MONROE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 17, 2026

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Monroe County Board of Commissioners held a Regular Meeting in the City of Monroe, on Tuesday, February 17, 2026. Chairman David Vensel called the meeting to order at 6:00p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Roll call by Deputy Clerk, Grace Miles, as follows:

PRESENT			ABSENT
Jay Heinzerling	Brian Lamour	J. Henry Lievens	
David Hoffman	David Vensel	David Swartout	
Greg Moore, Jr.	Dawn Asper		

A quorum being present, the Board proceeded to conduct business.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Hoffman led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. OPENING PRAYER

Deputy Clerk, Grace Miles led the Opening Prayer.

V. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion by Vice-Chairman Lamour, supported by Commissioner Lievens to approve the February 17, 2026 Regular Meeting Agenda as presented.

Roll call by Clerk as follows:

AYE			NAY	EXCUSED	ABSTAIN
David Hoffman	Greg Moore, Jr.	J. Henry Lievens			
Dawn Asper	Brian Lamour	David Swartout			
David Vensel	Jay Heinzerling				

Motion carried.

VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (02/03/2026 Regular Meeting Minutes)

Motion by Commissioner Swartout, supported by Commissioner Hoffman to approve the minutes as presented for the February 3, 2026 Regular Meeting and waive the reading thereof.

Roll call by Clerk as follows:

AYE			NAY	EXCUSED	ABSTAIN
David Hoffman	Greg Moore, Jr.	Brian Lamour			
J. Henry Lievens	David Swartout	Dawn Asper			
David Vensel	Jay Heinzerling				

Motion carried.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT—

1. Lamar Frederick: Addressed the first closed session and shared his concerns with how often the Board has gone into closed session. Recognized legal counsel for their work and reports and asked for the first closed session to be conducted in open session.

2. Darcy Piedmonte: Shared her concerns with a settlement and explained Mark Brant's personal circumstance has interfered with the County for two years (quoted resignation) and Aundrea Armstrong is the only person who paid the price. Shared that only 9% voted for Bant in the last election and requested the Board returns to court.

3. Helen Kourous Harrigan: Explained a quo warranto action should have been filed. Asked for an explanation of any settlements and asked the Board to complete the proper legal actions to close the matter. Urged the board to adopt updated ethics guidelines and policies for Commissioners and requested the quo warranto action be filed.

4. Gail Keane: Quoted the mission statement and stated the County is spending too much time on District two (2). Shared her concerns with a settlement and stated the closed session is needed. Explained the board has done a good job and it is sad that the legalities of the election are being questioned. Stated district two (2) has the job to take care of the problem by recalling a person.

VIII. CLOSED SESSIONS

1. Closed Session to consult with County Legal Counsel regarding trial/settlement strategy in connection with specific pending litigation captioned: Monroe County and Monroe County Board of Commissioners vs. Mark Brant, Monroe County Circuit Court Case No. 25-149222-CZ, and Mark Brant vs. Monroe County Board of Commissioners, Monroe County Circuit Court Case No. 25-149230-CZ, pursuant to Section 8 (1)(e) of the Open Meetings Act (MCL15.268 (1)(e)).

   Motion by Commissioner Moore, supported by Commissioner Asper to stay in open session to consult with County Legal Counsel regarding trial/settlement strategy in connection with specific pending litigation captioned: Monroe County and Monroe County Board of Commissioners vs. Mark Brant, Monroe County Circuit Court Case No. 25-149222-CZ, and Mark Brant vs. Monroe County Board of Commissioners, Monroe County Circuit Court Case No. 25-149230-CZ.

   Commissioner Moore explained that the Board is permitted to go into closed session but not required. Stated this Board promised transparency to the people and thinks it would be best to discuss this publicly. Commissioner Moore also argued against the Opens Meetings Act (MCL 12.268 (1)(e)) and explained there is no detrimental financial effect which means the Board can't go into closed session.

   Commissioner Lievens asked if legal counsel would advise the Board on the merits of whether the Board should or shouldn't go into closed session as well as if the Board can.

