

DRAFT – Agenda
Tuscola County Board of Commissioners
Committee of the Whole – Monday, October 12, 2015 – 7:30 A.M.
HH Purdy Building - 125 W. Lincoln, Caro, MI

Finance
Committee Leaders-Commissioners Kirkpatrick and Bierlein

Primary Finance

1. Judge Gierhart (See A)
 - Referee Position Vacancy
 - District Court – Court Appointed Attorney Contract
 - Developmentally Disabled Individuals Attorney Contract
2. 2016 Budget Development
3. Michigan Renewable Energy Collaborative Update
4. House Bill 4904 – Elections (See B)
5. Sale of County Assets (See C)
6. Phragmites Grant Application Update (See D)
7. Contract with Huron County for Equalization Services
8. Caro Dam Grant Funding Potential

On-Going Finance

1. CDBG Housing Grant Check Presentation 10/26/15 HDC offices 11:30 A.M. (See E)
2. Road Commission Legacy Cost (Schedule)
3. Tuscola County Community Foundation and Next Steps
4. MAC 7th District Meeting in Tuscola County
5. MSU-e/4-H Millage Ballot Language – Approval Needed

Personnel
Committee Leader-Commissioner Trisch

Primary Personnel

1. Staffing Change Requests Buildings and Grounds and Recycling (See F)

On-Going Personnel

1. DOL Proposes Rule Changes to Exempt Employees

Building and Grounds
Committee Leader-Commissioner Allen

Primary Building and Grounds

1. Review USDA Potential for County Building Energy Efficiency Retrofit

On-Going Building and Grounds

1. Certificate of Occupancy Issued for Mobile Medical Response Building
2. County Land Farmland Lease Agreement – Bidding
3. Fixed Assets Inventory Update
4. Vanderbilt Park Grant Application – Next Meeting of Parks and Recreation 10/21/15
5. Vanderbilt Parking Ordinance
6. Farmland Lease Bids
7. Mosquito Abatement Building Construction

Other Business as Necessary

1. Federal Truck Size and Weight Update (See G)

Public Comment Period

STATE OF MICHIGAN



54TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT
440 NORTH STATE STREET
CARO, MICHIGAN 48723

HON. AMY GRACE GIERHART
CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

(989) 672-3720

Memorandum

TO: Mike Hoagland

FROM: Hon. Amy Grace Gierhart 

RE: Referee

DATE: Oct. 6, 2015

Although the Board of Commissioners has approved a domestic relations referee position for Tuscola County for this fiscal year, for the last several weeks the position has been vacant. We feel we are ready to move forward with filling this position, and I am writing to ask for your approval to fill the vacancy with Mr. Philip J. Hiltner, who is presently our Law Clerk. I believe that this change is both important in providing adequate service levels to Tuscola County, and is in the financial best interests of the County.

Every 2 years, the State Court Administrative Office (SCAO) performs a calculation to determine the amount of work in each court in Michigan. After a series of time studies, SCAO has calculated an average amount of time that each case code type "should" take. These range from 1.3 minutes for Traffic Civil Infractions, to 670 minutes for Capital Felony and Felony Juvenile cases. Based on the average number of cases of each case type filed from 2012-14, SCAO estimates what a typical year's worth of work is for each court. Based on each county's size, SCAO also presumes that a certain fraction of the judicial workload is performed by quasi-

judicial officers (referees and magistrates). After applying these various formulas, SCAO then makes a recommendation about how many judges each court needs.

It may be easier to understand all of this by looking at the concrete numbers that apply to Tuscola County. Based on average case filings for the years 2012-14, SCAO assumes that we have 197,044 minutes of circuit-type work to do, and 27,144 minutes of probate-type work to do, for a total of 224,188 minutes of work. A "judicial year" is assumed to be 77,400 minutes, which means that we have 2.90 judges' worth of work to do in the circuit and probate courts.

So, the question is: if we have nearly 3 judges' worth of work to do in the circuit and probate courts, why are we only assigned 2 judges? This is because SCAO assumes that a portion of the work is handled by quasi-judicial officers (in this context, a referee). In a "medium"-sized county like Tuscola, SCAO assumes that 44% of the judicial work will be performed by a referee. Consequently, of this 224,188 combined minutes of circuit- and probate-type work, SCAO assumes that 98,643 minutes will be performed by a referee, with the other 125,545 being handled by judges. Consequently, SCAO calculates that we need 1.62 judges ($125,545/77,400$) and 1.27 referees ($98,643/77,400$). In short: SCAO's recommendation that we only need two judges is premised on us hiring a referee. In the absence of a referee, SCAO's figures show that our circuit and probate judges are grievously overworked.

