

# Digital EGLE/USACE Joint Permit Application (JPA) for Inland Lakes and Streams, Great Lakes, Wetlands, Floodplains, Dams, Environmental Areas, High Risk Erosion Areas and Critical Dune Areas

version 1.23

(Submission #: HP9-F9N1-G87EN, version 3)

## Details

---

**Submission ID** HP9-F9N1-G87EN

**Submission Reason** New

## Form Input

---

### Instructions

[To download a copy or print these instructions. Please click this link \(recommended\).](#)

### The EGLE/USACE "Joint Permit Application" (JPA)

---

#### READ THOROUGHLY BEFORE STARTING THE FORM

It is recommended to download a pdf of this page at [www.michigan.gov/jointpermit](http://www.michigan.gov/jointpermit) for reference while filling out the form. Please also refer to this website for additional information regarding this form, including a glossary and other helpful resources on information required to be submitted in this form.

This is the Joint Permit Application (JPA) for construction activities where the land meets the water. This application covers permit requirements derived from state and federal rules and regulations for activities involving:

Wetlands  
Floodplains  
Marinas  
Dams  
Inland Lakes and Streams  
Great Lakes Bottomlands  
Critical Dunes  
High Risk Erosion Areas

This application prevents duplication of state and federal forms for these activities and provides concurrent review under all pertinent state and federal laws. In the case of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) jurisdiction, the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy will also send a copy of this Joint Permit Application to the USACE for simultaneous processing. The Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy will provide coordination between state and federal agencies during the application review.

This application form is set up with the following sections to be completed by the applicant (note that it is recommended to gather all this information prior to starting this form):

#### Contact Information:

Applicant, Property Owner(s), Consultant(s), and any other Authorized Representative(s)

Authorizations are required from the property owner for:

- when the applicant is not the owner,
- when there is a consultant/representative for the applicant,
- when spoils disposal locations are not on site,

- when other permissions are necessary based on project specifics and are identified by the form.

**Project Location Information:**

Address, coordinates, and directions to the site, etc.

**Background Information:**

Existing site conditions, other related permits, existing easements/encumbrances, other related application numbers (pre-application meetings, Wetland Identification Program, etc.)

**Permit Application Category and Public Notice Information:**

This section asks what permit application category you believe fits your project. While this is not required to submit the application, knowing this will also help you submit the right permit application fee and avoid a correction request and processing delays.

The choices of permit application categories to select in the form are:

General Permit, \$50 fee ([https://www.michigan.gov/documents/deq/wrd-general-permit-categories\\_555828\\_7.pdf](https://www.michigan.gov/documents/deq/wrd-general-permit-categories_555828_7.pdf))

Minor Project, \$100 fee ([https://www.michigan.gov/documents/deq/wrd-minor-project-categories\\_555829\\_7.pdf](https://www.michigan.gov/documents/deq/wrd-minor-project-categories_555829_7.pdf))

Public Notice Individual Permit, range from \$500-\$4,000 depending on type of activity. For High Risk Erosion Areas and Critical Dune Areas fees for Public Notice individual permit applications can range from \$50-\$4000. Additional fees may be applied for some special project requirements such as hydraulic analysis, dam projects, and a special exception application in a critical dune area. See Fee Schedule on website for more information.

Unsure, select this and the permit reviewer will make the determination on permit type after the application is submitted based on the project details. However, some fee is required to be submitted with the application. If an additional fee is required, the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy will send a correction request that will show the remaining amount required. The application will not be considered complete without the proper fee.

Adjacent Landowner contact information for Public Notice projects is required by law. This includes any parcels touching the project parcel and parcels across the street.

**Project Description:**

Information on the Proposed Use and Purpose of the project (who and what the project is intended for and why is it needed). This includes a written summary of the project as well as a list of project uses and types to select from as follows:

**Project Use Selections:**

Private  
Commercial  
Public/Gov/Tribal  
Federal/State funded  
Non-Profit  
Other

**Project Type Selections:**

Agriculture  
Airport  
Development- Condo/ Subdivision/Residential  
Development-Commercial/ Industrial  
Drain-County  
Drain-Private  
Drawdown  
Lake, Drawdown  
Wetland Forestry  
Landfill  
Marina/Mooring Facility  
Marine Railway  
Mining-Mineral,  
Mining-Sand and Gravel  
Private Residence  
Restoration-Wetland  
Restoration-Stream  
Transportation  
Septic System Surveying or Scientific Measuring Device  
Utility-Electrical, Fiber optic  
Utility-Oil and gas pipelines  
Utility-Sewer/water line  
Other

Construction Details including sequencing, timeframes, SESC measures, etc.

Alternatives Analysis detailing all options considered and why this is the least impactful feasible and prudent proposal. The depth of this analysis is typically commensurate with the size and purpose of the project and at minimum should include variables such as alternate locations (including other properties), configurations and sizes (layout and design), and methods (construction technologies), and other constraints (local regulations, resource issues). Discussion should also include why the do nothing alternative is not feasible or prudent.

#### Project Compensation:

Narrative of how proposed impacts will be compensated (mitigated or other minimization measures), including amount, location, and method; or why mitigation should not be required. This can be traditional mitigation and/or other techniques used to minimize overall loss of functions.

Resource and Activity Type. This section is intended to determine what additional sections of the application are generated (as seen on the left side of the screen) for further information gathering. This includes questions regarding what Resource feature is involved (e.g., wetland, stream, floodplain, pond, dam, critical dune, etc.) and if there are identified Special Activities (i.e., activities requiring a specific series of questions to be answered). Be sure to choose all that apply to your project. If your activity is not listed, choose None of the Above and move on to the next question. More specific activity questions will appear later based on the resource section answers.

Resource Information and Impacts Sections (Multiple Sections). These are a series of sections that will appear on the left side of the screen based on your answers to the Resource and Activity Types section. You will input further information on the existing resources to be impacted (e.g., wetland type, permanent or temporary impact, water elevation data, drainage area, etc.) and all proposed Project Activities with their Dimensions (e.g., length, width, depth, square footage). For example, when Wetland is selected as a resource that your project will involve, a Wetland Project Information and Impacts section will appear on the left side of the screen that includes questions specific to gathering information about the wetland.

For projects including Floodplains, Marinas, Dams, Critical Dunes, or High Risk Erosion Areas individual sections will appear on the left side of the screen that include different sets of specialized questions as required by those programs. These sections do not share a specific format. Help tips will guide you in filling out these sections.

For projects including wetlands, ponds, inland lakes, streams, or the Great Lakes resources, individual sections will appear on the left side of the screen that are similar in format to each other. Each of these resource sections asks initial general information and then has additional questions regarding the Types of Activities proposed for each resource. The outline for these resource activity impacts questions is Activity Type, Dimensions Table, and Special Questions.

There are four overall Types of Activities groups for wetlands, ponds, inland lakes, streams or the Great Lakes:

- Fill Activities
- Dredge Activities
- Structure Activities
- Other Activities

Under each of these Types of Activity questions, specific activity lists will be shown that are typical for that type (fill, dredge, structure, other) and resource (wetland, lake, stream, etc). Follow these steps to accurately fill out the Activity Type Questions:

1. Start with the Fill question and choose any activities on the list that is included in your project. If your activity is not shown, then select None of the Above and move to the next question.