   Phil Goldsmith, Legal Counsel, stated the Board can go into closed session. Explained this closed session is to discuss trial strategy and since the opponent of this lawsuit is in the room, discussing strategy in open session would be inappropriate. Further explained the financial stake at interest is an unresolved issue regarding Mark Brant being compensated while imprisoned. Stated there is always a financial interest for each side of a dispute to consider as well and that is the payment of additional attorney fees. Mr.

Goldsmith explained the verbiage of this closed session came directly from the Open Meetings Act that comes from the statute to discuss trial or settlement strategy. Mr. Goldsmith stated his recommendation is the Board has a right to go into closed session and that the Board should go into closed session to discuss these matters.

Commissioner Asper stated based on the comments made at the podium, it is clear that the public is unaware of everything that has gone on from the beginning as well as what the law is in regard to County Commissioners. Stated when the Board goes into closed session, they come out with a vote that some of the members are against but it is represented like the Board is all together. Explained the original injunction was filed by the County not by Mark Brant. Further explained she does not think the Board has been guided in a good way over the last year and a half. Stated what the Board was trying to say from the beginning was not followed and now the County is back at square one. Stated districts other than district two (2) have been hurt by this.

Chairman Vensel clarified the vote is not a "we" or "they" vote when the board comes out of closed session. Stated this is a nine (9) member board that collectively makes decisions. Explained when a board comes out of closed session, it is the collective decisions of entire board and the entire board takes responsibility and owns that vote.

Commissioner Asper stated there is usually a meeting before and after each agenda meeting that doesn't include some members.

Chairman Vensel explained the other night was because the Board leadership (Chairman and Vice-Chairman) sought advice from legal counsel on how to move forward on some of these closed session matters.

Commissioner Asper stated that should have been discussed at the agenda meeting.

Chairman Vensel agreed to disagree.

Roll call by Clerk as follows:

AYE		NAY		EXCUSED	ABSTAIN
Greg Moore, Jr.		J. Henry Lievens	David Hoffman		
Dawn Asper		Greg Moore, Jr.	Jay Heinzerling		
David Swartout		Brian Lamour	David Vensel		

Motion did not carry.

Motion by Vice-Chairman Lamour, supported by Commissioner Hoffman to go into closed session to consult with County Legal Counsel regarding trial/settlement strategy in connection with specific pending litigation captioned: Monroe County and Monroe County Board of Commissioners vs. Mark Brant, Monroe County Circuit Court Case No. 25-149222-CZ, and Mark Brant vs. Monroe County Board of Commissioners, Monroe County Circuit Court Case No. 25-149230-CZ, pursuant to Section 8 (1)(e) of the Open Meetings Act (MCL15.268 (1)(e)).

Roll Call by Clerk as follows:

AYE			NAY	EXCUSED	ABSTAIN
David Hoffman	Jay Heinzerling		David Swartout		
J. Henry Lievens	Brian Lamour		Greg Moore, Jr.		
David Vensel			Dawn Asper		

Motion did not carry. The Board temporarily moved to the next agenda item.

2. Closed Session to discuss confidential attorney client communication pursuant to MCL 15.268(1)(h) regarding the Forensic Audit.

   Motion by Commissioner Lievens, supported by Vice-Chairman Lamour to go into Closed Session to discuss the confidential attorney client communication pursuant to MCL 15.268 (1)(h) regarding the Forensic Audit.

   Roll call by Clerk as follows:

AYE			NAY	EXCUSED	ABSTAIN
David Hoffman	Jay Heinzerling		David Swartout		
J. Henry Lievens	Brian Lamour		Greg Moore, Jr.		
David Vensel			Dawn Asper		

Motion did not carry. The Board temporarily moved to the next agenda item.

3. Closed Session to discuss collective bargaining negotiations pursuant to MCL 15.268(1)(c).

   Motion by Vice-Chairman Lamour, supported by Commissioner Lievens to go into Closed Session to discuss collective bargaining negotiations pursuant to MCL 15.268 (1)(c).

   Roll call by Clerk as follows:

AYE			NAY	EXCUSED	ABSTAIN
David Hoffman	J. Henry Lievens		Greg Moore, Jr.		
David Swartout	Brian Lamour		Dawn Asper		
David Vensel	Jay Heinzerling				

Motion carried. The Board moved into closed session.