Of course, until recently, this County *did* have a domestic relations referee. Our most recent referee began work in March of 2014, and heard 483 cases for the remainder of that calendar year. From January until her departure in August of this year, she heard 325, and that includes a substantial absence for maternity leave. Her departure has not eliminated the *need* for a referee. We have attempted to fill the gap by drawing some money that had been appropriated for visiting judges and spending it on a part-time contractual referee, to ease the burden. This is

fine as a stopgap, but is not a sustainable state of affairs. Given the SCAO statistics and methodology, there is absolutely no prospect of additional judgeships being authorized for this County. In the end, we only hurt ourselves and the public we serve if we do not provide ourselves with the staffing levels that SCAO assumes we are providing ourselves when it recommends how many judges we need. This is also far from outside the norm: all of our surrounding counties (Huron, Sanilac, Lapeer, Genesee, Saginaw, and Bay) employ domestic relations referees.

Fortunately, filling this position can be done in a way that substantially mitigates its cost to the County. As noted, I intend on putting our Law Clerk into this position. His responsibilities will be assumed by the current Circuit Court Administrator, Adam Pavlik. I would then leave the current Law Clerk position vacant. In short, by filling the referee position internally, 3 positions can become 2: we go from having a referee, a law clerk, and Mr. Pavlik, to simply having a referee and Mr. Pavlik, saving the County the \$69,626.27 that the Law Clerk is estimated to cost the County next year.

All this said, I do not want to eliminate the Law Clerk position. Our current staff has employees who are capable of picking up this slack over fewer people, but that may not always be the case. In particular, if Mr. Pavlik were to leave our employ, I am not confident we could find someone who could handle all of his current responsibilities adequately. In the event of such a contingency, I would need to hire out a new law clerk and hire an administrator to replace Mr. Pavlik.

mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org

From: mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2015 4:19 PM
To: 'The Office of Senator Green'
Cc: Joseph Bixler; jfetting@tuscolacounty.org; ctrisch@tuscolacounty.org; 'Bardwell Thom'; 'Bierlein Matthew'; 'Kirkpatrick Craig'; 'Roger Allen'
Subject: RE: House Bill 4904

Travis

Thank you for the update.

Mike

From: Travis Howell [mailto:THowell@senate.michigan.gov] **On Behalf Of** The Office of Senator Green
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2015 3:18 PM
To: mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org
Subject: RE: House Bill 4904

Mike it did pass in the House 105 to 1. It has now been referred to the Senate Elections & Government Reform Committee.

Travis Howell
Constituent Relations Director
Sen. Mike Green
866-305-2131

From: mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org [mailto:mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2015 3:08 PM
To: The Office of Senator Green <SenMGreen@senate.michigan.gov>; Representative Canfield <edwardcanfield@house.mi.gov>
Cc: ctrisch@tuscolacounty.org; 'Bardwell Thom' <bardwellthomas1@gmail.com>; 'Bierlein Matthew' <mbierlein@tuscolacounty.org>; 'Kirkpatrick Craig' <ckirkpatrick@tuscolacounty.org>; 'Roger Allen' <beetman95@yahoo.com>
Subject: FW: House Bill 4904

Senator Green and Representative Canfield

Are there any updates regarding HB 4904?

Mike

Michael R. Hoagland
Tuscola County Controller/Administrator
989-672-3700
mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org

VISIT US ON LINE FOR COUNTY SERVICES @ www.tuscolacounty.org

From: mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org [<mailto:mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org>]

Sent: Thursday, October 01, 2015 1:08 PM

To: Senator Mike Green <senmgreen@senate.michigan.gov>; Representative Canfield <edwardcanfield@house.mi.gov>; Jim Mcloskey <mcloskey@charter.net>

Cc: jfetting@tuscolacounty.org; Joseph Bixler <bixlerj@anr.msu.edu>; ctrisch@tuscolacounty.org; 'Bardwell Thom' <bardwellthomas1@gmail.com>; 'Bierlein Matthew' <mbierlein@tuscolacounty.org>; 'Kirkpatrick Craig' <ckirkpatrick@tuscolacounty.org>; 'Roger Allen' <beetman95@yahoo.com>

Subject: House Bill 4904

Senator Green and Representative Canfield

Your assistance is requested so the county can conduct a county millage election vote in March of 2016. Currently under state election law the county cannot have a millage question on the March 2016 ballot. Passage of HB 4904 would provide the ability for the county to conduct an election at the already scheduled March 2016 presidential election date.

Recent state election law changes restricted local elections to four times in a year: February, May, August and November. In order to help resolve county financial issues the Board of Commissioners decided to request .1 mill (1/10 mill) to fund Michigan State University Extension and 4-H programs. For financial reasons the Board decided to conduct the election as soon as possible in 2016 which was the March 8, 2016 presidential primary election. The two major advantages of voting at this already scheduled March election are:

- Eliminates the \$30,000 county cost to conduct a special election
- Conducting the millage election early in 2016 decides the question of MSU Extension/4-H programs early in the year. If the question fails and programs are eliminated county costs are reduced by approximately \$12,000 per month

It was then discovered the election could not be held in March of 2016 because the state made another change in election law that eliminated the February election date for counties and local units of government except for schools. Passage of the attached HB 4904 (introduced by Rep. McBroom) corrects this situation for 2016 and enables the county to conduct the election at the scheduled March 2016 presidential primary.

