

**OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
ALPENA COUNTY ROAD COMMISSION**

April 4, 2017

The Board of County Road Commissioners of the County of Alpena met in regular session on the above date. The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Fred Sterns, at 3:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Fred Sterns, Tom Heise and Tom Spaulding.
Absent: None.

Staff present: Larry Orcutt, Managing Director; Curt Gonyea, Superintendent; Julia Patterson, Finance Director/Board Secretary; and James Florip, Road Commission Attorney.

Others Present: Ken Lobert, Ossineke Township Supervisor; Ron McDonald, County Commissioner.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

AGENDA

Moved by Spaulding, seconded by Heise, to adopt the agenda as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

MINUTES

Moved by Spaulding, seconded by Heise, to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of March 7, 2017. Motion carried unanimously.

COMMUNICATIONS

- A. Patrick McCarthy, Administrator, Financial Operations Division, MDOT, letter dated March 3, 2017, regarding analysis of maintenance report for January 1, 2014 through December 31, 2014.
- B. MDOT, letter received March 16, 2017, inviting elected and appointed officials to the transportation planning meeting on Wednesday, April 5th at 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. at the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary, 500 W. Fletcher Street in Alpena.

Moved by Spaulding, seconded by Heise, that the above communications become part of the minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

AUDIT REPORT

Susan Sanford, CPA PLLC., appeared before the Board to present a brief summary of the Annual Financial Report for the year ended December 31, 2016. Ms. Sanford noted there were no significant issues during the audit but noted that there needs to be better inventory control. She noted that the Alpena County Road Commission is in sound financial condition with a Fund Balance of \$3,669,468.

Official Proceedings

Page 2

April 4, 2017

MANAGING DIRECTOR REPORT

Managing Director Larry Orcutt presented a brief update on the

following:

- Sending out RFP's to consultants for the design of the Werth Road Bridge for 2019. Anticipating having the design completed this summer.
- Preconstruction meeting for the Long Rapids Road, M-65 to Collins Road, resurfacing project that was bid last month will be held on April 5th. Elmer's Crane and Dozer from Hillman was low bidder and anticipating a May 1, 2017 start date.
- Posen to Carr Road's design nearly complete and in the process of acquiring additional right-of-way from residents to be able to construct the project.
- Bridge funding applications for Bagley Street Bridge and Ossineke Road Bridge will be submitted this month for 2020 funding. Putting together a new funding plan by looking at potential grants and have the Road Commission to increase its' matching funds to \$580,000 to increase the chances of receiving funding.
- Attended mandatory Paser Ratings Training for the Asset Management Program in Gaylord on April 4th.
- Application requests are open for Category F Economic Development Funds that can only be used on Small Urban federal aid eligible routes. Could possible use as a source of funding for the Bagley Bridge and also to resurface Werth Road, Lowell to Piper Road.
- Spring weight restrictions are still in effect.
- Waiting to receive the contract back from the contractor for the Hamilton/Wessel Road chip seal project. Project should be completed in mid to late May.

COUNTY ROAD REPORT

The Superintendent presented the County Road Report for the period February 27, 2017, through March 26, 2017.

FEBRUARY FINANCIAL REPORT

The Finance Director presented the Cash/Cash Equivalents Financial Report for the month ended February 28, 2017.

ANNUAL ACT 51 FINANCIAL REPORT

Moved by Spaulding, seconded by Heise, to approve the Annual Act 51 Financial Report for the year ended December 31, 2016, as presented and to review it at a future regular meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

Moved by Spaulding, seconded by Heise, that all reports become a part of the minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

Official Proceedings
Page 3
April 4, 2017

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

Commissioner Heise commented that with the traffic congestion on the Hobbs Drive/Third Street area, and truck traffic through downtown Alpena, there should be a plan for a bypass to reroute traffic around the Alpena area. Managing Director Larry Orcutt responded that there are plans from 2003 in the Alpena Area Wide

Comprehensive Transportation Plan when options were reviewed for future improvement options. Mr. Orcutt commented that some of those options are now subdivisions and are no longer possible for a road. Another problem that faces the bypass plan is the cost of the construction of the roads and bridges that would be needed to make the bypass a success.