Motion by Vice-Chairman Lamour, supported by Commissioner Swartout to go back into open session.

Roll call by Clerk as follows:

AYE			NAY	EXCUSED	ABSTAIN
David Hoffman	Greg Moore, Jr.	J. Henry Lievens			
Dawn Asper	Brian Lamour	David Swartout			
David Vensel	Jay Heinzerling				

Motion carried.

Commissioner Greg asked for a motion regarding what was discussed in closed session.

Motion by Chairman Vensel, supported by Vice-Chairman Lamour to move on the recommendations made in closed session to Human Resources Director, Jeff McBee, and Labor Counsel.

Roll call by Clerk as follows:

AYE			NAY	EXCUSED	ABSTAIN
David Hoffman	J. Henry Lievens		Greg Moore, Jr.		
David Swartout	Brian Lamour		Dawn Asper		
David Vensel	Jay Heinzerling				

Motion carried.

Commissioner Lievens explained anything discussed in closed session would have to come back to the Board for a final vote. Further explained the agenda item is to discuss negotiations not to discuss a final outcome.

Chairman Vensel turned it over to Mr. Goldsmith to discuss trial/settlement strategy in connection with specific pending litigation captioned: Monroe County and Monroe County Board of Commissioners vs. Mark Brant, Monroe County Circuit Court Case No. 25-149222-CZ, and Mark Brant vs. Monroe County Board of Commissioners, Monroe County Circuit Court Case No. 25-149230-CZ.

Mr. Goldsmith addressed the Michigan Court of Appeals decision that was recently released. Explained the singular issue that the County presented first to the Trial Court, and then to the Court of Appeals, is based on MCL 46.411. Stated the County asked for declaratory judgement, which was the proper way to go about this. Explained the County asked the County Legal Counsel (himself) whether or not, as on January 1, 2025, Mark Brant was a qualified elector and thus a registered voter. Mr. Goldsmith further explained that Mr. Brant had not taken office at the time because he was incarcerated in a federal prison in West Virginia. The statue states a candidate for the office of county commissioner must be a resident and registered voter of the district that he or she seeks to represent and must remain a resident and registered voter to hold his or her office, if elected. Stated this is the argument we've put forth to the Trial Court and to the Court of Appeals. Explained this information if from two sections of the Michigan Constitution of 1963, and the various statues are from Michigan Election Law. With respect to quo warranto, the court finds fault that neither party pled this as a quo warranto action. Mr. Goldsmith explained the requirements of a quo warranto action and elaborated on what that could look like. Stated he stands by the way this case was presented.

Mr. Goldsmith explained all arguments made to the Trial Court and to the Court of Appeals are arguments that still apply. The Court of Appeals wants us to make an application to the Attorney General. Mr. Goldsmith reiterated Judge Honkeys ruling as well as the Court of Appeals decision. Stated this Board did not remove Mr. Brant. Explained the legal theory is since Mr. Brant could not take office on January 1, 2025, the office was vacated automatically by operation of law pursuant to MCL 46.411.

Mr. Goldsmith stated if this board chooses to move forward, he would need authorization to make an application to the Attorney General. Explained the Attorney General could take it up and issue an opinion, or they could decline and send it back. Explained this is a situation where settlement is not as simple since the original legal questions still needs to be resolved. Stated the legislature needs to take this incarceration issue up.

Commissioner Asper explained this goes back to when Mr. Brant resigned from his previous term and stated the felony in question happened prior to the election. Commissioner Asper reiterated the events that had taken place regarding this case. Stated she is discouraged that the Board did not do it the right way. Explained she believes the Board should have moved forward, according to the law, and not a theory.

Mr. Goldsmith explained the Board did move forward according to the law, MCL 46.411. Explained it is much more than a theory; it is coupled with the constitution and Michigan Election Law. Mr. Goldsmith clarified on January 1, 2025; Mr. Brant couldn't take office because he was in prison. A county commissioner can only do the business of a county commissioner at a meeting open to the public. This can't be done through a third party or through email. Mr. Goldsmith stated the important question again, was he or was he not a qualified elector on that date.