Thank you for your assistance and if you have questions or if we can help in any way please contact us.

Mike

Michael R. Hoagland
Tuscola County Controller/Administrator
989-672-3700
mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org

VISIT US ON LINE FOR COUNTY SERVICES @ www.tuscolacounty.org

Memo

To: TUSCOLA COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
From: BRAUN KENDRICK FINKBEINER
Date: OCTOBER 7, 2015
Subject: Procedural Requirements for Property Sale

You requested our analysis regarding whether state law imposes certain procedural requirements (i.e., auction, notice, public hearing, etc.) on the County's intended sale of county-owned property in light of the following facts:

- The property at issue is 40-50 acres of vacant land.
- The County intends to actually sell the property to a local medical care facility, not simply contractually transfer the property.
- The medical care facility receives millage funds, and is therefore a governmental entity.

Brief Answer

The County may freely authorize the sale of county-owned property at a lawfully held board meeting. Research revealed no additional procedural requirements.

Analysis

Michigan law expressly empowers county boards of commissioners to freely authorize the sale of county-owned property:

The board of supervisors of each county, or other public officers having the charge and management of the county lands, may, by their order of record, appoint or more agents to sell any real estate of their county not donated for any special purpose, and all deeds made on behalf of such county, by such agents under their proper hands and seals, and duly acknowledged by them, shall be sufficient to convey all the right, title, interest and estate which the county may then have in and to the land so conveyed. [MCL § 45.5].

To this end, a county board of commissioners,¹ at "a lawfully held meeting," may "[a]uthorize the sale or lease of real estate belonging to the county, and prescribe the manner in which a conveyance of the real estate is to be executed." MCL § 46.11(c); See also Op Atty Gen, February 25, 1958, No 3217 (County board of supervisors had authority to close and sell county infirmary and deposit proceeds of sale in public improvement fund without a vote of the people).

Though the statute requires that the board of commissioners give notice of the board meeting,² it does not require that the notice specifically inform the public of the intended property sale. In pertinent part, the statute only requires the following of public notices:

- (a) A public notice shall always contain the name of the public body to which the notice applies, its telephone number if one exists, and its address.
- (b) A public notice for a public body shall always be posted at its principal office and any other locations considered appropriate by the public body. Cable television may also be utilized for purposes of posting public notice.
- (c) If a public body is a part of a state department, part of the legislative or judicial branch of state government, part of an institution of higher education, or part of a political subdivision or school district, a public notice shall also be posted in the respective principal office of the state department, the institution of higher education, clerk of the house of representatives, secretary of the state senate, clerk of the supreme court, or political subdivision or school district.
- (d) If a public body does not have a principal office, the required public notice for a local public body shall be posted in the office of the county clerk in which the public body serves and the required public notice for a state public body shall be posted in the office of the secretary of state. [MCL § 15.264]

Nothing in the statute suggests that the notice must include the meeting's subject matter.

Research did not reveal further requirements and/or restrictions attached to the board's statutory authority to sell county-owned property unless the property to be sold was "donated [to the county] for [a] special purpose." MCL § 45.5. Furthermore, courts do not even construe this "special purpose" restriction to mean that "irrespective of change in social and economic needs, express desires of one who donates realty to county for a special purpose should never be thwarted," especially in view of the broad authority granted to counties to sell county-owned property in MCL § 46.11. *Oakland County Taxpayers' League v Board of Sup'rs of Oakland County*, 355 Mich 305 (1959) (Where new courthouse was necessary, county board of supervisors had the authority to sell existing courthouse and land on which it was situated despite the fact that the land was donated for a special purpose).

Michigan law does contain additional requirements where there is an intergovernmental conditional transfer of municipal property. MCL § 124.22. Where one local unit of government

¹ "Board of supervisors" and "board of commissioners" are used interchangeably throughout all pertinent statutes. See MCL § 46.416.

² "Public notice of the time, date, and place of meetings of the county board of commissioners shall be given in the manner required by Act No. 267 of the Public Acts of 1976, as amended." MCL § 46.1(4).

(i.e., a city, township, or village)³ intends to transfer property to another local unit of government, notice, public hearing, and the majority vote of constituents are required:

(1) The legislative body of each local unit affected by a proposed transfer of property under this act shall hold at least 1 public hearing before entering into a contract under this act. Notice of the hearing shall be given in the manner provided by the open meetings act, Act No. 267 of the Public Acts of 1976, being sections 15.261 to 15.275 of the Michigan Compiled Laws.

(2) A decision to enter into a contract under this act shall be made by a majority vote of those members elected and serving on the legislative body of each affected local unit. [MCL § 124.24]

The intended property sale in this does not amount to an intergovernmental conditional transfer of property because neither Tuscola County nor the medical care facility are local units of government as defined by state law.

Conclusion

Since the intended property sale does not amount to an intergovernmental conditional transfer of property, state law does not impose procedural requirements beyond those otherwise required for regular or special board of commissioner meetings.