Workshop sessions will be held in the future review the options that were planned and identify new possibilities.

PURCHASES

Moved by Spaulding, seconded by Heise, to approve the following purchases:

Item	PO/Inv	Date	Description	Amount
1	S52594	3/14/2017	Alpena Diesel Service Inc., Brake kit and core shoes for Truck #088.	\$1,391.39
2	21826	3/17/17	Alpena Oil Company, 2,600 gallons nolead gas @ \$1.6540 per gallon.	\$4,303.71
3	610942	3/31/17	Besser Company, steel for fuel pump steps.	\$760.50
4	21827	4/3/17	Crystal Flash, 10,005 gallons diesel fuel @ \$1.7191/gal.	\$17,199.60
5	38923	3/30/17	D&B Heat Transfer Products, Inc., new radiator for Truck #086.	\$625.00
6	10611	3/25/17	Larry's Truck Stuff, bed liner and mud flaps for Pickup #12	\$687.00
7	5109	4/1/17	Michigan County Road Commission Self-Insurance Pool, for liability and property insurance.	\$96,988.00
8	466013	3/9/17	Team Elmer's, 111.23 tons of 22A gravel at \$4.65/ton for county roads.	\$517.23
9	466406	3/24/17	Team Elmer's, 195.65 tons of 22A gravel at \$4.65/ton for county roads.	\$909.77
10	CF72106	3/24/17	Todd Wenzel Buick GMC, 2017 GMC Sierra foreman's pickup.	\$25,908.10
11	35700	3/27/17	Tredroc Tire, three (3) 12R22.5 recap tires @ \$188.00 / tire for stock.	\$564.00
12	35702	3/27/17	Tredroc Tire, two (2) new 12R22.5 tires @ \$373.48 / tire for Truck #062.	\$746.96
13	32817	3/28/17	Tredroc Tire, Six (6) Retread Tires for #128 Grader @ \$945.00/tire.	\$5,670.00
14	19864	3/29/17	Truck & Trailer Specialties, 20 serrated scraper blades @ \$73.20/blade.	\$1,464.00
15	S103579	3/6/17	Zarembe Equipment Inc., muffler for Truck #088.	\$587.25
16	S103733	3/17/17	Zarembe Equipment Inc., inlet pipe for Truck #088.	\$511.55
TOTAL PURCHASES				\$158,834.06

Official Proceedings
Page 4
April 4, 2017

Motion carried unanimously.

Moved by Spaulding, seconded by Heise, to approve the following contract purchases:

CONTRACT PAYMENTS

Item	PO/Inv	Date	Description	Amount
1	1884	1/30/2017	Huron Engineering & Surveying, Design Services for Posen and Carr Road reconstruction project	\$2,552.50
			TOTAL CONTRACT PAYMENTS	\$2,552.50

Motion carried unanimously.

MARCH BILLS

Moved by Spaulding, seconded by Heise, to approve March 2017 bills in the amount of \$294,331.23. Motion carried unanimously.

ACT 51 MILEAGE CHANGE

At the Alpena County Road Commission Board meeting of February 21, 2017, the Board passed a resolution to approve the Act 51 mileage certification for 2016. MDOT has requested a resolution approving the specific change of reducing the mileage on Maple Grove Road by 950' to match the actual length.

Moved by Spaulding, seconded by Heise, to approve the change of the Act 51 mileage certification. Motion carried unanimously.