Commissioner Asper explained the law states the Board has to appoint someone within thirty (30) days and it did not. Regarding physical attendance at meetings, Commissioners do not have an attendance policy so she doesn't see how that applies.

Chairman Vensel inquired when Mr. Brant entered a guilty plea in March, was he legally obligated to let the Board know that he'd entered a guilty plea? Also, was he at that point ineligible to hold office and was he required to resign pursuant to that statute?

Mr. Goldsmith stated, by law, once Mr. Brant was fully adjudicated (sentenced), which came after that March date, then he was obligated to let the commission know and to resign.

Chairman Vensel asked during the period of time from March to when he plead guilty until the sentencing in September, was he legal to sit on this board and make decisions and vote on issues?

Mr. Goldsmith stated once sentenced, Mr. Brant should have resigned because the statue says the office is vacated due to the felony conviction. Mr. Goldsmith explained that these statutes are quite old and should be reviewed by the State legislature but they are still good law.

Chairman Vensel asked when Mr. Brant plead guilty in September, according to Commissioner Asper, the previous chair had an obligation to appoint. Is this correct?

Mr. Goldsmith explained it would have been the entire board, not just the Chairman, but the way the statute reads is if the board doesn't appoint someone within thirty (30) days, then there could be an election called. Further explained there was no point in having an election at that point, nor could the County call an election because the term of office ended December 31st.

Chairman Vensel clarified that not appointing someone was not breaking the law.

Mr. Goldsmith agreed. Explained the guidelines for recalling a commissioner.

Commissioner Moore quoted a section of the Court of Appeals ruling. Inquired if this is saying that both parties are to blame for not properly trying this in the right court? Asked what parties is it referring to?

Mr. Goldsmith stated when it talks about proper parties not being joined, they are talking about Mark Brant's claim when he asked the Court of Appeals to enjoin the County from going forward with the special election. They would have had to add parties (Monroe County Clerk) in order to do that. Further explained the parties, County of Monroe, and Mark Brant, should have added a count to their respective complaints under quo warranto.

Commissioner Moore asked if Mr. Goldsmith's legal opinion was that Mr. Brant wasn't a qualified elector, why was his office sending board recommendations to his prison email?

Mr. Goldsmith states his legal opinion was written and provided prior to that.

Commissioner Moore asked if Mr. Goldsmith's office, before the legal opinion, had the natural assumption that Mr. Brant was still a County Commissioner?

Mr. Goldsmith explained it was not his natural inclination. Regarding how his office was going to advise the board, he was still researching it, so a decision had not been made yet. Mr. Goldsmith also explained that it has been suggested he was given an assignment with a specific point to reach. Stated if that was asked of him, he would never do it. He is going to research it thoroughly and come up with his own opinion that he has faith in and is well grounded in the law. Mr. Goldsmith elaborated many people were reaching out to his partner, Tom Graham, asking what to do because they needed appointments made. Mr. Goldsmith stated Mr. Graham did what he did while Mr. Goldsmith was researching.

Commissioner Moore inquired what would happen if the County did nothing?

Mr. Goldsmith explained the legal question would never be answered and it would leave Mr. Biniecki in limbo due to the course of this litigation. Stated the only way this could be done is if the Board collectively agrees to dismiss the complaint. This would still leave the question unanswered. Mr. Goldsmith believes this would create a larger mess.

Commissioner Moore inquired what the ramifications are if there's two people wanting to sit in the same seat and what the next step is if the Board decides to dismiss?

Mr. Goldsmith explained Mr. Biniecki could file a quo warranto action through MCL 3.30(6)(b). Assumed Mr. Brant would be happy if the Board chose the throw up the white flag.

Commissioner Asper stated she resents that interpretation. Stated it is sad that the prior chair accomplished more in prison in eight (8) months than this entire Board has in the last year. Explained throwing up the white flag is hardly what she would call putting Mark Brant back on this board.

Mr. Goldsmith explained throwing up the white flag means that the Board is giving up the claims that were raised in the litigation. Stated he is not there to challenge or contest the job that Mr. Brant did while he was on the Board.

Commissioner Asper stated Mr. Goldsmith's initial letter advised us to go to a higher court. After a while it turned into a theory that Brant wasn't an elector and it went a totally different direction. Inquired why Mr. Goldsmith did not persist to say it should go to a higher court.