2. When you select an activity listed under Fill, Dredge, Structure, or Other, a dimensions table will appear under that question. This table is where you enter EACH activity OF THE TYPE YOU SELECTED and associated dimensions. Be sure that all the activities you selected are also listed in the table with the dimensions. Multiple activities covering the same footprint may be combined on one line in the table (for example, riprap on slopes of driveway fill can be entered on the same impact dimensions line and does not necessarily need to be broken out).

3. Continue to answer the Activity Type questions (Fill, Dredge, Structure, Other) until all have been answered with either a specific Activity listed under that Type or None of the Above. If you did not find your activity in any list then select Other, Other and provide a description of your activity in the space that appears. Please be as descriptive as possible.

Proposed mitigation questions may appear within specific resource types sections based on your answers. Enter any proposed mitigation in the appropriate section (wetland, stream, etc.) and if no mitigation is proposed you must provide commentary with an explanation as to why it is not required. Mitigation plans according to the mitigation checklist (link) are required for a complete application. When mitigation is proposed be sure to also select mitigation in the Permit Application Type section under the second question.

In the above sections, uploads will be prompted as required by the answers to questions. These should be uploaded in these location (ex, mitigation plans should be uploaded in the mitigation section). Please do not wait to upload one large document with all plans combined at the end. Note that each individual upload is limited to 10M.

#### Upload of Proposed Site Plans.

Any plans or explanatory narratives not requested in previous sections should be uploaded in this section. Construction Plans

including overhead view, cross sections, and profiles showing each impact either to-scale or with dimensions are required and typically would be uploaded here. Plan labels should correspond with labels entered in the form for each activity selected. The application will not be complete without the proper site plans. If drawings are not received with all required dimensions and resources identified, then the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy will send a correction request and your application processing will be delayed. However, please limit drawings, plans, and narratives submitted to the items necessary for permit review. For example, entire bid package documents and CAD drawings are often not helpful for permit review and may cause delays from wading through extraneous information. Plans, profiles and cross sections specific to the resource impacts are the most helpful.

**Review:**

This section allows you to see the entire form with the answers you entered. Please review for accuracy prior to hitting the submit button. A print option is provided on this screen (print to PDF is recommended). Once the application is submitted you may not make changes to it until the application has been assigned to a staff person.

**Certify & Submit:**

This is the final section of the application form. The **Submit Form** button selection certifies that all information in the application is true and accurate and that you have the authority to apply for the permit as indicated. This application will become part of public record.

We recommend that you have the above information ready prior to starting this application. You will be able to save in-progress applications and come back later, but all required uploads and questions are necessary before the system will allow submittal of the application. Some sections of this application form load faster than others depending on the complexity of the questions.

Thanks for your patience while you work through the application. For assistance with this form visit:

<https://www.michigan.gov/jointpermit>

[Click here for additional information on maps, drawings, and other attachment](#)

## Contact Information

### Applicant Information (Usually the property owner)

**First Name      Last Name**

Emile              *Lauzzana*

**Organization Name**

*Ann Arbor Public Schools*

**Phone Type      Number              Extension**

Business          734-994-8118

**Email**

*lauzzanae@a2schools.org*

**Address**

2555 South State St

Ann Arbor, MI 48104

**Is the Property Owner different from the Applicant?**

No

**Has the applicant hired an agent or cooperating agency (agency or firm assisting applicant) to complete the application process?**

Yes

**Upload Attachment for Authorization from Agent**

AAPS\_Agent Authorization\_Westerman Culvert.pdf - 06/14/2021 12:05 PM

**Comment**

NONE PROVIDED

## Agent Contact

**First Name**      **Last Name**

Charles              *Humphriss*

**Organization Name**

*Environmental Consulting and Technology, Inc.*

**Phone Type**      **Number**              **Extension**

Mobile              734.545.0873

**Email**

chumphriss@ectinc.com

**Address**

2200 Commonwealth Blvd

Suite 300

Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105

**Are there additional property owners or other contacts you would like to add to the application?**

No

## Project Location

**DEQ Site Reference Number (Pre-Populated)**

-2224828820688601772

**Project Location**

42.24762,-83.7343954

**Project Location Address**

2775 Boardwalk Dr

Ann Arbor, MI 48104

**County**

Washtenaw

**Is there a Property Tax ID Number(s) for the project area?**

Yes

**Please enter the Tax ID Number(s) for the project location**

09-90-00-080-753

**Is there Subdivision/Plat and Lot Number(s)?**

No

**Is this project within Indian Lands?**

No

**Local Unit of Government (LUG)**

Ann Arbor

**Directions to Project Site**

The project site is located to the north of the Westerman Preschool and Family Center at 2775 Boardwalk Dr. The site is approximately 0.2 miles north of the intersection of E Eisenhower Pkwy and Boardwalk Dr.

## Background Information

**Has the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy (EGLE) and/or United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) conducted a pre-application meeting/inspection for this project?**

No

**Has the EGLE completed a Wetland Identification Program (WIP) assessment for this site?**

No

Environmental Areas are coastal wetlands on the shorelines of the Great Lakes. Enter this number only if a designated Environmental Area is in the proposed project area. Environmental Areas are designated locations along the Great Lakes shoreline. If you don't know whether there is an environmental area within the project area, leave blank. Additional information on Environmental Areas can be found by clicking the following link:

[Click Here for Link](#)

**Environmental Area Number (if known):**

NONE PROVIDED

**Has the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) completed either an approved or preliminary jurisdictional determination for this site?**

No

**Were any regulated activities previously completed on this site under an EGLE and/or USACE permit?**

No

**Have any activities commenced on this project?**

No

**Is this an after-the-fact application?**

No

**Are you aware of any unresolved violations of environmental law or litigation involving the property?**

No

**Is there a conservation easement or other easement, deed restriction, lease, or other encumbrance upon the property?**

No

**Are there any other federal, interstate, state, or local agency authorizations associated with this project?**

No

## **Permit Application Category and Public Notice Information**

**Project Category Selection:**

The Permit Application Category you apply under is dependent on the type and scope of activities you are undertaking and the resources affected. There is a three-tier permitting process to aid in expediting permits for regulated activities that occur on wetlands, inland lakes and streams, and the Great Lakes (Parts 301, 303, and 325): General Permit, Minor Project, and Individual Permit.

Additionally, Minor Project categories exist for floodplains under the authority of Part 31.

General Permit and Minor Project categories generally meet specific Best Management Practices criteria that have been shown to minimize impacts to resources if followed correctly. If you select a General Permit or Minor Project Category you must select the specific category(ies) that your project fits under. Any project that does not fit a General or Minor Category are Individual Permit projects. All projects in Critical Dunes, High Risk Erosion Areas, or Dam Safety projects will be Individual Permit Projects.

**Indicate the type of permit being applied for.**

Individual Permit for all other projects

**This type of permit application requires that you include contact information for the adjacent landowners to this project. If you are only entering in a small number of bordering parcel owners contact information, please select "Enter list of recipients". If there is a rather large number of affected property owners such as a project that significantly affects lake levels, please upload a spreadsheet of the property owners. Please include names and mailing addresses.**

Enter list of recipients.