³ "Local unit of government" is statutorily defined as a city, township, or village. MCL § 124.21.

mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org

From: Laura Ogar <OgarL@baycounty.net>
Sent: Thursday, October 08, 2015 11:29 AM
To: Tom Foret; erik.palm@mi.nacdnet.net; Heather Shaw; Trevor Edmonds; Heise, Jeremiah (DNR); Tuscola Co. Brd of Commissioners -Michael Hoagland; 'Roger Allen'; serickson@tuscolaedc.org; Richard G. Hall (rick.hall@cmsenergy.com); Mary A Kulis (mary.kulis@cmsenergy.com); Bonnette, Donald (DNR) (BONNETTED@michigan.gov)
Cc: Michelle Vanderhaar; Cynthia Gaul; Katy Hintzen; Alicia Wallace; lutzbrothers@charter.net
Subject: Phragmites Proposal Mtg Oct 15th 1-3p (SBCI)
Attachments: 5003 comments.doc; MISGP-2015-prep-template_491805_7.docx; MISGP 2015 Partner Information.docx

Greetings Project Team, as you are aware we were invited back to submit a full proposal for the Phragmites grant..the proposal is attached above at 2015 prep template... Also the funders have provided some commentary on the proposal...that is also attached above at 5003 comments.

Please take some time to review both the grant proposal and the comments as we need now to work to finalize the full proposal, incorporating changes and edits identified in the comments.

I intend to use the next standing meeting of the Saginaw Bay Coastal Initiative (SBCI) on the third Thursday as a working session to discuss and update the proposal.

Please mark your calendars now for Thursday, October 15 from 1-3 at the Bay County Building, Second Floor Old Chambers, 515 Center Avenue, Bay City Michigan 48708.

I wanted to get this notice out ASAP to save the date for the meeting, ..but between now and then I will send out the draft maps of the coastal area we had proposed for treatment...and they include Saginaw Chippewa Tribal lands in Arenac County, Bay County shoreline along Hampton Township that are owned by the SBLC, Hampton Township and DNR, and lands in Tuscola County, public and private.

Please mark your calendars and plan to attend as we finalize this important project.

Laura Ogar, Bay County Director
 Environmental Affairs and Community Development
 Bay County Building
 515 Center Avenue, Suite 500
 Bay City, Michigan 48708
 T 989-895-4135
 F 989-895-4068
ogarl@baycounty.net

From: Laura Ogar

Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2015 1:29 PM

To: erik.palm@mi.nacdn.net; Tom Foret; Tuscola Co. Brd of Commissioners -Michael Hoagland; Heather Shaw; Trevor Edmonds; Richard G. Hall (rick.hall@cmsenergy.com); serickson@tuscolaedc.org; Heise, Jeremiah (DNR)

Cc: Michelle Vanderhaar; Tom Hickner; Ernie Krygier; Robert Redmond; lutzbrothers@charter.net; Mike Duranczyk; Mary A Kulis (mary.kulis@cmsenergy.com)

Subject: FW: Restoration of Inner Saginaw Bay Coastal Ecosystems and Community Socio-Cultural Connections through Phragmites Treatment, Control, and Sustainable Long-Term Eradication

Good news !

We were invited by the State review team to submit a full proposal, and they have provided helpful comments for us to more fully develop the project proposal. I am attaching a copy of the Proposal in Word so we all can review the project as proposed and start to consider how we will incorporate the agency comments provided. I envision we will need to have a meeting soon to update the proposal, and will let Erik Palm the Cooperative Invasive Species Management Area Coordinator (CISMA) schedule this meeting as he will need time to reflect on the comments in consideration of drafting the first revision.

A Special Thank You goes out to Consumers Energy (Mary and Rick, and others) who graciously allowed for the cost of their own Phragmites work to be reflected in the project – as a project partner, and these costs have been as considered towards our local match contribution – again, thank you. We will include you on all future project email but the only further action item for you Rick would be to keep track of your costs and time etc spent on Phragmites. We will need to get a copy of the cost tracking to show as match, and any costs you spend now (after this 2015 pre-proposal) may qualify.

A couple things to keep in mind:

- 1). **The Full Proposal is due October 30, 2015** – so we have some time but we can't delay and need to get the update actively underway.
- 2). This is proposed to be a two year project, to run from April 2016 through October, 2017. The start date is based on when DNR says the funding should be available.
- 3). I will forward a copy of the proposed acreages and treatment areas considered under a separate email... much of the designated proposed Treatment areas' are based on the conversations..with the Saginaw Chippewa Tribe, Hampton Township for their frontage, SBLC along with DNR and Tuscola Co. ... and some of it, at least in Tuscola was fluid for the actual acreage at the preferred location(s). We have proposed treating 894 acres, and most of that is in the Hampton Township frontage area – at public access locations.