Mr. Goldsmith stated his legal opinion is based entirely on MCL 46.411, the Constitution, and the same statues that he pled in the Trial Court. Further explained he did not change it midstream. The trail court failed to answer the questions.

Commissioner Lievens asked Mr. Goldsmith for his legal recommendation.

Mr. Goldsmith explained this has to be brought to a conclusion so he would recommend that the Board allows legal counsel to file an application with the Attorney General as suggested by the Court of Appeals. Elaborated on the possible next steps.

Commissioner Moore inquired if this is a better option than doing nothing? Stated both ways leave District two (2) unrepresented, so which way would be quicker to get to a resolution?

Mr. Goldsmith stated it would be quicker for the County to do it because this can get bought to the Attorney General quickly. Explained he cannot answer the question of how long it could take.

Commissioner Swartout inquired if he is questioning himself on how to move forward.

Mr. Goldsmith said no and elaborated on the issues he will touch on in the application.

Commissioner Swartout asked if there was an option to have one of our legislators make the request for the opinion from the Attorney General.

Mr. Goldsmith stated it has to be by application. The legislator could encourage the Attorney General to take a look at it and made a decision.

Commissioner Swartout explained that is where he was going with this because he doesn't want this dragged out.

Commissioner Asper stated the Board could have him seated to take care of his district until its decided. Explained she does not understand holding off on District two (2) having someone.

Commissioner Hoffman stated if this character would get up and leave and give the County back to us and let the new man up here, the Board could put this whole thing to bed tonight.

Motion by Commissioner Lievens, supported by Commissioner Hoffman to allow legal counsel to file an application with the Attorney General as suggested by the Court of Appeals.

Roll Call by Clerk as follows:

AYE			NAY	EXCUSED	ABSTAIN
David Hoffman	J. Henry Lievens		Greg Moore, Jr.		
Jay Heinzerling	Brian Lamour		Dawn Asper		
David Vensel			David Swartout		

Motion carried.

Chairman Vensel explained the Board will now move onto the agenda item regarding the Forensic Audit. Explained the vote for closed session did not pass so it will be conducted in open session.

Mr. Goldsmith stated the Board has received an MIDC billing analysis that was provided by Plant Moran. It is a forensic analysis that focuses within the scope that this Board provided; investigate the billing practices of one MIDC council and one MIDC attorney. Mr. Goldsmith explained that based on the investigation of Plant Moran, there were improper billing practices resulting in overbilling. Stated the study is pretty straight forward. The County appears to have been grossly overbilled for work performed. The Board has to decided what to do next. Mr. Goldsmith stated he thinks it would be appropriate to send a copy of this to MIDC as well as the Sixth Amendment group the Chairman brought up, since they are investigating at the request of the County.

Commissioner Lievens shared his concerns with the billing patterns, recalculation of hours, the attorneys' provided corrections, block and bundled billing, and duplicative billings. Stated since this is being conducted in open session, these are now all public documents. Commissioner Lievens stated to put it into perspective, this wasn't an anomaly of a few dollars; this is over $600,000. Multiple members of this board questioned these claims and the more our staff ignored it and slow-walked it, the amount exceeded over a half a million dollars.

Motion by Commissioner Lievens, supported by Commissioner Hoffman to refer this report to the Michigan Indigent Defense Commission, the Attorney General, the Sixth Amendment Group, the Attorney Grievance Commission, and post it on the County Website.

Commissioner Lievens explained when something of this nature comes before the Board, as an attorney, there is an affirmative duty to advance it. According to the Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct, attorneys are mandatory reporters.

Commissioner Asper stated the County paid for a forensic audit, paid for an additional forensic audit, and we don't have a figure. Inquired if any money is going to be returned to the County. Stated she thinks one of the problems is that some of the attorneys in this County don't believe they should owe the County some sort of service for the indigent population. Explained she wants to know how much money the County is owed.

Commissioner Lievens stated his position, based on council and this report, is that the County stops the hemorrhaging and has the people in charge take it the rest of the way.

Commissioner Asper explained the events that have led up to this and explained if there was money that was taken improperly, there should be a pathway back here.