**This project may require public noticing. Please list the adjacent landowners to the project, along with any of the others that may apply:**

Contact Type	Contact Person	Mailing Address	City	State	Zip Code
Adjacent Landowner	NNN AUTO OWNER V LLC C/O APOLLO NET LEASE CAPITAL	2605 BOARDWALK DR	ANN ARBOR	MI	48104

Contact Type	Contact Person	Mailing Address	City	State	Zip Code
Adjacent Landowner	PUBLIC STORAGE INC C/O PUBLIC STORAGE - #MI-8087	2500 SOUTH INDUSTRIAL HWY	ANN ARBOR	MI	48104
Adjacent Landowner	CITY OF ANN ARBOR ANN ARBOR TRANSPORTATION	2700 SOUTH INDUSTRIAL HWY	ANN ARBOR	MI	48104
Adjacent Landowner	BOARDWALK COMMERCE PARK ASSOC LLC OXFORD PROPERTY MANAGEMENT	2875 BOARDWALK DR	ANN ARBOR	MI	48104
Adjacent Landowner	SOUTH STATE COMMONS II, L.L.C. C/O MAV DEVELOPMENT CO	1000 OAKBROOK DR	ANN ARBOR	MI	48104
Adjacent Landowner	NNN AUTO OWNER V LLC C/O APOLLO NET LEASE CAPITAL	2575 SOUTH STATE ST	ANN ARBOR	MI	48104

[Link to General Permit Categories with Descriptions](#)

[Link to Minor Permit Categories with Descriptions](#)

[Link to Minor Project Category descriptions for Floodplain Only projects \(See R323.1316\)](#)

## Project Description

**Project Use: (select all that apply - Private, Commercial, Public/Government/Tribal, Receiving Federal/State Transportation Funds, Non-profit, or Other)**

Public/Government/Tribal

**Project Type (select all that apply):**

Other: Preschool playground construction and culvert installation to access playground

Please enter your answers in the text box for the next four questions. If you have a long description, please use the document upload at the end of the section. Please make every effort to enter your information directly into the application text boxes. If the answer is in an attachment, please identify that in the text box below.

**Project Summary (Purpose and Use): Provide a summary of all proposed activities including the intended use and reason for the proposed project.**

Ann Arbor Public Schools desires additional play area space to be located north of the main building to include: ♦ The installation of a culvert to provide pedestrian access over the existing ditch from the main building to the proposed natural play area. ♦ A limestone path, timber boardwalk, and engineered wood fiber mulch, providing ADA access within play area. ♦ A flat area of turf to provide an area for children to run around. ♦ Natural play components such as: play mounds, log/stump scrambles, engineered wood fiber mulch play areas, outdoor learning space, stump stools, log balance beams, etc. all requiring ADA accessibility. ♦ Wetland restoration includes clearing of undesirable, invasive plants, with supplemental native plantings. ♦ Play area will be fenced in. ♦ The length of the culvert is driven by the vertical elevation change. Based on the height/profile needed for water to pass, the culvert needed to be extended on either side of the walk, then backfilled and graded to a reasonable 3:1 maximum slope, down to the ditch. This, along with plantings, was requested by AAPS for safety measures if a child were to step off the walk. The limestone path is proposed because it fits the material scheme for a natural playground, is ADA compliant, is much easier to construct, and less costly.

### CORRECTION REQUEST (APPROVED)

#### Project Purpose

Additional information is needed regarding the reasoning for the proposed impacts. You must explain the reasoning for proposing a culvert that far exceeds the width of the pathway proposed over the culvert. Additionally, what is the reason for proposing a limestone path instead of a second boardwalk.

Created on 7/15/2021 2:58 PM by **Melissa Letosky**

#### 1 COMMENT

**Charles Humphriss (chumphriss@ectinc.com) (7/31/2021 10:45 AM)**

The length of the culvert is driven by the vertical elevation change. Based on the height/profile needed for water to pass, the culvert needed to be extended on either side of the walk, then backfilled and graded to a reasonable 3:1 maximum slope, down to the ditch. This, along with plantings, was requested by AAPS for safety measures if a child were to step off the walk. The limestone path is proposed because it fits the material scheme for a natural playground, is ADA compliant, is much easier to construct, and less costly. A boardwalk or bridge is a good alternative but it is cost prohibitive.

**Project Construction Sequence, Methods, and Equipment: Describe how the proposed project timing, methods, and equipment will minimize disturbance from the project construction, including but not limited to soil erosion and sedimentation control measures.**

Standard construction methods are proposed and anticipated. General sequence will be: 1) Mobilize; installation of temporary fencing and soil erosion control measures; acquire necessary permits; and install and maintain construction staking, 2) Demolition activities; mechanically clear areas of proposed grading, 3) Installation of recreation amenities, 4) Installation of culvert, 5) Development of As-Builts, 6) Demobilize including removal of temporary fencing, site cleaning, and restoration, seeding of area disturbed by contractors work, removal of any control devices, and 7) Contract closeout.

**Project Alternatives: Describe all options considered as alternatives to the proposed project, and describe how impacts to state and federal regulated waters will be avoided and minimized. This may include other locations, materials, etc.**

No Action The wetland and stream adjacent to the Westerman School would not be impacted, however project goals will not be met. Shifting Access Route to Boardwalk Dr. Providing access to the proposed playground without crossing the stream would require children to walk along Boardwalk Dr. This option was ruled out due to safety concerns from Ann Arbor Public Schools. Access via culvert and Minimized Playground Footprint (Preferred Alternative) A culvert with a buried bottom would allow for foot traffic to cross the stream and access the playground without the above-mentioned safety concerns along Boardwalk Dr. The layout of the playground was designed to minimize impacts to the existing wetland. Therefore, this alternative is the preferred alternative. A shorter crossing is not feasible because it would increase the risk of four- to six-year-old children falling into the highly entrenched stream. For example, a narrow bridge or box culvert with railings would make it relatively easy for a small child to step off the path immediately before or after the crossing and fall into the stream. The proposed 70-foot wide crossing is only approximately 60 feet wider than a bridge or box culvert. Native plantings will be installed on either side of the crossing as a barrier to further reduce the risk of a child falling into the stream. The proposed native plantings on either side of the crossing will also provide wildlife habitat and help offset stream impacts. It is important to note that the proposed crossing will not impact a high-quality, meandering stream. On the contrary, the stream is a straight, manmade ditch that originates from the detention pond immediately upstream of the Boardwalk Drive road crossing (3-foot diameter culvert). The stream at the proposed road crossing is channelized, lacks bedform diversity, and is stained with shading dye from the detention pond at its headwaters, which is located approximately 400 feet upstream of the proposed crossing. Providing a shorter crossing to minimize impacts to such a degraded stream, while significantly increasing safety risks and costs, was not considered practical. The proposed stream crossing is the safest route because it is much farther away from higher intensity vehicle traffic than the alternative routes described below. The proposed stream crossing would allow four- to six-year-old children to utilize the exit at the northeast end of the building, which is located a safe distance (approximately 300 feet) from vehicle traffic, the convergence of two parking lots and a street intersection on Boardwalk Drive. Children would walk directly to the proposed stream crossing, less than 50 feet from the building at the calming end of a parking lot. This access route would be safer for small children than the alternative access near Boardwalk Drive. Not having the proposed stream crossing would require children to use one of the following alternative access routes, which were excluded due to safety concerns. This area is not for field trips, but for daily outdoor play activities for approximately 14 ♦ 30 children at one time. It is less structured than a classroom; therefore, extra precautions are needed to reduce risks to the health and safety of the children. i. Alternative #1: Children would exit at the northeast end of the building as proposed, but instead of heading directly to the proposed stream crossing, they would turn and walk west approximately 200 feet along the 6-foot wide sidewalk between the parking lot and the building (increasing the risk of children wandering off between parked cars or disrupting other classrooms in progress); then turn northwest and walk for approximately 80 feet, crossing at a vehicle intersection where two parking lot drive lanes meet in front of the school at Broadway Drive; then turn north and walk at least 40 feet parallel to Boardwalk Drive, along a path that would need to be constructed within the 50-foot space between Boardwalk Drive (to the west) and the stream (to the east). ii. Alternative #2: Children would exit at the main entrance on the west side of the building; turn north and walk approximately 150 feet along the 10-foot wide sidewalk that runs along the parking lot in front of the building; then turn northwest and walk for approximately 80 feet, crossing at a vehicle intersection where two parking lot drive lanes meet in front of the school; then turn north and walk at least 40 feet parallel to Boardwalk Drive, along a path that would need to be constructed within the 50-foot space between Boardwalk Drive (to the west) and the stream (to the east). The current playground has no room to expand due to existing utility easements that prohibit building new site features within, access/delivery road in the back, overhead power lines, and other potential wetland impacts. Furthermore, AAPS is working to redefine what play means and transition to natural play as the new norm. The proposed natural playground will help shape the future stewards of the landscape.