Laura Ogar, Bay County Director
Environmental Affairs and Community Development
Bay County Building
515 Center Avenue, Suite 500
Bay City, Michigan 48708
T 989-895-4135
F 989-895-4068
ogarl@baycounty.net

From: Frayre, Kammy (DNR) [<mailto:FrayreK1@michigan.gov>]

Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2015 2:49 PM

To: Laura Ogar

Subject: Restoration of Inner Saginaw Bay Coastal Ecosystems and Community Socio-Cultural Connections through Phragmites Treatment, Control, and Sustainable Long-Term Eradication

Good Afternoon,

A full application for the **Restoration of Inner Saginaw Bay Coastal Ecosystems and Community Socio-Cultural Connections through Phragmites Treatment, Control, and Sustainable Long-Term Eradication** project submitted for the 2015 Michigan Invasive Species Grant Program (MISGP) is requested for review. Full applications, as described in the 2015 Michigan Invasive Species Grant Program Handbook, are due by 3:00 p.m. on **October 30, 2015**. The MISGP full proposal application form can be found at www.michigan.gov/dnr-grants. Scroll down and select Invasive Species Grant Program, then in the Application Information drop down menu, select: MISGP Full Proposal Application. The application should be returned as an .xls file with an electronic signature. If you do not have an electronic signature, please print the signature page, sign, then scan and upload separately.

Fifty-five project pre-proposals, totaling \$9.2 million in requested grant funds, were submitted for review. Of these, 30 projects have been selected for the full application process. The combined request for these projects totals over \$6.2 million. With approximately \$3.6 million available for the 2015 grant program, the selection process remains competitive. The MISGP would like to fund as many quality projects as possible. Project budgets will be reviewed for reasonableness, and projects may be approved contingent on lower grant amounts; therefore, be as accurate as possible in estimating costs.

In order to assist in the full application process, reviewers' comments on the project pre-proposal are attached.

Applications will be scored utilizing the same criteria as the pre-proposal. The scoring criteria and details for the full proposal can be found in the 2015 MISGP Handbook at www.michigan.gov/grants-dnr. Select the Invasive Species Grant Program, then the Applicant Information drop down menu. Projects selected for funding will be chosen based on a combination of project score, project type, project metrics, geographic location, and available funding. Statewide goals for the Michigan Invasive Species Grant Program include statewide Cooperative Invasive Species Management Area coverage; detection and response to 90 new locations of targeted invasive species; management and control of terrestrial and aquatic invasives on 6,000 acres; and reaching 750,000 contacts through outreach and education efforts.

Applicants may seek clarification from state department staff in preparing their application and should be able to prepare an application without the cost of professional consulting services.

Department Contact Information:

- Projects and Focus Areas: Joanne Foreman, DNR, Invasive Species Communications Manager, 517-284-5814, foremanj@michigan.gov
- Expenses, Forms, General Grant Requirements: Kammy Frayre, DNR, MISGP Project Manager, 517-284-5970, frayrek1@michigan.gov

Thank you for your interest in the Michigan Invasive Species Grant Program!

Kammy

Kammy Frayre
Invasive Species Grant Program Manager &
Conversion Officer

Michigan Department of Natural Resources
Grants Management
Finance and Operations
frayrek1@michigan.gov
517.284.5970

The Michigan Department of Natural Resources is committed to the conservation, protection, management, use and enjoyment of the state's natural and cultural resources for current and future generations.

Project ID: 5003

Project Title: Restoration of Inner Saginaw Bay Coastal Ecosystems and Community Socio-Cultural Connections through Phragmites Treatment, Control, and Sustainable Long-Term Eradication

Applicant Name: Laura Ogar

Applicant Organization: Bay County

Overall Project Comments:

- Scale of project is extremely large. Project success is possible given enough time and resources, unique goal of re-establishing cultural connection to resource.
- Project should more clearly address long-term sustainability (especially monitoring, restoration, protection of treated areas beyond this project time frame), should address and justify the proposed aerial herbicide application for all areas in contrast to ground application for areas which are not total monocultures of Phragmites, should follow the Guide to Management and Control of Invasive Phragmites (not the Landowner's Guide to Phragmites which is out-of-date and no longer accurate), and should address any proposed mechanical treatment techniques or why they are not planned. In addition, this proposal could expand on how this project will compliment other management efforts in the region such as watershed management actions, native vegetation protection/restoration, etc.
- Has a large control component, but seems to lack robust methods for evaluation, which would be needed to determine success/effectiveness. The scope of the treatment seems somewhat limited with only conducting chemical treatments.
- The proposal has well defined goals. This project has a good collaborative base.

Purpose and Scope:

Q1: Lists 3 plans with focus on invasive species management. Directly addresses invasive species objectives in several Michigan plans.

Q2: Regional focus, though this region and wetland area has been identified as having statewide and national significance for Great Lakes fish and migratory birds. Regional implication - Saginaw Bay; although the effects on migratory waterfowl would possibly be realized across the eastern shoreline of the Lower Peninsula.

Q3: Focuses only on Phragmites but addresses multiple management categories

Q4: Proposal does not mention complimenting other management efforts, mentions improvement of native plant community. Project leverages outcomes with limited other management efforts, like native vegetation identification and protection post-treatment.