Chairman Vensel explained the bigger issue is that this model needs to be fixed. There are bills in the claim run today that are over $20,000 and there is no way for the Board to know if it is a monthly or quarterly claim. These concerns were supposed to be addressed but they haven't been. Stared he agrees with Commissioner Lievens that we need to stop the hemorrhaging but stated the County needs to fix a broken model. Explained there was no other way around this other than for us to proceed the way we did.

Commissioner Moore asked Commissioner Lievens if he would break up his motion. Stated these are totally separate issues. Explained he is not comfortable voting yes for one issue but is totally comfortable voting yes on the other issue.

Chairman Vensel asked if he didn't want the firm that is doing the feasibility study to determine whether or not the County should possibly change models to have the information?

Commissioner Moore stated not until this gets to MIDC and the Attorney General and they make a decision on it.

Commissioner Lievens did not accept the amendment to the motion.

Roll call by Clerk as follows:

AYE			NAY	EXCUSED	ABSTAIN
David Hoffman	J. Henry Lievens		Greg Moore, Jr.		
Jay Heinzerling	Brian Lamour		Dawn Asper		
David Vensel	David Swartout				

Motion carried.

IX. RESOLUTIONS, SPECIAL TRIBUTES & PRESENTATION

1. CASA Presentation

   Mr. Bosanac explained he allowed them to excuse themselves. They will reschedule.

X. FINANCE MATTERS

1. Payment of the 02/18/2026 Accounts Payable Current Claims Report in the amount of $1,055,551.72

   Discussion was held regarding two vendor payments, Vendor #10729 and Vendor #750521.

   Motion by Commissioner Lamour, supported by Commissioner Heinzerling to approve the 02/18/2026 Accounts Payable Current Claims Report for $1,055,551.72 and approve the Claims for the date and amount presented.
   Roll call by Clerk as follows:

AYE			NAY	EXCUSED	ABSTAIN
David Hoffman	David Vensel	Dawn Asper	J. Henry Lievens		
David Swartout	David Swartout	Brian Lamour			
Greg Moore Jr.	Jay Heinzerling				

Motion carried.

2. Letter dated February 9, 2026 from Mr. Jesse Stanford, Monroe County Treasurer, submitting the Cash and Investment Report for the quarter ended December 31, 2025.

   Motion by Commissioner Heinzerling, supported by Commissioner Hoffman to accept and place on file the quarter-ended December 31, 2025 Cash and Investment Report.

Discussion was held.

Roll call by Clerk as follows:

AYE			NAY	EXCUSED	ABSTAIN
David Hoffman	Greg Moore, Jr.	J. Henry Lievens			
Dawn Asper	Brian Lamour	David Swartout			
David Vensel	Jay Heinzerling				

Motion carried.

XI. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Approval of Non-Claims
   a. Check Register dated 02/06/2026 in the amount of $ 1,453,015.44
   b. Check Register dated 02/13/2026 in the amount of $ 425,137.67

Motion by Commissioner Swartout, supported by Commissioner Heinzerling to confirm the non-claims payments as presented on the agenda for the dates and amounts listed.

Roll call by Clerk as follows:

AYE			NAY	EXCUSED	ABSTAIN
David Hoffman	Greg Moore, Jr.	J. Henry Lievens			
Dawn Asper	Brian Lamour	David Swartout			
David Vensel	Jay Heinzerling				

Motion carried.

XII. COMMUNICATIONS

1. Letter dated February 6, 2026 from Mr. Michael Preadmore, Chief Deputy, requesting approval to apply for the Fiscal Year 2026 Marine Safety Grant to the Michigan Department of Natural Resources in the amount up to $59,804.00; the potential local match is included in the 2026 adopted budget.

   Motion by Commissioner Heinzerling, supported by Vice-Chairman Lamour to accept the communication, place it on file, and approve the application for the Fiscal Year 2026 Marine Safety Grant to the Michigan Department of Natural Resources in the amount up to $59,804.00; the potential local match is included in the 2026 adopted budget.