**CORRECTION REQUEST (CORRECTED)**

**Project Alternatives**

A more thorough alternatives analysis is needed. In regards to the stream crossing, you must address why a shorter crossing is not feasible, as well as different crossing structures, like a bridge or a box culvert. You also need to expand on the option of eliminating the stream crossing. You've stated that walking along Boardwalk Dr. would be unsafe, however, a review of aerial photos shows an approximately 50 foot wide space between the stream and the road, which far exceeds the 15 foot space between the sidewalk and road across the street from the project site. Why can't that 50 foot space be safely utilized to avoid the stream impact? There also appears to be an existing playground at the school. Why can't that playground be utilized and expanded upon?

Created on 7/15/2021 3:36 PM by **Melissa Letosky**

**4 COMMENTS**

**Charles Humphriss (chumphriss@ectinc.com) (8/12/2021 6:10 PM)**

The current playground has no room to expand due to existing utility easements that prohibit building new site features within, access/delivery road in the back, overhead power lines, and other potential wetland impacts. Furthermore, AAPS is working to redefine what play means and transition to natural play as the new norm. The proposed natural playground will help shape the future stewards of the landscape.

**Charles Humphriss (chumphriss@ectinc.com) (8/12/2021 6:06 PM)**

A narrow bridge or box culvert with railings would make it relatively easy for a small child to step off the path immediately before or after the crossing and fall into the stream. The proposed 70-foot wide crossing is only approximately 60 feet wider than a bridge or box culvert. Native plantings will be installed on either side of the crossing as a barrier to further reduce the risk of a child falling into the stream. The proposed native plantings on either side of the crossing will also provide wildlife habitat and help offset stream impacts. It is important to note that the proposed crossing will not impact a high-quality, meandering stream. On the contrary, the stream is a straight, manmade ditch that originates from the detention pond immediately upstream of the Boardwalk Drive road crossing (3-foot diameter culvert). The stream at the proposed road crossing is channelized, lacks bedform diversity, and is stained with shading dye from the detention pond at its headwaters, which is located approximately 400 feet upstream of the proposed crossing. Providing a shorter crossing to minimize impacts to such a degraded stream, while significantly increasing safety risks and costs, was not considered practical.

**Melissa Letosky (LetoskyM@michigan.gov) (8/2/2021 4:12 PM)**

Not all of the requested information was provided. Please also address the crossing structure (bridge and box culvert) in your alternatives analysis and the possibility of expanding the existing playgrounds at the project site.

**Charles Humphriss (chumphriss@ectinc.com) (7/31/2021 10:52 AM)**

A. A shorter crossing is not feasible because it would increase the risk of four- to six-year-old children falling into the highly entrenched stream. B. The proposed stream crossing is the safest route because it is much farther away from vehicle traffic than the alternative routes described below. The proposed stream crossing would allow four- to six-year-old children to utilize the exit at the northeast end of the building, which is located a safe distance (approximately 300 feet) from vehicle traffic on Boardwalk Drive. Children would walk directly to the proposed stream crossing, less than 50 feet from the building. This access route would be safer for small children than the alternative access near Boardwalk Drive. Not having the proposed stream crossing would require children to use one of the following alternative access routes, which were excluded due to safety concerns. This area is not for field trips, but for daily outdoor play activities for approximately 14-30 children at one time. It is less structured than a classroom; therefore, extra precautions are needed to reduce risks to the health and safety of the children. i. Alternative #1: Children would exit at the northeast end of the building as proposed, but instead of heading directly to the proposed stream crossing, they would turn and walk west approximately 200 feet along the 6-foot wide sidewalk between the parking lot and the building (increasing the risk of children wandering off between parked cars or disrupting other classrooms in progress); then turn northwest and walk for approximately 80 feet, crossing at a vehicle intersection where two parking lot drive lanes meet in front of the school at Broadway Drive; then turn north and walk at least 40 feet parallel to Boardwalk Drive, along a path that would need to be constructed within the 50-foot space between Boardwalk Drive (to the west) and the stream (to the east). ii. Alternative #2: Children would exit at the main entrance on the west side of the building; turn north and walk approximately 150 feet along the 10-foot wide sidewalk that runs along the parking lot in front of the building; then turn northwest and walk for approximately 80 feet, crossing at a vehicle intersection where two parking lot drive lanes meet in front of the school; then turn north and walk at least 40 feet parallel to Boardwalk Drive, along a path that would need to be constructed within the 50-foot space between Boardwalk Drive (to the west) and the stream (to the east).