Q5: There is a well-established partnership between several counties, CISMA, tribe, land conservancy, state agency, and industry.

Management and Success:

Q1: Clear goals and objectives, but would like to see more robust methods for evaluations

Q2: No unique or innovated technique or technology. Methods are well described and generally accepted as appropriate, although aerial herbicide application is the only method proposed for 894 acres, and ground application may be more appropriate in some areas - more information on the specific site information and why this application technique is appropriate would be helpful. This proposal has innovative methods.

Q4: More than adequate to fulfill project requirements. Partners summary and project description indicate some experience with data management and reporting

Q5: Education and outreach is mentioned, enumeration is also mentioned or attainable.

Q6: Applicant is familiar with ANC permitting, securing landowner permissions.

Q7: The project team has the experience and capacity for this project.

Q8: There appears to be interest for continuing efforts, likely dependant upon available funding. Project is moderately likely to continue, though without additional funding its unclear how much monitoring or follow-up management can be done.

FAS:

Q1: Referenced the Prioritization Tool as well as other prioritization criteria from the SB-CISMA Management Plan, but did not explain what these criteria were. Applicant should describe how criteria will be implemented in project.

Q2: Vision for long term monitoring is implied based upon goal of cultural connections, commitment to long term monitoring or restoration is questionable, likely depend upon funding. Proposal lacks description of long-term sustainability - monitoring is proposed during the second year of the project, but not beyond. Long-term sustainability of the monitoring and restoration/management of treated areas should be expanded in this proposal. Unclear on long-term commitment for management efforts including restoration.

Q3: Does not mention DEQ's BMP Guide, does mention DEQ's introduction guide to invasive Phragmites, could be mistaken reference. This proposal should be revised to follow the up-to-date Guide to the Control and Management of Invasive Phragmites,

instead of the out-of-date Landowner's Guide. Good adherence to using multiple methods to control phragmites including herbicides, mowing and burning.

Q4: The project incorporates collaborative partnerships.

Q5: Because the project references the Prioritization Tool, and criteria in the SB-CISMA Management Plan, it appears that it will somewhat build upon previously managed sites, adjacent control efforts, and target sites providing public benefits. However, these locations and how this project directly builds upon these is not clear in the proposal, and should be more clearly defined and explained. In particular, there have been many large treatment areas in this region in the past, and this proposal should address these.

**Restoration of Inner Saginaw Bay Coastal Ecosystems and Community Socio-Cultural Connections
through Phragmites Treatment, Control, and Sustainable Long-Term Management**

Saginaw Bay Cooperative Invasive Species Management Area (SB-CISMA)

Saginaw Conservation District

Erik Palm, CISMA Coordinator

(989) 781-1720 x 117

erik.palm@mi.nacdn.net The Saginaw Bay CISMA is a collective organization of local stakeholders who wish to assess, prevent, control and manage invasive species within the Saginaw Bay Watershed. The SB-CISMA Coordinator is a full time contract employee who is experienced with grant administration, reporting and natural resource inventories. The Coordinator is responsible for providing oversight and support for the implementation of the SB-CISMA and will work with public agencies, private landowners and conservation groups to ensure abatement of invasive plant species threats.

Bay County, Michigan, CISMA Signatory

Department of Environmental Affairs and Community Development

Laura Ogar, Director

(989)-895-4196

ogarl@baycounty.net Ms. Ogar has over 25 years' experience in the environmental resource management field and has successfully administered over 120 local, state and federal grants including a \$4.6 million ARRA grant, a NOAA Land Acquisition grant for Wildlife Habitat, and other coastal Zone grant to develop the Saginaw Bay Blueways Trail map. She is fully knowledgeable with public procurement procedures and has been recognized for exceptional grant management by the State of Michigan.

Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe

CISMA Signatory

Heather Shaw, Wildlife Biologist

(989)-775-4146

hshaw@sagchip.org The Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe wishes to improve water quality and wildlife habitat in the Saginaw Bay Watershed. Ms. Shaw has exceptional skills in validation and collection of data and data management. She previously worked for Ducks Unlimited and gained extensive field reconnaissance expertise and wildlife biology. She also has a strong background in communications and translating scientific technical concepts to the general public. As a representative of the Tribe she is a critical asset to the project team.

Saginaw Basin Land Conservancy, CISMA Signatory,

Trevor Edmonds, Conservation Lead

(989)-891-9986

trevor@sblc-mi.org The Saginaw Basin Land Conservancy is a non-profit whose mission is to conserve land and water resources to promote sustainable communities and a higher quality of life in the Saginaw Bay Watershed. Trevor is a certified aquatic pesticide applicator as well as an experienced land conservation manager.

Consumers Energy, Kam/J.C. Weadock
Richard G. Hall, Site Environmental Manager
(989)-891-3464

rjck.hall@cmsenergy.com

Consumers Energy works closely with a variety of organizations throughout Michigan to achieve a common goal of protecting the state's water, air, wetlands, and wildlife. Phragmites control is performed throughout their campus at the mouth of Saginaw River along the shores of Saginaw Bay and their expertise and familiarity of the local conditions are critical.

