 9 Roster	Hourly Rates for Contract Attorneys in FY27				
		$135	$135	$150	$150	$165

Part of 8-County regional MAC system. For the initial submission, staff recommended a 5% reduction from the FY26 approved total for FY27; staff further recommended deleting the "cost allocation" request (funding already included as indirect costs in compliance plan) and approving the balance of the FY27 request.

Staff recommends maintaining the original award. The cost allocation plan should be deleted, a separate line for indirect costs using the 10% personnel and fringes line is included and should remain.

94. Cheboygan County
FY 26 approved funding: $976,917.56
Spending through Q3: 78%
FY 27 approved funding: $976,917.56
FY27 revised requested funding: $992,857.56

Cheboygan County		Attorney Workloads (Last 4 Quarters) = 2.5 Std6 "FTE"				
		Docket Hours	Misd	LS Felonies	HS Felonies	Life Offenses
Delivery System	# Attorneys	361	415	96	72	31
MAC	1 PD / 20 Roster	Hourly Rates for Contract Attorneys in FY27				
		$132	$132	$145	$145	$158

In the initial request, staff recommended the FY26 funding level should be maintained in FY27. Staff further recommended moving the "cost allocation plan" line item to the indirect costs category to capture usage in quarterly reporting for the actual expenditures on personnel and fringe benefits during the fiscal year.

On resubmission, staff recommends maintaining the original award. The cost allocation plan should be deleted, a separate line for indirect costs using the 10% personnel and fringes line should be restored.

Correspondence from funding unit regarding cost allocation plan.

Cost allocation plan for Cheboygan County.