**Project Compensation: Describe how the proposed impacts to state and federal regulated waters will be compensated, OR explain why compensatory mitigation should not be required for the proposed impacts. Include amount, location, and method of compensation (i.e., bank, on-site, preservation, etc.)**

We ask that EGLE reconsider its position of requiring wetland mitigation, for impacts under 1/3 of an acre, based solely on the availability of mitigation credits. Please consider waiving the wetland mitigation requirement for the following reasons. i. Wetland mitigation is expensive. The wetland mitigation bank credits EGLE suggested cost \$120,000 per acre. It is our understanding that 1.5 acres of mitigation would be required per acre of impacts, based on the proposed impacts to the existing scrub-shrub wetland type. Therefore, purchasing mitigation credits for the 0.27 acres of proposed impacts would cost nearly \$48,600. The school has limited financial resources on already tight budgets and committed expenditures. ii. The purpose of the proposed natural playground is to create a safe space for kids to get out in nature. The proposed playground would provide natural elements (stones, boulders, logs, stumps, etc.) for play, exploration, imagination, creativity, and develop social skills. Children would also learn about nature and develop a deeper appreciation for wetlands and other natural spaces. iii. The proposed project would only affect a low-quality scrub-shrub wetland that lacks plant and tree species diversity and provides marginal habitat value. Existing vegetation is predominately invasive, non-native species such as buckthorn and honeysuckle, which have excluded many native species that local wildlife depend on. Mitigation would be more reasonable if the proposed project impacted a high-quality wetland type such as a fen or wet prairie, but this is not the case. iv. The proposed natural playground was designed to minimize wetland impacts. The size of disturbed areas for the natural playground was limited to keep wetland impacts below 1/3 of an acre. The location of the proposed natural playground was selected to maximize the use of uplands and reduce wetland impacts. A boardwalk was incorporated to help maintain existing drainage patterns. v. Ann Arbor Public Schools (AAPS) is exempt from the City of Ann Arbor's wetland mitigation requirements. For the 0.27 acres of proposed wetland impacts, would EGLE be willing to accept a commitment from AAPS to restore some of the remaining 1.13 acres of scrub-shrub wetlands surrounding the proposed natural playground as an alternative to the more conventional mitigation options? AAPS could provide a letter to formalize its commitment to making a good faith effort to complete restoration activities within the next 3 to 5 years and incorporate the results into an outdoor education program. The goal is to provide a mitigation alternative, which would likely include invasive species removal and native planting, but not have it tied to the permit, so that the construction of the proposed playground can move forward this year and the unforeseen expenses related to the proposed wetland restoration could be spaced out over a longer period of time.

**CORRECTION REQUEST (CORRECTED)**

**Wetland Mitigation**

The statute says that we may waive the mitigation requirement when wetland impacts are less than 1/3 of an acre and no reasonable opportunity exists. There are credits available for purchase at a wetland mitigation bank with the project location watershed. As that is an available, reasonable opportunity, we will not be able to waive the mitigation requirement. Created on 7/15/2021 3:39 PM by **Melissa Letosky**

**3 COMMENTS**

**Charles Humphriss (chumphriss@ectinc.com) (8/12/2021 6:11 PM)**

For the 0.27 acres of proposed wetland impacts, would EGLE be willing to accept a commitment from AAPS to restore some of the remaining 1.13 acres of scrub-shrub wetlands surrounding the proposed natural playground as an alternative to the more conventional mitigation options? AAPS could provide a letter to formalize its commitment to making a good faith effort to complete restoration activities within the next 3 to 5 years and incorporate the results into an outdoor education program. The goal is to provide a mitigation alternative, which would likely include invasive species removal and native planting, but not have it tied to the permit, so that the construction of the proposed playground can move forward this year and the unforeseen expenses related to the proposed wetland restoration could be spaced out over a longer period of time.

**Melissa Letosky (LetoskyM@michigan.gov) (8/2/2021 4:15 PM)**

EGLE may reconsider the mitigation requirement if the applicant proposes alternative mitigation methods (i.e. conservation easements, wetland enhancements, etc.). Please provide an alternative to purchasing mitigation credits for our consideration.

**Charles Humphriss (chumphriss@ectinc.com) (7/31/2021 10:58 AM)**

We ask that EGLE reconsider its position of requiring wetland mitigation, for impacts under 1/3 of an acre, based solely on the availability of mitigation credits. Please consider waiving the wetland mitigation requirement for the following reasons. i. Wetland mitigation is expensive. The wetland mitigation bank credits EGLE suggested cost \$120,000 per acre. It is our understanding that 1.5 acres of mitigation would be required per acre of impacts, based on the proposed impacts to the existing scrub-shrub wetland type. Therefore, purchasing mitigation credits for the 0.27 acres of proposed impacts would cost nearly \$48,600. The school has limited financial resources on already tight budgets and committed expenditures. ii. The purpose of the proposed natural playground is to create a safe space for kids to get out in nature. The proposed playground would provide natural elements (stones, boulders, logs, stumps, etc.) for play, exploration, imagination, creativity, and develop social skills. Children would also learn about nature and develop a deeper appreciation for wetlands and other natural spaces. iii. The proposed project would only affect a low-quality scrub-shrub wetland that lacks plant and tree species diversity and provides marginal habitat value. Existing vegetation is predominately invasive, non-native species such as buckthorn and honeysuckle, which have excluded many native species that local wildlife depend on. Mitigation would be more reasonable if the proposed project impacted a high-quality wetland type such as a fen or wet prairie, but this is not the case. iv. The proposed natural playground was designed to minimize wetland impacts. The size of disturbed areas for the natural playground was limited to keep wetland impacts below 1/3 of an acre. The location of the proposed natural playground was selected to maximize the use of uplands and reduce wetland impacts. A boardwalk was incorporated to help maintain existing drainage patterns. v. Ann Arbor Public Schools (AAPS) is exempt from the City of Ann Arbor's wetland mitigation requirements.

**Upload any additional information as needed to provide information applicable to your project regarding project purpose sequence, methods, alternatives, or compensation.**

NONE PROVIDED

**Comment**

NONE PROVIDED

**Resource and Activity Type**

**Important! Answer all questions completely. Properly identifying your project in this section generates the proper application sections. Incomplete applications will require corrections before they can be fully processed.**

**SELECT THE ACTIVITIES from the list below that are proposed in your project (check ALL that apply). If you don't see your project type listed, select "Other Project Type". These activities listed require additional information to be gathered later in the application.**

Culverts - Stream Only

Other Project Type

Fences

CORRECTION REQUEST (APPROVED)

**Activities**

Please also select fence from this list and complete the fence section for all portions of the fence proposed in wetland.  
Created on 7/15/2021 3:42 PM by **Melissa Letosky**

1 COMMENT

**Charles Humphriss (chumphriss@ectinc.com) (7/31/2021 11:57 AM)**

The JPA has been revised on the MiWaters website to reflect the anticipated wetland impacts associated with the proposed chain-link fence that will surround the proposed playground.

**The Proposed Project will involve the following resources (check ALL that apply).**

Wetland

Stream or River

**Major Project Fee Calculation Questions**

---

**Is filling of 10,000 cubic yards or more proposed (cumulatively) within wetlands, streams, lakes, or Great Lakes?**

No

**Is dredging of 10,000 cubic yards (cumulatively) or more proposed within streams, lakes, or Great Lakes? (wetlands not included)**

No

**Is new dredging or adjacent upland excavation in suspected contamination areas proposed by this application?**

No

**Is a subdivision, condominium, or new golf course proposed?**

No

**Wetland Project Information and Impacts**

**PLEASE READ**

This section is for entering information regarding the impacts to Wetlands only. Do not input information that pertains to other resources (inland lakes, streams, floodplains, etc.). The initial questions are related to wetlands on the project site in general. The Proposed Activities questions are grouped into Fill, Dredge, Structures, Other and are only for wetland impacts related to these activities.

[Click HERE for more information on Wetlands Protection Program.](#)

**Has a professional wetland delineation been completed for this site?**

Yes

**Attach a copy of wetland delineation report with data form.**

[Wetland\\_map\\_and\\_datasheets.pdf - 07/31/2021 11:01 AM](#)

**Comment**

NONE PROVIDED

CORRECTION REQUEST (APPROVED)

**Wetland Datapoints**

The delineation document only contains a map. Please provide all datapoints (wetland and upland) that were completed during the delineation.