COMMUNICATION SERVICE PROVIDER FACILITIES POLICY

Moved by Spaulding, seconded by Heise, to adopt the following Communication Service Provider Facilities Policy:

ALPENA COUNTY ROAD COMMISSION
COMMUNICATION SERVICE PROVIDER FACILITIES

WHEREAS, the Board of County Road Commissioners for the County of Alpena (the "Board" or "Road Commission") is a body corporate with the statutory mandate created by MCL 224.9 to formulate policy and to perform those official duties imposed by law or delegated by the Alpena County Board of Commissioners; and

WHEREAS, real property interests—including easements, various fees, and the right to regulate related to the use of public right-of-ways within the county road system—have been vested in the Road Commission to be held in trust for the benefit of the public; and

WHEREAS, the Road Commission intends to discharge its obligations as trustee of those certain real property interests in a manner that benefits and protects the public generally, and any adjacent landowners specifically; and

Official Proceedings
Page 5
April 4, 2017

WHEREAS, Article 7, §29 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963 reserves to county road commissions the reasonable control of their highways, streets, alleys and public places, and specifically prohibits any person, partnership, association or corporation, public or private, from operating a public utility within the highways, streets, alleys and public places of any county without first obtaining the consent of the duly constituted authority of the county road commission; and

WHEREAS, MCL 247.184 requires the consent of the Road Commission before any public utility may construct wires, cables, poles or like structures upon, over or under a county right-of-way including any improved highway or bridge; and

WHEREAS, MCL 224.19b(1) requires any person, partnership, association, corporation or governmental entity to obtain a permit from the Road Commission (and the applicable township, city or village if required by those entities) before constructing, operating, maintaining or removing any facility or performing any work within a county highway right-of-way; and

WHEREAS, MCL 224.19b(2) empowers a county road commission to adopt reasonable permit requirements and a schedule of fees sufficient to cover the necessary and actual costs applied in a reasonable manner for the issuance of the permit and for review of the proposed activity, inspection and related expenses; and

WHEREAS, MCL 691.1402 charges a county road commission with maintaining highways under its jurisdiction in reasonable repair so that they are reasonably safe and convenient for public travel; and

WHEREAS, communications technologies are constantly evolving, resulting in the potential for proliferation of communication service facilities within the public right-of-ways which carry the potential, if not appropriately managed, to jeopardize the safety and convenience of the public; and

WHEREAS, those seeking to install and operate Communication Service Provider (CSP) Facilities within county highway right-of-ways to meet demand for such service, gain a pecuniary profit therefrom; and

WHEREAS, certain entities seeking to install CSP Facilities claim right of way access as a benefit of utility status; regarding which the Road Commission specifically reserves its right to challenge these claimed benefits and status as utilities, regulated or otherwise; and

WHEREAS, the Road Commission has made significant investments of time and resources in the acquisition, construction, repair and maintenance of the public right-of-ways under its jurisdiction, for the principal purpose of making such rights-of-way safe and convenient for public travel, and such investment has enhanced the utility and value of those public ways; and

WHEREAS, the public right-of-ways under the Road Commission's jurisdiction are used by and useful to private enterprises including

Official Proceedings

Page 6

April 4, 2017

the Applicant and others engaged in providing Communication Services to citizens, institutions, and businesses that are served by the county road system; and

WHEREAS, the right to access and/or occupy portions of such public right-of-ways for limited times, for the business of providing communication services, is a valuable economic privilege; and

WHEREAS, beneficial competition between providers of communication services can be furthered by the Road Commission's consent to locate within and for rights to use the public right-of-ways on non-discriminatory and competitively neutral terms and conditions; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant is a private enterprise engaged in installing facilities related to and/or providing various Communication Services; and

WHEREAS, the Road Commission will grant its consent pursuant to its constitutional and statutory authority to manage and control its public right-of-ways, and will issue a right-of-way permit in consideration of the terms and conditions set forth herein:

1. Purposes

The purposes of this Policy are to balance the interests of protecting the public from harm with the interests of the public and applicants in the expansion of communication services via the preceding and following statements of interest:

- 1.1. Establish a local policy concerning CSP Facilities for use of the public right-of-ways that also serves the Road Commission's statutory mandate to make the rights-of-way under its jurisdiction safe for public travel;
- 1.2. The Road Commission specifically reserves its right to alter, amend and adjust these policies where public safety or convenience requires on a per application basis;
- 1.3. Establish a local policy that promotes beneficial competition between providers of communication services on non-discriminatory and competitively neutral terms and conditions; and that ensures that the Road Commission retains the authority and ability to act to protect the public safety and welfare in the face of multiple rapidly-changing industries, including the communications industry, that are placing increasing demand on public property and resources;
- 1.4. Establish clear and nondiscriminatory local guidelines, standards and time frames for the exercise of local authority with respect to the regulation of the use of public right-of-ways by Communications Providers, and their respective facilities and licenses;
- 1.5. Permit and manage reasonable access to the public right-of-ways under the jurisdiction of the Road Commission for communications purposes on a competitively neutral basis, to the extent required by law;

Conserve the limited physical capacity of the public rights of ways held in trust for the benefit of the public by the Road Commission, and over which the Road Commission shares jurisdiction, to a limited extent, with other governmental

Official Proceedings

Page 7

April 4, 2017

- 1.6. entities;
- 1.7. Assure that the Road Commission's current and ongoing costs of granting and regulating private access to and use of its public right-of-ways are fully paid by the persons seeking such access and causing such costs;
- 1.8. Secure fair and reasonable compensation to the Road Commission and the residents of Alpena County, in a nondiscriminatory manner, for permitting private use of the public right-of-ways;
- 1.9. Encourage economic development while preserving aesthetic and other community values and preventing proliferation of above ground facilities;
- 1.10. Assure that all persons or entities providing communication services within public right-of-ways in the county highway system comply with all state, federal and local laws;

- 1.11. Enable the Road Commission to manage its obligations to the public generally, and adjacent landowners specifically, consistent with rapidly evolving federal and state regulatory policies, industry competition and technological development; and
- 1.12. Reserve to the Road Commission and provide for the fullest exercise possible of its authority and discretion to require that:
 - 1.12.1. CSP Facilities are installed and maintained within public right-of-ways under the jurisdiction of the Road Commission in such manner and at such points so as not to inconvenience the public use of the public right-of- ways or to adversely affect the public safety and welfare;
 - 1.12.2. All nonpublic users of the right-of-ways under the jurisdiction of the Road Commission shall be required to defend, reimburse, indemnify and hold harmless the Road Commission for the actual costs incurred by the Road Commission by reason of the construction or presence in the public rights-of-way of the facilities of such users. Further, that insurance and bonding be secured to assure that such defense, reimbursement and indemnity is available.

2. Definitions

- 2.1. For the purposes of this Policy, the following terms, phrases, words, and their derivations shall have the meaning given in this section. Unless otherwise expressly stated, words not defined in this title shall be construed consistent with Title 47 of the United States Code and Chapter 484 of the Michigan Compiled Laws. References to governmental entities (whether persons or entities) refer to those entities or their successors in authority. If specific provisions of law are renumbered, then the reference shall be read to refer to the renumbered provision. References to laws, ordinances or regulations shall be interpreted broadly to cover government actions, however nominated, and include laws, ordinances and regulations now in force or hereafter enacted or amended. "Applicant" means any person applying for a right-of-way permit who is a "Communication Service Provider (CSP)."

- 2.2. "Communication Service Provider" or ("CSP") and related "Facilities" as used herein, may include broadband,

Official Proceedings

Page 8

April 4, 2017

- 2.3. telecommunications and wireless related infrastructure as required by communication service providers and their various contractors, in order to provide voice, video, and/or data, to the public or other end users, and necessary infrastructure including, but not limited to wirelines including copper wire, fiber optic cable, or coaxial cable, and wireless including antennas, radios and, those related support structures, all as deemed necessary and as specifically approved by the Commission in its written right-of-way permit if and when issued.
- 2.4. A person that operates under written agreement with a CSP to provide communication services over a communications service facility or to install communications service facilities, shall be treated as a CSP for purposes of this Policy. A copy of all such agreement(s) shall be furnished upon application for a permit under this policy.
- 2.5. "Right-of-way" means the area on, below, or above any land

acquired or dedicated for public roads, highways, streets, alleys, easements, or waterways, to the extent the Road Commission has jurisdiction and the ability to grant the rights set forth herein. Right-of-way does not include a federal, state, or private right-of-way.