Hampton Township, CISMA Signatory,
Tom Foret, Township Supervisor
(989)-893-7541

tforet@hamptonmi.net

Hampton Township is a local unit of government in Michigan looking to control and manage invasive Phragmites. Tom Foret is the Township Supervisor responsible to public relations and ensuring all the Township responsibilities are met. He has administered numerous grants and is responsible for financial matters on the township. Tom serves as Public Works Director for Hampton Township for 8 years prior to becoming Supervisor. He is experienced and has vast firsthand knowledge on maintenance needs and Phragmites challenges at the Hampton Campground and Boat launch at Finn Road along the Saginaw Bay.

Tuscola County, CISMA Signatory
Michael Hoagland, County Administrator
(989)-672-3700

mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org

Mr. Hoagland is the County Administrator of Tuscola County, a community located on the Great Lakes coast; however the community has no visual access to the Saginaw Bay, and has a Phragmites choked shoreline.

Tuscola Economic Development Corporation
Steve Erickson, Executive Director
(989)-673-2849

serickson@tuscolaedc.org

The Tuscola County Economic Development Corporation is a non-profit organization that is dedicated to raising the quality of life in Tuscola County, MI through economic development. Mr. Erickson also serves on the Tuscola Parks Commission.

Michigan Department of Natural Resources
Wildlife Division

Jeremiah Heise, Wildlife Biologist (989)-865-6211

HeiseJ1@michigan.gov The Michigan Department of Natural Resources is committed to the conservation, protection, management, use and enjoyment of the state's natural and cultural resources for current and future generations.

mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org

From: Jeff Bliss <jeffb@hdc-caro.org>
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2015 8:07 AM
To: Mike Hoagland (mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org)
Cc: Brian Neuville
Subject: MSHDA Check Presentation

Good Morning Mike,

I confirmed the date, time and place for the check presentation with MSHDA late last Thursday afternoon. They would like to have it at one centralized location as they will not only be presenting to Tuscola County, but also to Huron and Sanilac. The reason for one location is they are working on getting the local television crews involved and if the weather is bad a place for it to be done inside. We agreed on holding here at HDC as we have a good sized parking area and also a large classroom area for bad weather.

The date will be Monday October 26, 2015. The time is 11:30 A.M.. The location is HDC in Caro. I would like to get confirmation as to Who will be coming as soon as possible.

If there are any questions, please contact me direct.

Thank You,

Jeff Bliss

CDBG/Housing Rehabilitation Coordinator
Human Development Commission
429 Montague Ave.
Caro, MI 48723
Phone: (989)672-1724
Fax: (989)673-2031
Email: jeffb@hdc-caro.org



"Restoring Hope by Helping People and Changing Lives"



MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE

PROJECT BUDGET FORM
(Authorized by 1994 P.A. 461)

Applicant Name: Tuscola County Recycling Material Recovery Facility
Project Name: Tuscola County Recycling Trailer Project
Tracking Code Number: 430291-15

STAFFING		HOURS	RATE	GRANT AMOUNT	LOCAL MATCH AMOUNT	TOTAL
TBD - Drop off Trailer Facilitator		1040.00	\$ 12.98	\$ 10,109.00	\$ 3,369.40	\$ 13,478.40
Material Handler 2015 rate		350	\$ 13.92	\$ 3470.25	\$ 1156.75	\$ 4627.00
Material Handler 2016 rate		575	\$ 13.48	\$ 5813.25	\$ 1937.45	\$ 7751.00
STAFFING Subtotal				\$ 10,109.00	\$ 3,369.40	\$ 13,478.40
FRINGE BENEFITS (not to exceed 49%)				\$ 9283.50	\$ 3094.50	\$ 12378.00
NAME & TITLE			RATE			
TBD - Drop off Trailer Facilitator			0.00%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
FICA			7.65%	\$ 710.18	\$ 236.72	\$ 946.92
WORK COMP			.89%	\$ 82.63	\$ 27.54	\$ 110.16
FRINGE BENEFITS Subtotal				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
STAFFING AND FRINGE BENEFITS Subtotal				\$ 10,109.00	\$ 3,369.40	\$ 13,478.40
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES		HOURS or UNITS	RATE or TOTAL	\$ 10,076.31	\$ 3,358.76	\$ 13,435.08
NAME						
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES Subtotal				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
SUPPLIES, MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT		QUANTITY	COST			
SUPPLIES & MATERIALS (Itemize)						
SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS Subtotal				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
EQUIPMENT (any item over \$1000)						
16 foot drop off trailer		1.00	\$ 16,854.93	\$ 11,891.00	\$ 3,963.93	\$ 15,854.93
EQUIPMENT Subtotal				\$ 11,891.00	\$ 3,963.93	\$ 15,854.93
SUPPLIES, MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT Subtotal				\$ 11,891.00	\$ 3,963.93	\$ 15,854.93