   Roll call by Clerk as follows:

AYE			NAY	EXCUSED	ABSTAIN
David Hoffman	Greg Moore, Jr.	J. Henry Lievens			
Dawn Asper	Brian Lamour	David Swartout			
David Vensel	Jay Heinzerling				

   Motion carried.

2. Letter dated February 9, 2026 from Ms. Jamie Dean, Health Director requesting approval to accept a Public Health Capacity Buildings Mini-Grant in the amount of $10,000.00 with no matching funds required.

   Motion by Commissioner Lievens, supported by Commissioner Hoffman to approve the acceptance of a Public Health Capacity Buildings Mini-Grant in the amount of $10,000.00 with no matching funds required.

Roll call by Clerk as follows:

AYE			NAY	EXCUSED	ABSTAIN
David Hoffman	Greg Moore, Jr.	J. Henry Lievens			
Dawn Asper	Brian Lamour	David Swartout			
David Vensel	Jay Heinzerling				

Motion carried.

3. Letter dated February 17, 2026 from Mr. Jason Berry, Community Planning & Engagement Director requesting approval to apply for the 2026 Michigan Public Safety Critical Incident Mapping Competitive Grant for $23,785.60 with no local matching funds required.

   Discussion was held.

   Motion by Commissioner Swartout, supported by Commissioner Heinzerling to approve an application submission for the 2026 Michigan Public Safety Critical Incident Mapping Competitive Grant for $23,785.60 with no local matching funds required.

Roll call by Clerk as follows:

AYE			NAY	EXCUSED	ABSTAIN
David Hoffman	Greg Moore, Jr.	J. Henry Lievens			
Dawn Asper	Brian Lamour	David Swartout			
David Vensel	Jay Heinzerling				

Motion carried.

XIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS — None

XIV. OLD BUSINESS—

XV. NEW BUSINESS—

XVI. PUBLIC COMMENT—

1. Gail Keane: Addressed the money that was spent and asked about the consequences to the staff. Quoted the oath of office and discussed the radical sides of the Board. Stated she is more confused after tonight and district two needs to move forward on having an election. Shared her concerns with some board members responses to legal counsel.

2. Helen: Thanked the Board for their transparency. Stated it is very gratifying and helpful for this information to be in the daylight.

3. Lamar Frederick: Stated he was pleased tonight that the issue with District two (2) was done in public. Explained something closed sessions are not in the best interest of the group. Addressed the issue regarding attorney bills and stated a system need to be put in place for someone to review these. Stated legal counsel did a great job.

XVII. ANNOUNCEMENTS — None

XVIII. MEMBERS TIME –

Commissioner Asper – Assured the Board has an ethics policy. Explained she took it upon herself to create and bring one to the Board and it was passed. Stated she does have critical thinking skills. Explained she simply wants the Board to follow the law, make sure motives are pure, and say the truth.

Commissioner Moore – Agreed with some points made during public comment. Explained it is not always needed to go into closed session, for the sake of transparency. Explained he's disappointed in a fellow commissioner for not allowing the Board to vote on two separate issues. Stated this was a trojan horse way of going about this and it is a dirty political trick that he doesn't want to see at these meetings.

Commissioner Swartout – Passed.

Commissioner Heinzerling – Passed.

Commissioner Lievens – Passed.

Commissioner Hoffman – Passed.

Vice-Chairman Lamour – Shared the report from Plant Moran was very helpful. Inquired why the Board would avoid sending this to the proper people. Stated this is the truth and it should be followed. Explained this should be viewed by all parties involved. Believes this can help guide us in the future.

Chairman Vensel – Thankful for Phil Goldsmith for his outstanding work regarding the legal challenge the County has faced over the last year and half. Thankful the Board is going to see this through to the end. Explained Commissioner Asper saying Mark Brant received 90% of the vote in the 2024 election is misleading and elaborated on why. Explained by the time Mark Brant resignation letter was in place, there was very limited time where an appointment could have been made. After the election, the new Chairman (myself) did not have the legal authority to appoint. Very grateful to see this through finally.

XIX. ADJOURNMENT - Chairman Vensel adjourned the meeting at 8:57 p.m. with no further business to discuss.

Respectfully submitted by:

Grace Miles

Grace Miles
Deputy Clerk/Administrative Assistant
Monroe County Board of Commissioners