- 2.6. "Person" means an individual, partnership, cooperative, association, private corporation, public corporation, utility, personal representative, receiver, trustee, assignee, governmental entity or other legal entity.
- 2.7. "Right-of-way permit" as used herein means the County Road Commission's legal authorization, terminable as defined in the permit, to use a particular, discrete, and limited portion of the public right-of-way to construct, operate, or repair a CSP Facility, including any permit special terms and conditions. The term "right-of-way permit" shall not mean or include:
 - 2.7.1. Any other permit, authorization, agreement or franchise required for the privilege of transacting and carrying on a business within the applicable city, village or township required by state or local law;
 - 2.7.2. Any other permit, authorization or agreement required in connection with operations on public streets or property.
 - 2.7.3. Any other permits, authorization or agreements required for occupying any public or private property to which access is not specifically granted by the right-of-way permit, including, but not limited to, permits for placing devices on or in poles, conduits, other structures, or on railroad easements owned by any public or private entity.

3. Policy Guidelines

The administration of this Policy shall be governed by the following CSP Facility policy guidelines:

- 3.1. The Road Commission supports efforts to establish an open, competitive marketplace for communication services that also serves the Road Commission's statutory mandate to promote safety and convenience in the use of public right-of-ways

Official Proceedings

Page 9

April 4, 2017

under its jurisdiction. The Road Commission promotes and encourages competition for communication services that make the latest and best technology available and keep service prices affordable for all county residents and businesses. An integral component of this open marketplace is the consistent application of regulations to all communications providers and the preservation of local authority over matters of local impact.

- 3.2. The Road Commission recognizes that to balance the needs and interests of the public in the management of the right-of-ways together with the desire of the communications service industry to access such rights of way, facilities supporting communication services may be integrated into the right-of-ways in conformity principally with community standards, also taking into account industry standards and best practices. Guidelines identifying community standards together with an understanding of industry standards and best practices may be incorporated into the terms and conditions of the Road

Commission's right-of-way permit and permit process and may change from time to time, in the Road Commission's sole judgment and discretion.

3.3. Use/Installation Priority Preference Considerations

3.3.1. The Road Commission's primary goal is to make and maintain the right-of-ways under its jurisdiction safe and convenient for public travel. To further this goal, the Road Commission recites the following siting priority preferences, which shall be enforced wherever possible in the Road Commission's discretion:

3.3.1.1. Collocation on an existing facility outside the right-of-way shall be preferred to collocation on an existing facility within the right-of-way.

3.3.1.2. Locating a new CSP Facility outside the right-of-way shall be preferred to locating a new CSP Facility within the right-of-way.

3.3.1.3. Collocation on an existing facility within the right-of-way shall be preferred to locating a new CSP Facility within the right-of-way.

3.3.1.4. Locating a new CSP Facility in the right-of-way shall only be permitted when the applicant demonstrates, in the Road Commission's judgment, that locating a new CSP Facility outside of the right-of-way, or collocating on any existing facility, is not possible or practical.

3.3.1.5. Where possible and practical, facilities will be required to be located below ground where other existing facilities or structures are located below ground.

3.3.2. Collocation Guidelines

3.3.2.1. All applications shall be subject to collocation with existing structures where possible and practical. Mandatory future collocation of all subsequent CSP

Official Proceedings

Page 10

April 4, 2017

Facilities shall be required where possible and practical for any newly authorized structure under this Policy.

3.3.2.2. Any application that is not for a collocated facility must contain a statement justifying why collocation is not possible or practical. Such statement shall include:

33221. Such structure and technical information and other justifications as are necessary to document the reasons why collocation is not possible or practical, including all communication of denials of collocation requests from 3rd party entities; and

33222. A list of all eligible support structures and alternative structures considered as alternatives

to the proposed location.

33223. A written explanation why the alternatives considered were not possible or practical due to technical or physical constraints.