Created on 7/15/2021 3:43 PM by **Melissa Letosky**

1 COMMENT

**Charles Humphriss (chumphriss@ectinc.com) (7/31/2021 11:02 AM)**

Datasheets for the wetland and upland sampling points have been attached to the revised JPA and uploaded to the MiWaters website.

**Total acres of wetland affected by this project.**

Category	Affected area (acres)
Permanent	0.27
Temporary	0.0
	Sum: 0.27

**Is filling or draining of 1 acre or more (cumulatively) of wetland proposed?**

No

**Select all wetland types that will be affected by this project:**

Scrub-shrub

The following questions gather information on the specific Types of Activities your project includes that will impact WETLANDS. There are four overall Types of Activities: Fill, Dredge, Structure, Other. Under each of the Activity Type questions, specific activity lists will be shown. If the activity is not shown in the list given, select None of the Above and move to the next question. When you select an activity under Fill, Dredge, Structure, or Other, a table will appear under that type. Only enter the dimensions of the activity that are within wetland. Multiple activities covering the same footprint may be combined on one line in the table. Continue to answer the Activity Type questions (Fill, Dredge, Structure, Other) until all have been answered with either a specific Activity listed under that Type or  None of the Above. If you did not find your activity in any list then select  Other, Other and provide a description of your activity.

If your project includes placing fill in wetland then select the proposed activities from the following list. If your activity is not shown, then select  None of the Above and move to the next question. Only enter an impacted area in one of the impact tables (do not duplicate impact entries):

General Fill

Path/Sidewalk

Grading or Mechanical Land Clearing

Complete this table for projects involving Fill. Enter each activity/ location that corresponds with each activity selected in the previous question and enter the dimensions. Activities may be entered in one line of the table if they occupy the same impact footprint and cannot be broken out separately (Example: Activity - Driveway and Riprap slope). Multiple activities in different locations should be listed on different lines of the table.

Activity	Length (feet)	Width (feet)	Depth (feet)	Area (square feet)	Volume (cubic feet)	Volume (cubic yards)	Corrected value for complex impact AREAS (square feet)
Wetland Impact 1	75	4	2	300	600	22	NONE PROVIDED
Wetland Impact 2	112	0.5	1.5	56	84	3	NONE PROVIDED
Wetland Impact 3	150	57.5	0.33	8625	2846.25	105	NONE PROVIDED
Wetland Impact 4	6	4.5	1.25	27	33.75	1	NONE PROVIDED
Wetland Impact 5	118	20	1.33	2360	3138.8	116	NONE PROVIDED
Wetland Impact 6	1	52	3.5	52	182	7	NONE PROVIDED
				Sum: 11420	Sum: 6884.8	Sum: 254	Sum: NaN

**Source of Fill Material:**

Off-site

**Please Describe**

clean fill

**Type of Fill.**

Other: Topsoil

**Is riprap proposed?**

No

Select from the following list for Excavation/Dredge Activities (if your proposed project is primarily a structure enter the impact as a structure. Only enter an impacted area in one of the impact tables in one impact section):

None of the above

If your project includes STRUCTURES IN WETLAND then select all of the proposed activities in the following list. If your activity is not shown, then select  None of the Above  and move to the next question. Only enter an impacted area in one of the impact tables (do not duplicate impact entries):

Boardwalk

Fence

**Projects involving Structures:**

Activity	Length (feet)	Width (feet)	Depth (feet)	Area (Sq. feet)	Volume (cubic feet)	Volume (cubic yards)	Corrected value for complex impact AREAS (square feet)
Boardwalk - timber bridge	55	6	.5	330	165	6	NONE PROVIDED
Chain-link fence posts	412	.1	4	41.2	164.8	6	NONE PROVIDED
				Sum: 371.2	Sum: 329.8	Sum: 12	Sum: NaN

**Is the structure proposed on pilings or fill or both?**

Pilings

**How high above the ground is the bottom of the structure?**

Boardwalk: 0.25 feet; Chain-link fence: 0.0 feet (flush with ground)

If your project includes Other Activities in WETLAND not listed in this section, then select from the proposed activities in the following list. If your activity in Wetland has not been listed in this Wetland Section, then select  Other  and enter a description of your activity. Only enter an impacted area in one of the impact tables (do not duplicate impact entries). If you selected a Fill, Excavation/Dredging, or Structure activity above in this section, but do not have an activity listed as Other, then select None of the Above for this question.

None of the above

**Wetland Mitigation**

EGLE may impose as a condition of any wetland permit, other than a General permit, a requirement form compensatory mitigation. The wetland mitigation requirement may be waived for projects affecting less than one-third of an acre of wetland if no reasonable opportunity for mitigation exists.

Mitigation plans according to the mitigation checklist (link) are required for a complete application

[Wetland Mitigation Information](#)

## Is Wetland Mitigation being proposed as part of this proposed project?

No

### Explain why no mitigation is proposed.

We ask that EGLE reconsider its position of requiring wetland mitigation, for impacts under 1/3 of an acre, based solely on the availability of mitigation credits. Please consider waiving the wetland mitigation requirement for the following reasons. i. Wetland mitigation is expensive. The wetland mitigation bank credits EGLE suggested cost \$120,000 per acre. It is our understanding that 1.5 acres of mitigation would be required per acre of impacts, based on the proposed impacts to the existing scrub-shrub wetland type. Therefore, purchasing mitigation credits for the 0.27 acres of proposed impacts would cost nearly \$48,600. The school has limited financial resources on already tight budgets and committed expenditures. ii. The purpose of the proposed natural playground is to create a safe space for kids to get out in nature. The proposed playground would provide natural elements (stones, boulders, logs, stumps, etc.) for play, exploration, imagination, creativity, and develop social skills. Children would also learn about nature and develop a deeper appreciation for wetlands and other natural spaces. iii. The proposed project would only affect a low-quality scrub-shrub wetland that lacks plant and tree species diversity and provides marginal habitat value. Existing vegetation is predominately invasive, non-native species such as buckthorn and honeysuckle, which have excluded many native species that local wildlife depend on. Mitigation would be more reasonable if the proposed project impacted a high-quality wetland type such as a fen or wet prairie, but this is not the case. iv. The proposed natural playground was designed to minimize wetland impacts. The size of disturbed areas for the natural playground was limited to keep wetland impacts below 1/3 of an acre. The location of the proposed natural playground was selected to maximize the use of uplands and reduce wetland impacts. A boardwalk was incorporated to help maintain existing drainage patterns. v. Ann Arbor Public Schools (AAPS) is exempt from the City of Ann Arbor's wetland mitigation requirements.

## Stream Project Information (1 of 1)

### Stream Information

This section is for entering information regarding the impacts to a stream only. Do not input information that pertains to other resources (inland lakes, Great Lakes, floodplains, etc.).

If there are multiple streams associated with the project impacts, or different Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) elevation data on the stream reach, provide the information in duplicate stream project information tabs by clicking on DUPLICATE at the top right or bottom of this screen.