	RECYCLING GRANT	BUILDINGS & GROUNDS			2016 Original Budget
	Fuller-PT	Fuller-PT	TOTALS		Fuller-PT
	20 hours/ week	10 hours/ week			101-265
Salaries - PT/Temp 705-000	\$ 14,289.60	\$ 7,144.80	\$ 21,434.40		\$ 17,862.00
Overtime 706-000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -
Work Comp 710-000	\$ 127.18		\$ -		
Health & Dental Ins. 711-000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -
FICA 715-000	\$ 1,093.15	\$ 546.58	\$ 546.58		\$ 1,366.44
Life Ins. 717-000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -
Retirement 718-000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -
Total Per Employee	\$ 15,509.93	\$ 7,691.38	\$ 21,980.98		\$ 19,228.44
GRANT APPROVED AMOUNT	\$ 5,813.25				
25% County Match per Grant	\$ 1,937.75				

RECYCLING GRANT BUILDINGS & GROUNDS

Original 2015 Budget

	Fuller-PT	Fuller-PT	TOTALS
SPLIT	20 hours/week	25 hours/week	
	10/12/15-12/31/15	1/1/15-10/12/15	
	10 hours/week	10 hours/week	
	10/12/15-12/31/15	10/12/15-12/31/15	
Salaries - PT/Temp 705-000	\$ 3,201.60	\$ 14,940.80	\$ 18,142.40
Overtime 706-000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Work Comp 710-000	\$ 28.49		\$ 28.49
Health & Dental Ins. 711-000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
FICA 715-000	\$ 244.92	\$ 1,142.97	\$ 244.92
Life Ins. 717-000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Retirement 718-000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Per Employee	\$ 3,475.02	\$ 16,083.77	\$ 18,415.82

Fuller-PT
101-265
25 hours/week
\$ 17,342.00
\$ -
\$ -
\$ -
\$ 1,326.66
\$ -
\$ -
\$ 18,668.66

GRANT APPROVED AMOUNT	\$ 3,470.25
25% County Match per Grant	\$ 1,156.75

mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org

From: Brad Roseberry <broseberry@cabt.org>
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2015 4:49 PM
To: mhoagland@tuscolacounty.org
Subject: Federal Truck Size and Weight Update

Dear Michael,

In our last newsletter, we said we were expecting to see legislation supporting heavier trucks. Unfortunately, we were correct. Rep. Reid Ribble (R-WI) introduced in September legislation, called the "SAFE Trucking Act" (H.R. 3488), that would allow states to permit 91,000-pound, six-axle trucks. While this proposal has been framed by proponents as "a compromise," it is far from that. The Ribble bill is strongly opposed by the same broad coalition of law enforcement and safety groups, local government representatives, railroads, truck drivers and even a significant segment of the trucking industry.

The June 2015 USDOT Truck Size and Weight Study recommended against any increase in truck weight and found major negative impacts from 91,000-pound trucks, including:

- 47-percent higher crash rates compared to 80,000-pound trucks in Washington state
- Higher out-of-service brake violation rates compared to 80,000-pound trucks
- More than \$1 billion in additional bridge costs
- Diversion of more than 2.3 million tons of freight from rail to the highways each year

We will continue to oppose this, and any other legislation, that would increase the weight of trucks on our roads, and have been proactive in our approach.

In mid-September, CABT arranged a D.C. fly-in with supporters from 13 states to meet with Members of Congress. These supporters included law enforcement and local government officials. Also participating were two truck drivers and representatives from the rail supply industry. We had over 100 meetings, including meetings with 27 House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee offices and 21 Senate offices. The Members of Congress were highly receptive to our message of safety and infrastructure damage concerns with bigger trucks.

On the issue of longer trucks, as you know, we were successful in keeping longer double trailer-trucks out of the Senate DRIVE Act. This legislation, being pushed by a group of trucking companies led by the American Trucking Associations (ATA), would require states to allow 91-foot, super-sized doubles.

Our focus is now on the House T&I Committee, with a mark-up coming as soon as the week of October 19. We expect proponents of both 91-foot double-trailer trucks and 91,000-pound trucks will offer an amendment in that committee. Regardless of what happens in the T&I Committee, we must be prepared for a vote on the House floor. Also, we will still likely face another hurdle on longer-truck legislation in the appropriations process, which will come up again this year.

Your efforts have been instrumental in defending against the first wave of lobbying for these heavier and longer trucks. But we know the next few weeks, and possibly months, offer proponents time to intensify their efforts. We must keep the pressure on Members of Congress to oppose these bigger trucks, especially since it

is their constituents who overwhelmingly opposes these proposals.

As always, thank you for your commitment in keeping heavier and longer trucks off of our roads. Please let me know if CABT can be of any assistance.

Brad

Brad Roseberry
Assistant Vice President
Coalition Against Bigger Trucks

Don't forget to follow us on [Facebook](#) and [Twitter](#)

[Click here to unsubscribe.](#)