3.3.3. Stealth installations or otherwise aesthetically consistent designs shall be required at the discretion of the road commission, and will generally be similar to the existing infrastructure in the area.

3.3.4. New structures shall be limited to 45 feet in height, unless otherwise shown to be needed by the Applicant based upon the technical characteristics of the area or other considerations, including collocation. The dimensions of new facilities will generally not be permitted to exceed existing infrastructure in the same vicinity.

3.3.5. No new CSP Facility support structure may be erected in the public right-of-way within 500' of an existing CSP Facility support structure, unless shown, as determined by the Road Commission in its discretion, that it is required for technical feasibility or that all existing infrastructure is already exhausted or not available for use.

3.3.6. To the greatest extent possible and practical, placement of such facilities in Industrial Zones shall be preferred, followed by Commercial Zones, followed by Residential Zones.

3.3.7. Where possible and practical, location on private property shall be preferred to location on public property.

3.3.7.1. An application shall contain a statement explaining all alternative sites considered, including private property, and why such alternatives are not possible or practical.

3.3.8. The Road Commission will manage access to the public

Official Proceedings

Page 11

April 4, 2017

right-of-ways for CSP purposes in a nondiscriminatory, competitively neutral and nonexclusive way to the extent required under applicable law and, to the extent allowed under applicable law, to receive fair compensation. The public interest will be protected by collecting associated fees and administrative costs for use of the public right-of-ways under the jurisdiction of the Road Commission.

3.3.9. Right-of-way permits for location of CSP Facilities and all supporting equipment and structures will be managed to preserve the integrity of the county road system's infrastructure, ensure efficient use of the property under the jurisdiction of the Road Commission, and ensure compliance with state, federal and local law.

3.3.10. In order to effectively manage and regulate the use of public right-of-ways under the Road Commission's

jurisdiction in the best interests of the public, it is necessary for the Road Commission to reserve and exercise all proprietary, legislative, administrative and discretionary authority it may have to the full extent allowed or not prohibited by law and nothing in this policy shall be construed to diminish or in any way to limit the proprietary, discretionary, administrative or legislative authority of the Road Commission and its officials as respects the management and use of the Road Commission's public right-of-ways or in respect to the granting, delaying, or denying any right-of-way permit.

4. General Provisions

- 4.1. No CSP shall install, construct, or otherwise place within public right-of-way under the jurisdiction of the Alpena County Road Commission any CSP Facilities, except pursuant to the provisions of this policy.
- 4.2. A CSP must obtain a right-of-way permit from the Road Commission prior to constructing any CSP Facilities within a right-of-way under the jurisdiction of the Road Commission. At its discretion, the Road Commission may require a CSP to obtain an annual right-of-way permit for maintenance of its Facilities, for ongoing inspection and associated costs, and for any other costs associated with access to the right-of-way. The fact that a particular permitted CSP Facility may be used for multiple purposes does not obviate the need to obtain a permit for other purposes unless applicable federal or state law prohibits the Road Commission from requiring such additional permit. No permit shall become effective without the grantee signing an acceptance of the permit.
- 4.3. A CSP must provide a complete written right-of-way permit application on a form prescribed by the Road Commission, along with all requested supporting documentation.
- 4.4. If a right-of-way permit is granted, a CSP must agree to abide by the terms and conditions imposed by the permit and any permit special terms and conditions.
- 4.5. A right-of-way permit shall not convey equitable or legal title to the public right-of-ways. The right granted is only

Official Proceedings

Page 12

April 4, 2017

the right to occupy those portions of the public right-of-way to which the Road Commission has the right to grant access, for the purposes and the time period stated in the permit, and the right may not be subdivided or subleased. A right-of-way permit shall not grant a vested right for any CSP Facilities to be located or to remain at any specific location in the public right-of-way and any right, permission or consent to occupy any location in the public right-of-way shall be revocable and terminable at the discretion of the Road Commission and the facility therein removed at the cost of the operator in order to allow free and unencumbered use of the public right-of-way for public work or other public purpose as may be in the best public interest as determined by the Road Commission.