Elevation data must include a description of the reference point or benchmark used and its corresponding elevation. If elevations are from still water provide the observation date and water elevation. Include information in this section only as it pertains to proposed project activities in regards to impacts to streams.

This section is for entering information regarding the impacts to Streams only. Do not input information that pertains to other resources (Great Lakes, streams, floodplains, etc.).

Elevation data must include a description of the reference point or benchmark used and its corresponding elevation. If elevations are from still water provide the observation date and water elevation. Information provided in this section should pertain only to proposed activities in regards to Inland Lake impacts.

An OHWM can be determined by either surveyed information or through measurements taken in reference to a static benchmark such as an observed water level or base of a tree, etc. The following information indicates how to determine the OHWM in different situations:

OHWM for Inland Lakes (Part 301) is the line between upland and bottomland identified by the presence of a distinct change in character of the land caused by successive changes in water levels.

In Section 10 regulated waters, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) regulates activities below the USACE Great Lakes OHWM elevation.

See EGLE's YouTube Series for OHWM video tutorials, and the sample OHWM drawing for more information.  
[Determining the Ordinary High Water Mark \(OHWM\) - Video](#)

### Please provide a name for the stream, river, channel:

Unnamed drain

### Stream Water elevation reference\* (show elevation on plans with description):

NAVD 88

### Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) elevation (feet):

821.75

Date of observation (M/D/Y)

5/5/2021

What length (feet) does the project activity(ies) extend waterward of the OHWM?

10.7

What length (feet) does the project activity(ies) extend landward of the OHWM?

20

Is the drainage area upstream of the proposed project area greater than 2 sq. miles?

No

What is the the width (feet) of the stream where the water begins to overflow its banks. This is called the Bankfull width.

10.7

Will a turbidity curtain be used during the proposed project?

Yes

If there are multiple streams associated with the project impacts, or different Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) elevation data on the stream reach, provide the information in duplicate stream project information tabs by clicking on DUPLICATE or ADD NEW below. This adds a new section where you will enter the information about additional project impacts.

## Inland Lakes, Great Lakes and Stream Impacts (1 of 1)

### PLEASE READ

This section will collect information regarding Inland Lakes, Great Lakes, and Streams impacts and activities only. The initial questions are related to which waterbody the impacts pertain to. When there are multiple waterbodies (e.g., some impacts are on an inland lake and some impacts are on a stream), fill out a DUPLICATE tab for each waterbody impacted. For each waterbody, questions will be asked regarding the proposed activities. Proposed Activities questions are grouped into Fill, Dredge, Structures, Other and are only for the impacts related to these groups. Click [HERE](#) for more information on the Inland Lakes and Streams Protection Program.

[Link to information on Inland Lakes and Streams Permitting](#)

The following impact description applies to: (select only one at a time, duplicate this entire section if there are impacts to multiple waterbody types):

Stream

### Linear feet of stream affected by your project

Category	Affected linear feet (ft)
Permanent	82
Temporary	0
	Sum: 82

The following questions gather information on the specific Types of Activities your project includes that will impact INLAND LAKES, STREAMS, AND GREAT LAKES. There are four overall Types of Activities: Fill, Dredge, Structure, and Other. Under each of the Activity Type questions, specific activity lists will be shown. If the activity is not shown in the list given, select None of the Above and move to the next question. When you select an activity under Fill, Dredge, Structure, or Other, a table will appear under that type. Only enter the dimensions of the activity that are within INLAND LAKES, STREAMS, or GREAT LAKES. Multiple activities covering the same footprint may be combined on one line in the table. Continue to answer the Activity Type questions (Fill, Dredge, Structure, Other) until all have been answered with either a specific Activity listed under that Type or  None of the Above . If you did not find your activity in any list then select  Other, Other  and provide a description of your activity.

Select from the following list all Fill Activities (select all that apply to this waterbody impacted):

General Fill

Complete this table for projects involving Fill below the Ordinary High Water Mark. Enter each activity/ location that corresponds with each activity selected in the previous question and enter the dimensions. Activities may be entered in one line of the table if they occupy the same impact footprint and cannot be broken out separately (Example: Activity - Driveway and Riprap slope). Multiple activities in different locations should be listed on different lines of the table.



Activity	Length (feet)	Width (feet)	Depth (feet)	Area (square feet)	Volume (cubic feet)	Volume (cubic yards)	Corrected Value for complex impact Area (square feet)
Culvert bedding	70	9.25	1	647.5	647.5	24	NONE PROVIDED
Culvert inlet apron	4	10.7	1.5	42.8	64.19999999999999	2	NONE PROVIDED
Culvert outlet apron	8	10.7	1.5	85.6	128.39999999999998	5	NONE PROVIDED
				Sum: 775.9	Sum: 840.1	Sum: 31	Sum: NaN

**Type of Fill**

Gravel

**Source of Fill**

Off-site

**Is riprap proposed?**

Yes

**Indicate size range of riprap:**

4" x 8" riprap for culvert inlet/outlet aprons 6AA gravel for culvert bedding

**Type of riprap**

Field stone

**Will material be installed under the riprap?**

No

**Activities Involving Dredging or Excavation: Select from the following list for Excavation/Dredge Activities (select all that apply to this waterbody impacted):**

General Dredging New (lakes, stream, Great Lakes below OHWM)

**Projects involving Excavation/Dredging below the Ordinary High Water Mark:**

Activity	Length (feet)	Width (feet)	Depth (feet)	Area (square feet)	Volume (cubic feet)	Volume (cubic yards)	Corrected value for complex impact Areas (square feet)
Culvert embedment	70	9.25	1	647.5	647.5	24	NONE PROVIDED
Culvert bedding	70	9.25	1	647.5	647.5	24	NONE PROVIDED
Culvert inlet apron	4	10.7	1.5	42.8	64.19999999999999	2	NONE PROVIDED
Culvert outlet apron	8	10.7	1.5	85.6	128.39999999999998	5	NONE PROVIDED
				Sum: 1423.4	Sum: 1487.6	Sum: 55	Sum: NaN

**Has this area been previously dredged?**

No

**Is long-term maintenance dredging proposed?**

No

**What is the method used to be dredged?**

Mechanical

**Has the dredge material been tested?**

No

**Bottom dredge elevation determined by?**

Reference datum

**Elevation:**

818.0 NAVD88

**Spoils Disposal**

**Will the excavation/dredge spoils be disposed of on site or off site?**

Off-site

**Where will the excavation/dredge spoils be disposed of?**

Nearest landfill

If your project includes STRUCTURES then select all of the proposed activities in the following list. If your activity is not shown, then select  None of the Above  and move to the next question. Only enter an impacted area in one of the impact tables (do not duplicate impact entries):

Culvert

**Projects involving Structures constructed below the Ordinary High Water Mark:**

Activity	Length (feet)	Width (feet)	Depth (feet)	Area (square feet)	Volume (cubic feet)	Volume (cubic yards)	Corrected value for complex impact AREAS (square feet)
Culvert	70	7.25	3	507.5	1522.5	56	NONE PROVIDED
				Sum: 507.5	Sum: 1522.5	Sum: 56	Sum: NaN

If your project includes Other Activities not listed in this section, then select from the proposed activities in the following list. If your activity has not been listed in this Section, then select  Other  and enter a description of your activity. Only enter an impacted area in one of the impact tables (do not duplicate impact entries). If you selected a Fill, Excavation/Dredging, or Structure activity above in this section, but do not have an activity listed as Other, then select None of the Above for this question.

