

## DPS Responses to City Council Agenda Inquiries – July 7, 2025

Question Originator	Agenda Item	Question	Answer
Council Member: Theresa Mungioli	2025-0283	Do we have any standards/ordinances that cover this?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This work is regulated by the Michigan Public Services Commission (MPSC). Similar to electric and gas utilities, telecommunications companies file a case with the MPSC. Hearings are held, in which the agency rules on the request and decides on whether or not to grant a license. RH counsel reviews the applications for compliance to MPSC rulings (copy attached).</li> <li>○ Per Dan Christ: MCL 484.3107 of the METRO Act provides that if the provider and municipality don't agree after notice to public service commission, then a mediator is appointed to assist parties try to resolve.</li> </ul>
		Do these companies pay us a fee and what is it based on?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The applicants pay a one-time application fee. All costs involved with the permitting and inspections are at no charge per the METRO Act.</li> </ul>
		You mention "The City's annual METRO Act revenue increases per linear foot of communications conduit installed within our Rights-of-Way" - what does that amount to?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The State uses a formula based on linear feet of occupied ROW to distribute funds to municipalities. Permit holders pay the State, who in turn distributes it back to municipalities. RH currently receives \$.05 per linear foot of conduit in our ROW. In 2022, 2023, and 2024 Rochester Hills received \$297,521.82, \$317,252.23, and \$333,470.92, respectively</li> </ul>
		does this increase with each company that installs fiber optic lines?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Yes. Any additional underground cable (line) installation is reported by the carrier to the State, then reimbursed to the member communities. Our share goes up, accordingly.</li> </ul>

## DPS Responses to City Council Agenda Inquiries – July 7, 2025

		What is the impact to the residents?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The positive impact is that more carriers offer more competition and thus, better pricing and service to customers (residents). Also, with new infrastructure comes more reliable, efficient service with fewer interruptions, increased band-width resulting in less network congestion and fewer slowdowns.</li> <li>○ The negative impact includes inconvenience when the sub-contractors are installing the underground conduit. This can create burden for residents, RH clerks, inspectors and other staff, as we are the permitting department responsible for assuring proper restoration occurs.</li> <li>○ There is some above-ground equipment (junction boxes) installed and handholes (underground junction boxes), which can be off-putting to residents.</li> </ul>
Council Member: Theresa Mungioli	2025-0265	What are the width of the pathways? Are they the 8 ft that our current pathways are?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Yes, the pathways are proposed to be 8-ft width.</li> </ul>
		Will there be a need to acquire any new equipment to maintain the pathway - snow plow, etc?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No new equipment will be required.</li> </ul>
		Do we need to acquire any ROW to install the paths?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There are a few small ROW acquisitions that will be required to connect to the existing pathways on the south end. The ROW acquisition will be performed by MDOT as part of the project design.</li> </ul>
		Does the proposed path over M59 fit in the current sidewalk configuration?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The pathway is proposed to be located on the east side (only) of the bridge, abutments, and approaches. Dead-end pathway currently exists on the east side of Rochester Road at either end and will be connected to form a continuous, uninterrupted pathway across M-59.</li> </ul>

## DPS Responses to City Council Agenda Inquiries – July 7, 2025

		What are the "City may be responsible for grant reporting requirements, permits, administration, potential cost overruns, and any non-participating items"?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The project is two years out and design engineering, while having begun months ago, still has a long way to go. There are several design elements that are being considered that could affect the project cost. RH staff are fully embedded in the project team to influence decisions effecting cost.</li> <li>○ Non-participating items are work that the city requests which are deemed grant ineligible. Things like water main, sanitary sewer repairs and other improvements which the city requests to be included. The grant would not cover these types of work.</li> </ul>
		These already included in the budget? Or will a budget change be needed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ At present, we don't have any utility improvements planned but that could change in the coming months, as design work continues. If we do in fact request non-participating work, we would coordinate with Fiscal and the costs would most likely come out of water and sewer capital accounts.</li> </ul>
		Is all of the work mentioned covered in this grant (This project will construct a new pathway on the east side of M-150 between Michelson and Nawakwa Roads and includes non-motorized improvements to the M-150 bridge over M-59) or only the portion over M59?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The TAP grant will cover all aspects of connecting the pathways on either end of the bridge, satisfying the goals of the TAP Grant program. Namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "...to enhance the transportation system by supporting projects that provide safe, accessible, and environmentally friendly transportation options for all users."</li> <li>▪ "...improving safety, promoting multimodal transportation, and creating more walkable, bikeable, and environmentally friendly communities."</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
		What will the remaining budget cover?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There is currently no planned use of the budget surplus. The budget amount was established prior to agreements and grant application estimates.</li> </ul>