- 4.5.1. A CSP shall immediately (subject to seasonal work restrictions) restore, at its sole expense, in a manner approved by the Road Commission, any portion of the public right-of-way that is in any way disturbed, damaged, or injured by the construction, installation,

operation, maintenance or removal of the Communication Service Facilities, to a reasonably equivalent or better condition as that which existed prior to the disturbance. In the event that CSP, or its contractors or subcontractors, fail to make such repair within a reasonable time, the Road Commission may make the repair and the CSP shall pay the costs the Road Commission incurs for such repair.

4.6. No reference herein, or in any right-of-way permit, shall be deemed to be a representation or guarantee by the Road Commission that its interest or other right to control the use of such property is sufficient to permit its use for such purposes, and a permit shall be deemed to grant no more than those rights which the Road Commission may have the undisputed right and power to give.

4.7. Before any right-of-way permit will be issued, a CSP must demonstrate that it has obtained the necessary permits and/or consent of all units of state, local or federal government vested by law with the authority to require and grant permits and/or consent.

5. Taxes and Fees.

5.1. To the full extent permitted by law, recovery of all Road Commission costs related to the issuance of a right-of-way permit, or a consent fee, may be charged to a CSP related to its installation and maintenance of CSP Facilities in the right-of-way. Any such permit fee shall be approved by the Board of County Road Commissioners, and shall be in an amount sufficient to cover the actual administrative expenses incurred by the Road Commission that are directly related to receiving, reviewing and approving a right-of-way permit, consulting with any experts deemed necessary by the Road Commission to evaluate the permit application, to monitoring and inspecting the actual construction of the permitted Facilities, and to implementation of the requirements of this Policy and the terms and conditions of the permit. On request of an operator, the Road Commission will submit proof of any charges or expenses incurred. For any project or time frame, an operator can also request a written estimate from the Road Commission, in advance, of costs planned to be expended by the Road Commission.

Official Proceedings
Page 13
April 4, 2017

5.2. The CSP shall provide security, in a manner acceptable to the Road Commission, to ensure compliance with its obligations under Section 4.5 and 4.5.1 of this Policy to remove Communication Service Facilities and restore the adjacent right- of-ways at the termination of any Permit.

ROAD AGREEMENTS

Moved by Spaulding, seconded by Heise, to approve the following Road Agreements:

		Township	ACRC	Total
		<u>Match</u>	<u>Match</u>	<u>Estimate</u>
<u>SANBORN TOWNSHIP</u>				
Gravel Surfacing:				
Carriveau Road	North End then South 3800'	\$9,694.00	\$4,847.00	\$14,541.00

Sampson Road	1500' north of Nicholson			
	Hill Road then north 3600'	\$11,480.00	\$0.00	\$11,480.00

Ditching:

Scott Road	280' west of Carriveau Road			
	then west 1100' along north			
	side	\$6,937.00	\$363.00	\$7,300.00

Sealcoats:

Alphonse/Larose	East of US-23: .35 mile	\$5,067.00	\$2,533.00	\$7,600.00
Piper Road	US-23 to Northwest: .52 mile	\$9,400.00	\$4,700.00	\$14,100.00
Shawlani Lane	Precour Road: South to end			
	.24 mile	\$3,467.00	\$1,733.00	\$5,200.00

TOTAL SANBORN TOWNSHIP		<u>\$46,045.00</u>	<u>\$14,176.00</u>	<u>\$60,221.00</u>
-------------------------------	--	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------

Motion carried unanimously.

DUST CONTROL ROAD AGREEMENTS

Moved by Spaulding, seconded by Heise, to approve the following Road Agreements for Dust Control.