None of the above

**Does the proposed project include mitigation?**

none

If there are multiple waterbodies associated with the project impacts, or different Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) elevation data on the waterbody, provide the information in duplicate stream project information tabs by clicking on DUPLICATE or ADD NEW below. This adds a new section where you will enter the information about additional project impacts.

**Fences**

**Purpose of fence:**

Other: Chain-link fence will surround proposed playground

**Total length (feet) of fence through**

Streams	Wetlands	Floodplains
0	412	0

**Fence Type and Material:**

Steel chain-link fence with black polymer coating

**Fence height (feet)**

4.0

**Bridges and Culverts (1 of 1)**

**Complete once for a single structure or add multiple sections when multiple structures are proposed.**

Use the duplicate button to copy this section to enter information about each individual structure. If there are two or more you should duplicate for each one.

**Unique Identifier:**

Proposed Culvert - Refer to Details 6 and 7 on Sheet 11 of Plans

**STREAM INFORMATION**

**Width of the stream**

Upstream (feet)	Downstream (feet)
10.7	10.7

**Cross-sectional area of primary channel (square feet):**

15.2

**The width of the stream where the water begins to overflow its banks. Bankfull width (feet):**

10.7

**Is there an existing structure?**

No

Click the link below to view bridge profile sample drawings.

[Click here for link](#)

**Help for the following Table**

Structure Width: Enter the total width of culvert or bridge in feet.

Culvert Length or Bridge span: Enter the total length perpendicular or across the stream in feet.

Culvert Height Prior to any burying: Enter the total width of culvert in feet at this location as it measures on land. Do not subtract any depth the culvert may be buried. For bridges enter "0".

Depth culvert buried: Enter total feet the culvert bottom will be buried. Does not apply to bridges so enter "0".

Bottom of bridge beam (upstream) elevation (feet): For culverts enter "0".

Bottom of bridge beam (downstream) elevation (feet): For culverts enter "0".

Stream Invert Elevation (feet) Upstream: This is the elevation at the bottom of the culvert as it lies in place after installation on the upstream end of the culvert, not including any fill on the culvert bottom.

Stream Invert Elevation (feet) Downstream: This is the elevation at the bottom of the culvert as it lies in place after installation on the downstream end of the culvert, not including any fill on the culvert bottom.

Bride rise from bottom of beam to streambed or culvert crown height (feet): This is the elevation at the top of the culvert as it lies in place after installation, for bridges this is from the bottom of the beam. Do not including any fill on top of the culvert or the bridge structure.

Total structure waterway area above streambed (square feet): This is the total square foot area that would allow passage of water through the structure opening.

Total structure waterway area below the 100-year elevation (square feet) (if known): This is the total square foot area that would allow passage of water that is below the 100-year flood elevation.

Elevation of road grade at structure (feet): Enter the elevation at the road above the structure.

Elevation of low point in road (feet): Enter the elevation of the lowest point in the road nearest the structure.

Distance from low point of road to mid-point of structure (feet): How far (in feet) from the structure does any fill used for the structure extend before it reaches the existing grade?

Length of approach fill from edge of bridge/culvert to existing grade (feet):

**Existing and Proposed Bridge and/or Culvert Information**

Question	Existing	Proposed
Bridge width or Culvert length (parallel to stream) (feet)	0	70
Bridge span or Culvert width/diameter (perpendicular to stream) (feet)	0	7.25
Height of culvert prior to burying (if bridge enter 0)	0	5.25
Depth culvert buried (feet) (if bridge enter 0)	0	1
Bottom of bridge beam (feet) upstream (if culvert enter 0)	0	0
Bottom of bridge beam (feet) downstream (if culvert enter 0)	0	0
Stream invert elevation at bridge (feet) upstream	0	820.1
Stream invert elevation at bridge (feet) downstream	0	820
Bridge rise from bottom of beam to streambed or culvert crown height (feet)	0	5.25
Total structure waterway opening above streambed (square feet)	0	24.9
Total structure waterway area below the 100-year elevation (square feet) (if applicable)	0	-99
Elevation of road grade at structure (feet)	0	826.0
Elevation of low point in road (feet)	0	824.57
Distance from low point in road (feet)	0	16
Length of approach fill from edge of bridge/culvert to existing grade (feet)	0	11

### Culvert Type

Existing	Proposed
NONE PROVIDED	Arch

### Culvert Material

Existing	Proposed
NONE PROVIDED	Corrugated Metal

### Structure Entrance Design Type:

Existing	Proposed
NONE PROVIDED	Projecting

### Certification Upload

NONE PROVIDED

### Comment

NONE PROVIDED

## Upload of Proposed Site Plans

### REQUIRED Application, maps, and drawings:

\*Overall Project Site Plan

\*Cross-Sectional Drawings

For Part 315 Dam Safety applications attach detailed signed and sealed engineering plans for a Part 315 dam repair, dam alteration, dam abandonment, or dam removal.

[Examples site plan and cross-sectional drawings](#)

[For additional information on maps, drawings, and other attachments visit michigan.gov/jointpermit](#)

**Required on all Site Plan uploads. Please identify that all of the following items are included on your plans that you upload with this application.**

Site Plan Features	Existing and Proposed Plan Set
Scale, Compass North, and Property Lines	Yes
Fill and Excavation areas with associated amounts in cubic yards	Yes
Any rivers, lakes, or ponds and associated Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM)	Yes

Site Plan Features	Existing and Proposed Plan Set
Exterior dimensions of Structures, Fill and Excavation areas associated with the proposed project	Yes
Dimensions to other Structures and Lot Lines associated with the project	Yes
Topographic Contour Lines from licensed surveyor or engineer when applicable	Yes

**Upload Site Plans and Cross Section Drawings for your Proposed Project**

[ECT\\_WestermanNaturalPlayground\\_EGLE\\_PermitDrawings\\_073121\\_FINAL.pdf - 07/31/2021 12:12 PM](#)  
**Comment**  
 NONE PROVIDED

**Additional Required and Supplementary Documents**

[Culvert Basis of Design Memo\\_2021-6-23.pdf - 06/23/2021 05:33 PM](#)  
[EGLE\\_JPA\\_Westerman\\_Response\\_Letter\\_2021-8-12.pdf - 08/12/2021 06:16 PM](#)  
**Comment**  
 NONE PROVIDED

**Fees**

The application fee identified in this section is a calculation based on answers to the questions in this application. This calculation is an estimate of the total fee and will be reviewed by the application processor to determine if any additional fees are required for a complete application.

Individual Permit Fee:
+\$500.00

**Total Fee Amount:**  
 \$500.00

**Is the applicant or landowner a State of Michigan Agency?**  
 No

**Revisions**

Revision	Revision Date	Revision By
Revision 1	6/14/2021 11:58 AM	Lauren Edson
Revision 2	7/19/2021 4:20 PM	Charles Humphriss
Revision 3	8/12/2021 6:00 PM	Charles Humphriss