MAPLE RIDGE TOWNSHIP

2017 Local Road Dust Control Program

35% Solution/Brine	\$11,000.00	\$0.00	\$11,000.00
--------------------	-------------	--------	-------------

OSSINEKE TOWNSHIP

2017 Local Road Dust Control Program

35% Solution/Brine	\$13,200.00	\$0.00	\$13,200.00
--------------------	-------------	--------	-------------

SANBORN TOWNSHIP

2017 Local Road Dust Control Program

35% Solution/Brine	\$23,000.00	\$0.00	\$23,000.00
--------------------	-------------	--------	-------------

Motion carried unanimously.

Official Proceedings

Page 14

April 4, 2017

**RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT BAGLEY
STREET AT THUNDER BAY RIVER BRIDGE REHABILITATION
APPLICATION FOR LOCAL BRIDGE PROGRAM FUNDS**

Moved by Commissioner Spaulding, supported by Commissioner Heise, that the Managing Director, Larry Orcutt, file an application for State/Federal financial assistance in funding for the rehabilitation of the Bagley Street at Thunder Bay River Bridge. Due to deterioration and increased traffic, restrictions of this crossing would have a major impact to the motoring public.

WHEREAS, the Alpena County Road Commission is actively seeking participation in the rehabilitation of this structure; and

WHEREAS, the Alpena County Road Commission will commit the necessary funds for design and construction engineering and the

required five percent matching funds for the structure if approved;

WHEREAS, the Bagley Street at Thunder Bay Bridge is vital to the safety and welfare of the residents of Alpena Area, motoring public, including heavy commercial traffic, as well as the critically important to the economy of Northeast Michigan.

WHEREAS, due to the age and deterioration of the structure, it is imperative that the structure be rehabilitated to adequately service motorized and nonmotorized traffic utilizing the crossing.

Be it resolved that the Board of County Road Commissioners for Alpena County supports the rehabilitation project; and

Be it further resolved that the priority for the bridge rehabilitation projects for consideration for Local Bridge Program funds is as follows:

<u>Priority</u>	<u>MDOT Bridge Identification</u>	<u>Road Name</u>
1	0420003301B01	Bagley Street

Motion carried by a vote as follows:

Ayes: Commissioners Spaulding, Heise and Sterns.

Nays: None.

**RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT
OSSINEKE ROAD AT DEVILS RIVER BRIDGE REPLACEMENT
APPLICATION FOR LOCAL BRIDGE PROGRAM FUNDS**

Moved by Commissioner Spaulding, supported by Commissioner Heise, that the Managing Director, Larry Orcutt, file an updated application for State/Federal financial assistance in funding for the replacement of the Ossineke Road at Devils River Bridge. Due to deterioration and increased traffic, restrictions of this crossing would have a major impact to the motoring public.

Official Proceedings
Page 15
April 4, 2017

WHEREAS, the Alpena County Road Commission is actively seeking participation in the replacement of this structure; and

WHEREAS, the Alpena County Road Commission will commit the necessary funds for design and construction engineering and the required five percent matching funds for replacement of the structure if approved.

Therefore be it resolved that the Board of County Road Commissioners for Alpena County supports the replacement project; and

Be it further resolved that the priority for the bridge replacement projects for consideration for Local Bridge Program funds is as follows:

MDOT Bridge

Priority

1

Identification

04306A0002200B01

Road Name

Ossineke Road

Motion carried by a vote as follows:

Ayes: Commissioners Spaulding, Heise, and Sterns.

Nays: None.

BEAVER LAKE PARK ROAD WEDGE AND SEALCOAT

Ken Lobert, Ossineke Township Supervisor, appeared before the Board to request a cost share from the Road Commission for maintenance work on Beaver Lake Park Road. Mr. Lobert explained that the road needs to be wedged and a sealcoat applied for the length of the road. The approximate total cost could range from \$60,000 to \$75,000 depending on the repair option that is performed.

The Board directed Managing Director, Larry Orcutt, to estimate the costs for different repair options and report back to them at the next Board meeting.

NEXT MEETING DATE

The next regular meeting of the County of Alpena County Road Commissioners is scheduled for 3:00 p.m. Tuesday, April 18, 2017.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Frederick Sterns
Chairman

Julia G. Patterson,
Secretary